

We now begin the two year course in Church History. Some of you who are Seniors have the second half of the course two years ago, and are now taking the first half. The Juniors and the Middlers (1/2 - 1 undistinguishable) that may pass over the heads of the others who have not had the subject, . So I don't think that it makes a tremendous lot of difference which of the two halves you take first. Most you, of course, however are taking it in regular chronological order and so for you this is our first course in the Seminary year in Church History, and before we begin our consideration then of the material I would like to say a few introductory words (~~ix~~ 1 and 1/2 thru 2 indistinguishable)

Some people think of Church History or think of any kind of history as just a matter of names and dates. There's a long list of names and a long list of dates and you ~~just~~ memorize it and it's just a matter of a few words and you put it down and you forget about it. You may remember for instance that Columbus discovered America ⁱⁿ ~~and~~ something in --'92. Was it 1492, was it 1892, was it 1292? It was something in --'92. That idea of names and dates is just something irrelevant, something in a series of words that ^{of course} is/absolutely meaningless. I don't care particularly whether you remember that Columbus discovered America in 1492 or 1493 or 1483. But it is tremendously important that you know that ^{America} ~~the~~ was discovered towards the end of the 15th century. A century is tremendously important in almost any date. The half century really ought to be learned. Not that the figure makes much difference but if you are going to see how things fit together, these dates are like pipes upon which you hang the various points in order that you see their interrelationship, and that adds tremendously to your understanding. So I'm hoping that you will learn a great many dates in the course of this year, but it is not a matter of knowing the precise year, but of knowing the relat-

ionship of other events. I would like you to know at least the century of the events and perhaps the half century and that way we will be able to see better how they fit together. But history if it is simply a matter of learning that so and so reigned from this year to that and this war was in this year etc. then it'll be absolutely meaningless. It is as if one were merely to learn the names of the bones in the human skeleton. A doctor has to learn that, it is very important, but ~~not~~ just to learn those names is of itself of no value, it is the relationship of one to another that is the vital thing. Now we are hoping this year to see something of the relationship. I think (4 1/4) first reason for our interest in (4 1/2) this question. How did conditions originate? How did present conditions originate? ^{Where} ~~not~~ did our present situation come from? Why are things the way they are today? It is easy enough to say, "Let's cast aside everything that rests on traditions of man, let's just go back to the Bible." But you just can't do that. You will find that a tremendous part of the factors of tradition are right are dependent on your environment and background and many of these are not to be cast just lightly aside. There may be things to consider and to compare, but in a great many of the things that are not mentioned much in the Bible, they have ^{pers} ~~ex~~isted and existed and stood as an established situation and are of great importance while others are purely accidental. I remember once reading Wilder Lipton telling of an incident when someone noticed one of the Czars of Russia, who noticed that on the front lawn of the great palace there in St. Petersburg, there was a certain spot out there on the grass where a soldier was always stationed. For eight hours this soldier ~~not~~ stood at that spot and then after eight hours the guard would march in, they'd relieve him, they'd put another soldier their for eight hours and eight hours later another one took the position and every minute day and night there was a soldier stationed right at that spot and not moving from the spot.

And this Czar said that is (6) the man is not particu
(indistinguishable)

to do with what happened and he ~~took an~~ began to take an interest at this point (6 3/4)
his arena of Russia had imported a rare shrub and had gotten it and plant
it on the foot of the lawn of her and she wanted to be sure that
that shrub stood there and so she (7) - (7 3/4)

in every government. You will find it in every country. You will find it
in every organization that there are situations that are just as meaningles
as that. If something has come down to us from the past, it may be that
it has a very good reason and is extremely vital even if we don't know
the reason. Tremendous harm might be done by changing that. That is true
of many, many things that have come down from the past. But there are
many other things that have come down which are just as meaningless as that
soldier standing there at that place where 100 years before there had been
a shrub. Just as meaningless, and to study history enables us to learn
something of the difference between these two types of things and to
evaluate in each class a certain thing ^{belongs.} ~~to/learn~~ quite I was/shocked a year
ago ~~to/learn~~, two or three years ago it was now, one of our students
occasionally attended services at a modernistic church here in town. At
that church they had a minister who (8;3/4)the Bible to pieces, who
denied all the great doctrines of the scripture, who gave simply typical
modernistic form. The people sat there in the pew and listened to his
sermons and the preacher (9) ^{and the minister read the scripture} ~~the~~ lesson that morning from
the revised /standard version and those people were simply up in arms. That was terrible!
They were accustomed to the good old King James english. It was good
enough for the Apostle Paul and it was good enough for them, and they
were up in arms and that minister would have lost his pulpit if he had
not agreed never again to read from anything But the King James version.

He could read those wonderful old words, " I do you to wit" and "He got into the top of a hill, etc." and then he could go on and tear the Bible to peices and destroy all the doctrines and they would snooze through his message and think that they had a wonderful blessing from it. It is an illustration of the way in which people get a devotion to something to which they are accust/omed, and think that it is of importance simpley because they are used to it and fail to see what is really vital and what is really important. Well now it sounds quite simple. You might say, "Let the soldier be removed from the place where he is guarding the shrub and place him somewhere that is vital to defense. Let's simply rearrange everything and put it in such a way that there will be purpose in it,"but that is much easier said than done. If you go into a church, I don't care/^{where}it is or what it is and you say, "I'm going to rearrange everything purely from the viewpoint of what is practical and what is taught in the scripture and classify everything thus," you might last a week or you might only last three days. It simply doesn't work the way human beings are made. You cannot, there are many things that you simply cannot do away with as quickly as that, but it is much better if you can get an understanding of it and can know the situation and when you continue something that is rather unreasonable but perfectly harmless, ^{that} realize that/^{is} what you are doing and that it is nothing you need to get greatly excited about one way or the other. And on the other hand to find out ~~what~~ the matters are, that though they may not appear particularly important,^{are} tremendously important and should be (11) halted. It is a very important thing and church history is a help in getting this understanding and determining just how to do it. So that is our first reason then, for the study of Church History. How did present conditions originate? Where do things come from that we have in the world today? ^{Personally} /I think that in the political sphere, ~~today~~ one of the silliest things in the world today is Nationalism. The idea of national sovereignty is absolutely

senseless. There is no reason for it whatever. It is an historical development. It is so established it is almost impossible to rule it out, and from it comes as much havoc and misery in the world as from almost any other source that I know of. And yet it is so routed that our leading statesman never even think, as far as the evidence goes, of even trying to rule it out. They always talk about the right to form nations, as if the nation had any right. An individual has a right. A million people have a right because they are a million people, not because they are a nation. A hundred million people have a right because they are a hundred million people, not because they happened historically to be grouped together in one group. It's utterly ridiculous and yet it conditioned a tremendous part of the thinking and of the attitudes of political life today. We will have to touch on many political features ~~and~~ naturally as we go through Church history, but of course, they are quite incidental to our purpose. Our purpose is to see the development of the church, but you can't see that without noticing ^{that} a good many points is relation to the political situation. So the political situation has vitally affected the church. This present day history discussed religion as if it were purely a by product of political and economic ~~and~~ condition. They will try to show you, for instance that the Reformation is the result of the economic and political condition in Europe at the time. It is easier ^{not} ~~just~~ for us to jump to the opposite extreme, as to say, "No, it is purely a working of the Spirit of God and has nothing to do with economic and political situation, and that would be utterly false. The Reformation is a working of the Spirit of God in the midst of a political and social and economic situation and political and economic and social situation had a tremendous bearing on the way the thing worked out and what came, and you can't understand it without understanding them, but they would never account for it. It is a great (14) which could not possibly be accounted for without giving the religious fact it's full weight, and we want to

which our present day atheistic destroyers mostly utterly neglect, but we do not want to neglect the other ~~side~~ factors which are also of importance in (end of record one)

How this present condition originates and it is a very vital one.

Our second question is: What should be authoritative today?

Now for us as Bible believing Christians it is very easy to take a very definite stand on this right at the start. It is easy for us to say, "Our authority is the Bible and there is no other authority." It is very easy for us to say that, and if we say that, ^{I think} we are mighty close to the truth. I do not feel that anything else has any reason to be authoritative to the Christian ~~but~~ ^{except} what God's word says, for that which is derived by necessary consequence from the teaching of the Word of God. That is our foundation. But you will find in every group of people anywhere, you will find that there is a tremendous amount which they consider extremely important and extremely authoritative which rests upon other considerations than a clear definite statement of the Word of God.

~~BBB/~~
Ch 2

~~How~~ How did present conditions originate, and it is a very vital one. Our second question is, "What should be authoritative today? Now for ~~us~~ as Bible-believing Christians it is very easy for us to take a very definite stand on this right at the start. It is easy for us to say, "Our authority is the Bible and there is no other authority." It is very easy for us to say that. And if we say that I think we are mighty close to the truth. I do not feel that anything else has any reason to be authoritative to the Christian except what God's Word says, or that which is derived by necessary consequences from the teaching of the Word of God. That is our foundation. But you will find in every group of people anywhere that there is a tremendous amount which they consider extremely important and extremely authoritative, which rests upon other

considerations than a clear, definite statement than the Word of God. And it is important therefore to know something of the historical background of these attitudes. I think we Protestants can find it very easy to ignore the Roman Catholic Church, and to act as if there were only Protestantism and heathenism. I think it is a great ~~mistake~~ mistake for us to do so. The Roman Catholic Church is one of the most vital and living factors in America today. As Modernism sweeps over areas of our country and destroys spiritual ~~life~~ life in them, the Roman Catholic is actively reaching out to take control of those factors of life and of thought in this country, and it is growing in this country. And outside of this country there are many more people in the world who are nominal Roman Catholics than there are nominal Protestants. Under ~~these~~ these circumstances it is extremely vital that a Protestant minister should know a great deal about the Roman Catholic Church. Now the Roman Catholic Church has in it a tremendous amount which is not nearly the result of development through the ages, but which is specifically based upon something other than the Scripture, and they will give these arguments as the evidence; they put great ~~weight~~ weight on tradition, and they put great weight on arguments which are not simply a matter of an appeal to the Bible. I think it is vital, when we are dealing with them to go right straight ~~back~~ back to the Bible and say, "The Bible is the foundation of Christianity, so recognized by the Roman Catholic Church. The Bible is the ~~only~~ foundation; we say it is the only ~~foundation~~ foundation; now let's see what the Bible says and let's stand on that." But I think that it is also necessary that we be able to evaluate their arguments based upon tradition. I picked up a book not so long ago written by a Roman Catholic, a history of the papacy through the ages, a book to which we will refer many times during this course, and in that book, at the end of the book, the man said that ~~despite~~ the fact that despite difficulties and troubles the papacy had continued all through the ages, and the power of the Roman pope had continued from the time of Peter right up to date was a very strong evidence of the fact that

it was the divinely established leadership of the church and authority of the church. Now it is vital that we look into that, that we see something of the history of the papacy, that we see what the true facts are. ~~Is there something there that should be authoritative to us.~~ People often talk about the early church, "We want ~~to see~~ our church to be like the early church. We want to go back to the early church." And then often, when you find out what they ~~mean~~ mean by it, they mean the church of the Third Century or the Fourth Century A.D. How much more authoritative for us are conditions two or three hundred years after ^{the time of} Christ than conditions a hundred years ago or two hundred years ago. Is there any reason why they should be more authoritative for us. We want to go into that. A girl ~~has~~ brought me a letter about three years ago from a friend of hers, a member of a very fine Presbyterian Church, but he was with the troops over in North Africa and he had had a great deal of contact with some Episcopaleans there. And he wrote this girl a letter and he said it is interesting to ~~see~~ ~~the~~ ~~remains~~ of a ~~church~~ church of the Third ~~Century~~ Century A.D. and see the great amount of material used in this little church for worship purposes. And he said, "You see how important the early Christians considered all these different things of form and ceremony and ~~arrangement~~ arrangement and we've gotten away from all that and we've lost true Christianity," and he wanted to go into the Episcopal Church of England, ~~the~~ the high, Anglo-~~Catholic~~-Catholic branch of it, and he felt that only there could he find true Christianity. And what is the evidence on that program. Church history enables us to not only take up the evidence and examine it but to read it in relation to its context and to get ~~an~~ an idea of what it actually amounts to. And so ~~I~~ I stated our present purpose: Just what is there that should be authoritative for us today? And I have ~~particularly~~ particularly in mind the relation to the Roman Catholic Church, but not ~~exclusively~~ exclusively.

And if he could learn something of how human affairs actually proceed, and learn where it is vital that he grapple with the situation and where he should simply let events take ~~the~~^{there} course, and not become too excited about it. In the end he will accomplish many times as much as if he doesn't have that background of understanding. And/is^{that} something that can only be secured by experience, but you can ~~get~~ get something of that experience by observing the course of the history of the church. I've mentioned already the matter of conservatism as a moving force in life. People are ~~used~~ accustomed to something and it is almost impossible to get them to ~~do~~ change it. I remember hearing about an English woman who was over in Italy a few years ago before the First World War, when Italian currency was somewhat simpler than it is today, and after she'd been there about a month she said to somebody, "Oh, I'd like to get back to England, where we won't have this complicated coin system." She ~~said~~ said, "How many sountines are there in a lira? Oh that's right, there's a hundred~~s~~, isn't there? Isn't that queer. I'd like to get back to England where everything is ~~so~~ simple, ~~where~~ where there's twelve pennies in a shilling, twenty shillings in a pound, and twenty-one shillings in ~~a~~ a

Well now to us Americans that English system is terrifi~~cally~~ complicated. I takes forever to get used to it. But to the Englishman who's born and brought up in it, and accustomed to figuring ha-pennies and ~~and~~ and shillings and~~s~~ guinees and florins andpounds, ~~it~~ it's all so simple and natural to him, that this idea of a coinage system in which you have a hundred of the lower thing to make the upper seems complicat~~ed~~ dreary, and I expect the English would almost rather starve to death than change their coinage system. We may say "How perfectly silly it is," but we are just as silly when we cling to our silly ~~antiquated~~ antiquated system of inches and feet and yards, instead of adopting the sensible metric system, but you'd have a terrible time persuading people accustomed to the inch and the mile system to change to another system. This force of conservatism is a

tremendous force. It's a good thing; it helps keep life together and keep us all from ~~split~~ shooting off in a thousand directions as we all different ideas, but it ~~becomes~~ becomes a harmful force when it becomes irrational. It is good to learn something of how it ~~works~~ has worked in ~~its~~ history, and to see something ~~of~~ of how it is ~~going~~ going to work in our own life, and what the points ~~at~~ ~~which~~ ~~it~~ ~~is~~ ~~necessary~~ ~~to~~ ~~try~~ ~~to~~ ~~make~~ ~~a~~ ~~change~~, and where it is better just simply to recognize it and go along with it as it is. I remember one time when I was instructor in another seminary. At that time a matter came up ~~at~~. It was in the depression. It was necessary that we should cut down our ~~en~~ entering class in order to cut down expenses and so we tried to make a set of rules ~~which~~ that would keep our entering class a little smaller than it intended to be then and try to pick the best men for it and we worked out a set of rules. Eight members of the faculty sat together two or three Saturdays ~~and~~ mornings and discussed one rule after another and none of us liked any of the rules very much, and the result was that we were quite dissatisfied with the system. I remember a certain little detail I was particularly dissatisfied with, and I said, "I would ~~not~~ like it stated here ~~in~~ in the rules, ~~it~~ 'It being understood that this applies only to the year 1934-35.' " And the chairman said to me, "Why what's the sense of putting that in here? The whole thing really applies to '34 and '35. It has nothing to do with any ~~year~~, it's just for ~~the~~ ~~year~~ ~~1934-35~~ this situation." I said, "I know that, but I'd like it stated right here so that ~~it~~ it's specific about these particular clauses here." He said, "All right, we'll put it in." ~~And~~ And after about three Saturday mornings when it was worked out. And then they started to adopt it as a whole, they put it to a vote and there was one vote for it and none against it, ~~but~~ but none of the rest of us liked it, but it was as good as we could work out, and mutually agreed on it. Well that was adopted for that year, and the next year I remember that somebody raised a certain question, and they said, "Why no, the rule

is such and such," and for the next several years, those rules were ~~effective,~~ ^{they were} effective, the laws of the Medes and Persians.

Noone ever thought of changing them; they were established, even though they'd been originally established for only one year. Once this thing get's established it has a certain force with people, it has a hold upon people and it's hard to get away from it, and so that's important in letting things get established. Very, very often one of you will come to me and you will say, some one of you will say, "I would like to do so and so, can I have this privilege? Can I arrange it this way? Can I do this?" And I will say to you, " Well, now I think that would be a fine thing to let you do." But what ~~is~~ ^{is} the precedent for others? We have to do it in such a way that someone can say, " Well, this is the way you do it, now you got to do it for me," when in his case it wouldn't apply. We have to make a rule that can have continuous (14) or else have a reason for changing it. Once this thing gets established, it tends to get set and there's nowhere I know of where you see it more ~~easily~~ ^{easily} than in Church History. How easily situations get set and how hard it is to change them once they get set. I've occassionally been one of a group of older men who have established an organization and we consider different things, Would we like to use this name of that name? Would we like to have this particular way or that particular way-(end of record.) that we thought would be more effective, and we thought we could change it doesn't work and then five or six years later you have a lot of younger fellows that come into the thing and perhaps grew up in it, and you find that to you then this thing is almost sacred, and to make ~~change~~ change in this thing that they have been use to all these years, they would fight terrifically ~~to~~ to avoid any change. It is established. It's the thing they are used to. It's the great wonderful thing. How easy it is for us to let secondary consideration become primary in our minds. And so this matter of seeing how this ^{ese} matters of Church

History have proceeded is vital now only to see how the present conditions have come into existence, but ^{it} ~~is~~ (1) to stand something which every one of ^{us} will find himself in this life today how they are apt to work out in one direction or another.

Nor the fourth question in Church History here, is a rather obvious one and a rather extremely important one, that some might think of as the first question. Some might think of as the only ~~problem~~ question. It is a very important question. How ~~does~~ ^{has} God worked? How has God (1 1/2) attention to a little group of men have stepped out for God and God has worked wonderfully through them. God has done marvelous things beyond our imagination. It is the most important course in Church History. It is ~~is~~ the most vital thing in the world the way in which God has worked and the way in which he does work. It is something that we can learn best of all from the study of the Bible of course, but we can see it in Church History and everywhere else and it is extremely vital for us, but the reason I didn't put it first on this list is because ~~is~~ as Theological Seminary students, we are interested in getting into the details of Church History and seeing the working out of many factors and I think that this factor can be learned better from the Bible than anywhere else. But there are other factors which we perhaps can learn from Church History particularly well, and therefore I have put this fourth. It is certainly first in importance, to see the hand of God as He has worked through the ages.

The fifth question is not nearly so obvious, but is (2 3/4) for the viewpoint of a Theological Seminary course in Church History, just as important, and it is something that is particularly vital for the Christian worker and the Christian leader to understand. #5 is to see how Satan has worked. You cannot understand human life, and you cannot

understand the History of the Church if you do not recognize Satan as an active, moving force. There is no other possible way to understand it. I have often heard a man give a talk on how God has worked in a particular mission, in a particular organization, in a particular advance and shown the wonderful way God has worked here and there and the other place and it is marvelous and we praise the Lord for it. But then I have had the man to dinner perhaps, and we have talked over ^{the} ~~the~~ affairs of organization ~~and~~ with which he is connected and as we have discussed it, ~~we~~ had mentioned something which went forward and looked just as fine as anything (4) and then it reached a certain point and ~~it~~ ^{it just} ~~went~~ this way. And he described another one and then this came in and you could see how time after time Satan had been working (4) You cannot explain this world by simply believing in an absolute God, and saying that explains everything. It does nothing of the kind. There is an absolute God who has established and controlled everything, but God for purposes of His own has chosen to permit Satan a very large measure of freedom in this age, and this world is Satan's world and when Johah fled from the purpose of God, he got down to Joppa and immediately he found a convenient ship already for him to take him off in the opposite direction from which God wanted. ~~It~~ The door was open to take him there, ^{if} ~~it~~ is the opening of a door that shows you God's will then be pretty sure that it is God's will, and not Satan's that is opening the door. Satan is very, very active in the world, and in Church History it is vital to see how (5) It is wonderful to see how in Germany, God worked through Martin Luther in that little group in North Germany and God ~~turned~~ ~~2/3~~ turned 2/3 of Germany and England and Scotland and Scandinavia to the Gospel and ~~the~~ Wonderful things God accomplished. It is wonderful to know that, but if you are going to understand the working of the world as it is today, it is also vital to see how the reformation spread all ~~over~~ across Poland and across Southern Germany and completely across Austria, and how Italy and Spain there were thous-

ands reading Martin Luther's works, and how 1/3 of France was crossed
 ans as fine a group of people the world has ever seen today, among
 the Hugenots of France. Then, how the Devil worked internal descension
 among these groups and how he brought in clever attacks of one source
 of another from the outside and utterly destroyed Protestantism in full,
~~and why the world of France~~ and I've been told that a number of criminals
 in U. S. of Polish extraction is far beyond the number of Poles in the
 U. S. and I'm absolutely certain that would not be the case, if the
 REformation is (6 1/2) . Poland, instead has had it's opportunity
 to go on as it made it's wonderul start and become a great christian
 nation. You go into Switzerland today and Denmark, and^{they}/say, I was
 reading a travel book and it said that you could lay down a gold piece
 in the Public Square and you can leave it and when you come back five
 years later it will still be there. The only thing that might have
 happened, it says, is that they might have stationed a policeman by
 it to guard it lest some foreigner should come. But it is a fact that
 in Switzerland and in (7) ;you don't hesitate to leave things
 around, it's perfectly safe, you don't think of anybody stealing from
 you and then you steip across the border into Italy and⁷into Spain and
 you hold your hand 7 1/4 Are the Italians and the
 Spanish naturally dishonest? Not at all! One group, I don't say that
 they know the Gospel today, but they have a background of the results
 of the Gospel. It has been effective in the life of the nation where
 they've established a traditon and an attitude which effects all teh'
 people in the nation and the other sections have been deprived of the
 opportunity to hear the Gospel and the reason for **if** cannot be accounted
 for altogether if you leave out the clever activity of Satan.in the course
 of History. Now it is vital then, that we see how Satan has worked and
 that we learn to realize that you won't necessarily step out as one man
 and turn the world over but one man with God can do a great deal but it

may be God's will in any situation in which you find yourself to permit Satan to have a tremendous effect 8 3/4 We must learn how to look to God for deliverance from the wiles of Satan and we must learn what attitude we must take, but we should certainly never cooperate in any way in any of his activities. So this fifth question is an extremely important one as ^{part of the purpose} ~~1st/2nd/3rd/4th~~ of the Church history.

And then the 6th purpose of Church history. The 6th is one in which is often very easily overlooked as we study about different centuries that we learn of the great men as we learn of the movements and as we learn of the developments of Doctrinal ceremonies and so on, it is easy for us to see those men simply as names moving across the paper. The events that ~~may~~ ^{are} at the stream of history as it proceeds on and I think ^{one of the} that ~~the~~ greatest values of history is #6 to see the great men of old as real men facing God. To see them in the situation in which they were adn to see how baffled they of~~en~~ were as they saw the circumstances before them, and ~~is~~ see some of the problems that faced them as they tried to make necessary decision and to ~~see~~ how often just a hairs breadth would turn them away from this decision or that and how they came to the right decision. (10) To see them as real men, men of flesh and blood like ourself. Men ~~of~~ who faced real problems. It wasn't simply a cut and dried thing. It's soleasy to get a simply account of the Reformation and think of this wonderful man Martin Luther who went and nailed something on the church door and immediatly the great ^{abric} ~~fabrics~~ of Rome fell down and the Reformation was established, but to see the problems that faced him when he decided whether to do that and to see what he had in mind and how different the results were from what he had im- agined. And to see the problems that faced him and for many of them he decided in such a wonderful way, and in some of them he made such very unfortunate 9 9/10 even to the present day. We cannot

unfortunately give the time and attention to number 6 that I'd like. We have too much material to cover and it will be only occasionally that we can really delve into the life of one of these great men, but even at the risk of losing something of the great movement and something of the matters connected with our other questions, I think it is worth our while to take time to come to know some of these men and to ~~try~~ understand their problems for it has a very great bearing on our own country and let us learn something of the method so that with the background of the material ~~at hand~~ we get here in class, you can yourselves do it later on for various individuals thru the courses. And so these are the six questions that we had in mind in these two years in this course in Church history. We want to see how these six different matters have worked out and we want to see how they apply in different forms of church history. We want to get a background of knowledge which ^{tremendously} should be ~~very~~ vital in helping us in our service for Christ together. When I had Church History it was a ~~two~~ three year ^{course} ~~book~~. I wish that we had time for a three year course here, but there is so much to cover in the three years and I do believe that the interpretation of the Bible is far more important, ^{so} ~~but~~ we have found it necessary to cut it down to a two year course. I think that we will cover all that is vital in Church History and that is necessary in an undergraduate Seminary course. (12 1/2)

But I remember that in that course, which I had in Seminary, there was a great deal of time spent of the Medieval (13) and we looked at the
 and the
 and we looked at a tremendous mass of ~~detail~~
 in the middle ages ~~and~~ which I find extremely interesting, and I would enjoy giving a whole year in the study of the middle ages, but from the viewpoint of our practical drive and our purpose is definitely practical in this course as in all our Seminary courses, and from the viewpoint of practical value it is tremendously important to know what happened in the last three centuries. Tremendously important because ~~that~~ effected a thousand times

more than what had happened earlier and is tremendously important that we know what happened in the first few centuries because that layed the foundation of our ^{christian} ~~present/that~~ world and because many people who will go back to that as if it were the supreme authority. And the middle period has less direct effect upon us (14)

we will have to spend very little time upon it along with the other things which are not of greater interest but of more practical value. I shall always try in our selection of material to have in mind what is most necessary for us in serving the Lord (14)1/4

Now I think that there is time left to assign a lesson. I don't like this new fifty minute hour, we use d to have 55 and I've been realizing that is much to be lost out of each of my classes, a lost of 5 minutes every day, but we have to put up with it and after all 14 1/2

simply gathering evidence for it. I would like everyone here to get a loose leaf note book and a few pages for it and have one page for each of these subjects, that is I would like to be able to start at the beginning. Acts 1, and then mention the verses which seem to come under the heads mentioned and give the number for it then turn over to the page where you have that particular subject and put down the reference there and give a brief statement of what ;you found there under that heading. It's an 15 study, it's not an exesgetical study. In this class we won't be able to take time to study what is in dealing with seven different subjects called A, B, C, Etc. The first is The Nature of the Churdh. end of record

The Early Church. How did the Early Church do things. We suppose God the Early Church. what the Early Church did is told in the Bible.

And ~~if~~ you will find in the Bible that there are times when the members of the Early Church disputed among themselves and ~~if~~ disagreed. One part of the Church did one thing and one did another. So after all, the question isn't, "What did the Early Church do?" but the question is "What did God command the Early Church to do?" You will find that in the Early Church there were certain customs and practices followed in the first days after Pentecost and then changes were made/ at God's express command, and surely it was God's will that we should follow the changes He commanded when

Christians did before He commanded these changes. You will find that a whole system of living was established in the early days when there was a small group that had all things common, which never seems to have been used again in the Early Church, but it continued in Jerusalem/^{for}some time. That is what anybody/~~if~~ would say. That means that the whole church should be as the little group of Christians in the early days did. But when we ask what the Early Church did, we do not have such a simple matter to discuss. The question isn't, "What did the Early Church do?" The question is, "What did God command the Early Church to do? What was God's will/^{for them}to do?" And we can be sure that they like we came very short of His will so many times. But of course a great many people put tremendous stress on the Early Church and ~~if~~ what the Early Church did, and the Early Church should certainly primarily mean the church of the First Century rather than any proceeding centuries. And here we strike the vital fact that of the First Century, aside from what the Bible tells, we know very, very little. There are many books which we call the New Testament-~~Apostles'~~ ^{Apocryphal} books, which purport to tell us about the First Century. But mostly if historians pay any attention as far as historical material is concerned to any of these so-called New Testament ~~Apostles-~~ Apocrypha. The Old ~~Testament~~ Testament Apocrypha are good

religious books that were used, which never claimed to be authoritative and which have been given an authority, standing by the only which no other early day considered them to have. The New Testament Apocrypha are books written by imaginative writers long after the events described, claiming to give us new information about the great leaders of the Faith, information which rests entirely upon the imagination of the writer. There is no one of the New Testament Apocrypha which has a serious claim to be considered as a historical document. There are a few writings by early Christians which ~~would~~ naturally give great importance for historical purposes if they gave us much historical knowledge. But they don't. We have today a few writings from early Christians shortly after the time of the apostles, and we are tremendously interested in what they say, but there are very few of them and they do not give us much information about history. The so-called New Testament Apocrypha, all of the Acts of Peter, the Acts of Philip, the Acts of the apocryphal acts of apostle after apostle, telling us of what wonderful things he did, and all of them written probably centuries after, and all of them full of miraculous events which are ready to, so different from the miracles of Christ in the New Testament. They also press the Apocryphal Gospels all sorts of ridiculous things which the Lord Jesus Christ is alleged to have done in His early life, and they also ~~were~~ ^{are} not accepted by anyone by any Christian group, as having any authority whatever. In the First Century of the church our knowledge is less than of any century in the ~~whole~~ whole history of the church, that is aside from the true one which the Bible gives. The Bible does tell us a great deal about the church, that is the early church in Jerusalem, and then about the missionary journeys of Paul, but it says practically nothing about the activities of the Christians after Paul was converted aside from the direct activity of the apostle Paul himself. It is a very important and vital study, the contents of the Book of Acts, but in this particular course, that is part of

through

it also is part of Biblical study. And so we consider that as Apostolic History, and a different course that deals with it. We do not go into the history of Acts in this course at all except to merely point out the place which it has in Church History, and that ~~1/180/147/~~ insofar as Church History is authoritative as telling us something about the early church, that history is to be found in the Book of Acts and in the Epistles which are ~~1/147/~~ found in the New Testament, along with a very little, a very few other things(?) which were written shortly after the time of the writings of the . We have very little knowledge about the First Century which directly relates to the church, but there's a good deal of knowledge of the First Century in general. Infact it is a fairly ~~1/147/~~ well known century, and it vital that we know something about it as background, not only for the history contained in Acts, but our imagination of what must have happened between Acts and the Second Century, and of course for the few facts that that we do know to have in that era.

(abstract
6/2/1914)

And so we will make a capital A under 1, "The World Into Which Christianity Came". the world into which Christianity came was different from the world at any previous time in history, and the period of four centuries during which the Christian religion overspread the Roman Empire. It's different from any four centuries in the history of the world, these four centuries. And so if we are to understand aright the history of Christianity, it is vital that we know something about the very peculiar and different situation of that particular time, a situation in some regards more like the conditions which relate to in 1914, than any other period in the history of the world. and that condition ~~1/147/~~ from 1807 to 1914 is more different ~~1/147/~~ from world conditions today than perhaps in any period in history, except for this First Century. So we will look at number one, The Political Situation. The Political

situation had a great deal to do with the condition. God prepared the way for the spread of the Gospel. He established a political situation at that time which was different from any that had existed before and which made it profitable for the Gospel to spread with greater ease than it ever before had occurred. That which is primary of course about the Political situation is the establishment of the Roman empire. An Empire which was established just 26 years before the birth of Christ. Rome as you know was a small city in Southern Italy which some centuries before the time of Christ had begun a career of conquest over it's ^{1200 years before the} 8 3/4 and ~~at~~ the time of Christ all of Italy had come under the control of the Romans and then there always have proceeded and in the course of 200 years they have conquered most of the rest of Europe except northern Europe; of course and they had penetrated quite a distance into Asia. Now this conquest is not of course the only great conquest which has occurred in the history of the world. The Assyrian conquest a number of areas, the Babylonians did also and the Persians, but the Romans conquest is very definitely ⁽⁹⁾ of the nature of the Roman Gov't. which made the conquest. If one thing for a man like Napoleon and like Alexander the Great to build up a tremendous military enterprise and to ~~possess~~ ^{conquer} a tremendous territory and that is one thing but for a power like the power of wolves which constantly ⁽¹⁰⁾ during the period of several centuries until eventually it has conquered such a large territory/^{as this} so a force of much longer continuance and duration, a force which is not dependent on the genius of one man, but which is dependent on the condition and the situation of the nation and the talents that it may possess, and which it has gotten thru it's control. And therefore it has an ~~influence~~ far greater influence on the world than just a second conquest which occurred. It is remarkable to read the history of a period of a century and a half before the time of Christ, When Rome possessed little ~~of~~ more than Italy itself and you notice that in that time ^{how} ~~the~~ the Roman force was able to interfere in the events which were in Egypt and in Asia and to interfere so effectively that a word from the Roman authority was apt to mean more than a large army in some other field and ~~so first~~ ^{the Romans had to fight} ~~it/means/that/they/did/it/~~ many wars in order to

maintain and to hold such a word of such an authority. But there was a system there in Roman which made it possible to exert this cause over a long period of years. Most of us tend to have the idea ~~that~~^{of} the Roman Emperor at the time of Christ as simply autocrats, dictators which were being told the things (11) and Christianity came into the world

that is not true. That sort of Dictatorship was present but it was something that ~~was~~^{was engrafted} over something else this had existed. The other thing was that ~~this had existed~~^{power} the Roman ~~Empire~~ was extended toward a system of orderliness, a which had the ability to continue itself and to take over large areas and to include them within it's jurisdiction. It was a system of law, it was a system of control, a system that was well enough established that (12) during a long period and there have been very few

like it in the history of the world and none other which has been effective in this way in which the Roman Empire was effective. I think that there are in many ways ~~that~~ a similarity between the British Empire and the Roman Empire, altho there is a very striking difference, but it is perhaps in this particularly, God's more (12Ø) than in the other Empire

And so you have a situation in which there was a center of authority which is not ~~so~~ merely a center of arbitrary authority but a center of law and order. A center which was the desires of the particular fever might be arbitrarily carried out, yet in general there was order and justice established wherever the Romans went, and there was a situation, a (13) discussions took place, in which ideas ^{re} presented in which men could travel freely, carrying these ideas with them. It is utterly different than from any dictatorship that has been established anywhere within this present century. The Roman Empire was a system which permitted and established a tremendous amount of freedom. As far as religion was concerned, the ~~so~~ Romans were not interested in what the religion was of the people. People were free to have their own religion. The persecution of just the Christians were originally developed from another reason than religion. Religion is made an excuse for other

reasons for persecutions and then later on when the persecutions became intense against the Christians, it was on the plane that the religion had certain features in it which ~~had/come~~ were contrary to the orderliness ^{and} ~~of~~ the law ~~and/other~~ of the Roman citizens and this plane was not made against other religions. The Romans did not attempt to secure a uniformity among the people. They didn't try to enforce a (14) of ideas among the people. They were given freedom of discussions, thought, of speech, freedom of religion. The freedom of the Roman Empire was probably greater than the freedom that ^{has} existed over so large an area (14 1/2) since that time, unless it be just since 18 end of record except for a table (0) ch 5 attempt of the supreme Government to enforce uniformity along certain particular lines. So you have a system of law and order established by a powerful force over a large area, such as the world had not seen before and has ^{scarcely} ~~never~~ seen since, which made a situation in which people in general could freely discuss the things of ^{the} Gospel and in which the message of the Gospel could freely travel about with a minimum of interference by the (1) We think of the Roman Emperors and their ~~and~~ powers, but it is important to mention that the ~~and~~ powers of the Roman Emperors was something that was exercised originally by their personalities and their individual talents and which only gradually came to (1 1/4) For centuries Rome had been a republic with a Gov't ~~with~~ ^{in which} the powers were transferred from one man to another with no supreme power of only one man and with officials being changed quite frequently and with the Roman Senate, a large group of men, that exercised a continuous control over the whole organization, and this ~~Christian~~ system of the Romans was theoretically continued during all of the Roman Empire and especially during its early days. The Roman Emperor was controlled (2) one position, and then another position in it and in time his word became to be supreme and the filling of these various positions ~~through~~ ^{but} unless he deliberately exerted himself to control every position in it the various officials would consider themselves as (2) to carry out the system

which had been ~~an~~ existence already for some time. A system ~~in~~ which they had responsibilities to the Roman Senate and in which they were certain laws and certain systems and orders that they were bound to (2 1/2). In the Book of Acts you do not find any criticism of the Roman Gov't. In fact, outside of the Book of the Revelation in the NT, the attitude toward Rome is rather friendly, and in Rev. it is only un (2 3/4) such as Babylon that we recognized pictures of Rome But in the NT aside from that the Roman Empire is represented as in general friendly. It is represented as a power which was maintaining good order. A power which might be indifferent but which was not harmful. And that was the attitude of the Roman power in the early days of the spread of the Gospel. Augustus, the first Emperor and the word "Emperor" originally simply meant "leader of an army", it was not a position, ~~it~~ actually in the Roman Gov't. Augustus established a golden stone in the throne in the center of Rome and from this center (3 1/2) was ^{during} ~~it~~ ~~was~~ ~~the~~ ~~distance~~ from this center of this golden stone in the center of Rome by and then from various connections they spread out into all of the Roman Empire. (3 3/4) into Spain and France and eventually they were continued in England and far to the East and in Africa, these roads were continued and there never have been such a system of roads before as the Romans established and over these roads there was constant traffic and constant commerce, constant sending of , there was a situation established that was easy for Christians in different parts of the Empire to maintain communications with each other and for them to help one another, a system which the world had never seen before. And so while the Roman Empire eventually became a great persecuting power and Christianity had to face the persecution of the Roman Empire, this persecution was after all (4 3/4) the great persecutions and in between comparative indifference and in early days there was complete indifference against the first great persecution which came not from the Romans but from the Greeks, Paul appealed to the Roman Empire and it was his appeal to Caesar from the

(5) that brought him to Rome for and it is probable that the condition is that at his first appeal to Caesar that is before one of the representatives of Caesar, in Rome, he was acquitted and was set free and later his death at the hands of came from entirely different and had nothing to do with the original situation in Jerusalem from which he had appealed to Caesar. So in the providence of God there was established this Roman Empire, which provided a widespread area of peace for a fairly long period. There has never been peace for as long a time in the history of the world before over so large an area as there ~~was~~ was in the first two centuries of the Christian era. There has never been such a success of communicating roads, and such a ^{6/8} that a man might freely pass from area to another without having to have passports and permission of officials and give a full account of what he was doing and why he was going and all the restrictions which dictators and autocrats have established since in order to make difficult dissemination of ideas from one area to another. Dictatorship in our modern day means an attempt to compel people to think uniformly. Hitler didn't/try to make the Germans walk and march ^{merely}, he tried to make them think as he said, and make them take the attitude toward various groups and various nations; at least he tried to do that. There was nothing like that in the Roman Empire. So we have then a political situation in the Roman days of the Christian Church in which there was a system of orderliness, a system of ~~peace~~ ^{peace} a system which came during that century under the direction of the Roman Empire, and some of these Roman emperors were men of very arbitrary attitude, but ~~this~~ arbitrary attitude did not color the whole system nor did they make any attempt to extend it into every phase of life. And at the same time the arbitrary attitude was perhaps offset by the great ability of these some of these men ^{showed} in making the system work better even than it had worked before. And so in this great empire, with this great political power, Christianity began in Rome, and the leaders of the empire did nothing about it. And it was a century before any great

attempt was made to the Christians 7+7/8
About half a century after we found one of
the emperors using the Christians as an excuse for his particular purposes
which he had in mind and instituted a terrific persecution, but it was
that it was just an Oriental sect which he was using as a
means of carrying out his particular ideas. We will look at that of course
in a little more detail later.

#2 The Various Cultures of the First Century A.D. And this is very important
to understand the spread of Christianity, to see the sort of conditions
into which it came, the culture which was then widespread. Today you
go into France and you have a French culture, in Germany you have a
German culture, you go into Italy and you have an Italian culture, and you
have certain things in common with them depending upon your background. You
come into the United States and you have a general lack of culture. You
are certain to be amazed at the culture of these other nations found

But in the days of the early spread of Christianity you had
individual national cultures as you have today, but you had certain cultures
that were much more ~~xxx~~ widespread than anything in the world ~~today~~ today, and
perhaps much more dynamic than perhaps any culture is today.
And the outstanding one of these was the Greek culture. And consequently we
find that the New Testament is not written in Aramaic, the language of the
Jews, the language which Christ doubtless ordinarily spoke, the language
which most people in Palestine commonly used; it is not written in Latin,
the language of the Roman authority, the language which was used ^{for} ~~in~~ most
political purposes, but it is written in Greek, the language of the
~~the~~ dominant culture of the day. The Greek people were not the dominant
people, they were a subject people. They had no political power at this
time except as individuals of Rome and might have secured Roman citizenship
and become powerful in Rome, but comparatively few of them had at this time.

There were many _____ and assistants to Roman officials, that sort of thing, but actual power in the hands of a Greek was very uncommon at this particular period. They were a comparatively small people, Greece was one of the smallest countries, but the Greek culture was a factor in life just as important as the Roman political power at this time. As you know, previous to 300 B.C., there was the classical history of Greece, and the development of that great culture, and the culture of

_____ of anything that Rome has ever seen before or since. But Greece had lost its political independence before 300 B.C., but at that time Alexander the Great, whose arms had conquered most of the western world _____ and he introduced into the different areas Greek culture. And from that time on we find Greek culture somewhat

_____ becoming a constantly spreading and increasing (power on the globe?) and it was very different from Roman culture. Eventually it became the supreme force in the Roman Empire. We call this period after 300 B.C. not a Greek period but a Hellenistic period, and we use the word "Hellenistic" to indicate that it is not exactly the classical Greek culture, but somewhat modified. And this Hellenistic culture looks back to the culture of Greece, Athens, _____ the great cities of Greece, it looks back to them and it followed^{ed} them, but it followed them in certain regards which made a tremendous impact on the people of the areas into which it spread. It spread an emphasis on the individual, and emphasis on individual freedom, on the right _____ of individual thought, on the desirability of development of individual talent. (Almost 12¹/₂)

All over the Orient ---colonies--- . It was typical of _____ conqueror to have a large gymnasium and a large music hall. You will have concert halls and you will have athletic contests. _____ would naturally develop the talents of the individual, whatever ~~the~~^{those} talents may be in _____ particular sphere.

They had the reading and the study of the great classical writings of Ancient Greece, which tended to develop the individual power of expression, and of thinking, and the individual love of beauty. And there came to be these great athletic ~~contests~~ contests, and musical contests, contests in writing poetry, contests in making artistic productions, great activity in all the the Hellenistic culture. And it produced a unified system of culture more or less through~~out~~ the Roman Empire, with many national cultures here and there. It produced a situation in which there was one language which was understood everywhere, though not the common language of the people in any large section of the Orient. It was understood everywhere through the great Orient, much more than Latin would be understood even though it was the Roman Empire. You will find great numbers of people in Rome itself who would understand Greek, because every Roman who wanted to be cultivated would learn Greek, and Latin was simply the ~~common~~ common language, and the language of political Rome. Rome began to be a great colonistic city ^{really} ~~at~~ just about ^{at} the time of Christ. There was great opposition among the Romans previous to that time to the Hellenistic culture, but if someone would have

(Could not distinguish a couple of lines at the end of this record.)

Ch 6

which meant that He found Rome with many little houses and in which Romanist people lived, and buildings which were not particularly fine buildings many of the citizens, and as he built buildings on the model of the great Hellenistic buildings in the Hellenistic cities, even better than what he found there. And so in Rome there were buildings built on the Hellenistic model, but even finer because they had fitted together the ability of talent and of the whole empire, and during the next two centuries Rome was changed into the most beautiful city in the world, a city which had more of great culture and of great wealth of art than any city in the world, and it probably still retains that situation today.

It does not have quite the leadership and/ but when you think of art there is not any city and which it has maintained ever since. ^{1/4} But this culture which ~~Rome~~ Rome developed was a Hellenistic culture rather than a Roman culture. It was Roman power and Roman law, but it was an imitation of the Hellenistic culture. And so this Hellenistic culture is the great widespread culture of the day, and provides a background and a medium in which Christianity could spread, and with which Christianity had to deal as it went from place to place. This then was the outstanding culture of the day; the Roman culture had expediently absorbed the Hellenistic culture, the Romans were taking over the Hellenistic culture, they were ~~not~~ imitating it in many ways except in law and in power in which the Roman emperor was . They probably could mention the Roman culture as such a great culture, but it was one which people after people was absorbing the ~~of~~ Hellenistic culture. Now of course the other culture which was of interest to us, particularly in connection with the spread of Christianity is the Jewish culture. And the Jewish culture, or the Judaistic culture, is one which you know is very ~~of~~ very different from the Hellenistic culture. It is a culture which in our day has in many ~~senses~~ senses has now become very exclusive, enclosed within itself, and the general attitude of the Jews has been ^(almost 3) a born Jew, and the Jews, and there are others its entirely and not . They had proselytes all through the ages, and they have them today, but no great number, ~~of~~ but in the time of Christ, many of them felt that they had something that was unique and wonderful, and that other people should have the opportunity of adopting it. Remember that in the Gospels, Christ said to the Pharisees, "You compass heaven and earth to make one proselyte," and there was an attempt to get people to adopt it, to/adopt the Jewish religion and with it the Jewish culture , and there were groups of people all over the empire who adopted the Jewish religion even though not themselves Jewish by birth. And then the Jews had taken advantage of the Roman law and to spread all over

the empire, to engage in trade and other here and there through the empire, ~~so that~~ ~~the little~~ with a particular ~~of~~ culture and a particular, ar viewpoint , with a synagogue in which they gathered on the Sabbath to read the law of God, and this made it possible for Christianity when it went into an area to find people there already ~~to find~~ to whom many of the concepts were familiar, and people to whom it could first be presented, and people who ere prominent, many of the great leaders of Christianity in its early days .

The Jewish culture was known by the Romans nearly two centuries before the time of Christ; it was recognized by them as a very peculiar sort of thing, but ~~as if~~ yet as one which had ~~it~~ a right to exist in the empire. Relatively seldom up to this time were the Jews persecuted by the Romans. They had freedom to go on with their religion, and they had freedom to travel from place to place, ~~except~~ except occasionally some Roman official would think they were a nuisacne and would order them out of his particular area. But in general they enjoyed a good many freedoms, and some of them reached a fairly good position in the Roman State. But if they did it was difficult to do it and they ~~by~~

by the other people. One very interesting thing which happened in this First Century A.D. There was a Jew who was thoroughly familiar with Jewish culture, a man who had ^{lived} / with various groups in Jerusalem and Judea and knew the Pharisees and the Sadducees and the Essenes and the ^{had} the different groups, whose large personal acquaintance, and he was a general of the Jewish army. Then the Jews revolted against the Romans, but when his section was conquered, and the ~~army~~ Romans conquered his army in Northern Palestine, he became a close friend of the Roman general who later became Roman emporor. And ~~it~~ during the time when the Romans were conquering the rest of Palestine and killing thousands and thousands of Jews in ^{the} Jerusalem

area, this man was living in friendship with the general 6
 When this man became successor to his father ~~of~~ as emporor over the
 entire Roman Empire, he took Josephus with him, and he Josephus
 with great friendship and Josephus had every privilege as a friend of the
 Emperor in Rome and he continued to dwell in Rome for thirty years after
 that as a man who was highly esteemed 6 1/2 even though his nation
 as a nation was conquered and was very severly treated. Naturally the Jews
 looked on him as a colaborator and through the middle ages they had nothing good
 to say about Josephus and the history which he wrote were observed by Christ-
 ians not by Jews because the Jews had no use for this man Josephus. They
 considered him as a traitor, a man who had gone against his contry. But
 Josephus maintained the Jewish culture through his life as he wrote books
 in 7 of his nation. He wrote the history of the Jews, he wrote the
 history of the Roman conquest of the Jews and he wrote various other books
 and he took a very important place in defending the Jews from attack of
 other even though they considered him a collaborator and in general did
 not like him and detested him still more in later years. So we have these
 three great cultures and then of course the many local ~~of~~ cultures and
 the many local cultures in this time had an opportunity ~~of~~ to spread that
 they had not had before and so we find Roman in the time of
 the Apostle Paul who are becoming interested in the Jewish Religion
 7 3/4 a Roman guide who became interested in the Egyptian
 rights of
 and prophesing the/old Egyptian
 Gods in the world. Others are following ~~the~~ some of the old God's the
 Romans had and all sort of and viewpoints which had originated in
 the different areas were brought into Rome and found people there that followed
 them just as we have today, also some ethical cults that
 found themselves in some sections of U.S. today. In our big cities you will
 find dozens of these cults which have their own following of people here in

North and it was moreso in that day because there was greater freedom of travel in the world than there is in our day. Now #3, the Religious situation ~~of~~ in the world. At this time there were many 8 1/2 of religions throughout this area, but there were three great religions in the world. That is three, I don't mean great, but there are something herently great

I mean religion with a widespread influence of importance from our present viewpoint. And of these, of course, we are particularly interested in the religion of the Jews and we don't ~~need~~ ^{need} to go into this into this class, it did mean that there were people scattered ~~throughout~~ throughout the Roman Empire that believed in one God and who tried to observe the Sabbath day and who often suffered severe persecution for their insistance for not working on the Sabbath Day. It meant not only that it meant that Romans and Greeks everywhere heard of the existance of One God and ~~the~~ it is very likely that the great system of 9 1/2 was influenced by the knowledge of the Jewish belief ~~of~~ ^{about} God and about His command. It's not certain but it is hightly probable. ;At many points, the fact that there were pæople that believed in one God influenced the thinking of the people around them, and of course there were individuals ~~who~~ ^{politically} who adopted the Jewish religion. The religion which was/predominant was the religion of the Romans. The Religion of the Roman Gods, but the Religion of the Roman Gods was a rather 10 of a religion, there was great individuals among the Gods, but not a great deal is known about them. They were rather ~~great~~ figureheads. The Romans were very very strict in carrying out their religious observances. They thought that it was very important that the ~~Gods~~ Gods should not be displeased. They carried out all their religious observances very ~~strictly~~ ^{strictly}. One thing for instance, an army would cross a river if necessary if it would please the Gods and look up and see how many birds that they could find, the number of birds determined if the Gods were favored or unfavored, and ~~if~~ if they were unfavorable, you had to wait

and get their favor before you could go on. We read how one Roman army about the time of Christ which was fighting in an area and they had to cross a stream about six times and every time they had to stop and take a look around for the birds. And 11 got around that by seeing first that most of the Gods or Goddesses were some distance away from their work. They were very practical people but they followed these rites very carefully and very strictly, but it was a religion of certain precise forms and certain precise ceremonies, certain prescribed rules, there was no actual spiritual whatever to it. There was no heart relationship to these Gods. There was practically no influence on the real actual lives of the people. Now the Greek religion was very different from the Roman religion, ybut there was a superficial similarity to them, and the Romans decided that their God's were actually the same as the Greek Gods with other names, and so they took over the Greek legends about the Gods, the Greek stories and the Greek attitudes toward their Gods, and they attributed them to their own Gods, and teh Greek religion was a very lively religion, with God's that were simply human beings ~~that~~ to talk, with features and like passions and 12 of human beings, but still the tremendous influence on human lives. This Greek religion was largely taken over by the Romans by saying their God's were the same as the Greek Gods 12 1/2 and so the two religions were but the Greek and Romans Religions, and particulary the Greek Religion by this time had fallen upon a s of very great scepticism. We find in ~~the~~ **the book** of Acts that the in Ephesus was tremendously interested in the Greek Religion and the reason was ~~that~~ of course that they made the materials for statues , etc. from which they received a good income and there ~~was~~ ^{was} great 13 at this time to those that made money, that among the p~~o~~=le aside from that a great scepticism had come. Their record of the Greek Gods and of and there was actually

very little belief anywhere in the Empire in the God's of Greece alone, altho there was a feàling there were certain powers and they better be 13 1/2

But it was a time when the belief in the old religion had been largely forsaken, and the practical people of the day, as the practical people of today take the attitude that after all what matters what we do and how we live and fogget this supernatlural power and they maintain that attitude

into the family or into the group or tothe area and then when trouble came they could not naturally/^{but}recognized that there was another/^{higher}power and they attitude of the people today is to grab ahold of the nearest one whatever it is and keep up in that particular

But there was a state of 14

A state of general unbelief

end of record

Ch 7

---- and exactly the form in which I wished the work to be done. though not all had the form quite correct. There ~~was~~ were a few perhaps who did not understand the assignment. So I want to say just a word about it. I think I put notes on a number of your papers which will give you some ideas of the point which I noticed. In most cases you seemed to have a pretty definite understanding of exactly what it was. On the papers then which you had for last time and whihh we are continuing for today and next time the first matter which I wanted was one sheet which would go straight through the chapter and indicate those verses which you thought were vital in connection with the assignment. And most of you had that. There was maybe one person in perhaps seven or eight who did not havè such a sheet. In that sheet you do not have to tell what you derive from a particular verse except to give the main division under which it falls, like division A if the verse tells you something of the nature of the church or F if it tells you something of the government of the church, and so on. Just each verse from which you draw somethng, place down there in order, and then the letter

under which you had something related to it. Most of you had that correct. There were some who put the meaning right there. If you want to put the meaning there in addition to the other place I have no objection to it, but in so large a class as this you have to have a certain uniformity or it takes too much time in checking over the material. And so what I want is at least to have the verse given on that first sheet and the letter placed opposite it. Then ~~by~~/the other sheets were turned in by most everybody; there were maybe four who didn't turn in the remaining sheets. The remaining sheets were one page for A, one page for B, ~~1~~ one for C and so on. And these pages were to give us the verses which you had marked on the first sheet as showing something about the nature of the church, the ceremonies of the church, its government, its activities, these various other points, and on each sheet you'd have one subject and then the verses from the chapter there which had something about it. Then a brief statement of ~~something~~^{what} you found in the verse that is ~~relevant~~ relevant to that. Some of you copied the whole verse, and that is not the purpose which we have in mind. Naturally there's nothing better than the words of Scripture, but our purpose here is not ~~to~~ simply to memorize an English translation of the Scripture but to get out of it that particular idea which is relevant to our particular ~~study~~ study, and I don't know whether you get that or not, in fact I doubt if you do, unless you put it into words. And so I do not want you, if it is Activities of the Church, to simply quote a whole verse which tells how they met at a certain time and had prayer and continued with what they did, but if prayer is an activity, say "Prayer". If preaching was an activity, say "Preaching." If communion was observed, say "Communion." What the activities were, just say that, don't quote the verse. Well most of you understood the assignment accurately. Now in connection with this, I didn't check through the interpretation you had of all the points

(A blank space at 5)

And in your first chapter there in Acts, when you find that the first recorded act of the group of Christians, that is the first recorded discussion, in any official way, of the group of Christians, after the ascension of Christ and the return to Jerusalem, consists of their discussion in the upper room as to how they should fill up the body of the twelve apostles and should stand as witnesses at the day of Pentecost, and when you find that this discussion was initiated by Peter standing ~~u~~ up and raising the question, and presenting the situation, and saying what he thought ought to be done, and then when you find that they proceed to do what Peter said (he didn't say who and when it would be, but he said what they ought to do about determining one, what kind of a man and so on) and then they proceeded to make the selection, and give forth their lots. When you find that that is the ~~s~~ situation, no one who is interested in the government of the Christian church can deny that it is a passage of real importance in this connection. And consequently if you had in your paper in connection with that verse, if you simply said, "Peter the leader;" you stated what the verse contained that is important for church government. Peter was the leader at this point. There's no question of that. Now if you ignored Peter, you were not fulfilling the assignment, because the assignment was to see what the passages are that are important in connection with these different subjects. And this passage is certainly important in connection with the question, "What is the government of the church?" This passage shows Peter as the leader. Well now one man may say, "Yes, the Lord appointed Peter to control the church, and therefore Peter got up and he said what they should do, and they did it. Well someone else can very well say, "Well I don't know. Let's read the passage. Does Peter say, 'I as the authority declare this is what you must do'? It doesn't sound that way to me," he could say. ~~N~~ Now someone else could say, "Peter is simply one of the members of the church, there are dozens of them, there are one hundred twenty there. He gets up and makes a suggestion as anybody could do."

Well, you have a right to look~~e~~/~~and~~ at it and suggest different possible interpretations. And we're not interested in this class in determining which interpretation is correct, but we're interested in this, in designating this as a passage which is vital in connection with this discussion, and I would say that rather~~e~~ than spend three or four hours, if we were studying the Book of Acts now, in trying to decide ~~whether~~ whether in this case Peter was the ~~only~~ monarch who declared what the church should ~~do~~ as the vicar of Christ for now, that it would be much more profitable to look at the passage, see what's obvious in it, and ~~then~~/~~the~~ then before going further into detail on it, go on and look at the rest of Acts, and see if you find that everywhere ^{else} ~~else~~ in the Book of Acts that where an important decision or action was taken, Peter got up and said, "This is what we're going to do," and they did it, you'd have a ~~pretty~~ pretty hard job denying that Peter is the monarch and the Vicar of Christ as His representative. But if you don't find that to be the case, you're in an entirely different situation. And so simply to indicate this passage as important, and then as you notice other passages of importance on the question later, to indicate them, and then to eventually bring them all together and compare them, will give you a far better light on the problem than to spend a great deal of time on simply arguing about this one particular passage. Now from the other viewpoint, "Is Peter just an ordinary member of the church who got up and made a suggestion." Well, if it said, "~~The~~/~~following~~ ^{Bartholomue} got up and said (this)" , we would say right away, "~~The~~ "Well, Bartholomue is one of the apostles, he's one of the people Christ ^{got} up, but it's not Peter." This suggests that anyone of the apostles might get up and might make a suggestion. But it isn't Bartholomue. It is Peter. Now if it had said that Simon the Cyrenean got up to make a suggestion, or some~~one~~ other individuals who wasn't one of the apostles, if he got up and said it, you would right away say,

"Look here, at the very first very vital action in the Christian church the man who rules was just an ordinary ~~man~~ disciple, not even one of the apostles. That proves that they were all equal and anybody could get up and make a suggestion who wanted to." But it doesn't say that. The one who got up was Peter. And so that it doesn't prove that Peter was the monarch, it certainly doesn't, this alone. But certainly there is a certain evidence in that direction from this passage which must be taken in connection with other ~~a~~ passage, and if there is not from this passage evidence against a (primacy?) of Peter. Of course it is a fact that in any body of people you will find that a few naturally assume leadership, and actual equality of numbers in actual practice is impossible. The bulk of the numbers may have very definite ideas but unless somebody gets up and voices them most of them will sit quiet and say nothing. They may even sit quiet and go along when something is done they ~~even~~ disapprove of and criticize it privately later. It is comparatively few people who have the leadership ~~a~~ to get up and to make new suggestion like Peter did here, and to make it and ~~simply/not~~ have people ^{not simply} sit quiet and go on to the next business and ignore them, but to have people feel that "It is important that we consider this matter." Leadership is a vital matter anywhere. Peter is the leader in this situation, there is no question. Was he the leader because of his inherent ability, or was he the leader because Christ had appointed him and in him rested the authority? The passage doesn't tell us/ which. WE think of different possibilities, but it is extremely vital if you're interested in the question of the government of the Christian church to note this passage and give it its proper weight, and not to try to explain it away, but to compare it with other passages and see what you derive from them all taken together. ~~And~~ And therefore I was much pleased when I found as I did in about half the papers that you said, "Peter the leader," in connection with this verse, which I think was a very excellent statement of what the verse shows. He was there the leader, and that is important

for church government, and whether that proves he was a monarch, or whether he was simply a man of leadership quality^y~~ies~~, is a thing to be discussed and decided on comparison with other passages, but this passage definitely shows that much, he was the leader. Now if someone simply said, "Peter spoke," you didn't bring out the vital point, but you did notice that Peter was active here, and so I gave you half credit on that.

If you didn't mention Peter here, that was a very sad and serious omission, connection with of in/the matter ~~with~~/church government in relation to Acts 1. Now I discussed that here to this length to give you perhaps more of an idea of what our purpose is here in going through these chapters: To note what the passages are that are vital in connection with the questions I have mentioned about the Christian church; to note what the vital passages are, and then when you want to consider one of them, you look at all the passages. We're not interested, for instance, in this course in the matter of baptism as taught in the Book of Acts. But when ~~if~~ you finish going through Acts this way you will have all the passages there relevant to that subject mentioned on your one sheet, and when you are interested in it, you have them all together, and you will avoid the error that people make in connection with any of these, of taking two or three passages that fit with their viewpoint and talking about them a great deal, and ignoring others. You will have them all there, and you can look through them all and give them ~~each~~ each a proper weighting and study and compare them, and see what decision you reach. And that is true of fifty or a hundred other questions that will emerge as you go through the Book of Acts in this lesson. One other question was raised in one or two papers, and I'm sure that it is in the minds of a number of you. "When did the Christian Church start?" I asked you "What is the nature of the Church?" "What was the government of the church?" ; these different questions,

"Is a body of people who believe in the Lord Jesus Christ and are saved through Him the Christian Church?" If it is, then the Christian Church started/after the Garden of Eden, and Adam

(end of record)

ch 8

who were with Christ, and understood what His death meant, and were saved through it, certainly they were Christians, were the Christian Church. Certainly it was them, a representative body of the Christian Church, which stood with Him on the Mount of Olives. And so I think that a very very great argument can be made for saying that chapter one is dealing with the Christian Church very definitely, and that in chapter two we have the Christian Church empowered for service, given and equipment for witnessing, and for enlarging and extending itself, but not receiving its beginning. However, we're not trying to decide that question here. If someone wishes to take an opposite view, and say, "No, there was no Christian Church until the Holy Spirit fell upon the men at Pentecost, and they began to speak with tongues and to witness publicly to the Gospel. The ~~the~~ Christian Church starts in Acts 2." Well, if that is the case, nevertheless/ the body of men there who are the Christian Church in Chapter Two ~~is~~ on are already active in Chapter One; they were already concerned with what they believed in Chapter One; they're laying the foundation of the activities in Chapter One; Christ in the first part of it is giving them commands which relate to the whole history of the Christian Church. Whether those commands begin to be operative ^{not till} in Chapter One or/Chapter Two, the discussion in the upper room at which Peter spoke was a discussion about what they ~~is~~ should do; when the Holy Spirit fell upon them it related to their activities after Pentecost very ~~definitely~~ definitely, and therefore that even if you were to think that technically was not in existence until Chapter Two, yet nevertheless the material in Chapter One would be of great importance

in these decisions about the Christian Church. If that should be your view, that the Christian Church didn't begin until Chapter Two, you might say, ~~that~~ "Material from Chapter One has slightly less important bearing on the Christian Church than what follows, but the fact that the angles told the men that they were to be endued with power, or that the same Lord Jesus would come back as they had seen Him go into Heaven, you might say, "That's just men who weren't ^{yet} in the Christian Church, and yet when it's told in the chapter preceding that you would then say, "It's the account of the beginning of the Christian Church," it certainly is told there for the purpose by the H^oly Spirit of showing something of the attitude and viewpoint which characterized these men from this time on, and you cannot say, That is not part of the Gospel of the Christian Church, neither the resurrection nor the Second Coming, because they're told in Chapter One, before Pentecost." You couldn't take that position. So whenever you say that the Christian Church began, whether in the Garden of Eden, or on the Day of Pentecost, or at sometime in between, whichever your view is, Chapter One is vital in connection with these questions about the Christian Church, but certainly Chapter Two and all succeeding chapters are also very vital. Well now, so much then for the assignment for last time, which we went over, and in view of discussion it may be that some of you may want slightly to alter the work you've done for today. I'm not going to collect the papers today so if you should, you will have opportunity to do so. Now I'd like to have a very brief statement that will ~~me~~ give me a little better idea than I have of the background of some of you in connection with this early part of the Christian Church, so I wish everybody would take a piece of paper and write your name on it. And this is a written lesson which is not a quiz. By that I mean to say, it does not test what you have learned in the course, because it deals with something we haven't had in the course.

But I just want to know what you know already. So it will be of interest to me, but will have nothing to do with your mark, naturally, in the course. Below your name, if you can, give the names of five Roman emporors, and tell the approximate date and ~~sp/sp~~ something about them. Now you remember I said I don't care whether Columbus the world--- if you notice that it's '92, 1492, 1592, 1692, something '92--I don't see any value in that sort of date matter. But if you that it was in the latter part of the Fifteenth Century, that it was around 1500, or that it was around 1490, you've ~~got~~ have a place for it in history which relates to other things. And if you know the exact date, well enough, but what I mean is the approximate date. ~~?~~ Did this Roman emppror reign about 1000 A.D., or was it about 300 B.C., or was it when. If you can name five Roman emporors, give the approximate date, and tell a little about each. I'd be interested to see how many can do that, and what you know or think you know about . Now i want to say a few words about the Roman emporors of the First Century A.D. There are only two of these who are of vital importance in connection with the history of the church. That is, of the church since the New Testament. There are two, or perhaps three others, who are important in connection with the New Testament. I want to say just a word about them; we won't have time to go into their history much. You noticed last time that the Roman government was a government of law, but the emporshp was superimposed over it. The emporors did not build up the the Roman Empire. There was a system which had been built up in a period of centuries, in which ~~there~~ there was a very definite legal system ~~with~~ with very definite rights for Roman citizens, and with an attempt on the whole to deal justly, with not only Roman citizens, but also with the ~~conquered~~ conquered peoples. The Empire was superimposed upon it, and during most of the First Century, the emporors to quite a large extent held their authority by virtue of an understood system/ rather than

than that it was actually part of the law. They held various positions in the state, just as other men did, but they had of course a determining voice ~~of~~ often in who would be elected to these other positions. Now the emperors of this First Century, are mostly of one of two groups of emperors. The first we might call the Julian emperors, and the second, the Plavian emperors, and I think you ought both terms: the Julian emperors, J_u-l-i-an named after the middle name of Julius Caesar. And the Plavian emperors were a group of three emperors who held office for the latter part of the century. Now the Julian emperors derive their name from Julius Caesar, who was not an emperor in the strict sense, but laid the foundation of the Roman Empire, that is, of the imperial control of that which was already established by Rome in its power and authority and general system. Caesar was assassinated in 44 B.C., so he falls outside of the sphere of New Testament history. But his great nephew and adopted son, Octavian secured the power shortly after his death through a series of intrigues and battles, and took over the power which Caesar had managed to win. Octavian took it over and wielded it for a long period. Caesar had wielded it for a very brief time before his death. This man, Octavian, was given the name Augustus as an honor, "The August One"; it wasn't his real name, but we usually speak of him as Augustus. And he reigned until 14 A.D., so he was the emperor who commanded that all the world should be taxed, in connection with the birth of the Lord Jesus Christ. Augustus, like his foster-father Julius Caesar, was a man of great ability, and the two of them established the imperial control on a very solid foundation. I don't know how many people today realize that Julius Caesar is responsible for the present calendar which we have. It shows that he was not merely a man of ~~war~~ war, but that like Napoleon, after he gained control he proceeded to carry through some very excellent reforms. And one of them was, he took the old Egyptian calendar of 360 days and he introduced it into Rome, ~~replacing~~ replacing the lunar calendar. Rome, like the Jews ~~today~~ today, and like

the Mohammedans today, had a calander which went by the moon, and consequently your seasons would run all around the year, except when you introduced extra months in order to compensate. The Egyptians had a calander which went by the sun, but which was not accurate; it was five days off. Julius Caesar corrected the Egyptian calander of 360 days, and made it 365 days, and put in a leap year, which made it substantially accurate. And he introduced this system, and it has been followed with slight modifications right up to the present day. They took one of the months and they lengthened it a little in his honor, added an extra month and called it July, and then when Augustus became emporor, they took another month, added a day to it in his honor, and called it August after him. So we have July and August after Julius Caesar and Augustus, but both of them were able rulers who built up the country, and certainly had a beneficent effect on the whole on the whole world which Rome ruled. But they are not of great importance to the history of the church because the church was of course not yet founded as an organization. Tiberius, the foster-son of Augustus, ruled from 14 A.D. to 37 A.D., and he was the ruling emporor when Christ was crucified. There is an old tradition from about 200 A.D. that Tiberius suggested to the Roman senate that the name of Christ be enrolled among the gods of Rome. It's pretty hard for me to think there's anything to this tradition, because ~~that's all~~ after all there's only seven years after the death of Christ when Tiberius himself died. But it shows the attitude of the Roman emporors: they were tolerant toward all religions, and if people wanted to believe in Christ as god, they were glad enough to put up a statue to Christ, and to make Him one of the gods along with Jupiter and Apollo and a hundred others. Sre, worship Christ and worshp the rest of them. They were very very tolérant. Christianity was not persecuted by the Roman Empire because the Romans were intolerant; it was persecuted because the Christians were

intolerant. It was the refusal of the Christians to compromise which led to the persecution of the Christians. The Christians did not merely insist that their religion was important ~~and~~ and that Christ was God; they insisted the other gods didn't even exist, and they refused to give even the emporor himself a place as the equal of Christ. It was the intolerance of Christianity, its refusal to compromise, which led to its persecution of the proud Roman emporors, who permitted all sorts of religions to have free reign in their Empire. Tiberius died in 37; he was succeeded by two emporors who are not nearly as important ; if you're not familiar with this history I don't think you need to bother with their names, except that the first of them, Caligula, enters a little into the discussion of the Books of Daniel and Revelation, because of the fact that though he started out as a very fine man, he seems to have gone out of his mind and began to think of himself as a god, something that the previous emporors had never done. He seems to have thought of himself as a god and went into the temple and began to talk to the statues of the other gods, and demanded that people worship him, and he tried to have a statue of himself put into the temple at Jerusalem. The Jews resisted and it was not done. But Caligula's character is of interest in connection ~~with~~ with the Books of Daniel and Revelation, though his actions are not particularly important as bearing directly on the Christian Church. The Church was too small during his reign to come into any direct contact with him. His successor, Claudius, was a man also of minor character as an emporor

(end of record)

(No records made of the following lecture.

See outline.)

Outline of unrecorded lecture.

B. Roman Emperors.

The government was one of law--the emperor was superimposed over it.

1. The Julian Emperors.
2. The Flavian Emperors.

1. The Julian Emperors.

- a. Octavian.
- b. Tiberius.
- c. Caligula.
- d. Claudius--Acts records he ordered the Jews out of Rome. Seutonius, the historian, records this also, referring to one "Crestus". Christ?
- e. Nero (54-68 A.D.)--an arbitrary tyrant. Was devoted to his whims. He first contacted Christianity in a vital way. He persecuted Christians to veil his own wicked acts. Committed suicide.

2. The Flavian Emperors. (The family name.)

- a. Nespasian 69-79 A.D. Fought against the Jews.
- b. Titus--destroyed Jerusalem in 70 A.D.
- c. Domitian 81-96 A.D. The second great persecutor of the church. A wicked man.
- d. Nerva adopted Trajan (48 A.D. for 20 years.)

We have little knowledge of the Church from 60-100 A.D., forty years. Acts gives us our only early knowledge.

C. The Spread of the Gospel.

The last forty years of the First Century are dark for lack of facts. The Christian/s' zeal for Christ was a major factor. II. Cor. 11

D. Persecutions.

1. Persecutions of the Acts.

Persecutions were by the Pharisees and Sadducees. the Sadducees were of high social and political estate; they feared that Christianity would interfere with their revenue and begot the first persecutions. God allowed the small flame of faith to spread widely before the bloody persecutions. Paul appealed to the Roman law to save him from a bloody end in Jerusalem. Nero was enthroned when Paul arrived in Rome.

Tacitus says that Nero wanted to build great buildings in Rome. He had not the patience to tear down the old dwellings, so a fire burnt most of them down. There is no proof that Nero set it. He immediately erected a great palace. Some thought he set the fire, so he blamed the Christians. The Christians were brutally and viciously tortured. This was not done in an attempt to destroy Christianity deliberately, but rather to make ~~Christianity~~ Christians the scapegoat for his personal justification.

A certain amount of true recollection and other that are highly fictitious. Doubtless when an apostle did a great work somewhere, people remembered that for a time in the area. But ~~essential~~ a century or two later when they were interested in imaginary stories, when they didn't have evidence about all the apostles they so many erroneous stories sprung up that it is pretty hard to know what is true and what isn't about the apostles. We actually can't be sure about any of it except what we find in the New Testament. We have no certain evidence aside from the New Testament. Now we notice the last time that the persecution of Nero was not a persecution of Christianity on account of any doctrinal reason. No one either on the account of the refusal of Christians to refuse to worship the emperor on any such ground as that. In fact there was not in the time of Nero any widespread demand that individuals should worship the Emperor. The persecutions of the Christians by Nero would seem to have been simply an attempt to find a scape goat, and to distract people's attention from his own wickedness by blaming some other group and the Christians had many enemies and seemed a likely group to collect force. At least that was the view which was taken even by people who weren't even Christians at all. As we will notice in a few minutes. But that is the characteristic of Nero's persecution. Then after Nero we have three emperors we noticed last time. They were only a year and a half between them. And so we won't bother particularly about them but they were followed by the reign of their station. And their station as far as ⁽²⁾ goes there was no persecuting of the Christians. It was in his reign that Jerusalem was destroyed. He had his big war against the Jews. But there is no evidence of any persecution against the Christians under Spacion or under his son Titus. Titus then was succeeded by Domitian, his brother the other son of Domitian. And Titus was one of the best men who ever ruled as emperor. Though he only ruled for two years. Domitian who ruled for fifteen years was one of the worst men. Moody, suspicious, treacherous generally wicked, disliked by most people, eventually assassinated, Domitian seemed to have been moved by suspicion of Christians and initiated and carried through a certain amount of persecution of the Christians, but again it wasn't done

with much understanding with what the Christianity was or what they were doing. It would seem to be more of a matter of facial dislike of individuals. It may be there is a tradition that one of the leaders of Dominican reign, a man ^{usually} who was actually counceled a man who usually had two councils each year and the emperor was one of them though he might shift to some other position temporarily but in one year he was a council and a relative of his was also of council. And this relative of his, there is a tradition that he was a Christian. We do not know for sure. But we do know this that at the end of the year Dominican had the other man killed. And his wife who was also a relative of his, driven off to exile and there is better evidence that the wife was a Christian than there is that the husband was and there is some reason they both may have been Christians. But it was, it may have been that he as conqueror ~~had~~ had to take a certain position in relation to the gain for Rome and the sacrifices and the different pagan rites which didn't please him and made him abnoxious by his attitude in the eyes of the pagans. We don't know. We have practically no evidence. We will look at the evidence on this in just a few minutes. There but this we do know that the persecution of Dominican, like that of Nero was not an attempt on the part of the great Roman empire to wake up Christianity. It was an individuals corat (4½) which was rather severe in certain sections and particularly toward the end of his life but which did not involve any great number of individual Christians, although it may have involved quite a few in some certain areas. And it would affect ~~so~~ it seems of a certain amount of promise. And ~~those/nations/~~ Dominican practically finishes the first century A. D. And brings us to (blank space in record) ~~And/it/hate~~ Seventy years after the death of Christ and we have no pagan writer who wrote up to this time who makes any explicit ~~mention~~ mention of Christianity and we have no pagan discussion of Christianity from this century from these 70 years which have come down to us. And we have no evidence or recognition on the part of the Roman Empire during this century that Christianity was its bitter foe. And that either Christianity or the Roman empire must in the end cry and therefore in the end must root it out. The attitude was rather one of indifference and

of which would perhaps picking the Christians for targets for a particular dislike at a certain time but no concerted policy against Christianity. SIN the early days we notice that Paul appealed to Caesar and the Roman empire was perserved peace and made it easier for Christianity to spread. And while the attitude was more or less hostile in lthe end there was not a definite policy of destruction on the part of the Empire as yet. Now right at this connection I said there was no pagan literature dealing with Christianity at this time. There is one likelihood who at this time who was lnot a pagan but ~~la~~ Jew who with whom we should be familiar. That is Josephus. Josephus was born eicht years after the crucifixation. So ~~they~~ knew nothing with personal acquaintance with the disciples of Christ in lthe time that Christ was here on the earth. But he ~~was b~~rought up in Jerusaleum and he had acquaintance with all the diffrent groups of Jews and then Josephus made a General in the Jewish army before the destruction of Jerusaleum he was taken prisoner by the Romans and in northern Palestine he became a colaberator, became a freind of the Emperor Titus , was with Titus , ~~was~~ Titus/^{was not yet emperor} was the son of the Emperor but he was with Titus when Jerusaleum was taken and Titus took him with him to Rome and showered all kinds of favors upon hlm . Josephus lived in Rome the rest of his life with considerable affluence there and he wrote a good many books And when people would look down onhim as a Jew he tried to persuade them they should not do so ~~but/he/~~ by writing of the greatness of the Jew. The Jewish antiquity. The description of the history of the Jews. Copying from the Old Testament whatever he foundkthere using his imagination about those things that the Old Testament didn't tell about. He tells us forinstanc,e how Saul diid on Mt. Gilboa and he tells us what Saul said while he was dy ing. A regular soliquity like Hamlet, To be or not to be. Josephus tool ; into the mock of Saul. He had quite an Imagination which/~~copies~~ in some instances may have given us a pretty good k aproximation of what actually happened and in other cases it was doubtless very far away from it. In antiquties gives us no history that is of importance aside from what we already have in the Bible' But he wrote a history of the Jewish wars which is our best source ~~of~~ outside

of the New Testament for the history of Palestine. And/ in the first century
A.D. In that he tells us/a great deal/about Jerusalem as it was before the destruction
by Titus. And he tells about the ~~events~~ which led up to and concluded in the
destruction of Jerusalem.. Later in his life he wrote against Athenism (10 $\frac{1}{2}$)
an Alexanderian who was writing anti-semitic literature. Josephus wrote
against him in defense of the Jews. And so the latter part of Josephus life
was spent in research and in writing books designed to raise the reputation of
his nation but the Jews did not like him for they considered him a colaberator
with the Romans kwho had destroyed their land and so the Jews did not preserve
his work and so they had no likeing for him all through the ages. His works
were preserved by pagans or by Christians. Only in one place in the writings
of Josephus there is a reference to Christ. He is stelling us the history of
Palestine. I do not have the exact quotation here before me. Most of youj have
heard it at one time or another . He refers to the fact that tat at that time
sthere was a man who lived in Palestine who was the Christ. Andkwho wrought
miracles and who was raised from the dead and as you read it it sounds like
a Christian confession and you can't see how a man could write something like
that unæess he was a Christian. And so in the last century practicall all
criticals scores deecided that Josephus didn't like toree-write them , That
soem Christian inserated it later in his writings. However, Professor
H irac (12), the great German scholar presented a very strong argument that this
was genuine. That Josephus actually did write kand there are those who now tend
more th think that Josephus wrote this statement about Chrsit or Bhat Josephus
wrote a portion of it and later it was enlarged by Christians. It would seem
that, quite reasonalbe that Jospehusk in the year 10 90 A. D. should say
something about Christ. By that time Christianity was ~~quite~~ rather widespread
and he is giving a history of the Jews and the Christians ^{were} would occasionallyy
persecuted and at other times the Jews were persecuted, people were constantly
confusing the two and it was rather natural for Josephus to try to distinguish
between them and to show where Christianity began. If Josephus wrote this,
since he was not a Christian you would have to think that what he said that

he was raised from the dead and that he was the Messiah, that he means he was the one whom the Christians called Christ and the one whom they considered ~~the~~ to have wrought miracles and to have been raised from the dead. It is possible that that is what he meant by his line, This is the promise of the Christian sect that this is the time when he lived. It is rather hard to know I personally hesitate to take Josephus as a witness for Christ ^{for if a man} ~~when he-~~ naturally actually believed those things about Christ. you would certainly think he would become a Christian. It seemed inconsistent to say those things and then not actually become a Christian. The first mention in Josephus is I believe the only reference to Christ in any non-Christian literature that was written prior to the first century A. D. Christianity lived through the Empire ~~first~~ here and there little groups of Christians were established but the official writings of the Empire tell us nothing about it up to 100 A.D. Now of course that statement should be somewhat modified. I said the official writings of the Empire. We should modify that because the writings of this time ~~by~~ was sent on to Tyrus and To Tyrus to (14) This does not react. We have practically nothing preserved that was actually written during that first century. So a great many things written during that first century were copied later on parchment which he began to use two or three centuries later. And of the material of the first century that was later copied, nothing contained a reference to Christianity except this one which the Christianity (Eng of C 1) (Begin C 2)

--- in the early days and we are indestructable under ordinary circumstances. They may be buried thousands of years and you can dig them up and still read them. That is not true of Papyrus. He buried them and they disintegrate very rapidly unless you are in a very damp climate of Egypt. And so the literature of the first century has only been preserved in so far as that it was copied at a later time. and it would seem very reasonable to think there were reports for Paul's trial before Caesar, before Caesar's representative in Rome. And reports of many matters like that which were made at the time and remained in the archives for decades. but of which no copy remains to this day.

Now deal of Christian literature. Of Christian literature that we are sure comes from the first century A.D. There is only one thing outside of the New Testament. There are many apocryphal gospels, apocryphal acts and etc written during the next century. ^{Then} These we would hardly call literature, and I trust much of it is even Christian but they are mature dealing with Christianity which was written after the first century but not during the first century. We have one word from the first century which is recognized by all to be from the first century. And that is the ^{epistle} ~~official~~ of Clement. And this ^{epistle} ~~official~~ does not bear the name name of Clement. The copies, say the epistle of Clement say there is ~~not~~ evidence that it was originally called that. The name Clement appears nowhere in the epistle. but it is doubtless the work of Clement. The tradition is very early that it is his work and we have evidence that this epistle ~~had~~ was read in the church of Rome and repeatedly read through succeeding decades and copies of it were sent to other churches and even was included in Bible copies at various times. Just as we may include a concordance in a set of helps in a Bible or a little article on archeology or something in the back of the Bible. Many Bibles included this epistle of Clement along with the other books in the New Testament. along with the New Testament. You have all read this, at least by tomorrow you will have all read this. It is a very ^{fine} ~~trifling~~ production. it has a very ^{fine} ~~trifling~~ Christian spirit ^{and} ~~with~~ attitude in it. Clement would seem to have been a real Christian man. Of course you will indicate in the report which you give to me just how definitely it shows Clement's consciousness of his own position as the ^{he feels} ~~successor~~ of Peter and the one who has authority to speak and how much ^{he feels} his authority has lead the church of Rome and ~~with~~ what he thinks of the authority of the Roman church over other churches. ~~That~~ this is the only work that would ~~certainly~~ present any certainty that it comes from the first century. In fact there is considerable ~~certainly~~ that it comes from the first century. In fact there is considerable ~~certainly~~ that all our other apostolic fathers so called ~~were~~ were not written until after the first century. A. D. You occasionally find that

some group that likes the teaching of ~~some~~ of them insists that it comes from the first century. The Roman catholic church insists that the teaching (3½) so called vilicay the teaching of the twelve aposltes comes from the about 100 A. D. And if you read more closely what they say, they ~~will~~ say if as we have it comes from the latter part of the first century but doubtless much of it is copied from something that was from the very beginning of the first century. And the reason ~~for~~ that is of course because they think they find in ~~theit~~ evidence~~f~~ for some of their doctrines and some of their views. But there is ~~not~~ evidence of it coming before the ^{end of the} first century and very very-little reason ~~for/it~~ to put it even at the beginning. So we know go on to the second century and we will call that Roman numeral two. The Church in the Second Century land under this you will mention A. Pagan references to Christianity. ~~at the beginning of the century.~~ Pagan references to Christianity at the beginning of the century. Our first pagan refernces come from the beginning of this century . They come from three men. Three men who were good friends. Among whom I will mention third, I will discuss tjird, I will mention first because in some ways he is the most important fo the three. His name is Pliny. There was a great Roman leader who was a great student of science, of natural history, who wrote many books on various fields of knowledge whom we call Pliny the elder who lived in the first century A.D. And Pliny the elder had a great nephew who was his adopedet son. Whom he very carefully claimed and ^{m the one to} this is Pliny the younger/whom we are now refering. LP Plinly the younger outshone the adopted father. Perhaps not som much in the field of science as in the field of administration. He became a great leader in Roman government a d he was sent by the emperor to be governor of a province. **Socially-prominent** Fortunately forlus, two things may be mentioned. One-- he was a very able man an excellent writer, one whose writings were worth preserving for ~~their~~ own sake. And secondly he was a very close friend of the Emperor. He, it is hardly likely that all the governors of the provinces wrote a great length to the emporer ^{discussing} to~~second~~ everything that happened in their different kprovinces. But Pliny and the emporer where such close friends that

they corresponded at great length. And for that reason we have information about his ^{province} problems beyond what we have in any ~~other~~ province of the time. But before we mention specifically what ~~Ph/Alf/Wpt/~~ Phiny wrote, I want to mention what he supported and helped and who consequently were able to get along better than they would have otherwise. But first, and ~~then~~ there is the man who is generally ~~most~~-thought to be the greatest of the Latin historians, Tacitus. And Tacitus only in the second century A. D. wrote a history of Rome. And in Tacitus history of Rome he includes certain references. Yes he includes one or two references which are probably our very first references to Christianity. One T Renended in the account of the trial of a woman in the reign of Claudius whom he speaks of having been confused with accused of foreign superstitions. And some people think that this foreign superstition was Christianity. Well I will not read you his statement on this because it seems to me that that is very questionable. in any case. ~~But it may be~~ It may be. But much more important than that, is the statement by Tacitus from his history of Rome for he is telling about the career of Neor. And it is our evidence for the persecution of the Christian under Nero. and I read you a translation of what he said about it. Speaking of often mentioning the great fire in Rome in the summer of A.D. 64, Tacitus goes on to say that all the endeavors of men, all the emperors largeness in the propitiation of the gods did not suffice to enlay the scandle or banish the belief that the fire had been ordered as to say that Neor had told people to set the fire and so to get rid of this rumor, Neor set up as the culprit and punish with the utmost refinement of cruelty, a class heated for their abominations were commonly called *8½) That is our first pagan reference to the Christians. And it is written nearly, it is written about 80 years after the time of Christ. He describes them as a class hated for their abominations and were commonly called ~~Christius-~~ Christians. Christians from whom their name is derived was executed at the hands of the procureator Pontius Pilate in the reign of Tyberius. Check for the moment this ~~carinus~~ superstition again broke out, not only in Judea, but even in Rome that receptacle for everything that is ~~stope~~ sorted and degrading from every quarter

of the globe. which their kind will follow. Accordingly arrest was first made of those who confessed to being Christians. Then on their evidence an immense multitude was convicted. Not so much on the charge of arson as because of hatred of the human race. Besides being put to death, they were made to serve as objects of amusement. They were clad in the hide of beasts and torn to death by dogs. Others were crucified. Others set on fire to serve to illuminate the night when daylight failed. Nero had thrown open his grounds for display and was putting on a show in the circles where he mingled in the people and dressed as a chariteer or drove about in his chariot. All this gave life to a feeling of pity even towards men whose guilt merited the most exemplatory punishment. For it was for that ⁽¹⁰⁾ they were being destroyed not for the public good but to gratify the cruelty of an individual. Now this is fifty years after the time of Nero. Nearly 50 years after that Tacitus is writing. But you notice that Tacitus says that an immense multitude was convicted. That is evidence that as early as 64 A.D. Thirty years after the time of Christ according to the opinion of Tacitus 50 years later. As early as that time there was an immense multitude of Christians in Rome. Well not he has no statistics on it how large is an immense multitude. How much 10 $\frac{1}{2}$ we don't know. We don't know how many Christians there were in Rome but at least there were, there was a sizeable group of Christians there to be persecuted by men and you know that the attitude Tacitus takes toward the Christians, a very sneering hostile attitude and the terrible thing that he told the people whom he thinks they are and he thinks they fully deserve punishment as enemies of the human race. But he does think that Nero persecuted them in order to protect himself from being accused of what he evidently thinks Nero probably deserved. And that is our first mention of ~~the~~ the Christian in pagan light. Then the other man whom Ptolemy brought forth is ~~the~~ Suetonius. Suetonius was a bit younger than Tacitus. Fifteen years younger in fact. And he lived a good many years after Tacitus was dead. So his way is, his lives of the twelve first emperors of Rome. is written a bit later than Tacitus writing. And there are two references. They are questions in it. the first may or may not be a reference. I referred to this once before. In his life of Claudius. He says

since the Jews were continually making disturbances at the instigation of Chrestus ~~(122)~~. ~~But he~~ Claudius expelled them from Rome. And you know that Acts 18:2 tells about Paul meeting people who had come after the Jews were expelled from Rome. He says here that this was at the instigation of Chrestus. But what he means by that, we know nothing about. If Christianity had not developed into a great impassive force, we would not think of never connecting it with Christianity. And yet in the time of Suetonius, Christianity was ~~factly~~ well known. He makes this statement about it. People think that perhaps it shows some sort of confusion of mind of ideas as to the situation in which Christian teaching may have entered in some way. The statement for instance is sometimes said it probably refers to quarrels between Jews and Christian teaching. I am not all sure that is a satisfactory explanation. It is interesting this reference to this particular name here. Now the other reference by Suetonius is in the life of Nero. And there he says, of Nero in his ^{reign} ~~way~~, many ~~ways~~ abuses were severely punished and repressed and as many new ones were instituted. A wonderful (13 1/2) expenditure. The public ~~ways~~ banquet were reduced and yet . The sale of cooks food in province was forbidden except for classes in green (?) (13 1/2) There were formerly every kind of delicacy offered. SPunishment was inflicted on the Christian. A set of men had hearings to the novel and mischievous superstitions. You could have stopped at the flank of charioteers and (14) and cheating and robbing for amusement. The pantomines and their companies were banned. He very briefly summarized the activities of Nero and yet in the course of it he thinks it important enough to give a, to make a statement of punishment inflicted on the Christians, a set of men adhering to a novel and mischievous superstition. Now these are our first reference to the Christians and they show that these men had no interest in Christianity. These men who probably know nothing about it except that it was some sort of a queer and mischievous superstition. They found it was being disseminated among the slaves of their household. They found that slaves who formerly were, would, when they were given their life would crenge in fear and submit to do anything they were told would sometimes (End of C- 2)

prosperity which he thinks we will find ~~after~~ in the earth after Christ comes back . Eucevius qutoes a few of these statements, he says this shows a very small amount that (1½) And he likes to run ~~down~~ Tapias and I am not saying that Tapias was a great thinker but I am not sure that we should be too ~~convenced~~ that Euceivus statments are altogether trustworthy against him becuase of Eucevius great hostility to this viewpoint. wh ch Tapias along with ^{all the} ~~other~~ ^{of} writers from this time help as if you find the belief in the premellenium returne of Christ brought out not only in Tapias but in Baraabus and most of the early writers of this time. And through the rest of this century and most of the next century although not all in the next cenury. But when it comes to any question of the genuinness of the New Testament book ~~if~~ you can find it it a quotation from Tapias and Eucevius ~~and some~~ or in some other life, that is fully afpt kto be among the most important evidences that we have for the authenticity of this New Testament book. Tapias is particu~~lar~~ity interestied in ~~the~~ information about the ~~apostles~~ and he was a very valuable intermediate (2½) in preserving for us this information. He is Bishop of Hiraplous , a friend of St. Hohn, and one who doubtless had a very great influence in the early church. Now the other of the Apostolic fathers would be of cours Polycarte. You ave one letter ^{preserved} ~~here~~ form Polycarte, the letter to the Phillipians and then we hazve the account of his martyism.. Polycart , bishop of Smerna, a man who ~~had~~ knew John intimately and he himself who lived to be over ninety and who was the last slurvivor of probably of those who had known the apostbes. You have already discussed his maryterdom, a little bit of his career. I think it might however ~~at this~~ be worth at this point, telling one thing that is mentioned about Polycarte in connection with the very latter part of his life About A.D. 154 Near the very close of his life Polycarte , bishop of Smerna, a very old man about 90 years of age, made a trip around to the Southwick and the Anicetus, the head of the Roman church described by the Roman church as one of popes. A trip to discuss with him the day on which Easter would be the day on which the Christian passover should be celebrated, that is the

~~the~~ last supper. And Polycarte said it should always be on the 14th in the month Neshon. With out paying attention to the day of the week. He said that is the way St. John did it. He said that is the way we do it all through Asia Minor. And Anicetus said No, In Rome we always have the festival on Sunday and he said that is the time to celebrate the Easter, on a Sunday and neither bishop was ready to yield his opinion. They discussed it together and neither of them could convince the other that but they said this is nothing ~~that~~ which should interrupt our Christian union and Anicetus allowed Polycarte to lead in the communion service there in Rome and Polycarte converted many Heretics there in Rome and there was the close of fellowship between Polycarpe and the leader of the Church of Rome. And this incident was posted later on, against latter bishop of Rome who they hired by anyone who didn't observe Easter at the time they set it was a heretic from outside of the (5) and they were the authority who should determine how these things should be done. And they said well, look at bishop Anicetus of Rome, he didn't take that attitude toward Polycarpe, he had the finest of Christian fellowship with Polycarpe even though they differed on this vital point of when Easter should be observed. Well so much for the Apostolic Fathers. Now under this head I said the Apostolic Fathers and the Apologists, The Apologists deserve a heading by themselves. But the reason I have not given them a heading by themselves but listed them here are two. In the first place It is not always easy to say when the Apostolic Father and the Apologists begin. The Epistle of Diognetus. I did not mention. Perhaps I should mention. It is certainly one of these old writings even though it was completely lost until it was rediscovered about 70 years ago. It is certainly one of these early writings. It is generally considered as the very loftiest and finest of the early writings after the New Testament. It is probably comes from, it certainly comes from this second century, It may be from the time of Marcus Aurelius some would put it earlier. But in its date 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ it is like ~~it~~ the next group the apologists and so it would be pretty hard to know whether to call the epistle to Diognetus one of the

Apostolic Fathers which is where it is usually put or to call it one of the apologists. You have read it so we don't need to say much about it but we will close here for today and finish tomorrow and in five minutes we will have our chapel service here. (Continuing with 7) You have already read something in these, You have read the Epistles of Diognetus and you have read the martyrdom, let's see the epistle of Diognetus and the first letter of Clements the Martyrdom of Polycarp and the two letters of Irenaeus and those papers you were to turn in last Monday or this morning to the office. Now for next time I have two assignments again in reading and I would like to, I think it is best to divide them in order to have the books more distributed. The two in which we will read will be in Justin Martyr and from Irenaeus and they will all be assigned to all of you for next week but the first assignment is from Justin Martyr and that is for those from A to K for Monday and L to Z for Thursday. And so you had all better take it down. It is Justin Martyr's dialogue, Dialogue with Trypho. You will have no difficulty in finding it because we have only one in the library only the three works by Justin Martyr. The dialogue and the Dialogue with Trypho. But this assignment is from his dialogue with Trypho. And it includes three sections with that. The first is chapters 1 to 47. I don't know whether to call this chapters or paragraphs there are numbers with Roman numbers it is I to XLVII, the second part of it is from LXXX 80 to LXXXI 81. and the third is from CXXVI 126 to CXLII, 142 one to 47, 80 to 81, and 126 to 142. I don't give you the pages for those because we have 3 different editions of it and the pages are different in the different editions. But with the numbers of ^{the} ~~the/different~~/sections this way you will have no difficulty in figuring out just exactly what they are. Now this is to read and to note what does Justin Martyr, what does he believe, that is what is his attitude toward Christ. What does he think of Christ. What is his idea of God. What is his idea of Christ. Any other great doctrine on which you note clearly what his idea is, mention it in your report in this reading. And note of course anything else that strikes

you as important. in connection with the reading of it. I may ask you for instance sometime to discuss Justin Martyr's idea of the Lord's Supper or Justin Martyr's idea of Church Government of some other phase. I will not expect you to get necessarily anything that is just and implication of a word or a verse or something, but anything that he dwells on in these passages, I'd like for you to get an idea on it. Now that is the assignment for the A to K for Monday to be turned in by the time of Old Testament History on Monday and for the L to Z for next week Thursday. The other assignments for the A to K for Thursday, and for the L to Z for Monday, is in a writer known as Irenaeus. Irenaeus. Bishop of Southern France. We read, heard something about the great persecution in southern France when the Bishop who was 90 years of age was cruelly tortured and killed. Irenaeus is the next bishop in southern France. Succeeding that Bishop in that area. And this book of Irenaeus is called "Against Heresy." He discusses various Heresies at great length, explains them and tells what is wrong with them and it is very long and we can't assign the whole thing but I am selecting a few excerpts which will give you an idea of some irony and his viewpoints and his methods and ^{answer} after the same question in connection with Justin Martyr. Now ~~this is just~~ his divided into books and then each book is divided into chapters or paragraphs or whatever you want to call them. So it will be irony of book I, chapters 1 to 11. Book three, chapters 19 to 22, and Book four, chapters 7 to 9, Book 1, chapters 1 to 11, Book three, chapters 19 to 22 and book 4, chapters 7 to 9. You don't need to read this with such care as to study every word in it or anything like that but go through it and get his general favor and viewpoint and attitude and when he brings out what his doctrinal viewpoint or his attitude on some vital question of the history or development of this church, why read it rather carefully. When it comes to the differences in the differences between the types of heresies that he discusses, it will be enough to get just a general idea. Not asking you to recall all the precise details. Now ^{those are the two} ~~in the next~~ to assignments next time. And we were discussing at the end of the hour the apostolic fathers

and the apologists and just at the end of the hour we mentioned one who is one who is in between the apostolic fathers and the apologists. He is printed in the apostolic fathers usually but that is purely a matter of formal publications. Actually this work is pretty much an apologetic work. It has brief letters of Diagneus which probably means the man who was the teacher of Marcus Aurlius who couldn't see how Christians could be so stubborn and could go through the terrible tortures and still in spite of them obstinately refuse to get in line with the Roman state and he tried to explain why the Christians are ready to endure these tortures ~~and/mixup~~ amid suffering and to stand for the name of Christ as they do. But that is really (End of C 7)

Begin C 8 ---- Roman and Greek God reasons why Christianity is what it is and ~~was~~ defended from the false charges which are made against it. Diagnetius, then is a very good place to make a slip, from the apostolic Fathers to the apologists the names you see are names which are not usually exclusive. You say the numbers of the class from A to K and L to Z and everyone is in one or another of these two categories. But if we said the members of the class who are from west of the Mississippi and the numbers of the class who are over 25 in age, the two divisions would not be ~~usually~~ mutually exclusive (1) .. They would be overlapping and in this case the divisions are overlapping. The Apologists come a little later and consequently it is a good second division of our ¹ . The early Christian, the earliest writers, evidently did not have that purpose. in their mind so much. The apostolic fathers is a term of kind which represents those who ~~have~~ ~~done~~ been in the next generation after the apostles themselves. To the chief terms are different types of terms but they are merely convenient terms, designates the earliest writers and then one type of subsequent writer. Now this type which begins about 150 continues for quite a long time. There are many individual ^{whom} writers and we might call apologetics and there are many writers of other types of material who occasionally write what we call an apology. Of course ^{the} ~~ent~~ word apology is nothing like ~~the~~ our present modern English word, apology. In the theological sense, and ~~an~~ ~~apology~~ is of course is a defense, It is an explanation in order to remove misunderstanding and to show what

is.

Christianity. It is the exact opposite of an apology in the modern sense which confesses wrong done. This is confessing right stood for and is trying to show he is right. The first of the outstanding apology is a man whose name is Justin. And about 150 AD. This man was martyred for his faith and so he became known as the Martyr. so his is Justin the Martyr or we call him Justin Martyr. You will read from him next time. ~~His last~~ You would think from his name that his last name was Martyr. but it isn't.. Its merely a title. Justin Martyr was a man who was born in Samaria. Most likely of Greek background. Greek parents. But born in the new city that Diocletian (3) had built, ^{in ancient Samaria,} right/near/Sam right near Jacobs well, somewhere in that area. It is a city which is called Naples, a new city, and it was at Samaria in Palestine. And this young man brought up there at Naphthli, knew something about Jewish and Samaritan belief but seemed not to be particularly interested in them. He was a student of Philosophy and he was trying to determine what he could write Philosophy, What is the true interpretation of the universe. And he studied with very Philosophical teachers and he found reason to be dissatisfied with the teaching and viewpoint with each other. He found historic for instance had very fine lives and a very great loyalty to their concept of duty and the historic philosophy was very widespread through the empire. Marcus Aurelius was a historian. It produced a very high type of character. But they did not believe in God of course and it seemed to him to have no basis for its 4 and he was not satisfied with it He studied with other philosophical teachers and then someone talked to ~~him~~ him and presented Christianity to him and he came to the conclusion that the only satisfactory interpretation of the universe was that which Christianity gave and he became a Christian. But having become a Christian, he did not become a minister in the usual sense of the word and he went about as a traveling philosopher, just as a philosopher has been given those very plain going from place to place and discussing with people, discussing various questions that might interest people and trying to present their philosophical views on various points only Justin Martyr presented Christianity. And he traveled here and there as a philosopher and when it comes to explain the universe and ~~explain~~

and discuss problems and he discussed them in order to lead people to the Lord. And so his two apologies of short works in which he is presenting the claims of Christianity and the ^{his} ~~long~~ dialogue with Plato is an account ^{Trypho (5)} ~~with~~ of a dialogue which he has with a Jew named ~~Plato~~ Trypho, in which he tries to show Trypho that Christianity is a true religion. And it is a very interesting as showing something of his method and something of his viewpoint and also something of the viewpoint of Trypho the Jew. And I have given you a few ^{extracts from} ~~examples~~ it to give you an introduction to this great Christian, Justin Martyr. You will be interested in it as you look at it and see what he thinks of Christ. In one ~~interesting~~ interesting about these early writers is a theological terminology has not yet become crystalized. So we ^{they read} ~~had~~ the New Testament, they read the Bible they saw what it taught about Christ. They got the great teachings from it their viewpoint was very very close to ~~what~~ our viewpoint on everything essential but when it came to stressing it they were not familiar with the theological terminology that the church as worked out in the midst of controversy and discussion and consequently/^{sometimes} their language seems to go over here and you will say oh, he thinks that Christ is just sort of an influence, an expression of God, one God, and Christ is Gods influence, Gods expression, it is all just one person. There is not distinction in the God head. A heresy latter became to be called Monarchianism and it other states it came to be called rebellionism and you think, well, Justin Martyr holds that viewpoint but then you find over here here he is discussing another point and he is discussing the person of Christ and he is ~~is~~ is putting Christ in relation to God the father in such a way that you get the impression that, Oh, he believes in two gods and you get over there into the heresy that came when people failed to recognize the, that ~~of~~ Christ and God are one god, Christ in God the father and you read the expression there and you think, oh he is way off over here. And ~~naturally~~ ^{after you} you put these two viewpoints together, you find that he gives you a pretty good picture of Christian theology but the terminology has not yet become crystalized. It took two or three centuries to get it crystalized. And it is interesting ~~to~~ as an introduction to the problem that that church had to go through in

Christian theology in the next two or three centuries. Not the way that Justin referred to these matters. So now then Justin Martyr is our first great apologist and certainly one of the great apologists. After him there comes a succession of writers through that century and through the succeeding century and they wrote various apologies. And we could mention the names of quite a number. I don't know as there is much point though in it because we will not take the time to go into the life and teachings of a number of them and I don't think there is any point with just burdening you with the names. at just this point. We may refer to some of them individually later. But it is rather vital here to call your attention to the beginning of this great succession of these great apologetics. Now there is another type of writer that became prominent in this century to which Arianism particularly belong. But we are ~~not~~ not going to take them up under heading "C" here because in order to properly understand them it is well to have in ~~mind~~ mind of another phase of the history of the church in this second century. In this second century here we have the church growing and spreading reaching out, new centers being established all the time, more people coming into the knowledge of the gospel. Occasional sporadic persecutions here and there. Individual writing apologies that come to their face and try to show the emperor what they really stand for and try to show the leader of Greek thought what the Gospel really is and you get the impression from this, up to this point that Christianity is simply moving forward steadily and constantly with no difficulty and within its land. But that impression would be an utterly false impression. That is one phase of the matter. We must go on to look at these, in order to see another very vital phase of this second century history of Christianity. And these I shall entitle the ~~rise~~ ^{rise} of Gnosticism. The Rise of Gnosticism. Not gnosticism is a movement which began outside the Christian church even in the first century B.D. But as far as the church is concerned it is a movement which began even in the days of the Apostles. We find suggestions of it particularly in Paul's epistle to the Colossians. We read in Col. 2:8-18 "Let no man beguile you of your regard and in a voluntary and humility and worshiping of angels. Intruding

into those things which he has not seen. Vainly puffed by his fleshly mind. And not holding the head from which all the body by joints and bands having nourishment ministered and knit together increases with the increases of God. Wherefore if ~~we~~ be dead with Christ from the rudiments of the world, why is the living in the world, are ye subject to the ordinances which are touch not, taste not, handle not which all are to perish with the using after the commandments and doctrines of men, which things have indeed a show of wisdom and will worship and humility and neglecting of the body, ~~not~~ in any honor to the satisfact^{fy}~~ion~~ of the flesh. Earlier in the same chapter, in verse 8, beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit after the tradition of man. After the rudiments of the world and not after Christ and we have a particularly in Col. we have very clear that Paul is very much disturbed by influences that are coming in to mislead the people and to give them a little different attitude which is a wrong attitude and ~~to~~ who think if they take a voluntary humility worshipping of angels intruding into the things they haven't seen. Puffed by their fleshly mind through philosophy and vain deceit. Subject to ordinances affecting all phases of their life, a sure will-worship, as show of humility and subjection of the body. See here different attitudes which are coming up. Which Paul is very much concerned about and which he is opposing very strongly and of course other of the New Testament writers speak much more strongly ~~and~~ than Paul does here about false teachers who come in and they try to reach the people astray. We read the conviction ~~with~~ about the false teachers who will come and we think well they are describing our day, they are describing the situation at the end of the age and they do apply but they apply equally well with the second century A/D. and even some extent to the times of the ~~App~~ostles when these things began.. There is a tradition that the apostle John when he was an old man in Ephesus was in one of the bath~~houses~~¹²² there in Ephesus and there that he looked up and he ~~thought~~ Sarenthis, a professing Christian come into the room and that he rushed out of the place. and he said I don't want to be in a place with a man who holds the views as he does. I'm afraid the roof might tumble in on me. and discuss the views that he presented.

Saretnehis was wone of the early leaders of this attempt, this gnostic attempt. The word gnostis comes from the word gnossis (13) and the gnostic claims to have a higher knowledge. You read these things in the Bible. You get these things and what does it allmean, well we will tell you what it really means. And you get a real understanding of these things beyond just the bare elements there and you get a knowledge of how to view with them, beyond what you would get just from the statement of the Bible, that was their opinion. Their claim. They had a hidden secret knowledge egnostiss. Now this hidden secret knowledge was not just a matter of personally thinking things through. That is not his walk. They claim to have a knowledgethat requires a supernatural insight. A supernatural understanding. Many of them claimed to have extra books. They had really, vedry vital books that only the people who were, or who had been broughtinto their little group be allowed to read. They wouldn't dare to show them to the ordinaroay person. They wouldn't understand them anyway. But the people in their group would read these books and get the tunc insight. The tunc insidht the true motive and the see what the situatation really was. Well now this comes partly from people who were in among the proffessing christians but wern't satisfied with the scriptural statement and decide to let their imaginations run. and explain and work out a lot of things that twere not given to them. In the Bible but it also rests back upon the development of mystery religion. Even before the time of Christ. Also the Roman empire had been coming in , influences from Egypt and from Persia and from Babylon and from the various areas. Teachers came tin with the religion of those ountries and they would say one of them not simpley a belief froom sort of a heathen God but from some great udderstanding of the universe which was, had been revealed to them. (End of C 8) Begin C 9 After the death of Christ. And so Constantine conquered Rome but Constantine did nt proceed to try to make Christianity the religion of the Empire. Constantine declared that everyone should have his own freedom in matters of religion. He said Chrisitans are not to be persecutied They are not to be interferred wth in the carrying on of their religion in any way and he said that the people are to use their own judgment as to what religion

they want to follow. He said that everyone has his own right to decision and the matter of , and he said if they want to follow silly , foolish ideas about false doctrines (1) at their own misfortune. We are not going to try to stop them from it but he said we believe in Christianity. And he spoke in such language that he showed in that he had no belief in ~~it~~ Taginism as a whole. He spoke very strongly against it but he said people were free in their religion. Before the, insincere people became Christians, in order to get advancements in ^{Constantines} / his-empire and good position. they did not do it under any compulsion . They did it to esteem an opportunity for advancement. How many of them were Christians, we do not know. But doubtless there were individuals and it became the fashionable thing now to be a Christian. Rather than to be non Christian. And rapidly through out the empire. People turned more and more to Christianity. the last race of paganism was ~~gone~~. Rome. In Rome the center of the old god, the pagan authority, the pagan temple that the pagans had remained great after it had fallen to a very low ~~end~~ in most of the cities of the empire. Now Constantine ~~leapt~~ then secured complete power over the west century 312. And immediately he issued an edict of Milan in northern Italy M Milan. is a city that will occur a few times in the course of the history of Eustracius (2 1/2) . So if any of you are ^{un}familiar with what you are learning the names of the cities. Perhaps some of you are familiar with the city of Italy. It does not hurt to mention, I think it is worth knowing the five leading cities of Italy. Most ~~more~~ north of Italy ~~and the~~ as the center of Italy and only a short distance south , is the city of Milan. Today it is perhaps the greatest industrial city in Italy. It is the only possible ~~confederably~~ would be Rome. I doubt (3) . I doubt if Rome A great industrial city. It is perhaps the center of communism in Italy today but that is natural in any great the greatest industrial center where there is a large number of working people and the largest effort of communism begins in ~~Rome~~ (3) But the land here is very important in that center. Then to the east of the land and slightly south is the city of Venice. A city which does not apply ~~and~~ great importance in Italy than the town of which we have been speaking.

Then south about a third of the way down to Italy from there, maybe four hours south of that is the city of Florence which does not become important in history until many centuries after this time. It is one of the greatest cities (3 1/2) It is one of the two we hold the most beautiful cities in the world today. One of the greatest cities centers of art, if not the greatest. It is extremely important in the history in the Renaissance and the reformation if not only important in our present day. Then four hours trip by train south of Florence is Rome. The most important and interesting city in the world. Ancient city for medieval history or for modern history and the present capital of Rome. and then south of Rome quite a distance is the city of Naples. Those are the five outstanding cities of Italy and of those five, two are important in the sense of which we are speaking. The city of Rome of course and the city of Milan. Now of Milan here in northern Italy Constantine met the emperor of the east.. If some of your are interested in his name it is ~~Made~~ Licinius, he is the mother of four men. Not the original four (4 1/2)

but he is the one who is now in control in the east. He and Constantine had a meeting and decided to live peacefully together and joined the issued. the Edict of Milan in which they prepared throughout their would toleration for freedom to man. And thus there was toleration not only in the sections that Constantine controlled but toleration in the whole Empire. And both main sections. And Licinius made Constantine his friend (5) and they established friendship between the and the Greek all of which made friends and remained so for years. And eventually the fighting started again and in the end of 9 years, eleven years after this in 323 they fought. Licinius was defeated, He was taken prisoner and Constantine did not kill him He gave him the privilege to save himself and so Licinius died and Constantine from 323 on was the emperor of the whole Roman Empire. Now during these first years after Constantine became Emperor in the east here, in the west here, there had been considerable confusion, upheavels, just before there had been this period of terrific persecution there had been a great many changes, and it was necessary to bring order out of the situation. And so Constantine set himself to establish

establishing and^r revising the way out. And in the revision of the laws of the Empire, at many points, Constantine spoke a truly Christian spirit. Investigation had been made of these laws with ~~these observations that~~ ^{this question in mind.} ~~Does~~ Was constantine, now that he was in power in the west, simply proceeding to do as he wanted and having used Christianity simply as a means of gaining power ~~all/with~~ ^{or was} his attitude in these laws actually different? form the attitude which had been observed in previous instances. And we find definite differences. in his attitude as compared to theirs. We find for instance a great change in the direction of humanitarism. We find that the treatment of criminals the treatment of slaves and that sort of thing, was greatly am^liliated over Constantine from the harsh and burtal attitude of the Roman empire in general. It is not made what we would call mddern in its attitude , there is steill a good deal left that would prove very cnuel from our standard but there is a very great step in lthis direction. He forbid people to throw away their unwanted children and kill them which was a common practice among the Romans . It was such a common practice that every pagan ~~could~~ did it and thought nothing of it. And Constantine now for^{bid} it . And Constantine makes laws regarding ~~his~~ ^{their} general purity and deceancy and goes int o

*3) so their is a definte Chrsitian attitude in a grat deal of his law making at this time to show it wasn't a purely akmatter of being a Christian or of gaining power. He was really interest^{ed} and he was the influence by Christian advisors in 313 Dycletion died. I don't think that is too improtant to remember but it is just an interesting fact that Diacletion lived until after this edict of *8) until Constantine was formerly established in the western portion of the empire. Now in 323 after his battle with ~~the~~ ^{his} Lacinius, Constantine became sole ruler of the empire. And now Constantine foundhimself troubled now with descripancies within the empire. Before he had found trouble with Christian descr^apancies in the west And I think at this point we should say someting ajout them. There of interest ~~the~~ ⁱⁿ the view/^{point} of church history and fortunately you don't have as much clear informations I wished we had. Now when Constantine came into power in Rome there was already in Africa a very sharp division in the church, A division which was tearing the church in two parts.

And there was very heated arguments and Constantine ^{says} ~~thought~~ he had taken the side of Christianity and it was important that the Christians stand together and work together. Now it is interesting that after the troubles of (9½) there should have found the Novationism ~~difficult~~ in Rome partly from a reflection of (9½) . But the division did not come in Africa at that time. Whether Novatism became a power in Africa, we do not know, It was about 250 it began in Rome. and in the Novation denomination continues for 2 or 3 centuries. And spread all over the empire. B Whether it spread over half of the

I do not know. but I know it spread as far east as Constantinople and that area there. And this was over the question of whether of the treatment of people who in the persecution had failed to give a good testimony. Well now of the Seprian you remember had taken the position of the firm belief whether these people were welcoming them back and the relation in that position but the Roman leaders had seemed to take too weak a position and over this the Novationism was (10½) Now this is the same cause that brings a great cism to Africa, a cism which occurs shortly after 200. And well after the persecution I'd say about 308 . But it began it already at the time of the persecution. The , in Carthage there in Africa there was a great discussion about this treatment of these people who had left and also about the attitude towards the martyred. It seems that the Bishop of Carthage had at the time of the beginning of the persecution felt that there was people who were not of very high character and people who would be ready , who would probably be punished for their wickedness, seized by an authority who saw the chance to be to pretend to be martyred. And who were supposed to be suffering for the faith when really they were suffering for their misdeeds. And so he began to try to distinguish ~~the~~ between treatment who lived a true Christian character and who were so martyred in character and were so martyred and people who suffered in the persecution but who were not true Christians in their lives He began to make this distinction . Anophle (12) in the midst of the excitement and the truth of danger of the persecution mostly because he didn't feel like making . You will notice that when there comes a crisis in

If a person is falsely accused or is wrongly treated, even though that person figures he may have had many people who thought that they were, that they had a great many faults. ~~Up to~~ ^{After} that time, people were pretty apt to divide into two camps. Those who are sure this person was rightly freed and his is almost a double (12½) and they who are sure that this person was wrongly treated and is one of the greatest things in the history of the church. And Wesley decides someone who has been wrongly treated they are almost sure ~~it~~ that refuse to believe anything wrong about that person and consider it to (13) Now the Bishop of Tarsis appoints this attitude. He appoints this attitude of and he thought that they should try to distinguish between ~~the~~ ^{true} martyrs and martyrers that were not true martyrs and many people opposed him on this and in the controversy he says it is pretty hard to tell what the true situation is. According to the story that his opponent says ~~his~~ he acts desent to see him according to the story^s (13½) and stood by the prison where the people were and had been taken from their place and drove away the Christians who came ~~with~~ (13½) // with food for them and some of them they say died in prison because the arch bishop wouldn't let the people come and bring them food. And then ~~the~~ ^{refused to let the people} // ~~the~~ ^{the people} come in to help these people in prison with encouragement and comfort, he drove them away he prevented their gift from reaching them. (14) for their faith when he himself was a Christian. But that is the story they tell about. They say he took this attitude and he became verry ~~a~~ very critical of the Bishop and particularly of the k people. And then in the of the persecution, the bishop was killed, was martyred, And then it was necessary to get a new bishop and we find this Cicelian is elected Bishop. Well the fact that he was elected Bishop is taken by most Christians as showing that the accusaction against them were false. (End of C 9)

(Begin C 10) They formed a group today and they elected a man named ~~De~~ ^{Donatus} ~~to~~ ^{Donatus} to be their leader. Donatus and they said Donatus should be a true leader of the church in Africa and the others said that Cecielian should be the

and the situation was pretty tense between them and so appeal was made to the Emperor Constantine and Constantine conveyed the council of Bishop to Rome and asked them to send representatives from both sides in order that the case could be heard and be decided who was to be the true Bishop. And they decided that the Cecilian was the true Bishop and that everybody should follow him and acknowledge his supremacy. But the (1) refused to accept him. To follow the Plamatus, the church is called the kplamatus after this time and the plamatus continues for over a century and a century after this it was perhaps the majority of the people as a professing Christians in Africa in it. And a century after this there are still excitingly arguing the question. Was Cecelian a good man or was he a wicked man? And one the big arguments was that Cecelian, when he was made Bishop was concentrated Bishop by Felix, the Bishop of Enabling (1½). And they said that Felix was a . That is to say that he was one who had surrendered the books of the bible to a persecutor during the Persecution. Could he therefore, they said, bring up their veto and he had no right to be in the Christian church, to say nothing of concentrating a Bishop with/A/ and therefore the concentrating of Cecilain was not valid and a whole century later they argued are debating the question, was the people or not. Was this leader really ordained a Bishop and as you read the account of the strife and the discussion between the two sides and the Gunisists? (2½) party you simply can't hardly imagine how a/ ~~betwixt~~ jew to say nothing of the Christian people could get into argument over such very minor as many of them were and get so terrifically excited over it all make such harsh provisions as they did there ~~the~~ and to keep on feeling that way until it is their misfortune to find your ~~themselves~~ themselves in the middle of some church division in modern time and you find it is exactly the same way. And so it is human nature. even Christians to have these divisions which ~~are compelled~~ have come all through the history of the Church. And in this particular situation, you have the church in Africa divided into two parts, one they call the Catholic church, which is

recognized by the church in other parts of the Empire as the leading church of Africa. The other ~~is~~ the church of the ^{Deltists} Domquists, which is a separate ~~group~~ ^{group} ~~of~~ and however must have been a group of/ ^{grace point???} (3 1/4) because it is just also in Africa it has thousands of . They build many beautiful churches. It was a very powerful ~~and~~ movement and some ~~seemed~~ in the majority of the Christians in north Africa and it was over a century , lasted over a century until Christianity was almost wiped out in Africa altogether by the invasion. Nobody knows how long it might have lasted after that and there is ~~not~~ evidence of any doctrinal difference between these two. There is no evidence except on this one thing that the people who had not had the courage to stand brave in the persecution. And that was the only difference only doctrinal difference of which there was any evidence between these two. Now first, all of our Church History practically . Africa was as you know, later conquered by the Mohommadians, Christianity completely blotted out in it and we don't have much difference in Africa in later years ~~from the~~ have come down to us, most of our writings have come from people who are against the ^{Deltists} Domolimitists (4) And consequently our writings about them are mostly unfriendly. And most of the writings are in nearly church history you will read tell a great deal about the activities of the activities of the Circumcileonies. Who are a branch of the Domolimitists ? (4 1/2) ^{Whether} Well/they are typical branches it is hard to say, I think it is questionable At least they are a large group of fanatical people in Africa. who are very anxious, many of them to have the great blessing of martyrdom and if they couldn't get someone else to kill them they tell them to kill themselves, to kill one another and they travel around in Africa forcing their way , They were very strict a very ultra pure ~~at~~ atamically ideas and (5) the Catholic church in general and they travel around in Africa trying to force their ideas on sections there and the people and they read in the Bible, Christ said to Peter, put up thy sword, and so they didn't use swords, they used, instead, big clubs with which they put into submission. Now I've heard these stories about the Circumcilies taken from

naturally
the authorities who are/all very antognostic.to ^{Aelists} Dolomist church. And so
is it difficult to say whether there was a large group of people of this type
who were comparatively small type of that church and whether these accesses
were occat~~ionally~~/ attitude ~~typ~~ with occasional individual (5 3/4)
or whether they were typical of the group. But he gives an idea of the
situation which continues for over a century there in Africa. Now Constantine
was very much distrubed ~~wit~~/ about this and he sent several conations? (6)
to Africa to try to get the people together and they would listen to all
the arguments and they would make their d~~ec~~isions , they always deecided that
on the fact that Deltists were wrong that the people of the Catholics were
right and he urged them to change to Deltists and forget theri differences
but he never enforced it with legal power. There were some threts of legal
power but ~~thabe~~ never was actual enforcemtns by legal power. But Constantine
took an interest in this so it is vital to mention here in connection with
Constantine . It is important that, as understnding the history of the
African church during the next century. And it is a vital factor in the life
of St. Augustin at the end of the century who is one of the most important
characters in all the history of the Christian church. And so for these
Three ~~r~~reasons, it is vital that we know about the Dolomists division.
But after Constantine became Emperor of the whole empire in 323, he found
that now there was another dispute which was agitating the whole empire.
which has be~~come~~/ ~~be~~ begun in the East, not in the west. That the whole of
Christianity was now divided into groups calling themselves Aerians. (7)
NOW were in groups against Aerists. And there was much dispute and
discention over ~~thas~~ controversy, through the whole empire
through the whole empire particularly in the east, that in the Pagan
theatre they were making fun of the Christians and ridiculing them and
and they were, It was somuch of a source of a criticism of the Christians
that Constantine deecided something must be done about it. And so Constantine
called a council of all the Christian walk ~~w~~ for me to consider this
vital matter. And that ~~re~~/ we call the firstacting menical ? (7 3/4)

council. The first council of the whole Christian world as we supposed and it did represent a very large portion. It came as far west as Spain and in Asia Minor. And they had Bishops from all over the Empire. It was a very large and distinguished gathering. It met in 325 at the little town of Nicea. In Asia Minor. And there at this little town, this great number of representatives bring together from all over the empire, Constantine himself received them and presided at the meeting, that left them entire freedom in their discussion and asked them to decide these matters and come to a unity. And this ^{4th} eckumenical council of Nicea is very important in the history of the Christian church. We will discuss it later, rather than now in connection with Constantine. And I am interested now in having you see Constantine's vital relation to them. How he was called and his part in connection with it. But its details are so important that they must be taken up in considerable detail this whole area controversy is extremely vital but we will not right at this point deal with it. Now Constantine lived until 337. After the council of Nicea, you see, he lived another 12 years. Then after the council he went back to Rome and there he had some difficulty. We don't know much about the source of what happened. We know this that his son Constantine was very fond of him. This son had led the army which had destroyed Licinius' army. ~~This~~ Constantine was an able man, a very popular man. ~~He~~ ^{the} people began to become very enthused about Constantine. We don't know whether Constantine became jealous of him. We don't know whether there was an actual conspiracy against Constantine. But Constantine's entire history of it is not known ~~whether~~ to ~~have~~ us except that there is a great disagreement there and Constantine had Constantine killed. Much to the disgust of his mother. She was his favorite. He was her favorite grandson. ~~She~~ was very much distressed about it. That Constantine killed his son and then when Constantine's wife the mother of Constantine was very upset about it and perhaps said some things she shouldn't ^{have} said about the Emperor, ~~as~~ she was ordered to be suffocated to death. And Constantine killed his son and killed his wife and of course it was a great blot on the history of

the Emperor Constantine. Then after this Constantine didn't want to see Rome anymore. It reminded him of the awful things which had happened in Rome. That was one reason. Another reason is that the Empire was so big that to control it properly Rome was not in what was the center of it, he thought further East would be a better center as Diocletian himself had thought earlier and another reason for it was that Rome was a great center of Paganism. And his was a Christian Empire and he wanted not to have constantly all the time that paganism before (11) And so Constantine decided to build a new city and he took a little village called Bazentium which was in the most wonderful location for a city. Right at between two great lakes or seas where they come together and there is a narrow passage between the two, just a small river between the two seas and on the side of this passage is Europe and on the other side is Asia. And right there, the meeting place of two seas and the meeting place of two continents. Constantine took the little side of (11½) and changed it to grow a mighty city there to be New Rome. And so his New Rome there was supposed to be as great as the old one and he built a wonderful city there, wonderful buildings that stand in a very great place but though he called it New Rome, people soon called it the city of Constantine, in other words Constantine applied, Constantinople. So Constantinople which he built there now became the capital of the Empire. And of course still call it by his name but they shorten Constantinople to Stanbule. That is still named after the Emperor Constantine. and it is one of the best situated great cities of all of Rome. He moved there to Constantinople in 330 and lived his life seven years there. When Constantine saw that his life was drawing to an end, Constantine saw that his he decided that it was time to become baptized. ~~It~~ He wanted to leave it as long as possible so he could be sure that all ~~his~~ sins would be included in that which would be washed away in the baptism. He didn't want to take them with and he didn't want to be baptised earlier because there might come some crisis in the church which would make it necessary to put him in a bad situation afterwards and so two or three days before he died, he was baptized.

And this is just an indication of how infantagious and inaccurate was his understanding of Christianity and yet there is a great deal that he thought was difficult to understand. Whether he was a true Christian or not, that is something that is difficult to say. He was a wicked man but so is everyone.

Just as David was a very wicked man. Was he a true Christian? or was he not at all a true Christian? It is a thing that we are not in a position to say.

God knows the hearts of men. But Constantine really did many things that are wicked but many things that were excellent and he was one who exerted tremendous influence in the history of the world and the history of the Christian church. I see that there is now time to stop for five minutes and then Chapel. I hope everyone has his paper ~~in~~. (End of C 10)

(End of C11) Let us pray. Oh God our father we come before you this morning thanking thee for all thy goodness to us and above all for Jesus Christ, our Saviour and we ask our father that thou wilt help us to understand especially the meaning of what he did for us. That thou wilt make us moral, full and true and consecrated servants of His. We ask it in our Saviour's name, Amen. Yesterday we were speaking about Constantine. A creed. and we noticed ~~very~~/ various important activities of Constantine and saw a little bit about his character. We noticed ~~that~~/ the tremendous importance of the life of Constantine how the establishment of the Christian church. I don't think the most important thing as far as Constantine's relation to the church, (Record lines run together here) (1) did a great favor and put an end to persecution. That is not the most important thing. The most important thing is of the church became so associated with the government of the Empire that it tended to become almost a department of the government. While Constantine was usually very good about letting the church officials make their own decisions on that. And trying to get his force/^{simply} to enforcing what the leaders of the church thought to be the two answers in various situations. Nevertheless, the situation came more and more to be that the Emperor had a very great authority over the church. And a very great responsibility for the well being of the church. And it is questionable whether more harm than good

was an apothy (2) by the relation of Constantine to the church. ~~Because~~
Even though this would not be his fault in any way. It was the fault of
the situation. It would be so hard to avoid when an emperor began to
support this minority group and to find in it such a great help in his policy
as it was and yet undoubtedly it did great harm to the character and the
true spiritual progress of the Christian church. Now we go on to C and
" C " is a subject which I wish I wish to carry through the whole century
and then come back and look at details in relation to it and also look at
another vital movement in relation to the entire century. Instead of going
chronologically year by year and tell what occurred at each time, I want to
go through twice in the century in relation to two different movements. The
two movements are interrelated they affect one another and yet each of them
is in a way, very much independent of the other. And I think it is good that
we take them separately. This is similar to what we have done in previous
centuries, for we have taken the matter of persecution separately. And we have
begun and gone through in relation to each of the Roman Emperors, telling about
their relation to the church and about the matter of persecution and then
come back and look at the inner life of the church. Now that is more or less
what we are going to do now. "C" is entitled the ^{Form} ~~Part of~~ Paganism During
the Fourth Century'. So you see it is a continuation of what has been "A"
in most of our previous subjects. A summary of the relation of the Emperor
as to the Church and of how the church resisted the efforts to destroy it
That enters into it to some extent ; that enters into it to some extent
but this is more largely in the other direction. What happened to Paganism
during this century. Previous centuries, the question was, Will Christianity
manage to survive? In this Century, the question is, "Will Christianity
which has perhaps a third or a fourth of the people of the empire at the
beginning of the century, we found the predominant religion. Will it become
more than that? Almost the only religion to which people give nominal
adherence. And the answer is that this century saw almost the end of Paganism
And the fall of Paganism came very largely in the last ten years of the

influence among the slaves so they consider it a novel and mischievous superstition but they didn't bother to look into to find out what it really was. But they consider that the persecution at the time of Nero was at least important enough that it deserved this much attention. An this much reference in Yes?

Student ($\frac{1}{2}$) MacRae: Yes, the about persecutions is from annals 1544 and to is from his life of Nero, 16. But now I think a much more important reference to the Christians than these is the statement by Phiny himself and this statement is made about 112 A.D. in a letter, Letter no. 10 from him to Nerva to Agrippa. ^{the} Agrippa was the Emperor, Phiny was a very close friend of Agrippa and Phiny wrote a at length discussing his province. He was governor of the Province of Bithynia, in northern Asia Minor. And you will be interested in hearing this letter to note for one thing the impression which Phiny had of the number of Christians in Northern Asia Minor. The impression he had of whether there were an important force there or whether there were a sizeable number of them whether they affected conditions there or whether it is just a handful of people. And the impression that all you could get of the previous attitude of the Roman state was figured. Because you will find both plenty unsaved and referring to things not as something new but as something already established. After Nero persecuted the Christians, what was the attitude of the Roman people. It is very strange that the Christians had actually set fire in Rome and therefore were wicked people deserving it or did they think that Agrippa was simply using it to distract it, but Nero was using it to simply distract attention from himself and that probably the Christians were pretty fine people after all or did they like Tacitus and Suetonius think that even though the Christians might not have set the fire they were a pretty bad group and probably deserved ill treatment. So we have no evidence of what the people thought at large, but we do have evidence in this letter of Phiny, of the fact that a certain attitude was taken in the ($2\frac{1}{2}$) time of

An attitude that by the Roman emperor and an attitude by the governors and an attitude by the people as a whole. What did they think of Christianity. What was their general attitude toward it. What were the previous laws and

regulations that looked over detailed regulations and many many things in the empire which just had disappeared most of our writings would disappear if a couple mellenial past because we like the Romans write on perlishable materials. But there is what Phiny says and note the questions I have raised and see what you find about it. Phiny says to Tragient ~~is~~ is my (3½) so refer to you in matters where I ~~am~~ am uncertain. But who can better direct my hesitation or discuss my ignorance. A very good statement to make to the emperor. I have not present any of Christians therefore I do not know what are the customary penalties or investigations or what limits are observed. Now what is the implication of that satement? The implications are that there have been have it not? He doesn't say here is something new what shall we do about it? He says I was never present at any trial of Christians therefore I do not know what are the custormay penalties or investigations and in what limits are observed. It sounds as if a new judge were to say I have never been personally connected in a case w~~h~~ involving homicide and I don't know just what the right situation is in handling this sort of thing. There is an implicztion is is something which is occasionally tried and in on which there are certain definite limits. Is it a chap ^(4½) offense is it an offense in which there is a small fine given , just how bad a thing is it. He says he is not familiar with this sort of thing. But there is an implication that it is something which is considered as something illegal. I do not know what are the customary penalties or investigations or to what limits they are observed. I have hesitated a great deal on the question whether there should be any distinction between agesk, whether the weak should have the same treatment as the more robust. Whether those who recant should be pardoned whether a man who is ever been a Christian should gain nothing by ceasing to be such. Whether the name itself , as innocent a~~s~~ crime should be punished. Or only the crime attaching to that name. You see he doesn't noe; does jus the fact that a man is a Christian mean he is to be punished or is it only if he does those crimes which Christians naturally do ~~o~~ he is punished for the crime, not for being a Christian. What is the attitude he is asking? so evidently he understands something illgal or something wrong. But he soesn't

know just how wrong it is, or how bad it is or what treatment it should take. He says meanwhile sthis is the course that I have adopted in the case of those brougt before me as Christians. Evidently it was customary then to bring someone and say ~~there~~ is a Christian. That in itself was considered sufficient, to bring him before him evidently. I asked them if they sere Christians. If they admit it I repeat the question a second and a third time threatening capitalpunishment. If they insist I sentence them to death. Now that shows an attitude which seems to be not new with *6) . If they persist , I sentence them to death for I do not doubt that whatever crime it be that theyj have confessed there he doesn't know what kind of crime it is, this being a Christian, but evidently it is some kind and whatever kind of crime it may be to which they had confessed, I do not doubt that their putanancy and their obstinancy should dertainly be punished. There were others who displayed a like madness ane whom I reserved to be seInt to Rome since they were Roman citizens Thereupon the usual result follows. The very fact with my dealing iwith the question lead to a wider spread of the charge and a great varity of cases were brought before me and an anominous was phamplet was issued containing many ^{all who} ~~names and/who~~ deny that they were or ~~deified/~~ had been Christians, I considered that they should be discharged. Because they called upon the God of my dictation. and did reveren e with incense and wine to your image which I had ordered to be brought forward for this purpose together with a statue of their deity and especially because they cursed Christ. A thing which is said ^{it is} genuline Christians can not be induced to do. Others named by the informer first said they were Christians and then said they were Christians and then denied it declaring ~~that~~ they had been but were not so no longer. Some had recanted 3 ~~years~~ or more before and ~~wanted/tp/~~ one or two as long a 20 years. They all worshipped your image and the statue of the gods and cursed Christ. So you see somebody was bro~~ght~~ before him and they said he was a Christian. Evidenty a few people were br**o**ught and they said these are Christians . And he said, Oh they are Christians. Now I don't know hwat that crime is but I understand it is a terribel criem Then he said all these are Christians

And he said Oh is that true, are you a Christian? And he said Yes, Well, he said I'll give you a chance to deny it. And after three chances and if they persisted then he killed them. And after he had done that, then a lot more people would be brought. And very evidently some people said, here is a chance for me to advance myself. I will tell on this Christian and I will get a reward for it. Perhaps his property will be given to me if he is killed. And so wicked people who desire to insure their own lot began to accuse others of being Christians and now all this group is coming before Phiny. And Phiny has the problem what is he going to do with them all. And you ~~know~~ notice here that a good many of them ~~have left~~ become frightened and say they left the Christians 20 years ago or two or three and they curse Christ and do these others things to convince them they are not Christians and he says alright I think you are sincere and I won't do anything to you. Then he says All worship your image and the statue of their Gods and cursed Christ but they declared that the sum of their guilty ~~and~~ error had a ~~man~~ ^{only} only to this. They said we curse Christ we are willing to do what you say, but we didn't really do any crime in being Christians. They said the sum of their ~~guilt~~ ^{guilt} had amounted only to this that on an appointed day they ~~ad~~ had been accustomed to meet before daybreak and to recite a hymn and to Christ as to a god and to bind themselves by oath not to the commission, not for the commission of any crime but to abstain from theft, robbery, adultery and breach of faith. And not to deny a deposit when it was claimed. After the conclusion of this ceremony it was the custom to depart and meet again to take food. But it was ordinary and harmless food and they had ceased this practice just after my edict which in accordance with your orders I had forbidden secret society. So these people say, we ~~are~~ not Christians, we are ready to curse Christ, but they say you are under a misapprehension. There is nothing so criminal to being a Christian. These people are living together and deciding to live good lives not to do evil. And Phiny can not understand that because he has always understood Christians were always some pretty wicked people and now these people who first ¹⁰ ~~will~~ yet insist that Christians are not wicked. So he says, I thought a more

to find out what truth there was in this by applying torture to two maid servants who were called deaconesses. But I found nothing that would deprave an astrognant superstition. And I therefore postponed my examination and had recourse to you ~~of~~ the constertation. He had tortured these deaconesses and they wouldn't confess to murder or to any terrible crime. All they had was some sort of doctrinal belief in and he couldn't understand what on earth they were driving at. So he says, the matter seemed to me to justify my ~~of~~ consulting you especially on account of the number of those involved. So many people of all ages and sizes and of both sexes are being put in terror by accusation, and this we don't want. The contagion of this superstition has spread not only in the cities but in the villages and rural districts as well. Now that sounds as if there were a good many doesn't it. Yet seems capable of being checked and set right. There is no shadow of doubt that the temple which had been almost deserted, are beginning to be frequented once more. But the sacred rites which have long been neglected are being renewed and the sacrificial victims are for sale everywhere. They are so recently a buyer was rarely to be found. From this it is easy to imagine what a host of men could be sent right or given a chance of recantation. So evidently Pliny recognizes in northern Asia Minor, the temples have been practically empty and nobody has been going to the pagan services and those sacrifices and he says now all this is changing because I am making these Christians recant. And give up their Christianity. Because he probably meant there were a lot of people who were rather uncertain on the whole matter and hadn't been going to the temple and had now begun going there again. It doesn't tell us whether there were actually many Christians who gave up Christianity or not. But he says we can remedy this if we set about this vigorously. But what shall we do? Now here is Tragens answer. Tragent says: You have taken the right line my dear Phiny in examining the cases of those denounced they were Christians for no hard and fast rule can be laid down of universal application. They are not to be sought out. If they are informed against and the charge is proved they are to be punished. With this reservation, that if anyone deny that he is

a Christian and actually proves it by worshipping our Gods and he ~~is~~ shall be pardoned as a result of his recantation however suspect he may have been with respect to the past. Pamphlets published unanimously should carry no weight in any charge whatsoever. They constitute a very bad precedence and also are out of keeping with this age. Tragicant says ~~we/are~~ this is the age of enlightenment and we are not interested in anonymous pamphlets and in criticism ~~of~~ that someone makes that he isn't going to stand up and give his name for it. But he says if somebody is proven to be a Christian there is nothing you can do but punish them so don't hunt them out, don't make any effort to find them, don't, in other words so long as these Christians keep quiet and don't make trouble you are not to bother them. But if somebody comes and charges one then you've got to do something about it. Now this is very striking that this should be our first reference at any length to Christians in the Roman empire and yet that it should give such clear evidence that it is already so widespread. That it should show in that province ~~that~~ which is a long way from Palestine. But up in that province it is already having such a tremendous effect on the worship of the pagan gods, and cutting down the attendance of the shrines and the sacrifices and that it should have such an attitude already quoted in the Roman empire that Phiny said it was a crime worthy of punishment in itself. It is very interesting and striking. That something could develop ~~at~~ that point without any evidence of having come down to it yet and even in this evidence we would not have if it were not for the fact (End of C-3) (Begin C-4)

...And secondly that he was such a good friend of Tragicant that he wrote at a sufficient length about these men. So these are the only references to Christianity which have come down to us ^{from} through Pagan sources during the first 400 years after the death of Christ and yet they are very striking particularly this letter. And of course this is very important for showing the great spread of Christianity at this time and ^{AS} also very important ~~for~~ showing the attitude of the Roman emperors. ^(A) Tragicant by the way as you get it from his letter was a man of very high character. He was a man of such prime characteristic and fine quality that

some Christian writers felt that Trajan was saved. He was a man of remarkable good character and he was evidently trying, as emperor, to rule for the best interest of the Empire. But he did not think it important enough to look into Christianity and inquire what it really was. He took the word of people who said it was a crime and should be punished but he didn't think it was a bad enough crime that people should be hunted out who were subject to it. Now next is B, the Roman Emperors of the Second Century. And this is a period of the five good emperors, so called. We have noticed that the first century was one in which the emperors ~~by their~~ the men who by course of personality and by strength of character had secured the control in the land originally and then they (f2) followed them and it depended a lot on what sort of emperor you had whether the power was increased or diminished. During that time. We have two main families. that we note. Now we have a situation which began which ran for practically a century. Which was unique and which established a high plain of the Roman Empire. It was a time when you had a series of men, all of whom seemed to have been trying to rule for the best interest of their people. A series of able men and one thing that made it good was that it did not go from father to son during this period of time until you get to the end of the period and that was what ruined some. It began with a senator named Nerva who reigned from 96 to 98. He is not very important. Principally because he only reigned 2 years. But he adopted a very outstanding general. A man of high character. He adopted and designated as his heir. And this man Trajan succeeded him and reigned for 19 years, from 98 to 117. And through the rest of the period of these 5 good emperors, each of them adopted his successor and so each of them tried to pick out a man who was of good character with himself until you get to the best character of all., the last of the five and he had a worthless son who succeeded him and put an end to this fine period of the five good emperors which lasted for about a century. And it was a period of the great growth of Christianity and the period of the first great rise of Heresy which threatened to completely destroy Christianity. We look at that period a bit tomorrow. Now Mr. Sanderson just gave me a slip here which had got

a full newspaper ~~sheet~~ it seems like of reports on it but I think they are mostly things he is going to give rather than what he wanted me to mention. I think he wants me to mention this, though, ver particularly, that this morning at 10:15 immediately after prayer meeting here, Dr. Stam is going to give kan informal account , I believe of the congress in Geneva ~~last~~ /summer. The congress, the trips and the side lights. The students who were here last year and members of the faculty gave money to pay for Dr. Stams trip over to Geneva and D^R. Stam is no w going to give a report this morning in order to

(End of section on record) (4½) (Begin on 5) the Roman Emperors of the second century. And we notice that most of thés period ~~has~~ kbeen characterized by the five good kemperors. And we saw that the attitude of these Emperors toward Christianity was rather indifférent one. Up to the last of them. They considered that Christianity was against them all. That it was forbidden to become a Christian. And ~~consequently~~ if was told that a man wazs A Christian ~~he~~ naturally he had to be care. the law had to take its affect. But they did not think that people should be searched out. And the result is that we have the mob curious at one time or another on account of particular reasons and we have the ideas sq~~uared~~ false attack against the Christians, against their character statments, what they did in their secret rites and ceremonies etc. This would arouse the fury of lthe people in the different areas and the result in a persecution in one area and in another. And there were a number of individual martyers here and there but kthe effect of these martydoms was to increase the zeal of those who remained true and to some extent to purify the church of some of those who were not very sincere or earnest ln their faith. But there was no great widespread effort to root out Christianity and so we come to the very end of this peridd of ffive good ~~emperors~~. And then we notice Marcus ~~And~~lius, 161 to 180, one of the finest characters who ever sat on the Roman throne or on any throne, You will find few rulers and emperors in any ^{anywhere in} country/in the world whose charcgers will come ~~anywhere~~ lnear being as loftic or as humane as the kcharacter of the Emperor Marcus aruilus. And yet Marcus aruilus was the first Emperor who seems to have undertaken conscientiously

and differently to root out Christianity and to destroy it. His attitude was one of recognition that the foundations of the Roman society was contrary to the foundations of Christianity and one or the other must fail. And therefore he who had been brought by a pious mother and who had been trained in the best of the Greek philosophy and who desired to have everyone treated just as well as possible according to the highest ethics of the pagan civilization. Saw that everything that pagan civilization stood for and what he stood for was the best aspects of the pagan civilization. Saw that it all was threatened while this new and utterly different viewpoint which was becoming so widespread in the empire and deavored to root out Christianity entirely and there were great persecutions in various sections of the Empire. The persecutions were not nearly so expensive nor as thorough going as it was later under some emperor but it was much greater than any thing during the previous century and of course altogether different from the persecution of Nero or of Domitian, neither of them which had particularly in mind opposition to Christianity as such. But both of which were based on other motives altogether. Marcus Aurelius had a tutor, a very fine philosophical teacher named Diogenes. And this Diogenes had trained Marcus Aurelius the best of pagan ethics and pagan viewpoints and he asked once how is it that these obstinate Christians can stand up so resolutely for their superstitions and can even die for it and the epistles of Diogenes is probably an attempt to answer his question. An attempt to explain to him why it is. ^{whether} ~~Why~~ he himself actually saw the epistle or not. Now under Marcus Aurelius, perhaps the great part of the persecution, at least that of which we have most evidence is the persecution in southern France in the year AD 177. A persecution carried on there by the Roman governors but with close contact with the Emperor in Rome and frequent letters to and from him so it was with his approbation and with his approval. And this man who did everything he could to enlighten the suffering of the gladiators in the arena in Rome, who tried to make a lot of slaves better, who interfered with the supreme power of husbands over their wives and over their families, who softened the criminal law who did everything he could to make life more humane for his people. was interested

in rooting out Christianity in these terrific persecutions which were intended to put an end to it. And this evidence which we have from southern France tells us of this great persecution there in 177 A.D. In which the Christians in that in Leon and Vento, leading cities in southern France were seized and beaten slaves were taken and were tortured in order to confess to the wickedness of their masters, a female slave named Balandena who was tortured for a whole day, ~~how~~ so cruelly that ~~her~~ tormentors wondered that she still continued to live. And yet they kept on torturing her and she refused to confess anything terrible about her master and so ~~she~~ they took the Christians one by one and tortured them and had her to see them day after day and finally after all of the rest had been killed, she was thrown into a net and gored to death by a bull. Synicus, a deacon of the church at Leon had placed a red hot brass, attached to his body ~~he~~ but he said nothing but I am a Christian. A slave girl named Biblius ~~was~~ had charged ~~with~~ the Christians with great crime and they tortured her again to make her tell more and this time she repented of what she had said, said that she had lost her nerve in the terrific persecution that ~~was~~ all was false, that the Christians were good people and that she herself would like to have the faith of a Christian and she was put to death as a Christian. A large number died in a prison, the bishop of Leon who was over 90 was beaten and illused in the most brutal manner and died in prison. One of the men were roasted alive before the people. All in all there were 40 victims ~~of the~~ as far as the material has come to us of the cruel way here at Leon and Viena. It is not a large enough number to be a persecution comparable to the great persecutions a century later but yet it is easy to see how something of such a cruel and feargoing basis of this would scare people and have a temporarily great affect in driving people away from Christianity. Even though the attitude of the Christians in bearing it had a tremendous affect on those we saw and in the end to cause an increase in the church. You notice the Bishop was over 90 when he was killed this way and you remember Trollycart had been over 90 when he was killed and the fact of these Bishops and prominent leaders reached such an age was a pretty good evidence of the fact that there was not a full growing or

constantly carried on persecution during this period. It was more or less sporadic and this is the first great widespread attack to destroy Christianity as such to this one under Marcus Arulius. Persecutions under the Roman Empire were very terrific and it was a tremendous ordeal to which the church faced. But they are not comparable to persecutions to Christianity by Communists today because the Roman Empire attitude was so different. from the attitude of Communism and the Roman Empire did have a very great emphasis on law and on the right to the individuals. And the empire tried to ^{prevent} ~~convince~~ anyone from being punished or injured by the mob or hurt in any way until they had proven that he individually and personally was partial to the law of the emperor and everyone was entitled to a free, to a public examination and trial, in the attempt to bring witnesses. Which (End of C 4)

(Begin C 5) It had these five good emperors, each of whom adopted his predecessor, selected a very fine man ~~to~~ to succeed him, adopted him as heir and was succeeded by him as emperor. Now the series ends. Marcus Aurelius is succeeded by his own son, ^{Commodus} ~~Pomponius~~. A young man brought up with a most careful education, the philosophers taught him virtue, and temperance, told him all about all the fine attitudes that an emperor should take as characterized by his own father Marcus Aurelius, ~~that~~ but he was interested in one of them. The only thing he paid any attention to ^{of what} ~~what~~ his teachers gave him was the glad, the occasion of the gladiators and the deflensing matches. And he was very good in these sports . But the other education he turned against. He was not interested in the philosophic realizations. He opposed everything that was good in paganism his reign is called a disgrace to humanity and his death in 192 a blessing to the empire and yet under this monster of iniquity, the church enjoyed peace. The Christians who had been condemned to labor in the mines, were set free, One senator, one Roman senator was accused of being a Christian and an informer came forward and gave evidence this man was a Christian and should be killed according to the law and they killed him. But they also killed the man who brought the evidence against him and that so that made it less attractive to people to come forward with evidence against the Christian.

common noun in English, and when we speak of "vandalism" we mean ruthless, brutal destruction, and the name is taken from the name of the Germanic tribe.

(end of record)

c 7

I don't know, but at least they didn't fully deserve it. Well, now, I think that is all we will say about the general history of the period at this point/^{we will touch upon more details of it}in connection with the church history of the period. So we go on to B and under B we deal with a man who was very active in the first 30 years of this century. A man, who at the beginning of this century, was already 46 years old and consequently a good part of the activity of his life comes in the latter part of the Fourth Century, ~~but his most outstanding~~ but his most outstanding activity comes in the Fifth Century, and consequently I have placed him in this century rather than in the other. It is not necessary to know about him to understand any of the aspects of the Fourth Century that we have discussed. But it is ^{necessary to know} understand- about them to understand the early aspects of his life. And so we are dealing with him under the Fifth Century, even though only the last thirty ~~of~~ years ~~of~~ of his life come in the Fifth Century, and the first forty-six come in the Fourth Century. Now this man is known as Augustin. Some call him Augustin; some call him Augustine. I remember someone in a class in Princeton Seminary who preferred to say "Augustine", what St. Augustine had written on something, and the professor said, "St. Augustine is in Florida, and St. Augustin is in heaven," showing very strongly his feeling as to how the man's name should be pronounced in English. Well actually, of course, the city is named after him, and so I do ~~not~~ think that anyone has the right to say, there is only one way in English. After all, he wasn't an Englishman anyway. His correct name was Aurelius Augustinus, but he came to be known by the last part of it, and some call it Augustine, and some call it Augustin, and I don't care which you call it as long as you know the facts about him. This/^{man}is so important that I will call number 1. under B , "The Importance of St.

Augustin." St. Aug. is perhaps the most the important character in ancient church history after the apostle Paul. Now, of course, I don't mean he is ~~more~~ more important in political ~~l~~ events than Constantine; he is in a different ~~category~~ category altogether. But of the Christian leaders, and particularly of the Christian writers, he is the ~~most~~ most important figure between the ~~apostle-Pal-~~ apostle Paul and Martin Luther. I don't think there is much doubt of that. Some Roman Catholic might think Thomas Aquinas is equally important. I ~~do~~ doubt if he would think that Thomas Aquinas was more important, and T.A. comes six centuries after he does, not so long before Martin Luther. But certainly of the period previous to Thomas Aquinas, I doubt if anyone would think there was a Christian writer after the apostle Paul of greater importance than St. A. His importance has been recognized by the entire Christian church, at least by the entire western Christian church, by all branches of the western church since that day. Roman Catholics point back to Augustin, who in his writing, "The City of God", gave the great impetus to the primacy of Rome, and to the Roman idea of the church, and in his great stress on the sacraments they claim to have one of the foundation points of their views with which we differ ~~on~~ on the sacraments. And to them, he is one of their greatest leaders, since they claim that many of these points ~~are~~ are already held by the apostles. ~~They~~ They would say that he expressed them better than anyone ~~up~~ up to that time, and they would frequently quote St. A. on these matters. And on the other hand, Protestant leaders refer to his great statements on salvation by grace, on the grace of God as our sole source of salvation, the great stress that he laid on grace as opposed to works, ~~by~~ ^(this is ?) plus his descriptive of all the claims of Roman Catholicism. And so we find that all the great streams of Christian life and Christian thought since look back to St. A. as one of the great promulgators of one of their central features. Now we Protestants would claim that the R.C. stress upon his views is upon incidental ~~facts~~ factors of his

views, rather than upon the main central things. We would claim that he would not have meant- meant those things the way they take them, but at least he gave enough stress to them to be vital in forwarding them, and so he was a powerful influence on all Christian history ever since his time. One reason for this is because he was just---eus- such a voluminous writer, not as voluminous as Origin, not as voluminous as Jerome, but extremely voluminous. You notice that in the set of the Nicene Fathers, those writings which had been thought to be worth including from ancient times in the pre-N---Pre- Pre-antiNicene or Post-Nicene Fathers in the library, most volumes have half a volume, some have a volume, a few have two volumes, but Augustine may give five or six volumes. They give far more space to him. Now Jerome wrote just as much as he did, but they only give him a volume and a half--half. They do not consider the other as of equal importance in the Christian church. He wrote a tremendous amount. Much of that which he wrote was very well-written. He wrote too much for all of it to be well-written, but some people become so tremendously impressed with the very great excellence of his outstanding writings that they look at everything he wrote through colored glasses, and one modern theologian said, "A. is equally supreme, whether he is discussing the grace of God, or whether he is discussing the subject of music. Whatever he writes on, he is the very best there is. Well that, I think, is extreme, but that shows the attitude of mind under which some people come from the great excellence of so much that he wrote, but he wrote so very much that others think that some of it is of a far less excellence of degree of writing. He was a man who had a very active mind, and he was highly educated. He seems to have been familiar with most of the learning of his day, whether he touches upon music, upon the arts, upon history, upon the classics, upon literature, upon law. Almost any field he touches upon, you have the feeling that here is a man who has read and studied a great part of the literature and thought of his day to bring ^{these} materials to bear upon the subjects with which he is dealing. And it is typical of Christian history that when you find a

great work done for God, and a ~~gra~~- great movement started, you will usually find that the man who is instrumental in it, and who leads it ~~in~~(black) the learning and the thought of his day, and a man of great natural ability. This is true of Augustin, it is true of Origin, it is true of Jerome, it is true of Martin Luther, John Calvin, it is true of John Wesley, it is true of most of those who have led great movements in the Christian church. But those who have been greatly used of God have all had another feature in addition to this. This has never been sufficient to make a great leader of the ^{true} ~~the~~ Christian church. There has been another feature which is always present, and it was present to a very great degree in A., as it was in Martin ~~Luther~~ Luther, and that is a realization of the grace of God, a tremendous experience of divine grace, a tremendous realization that ~~apart~~ apart from the grace of God he deserves eternal punishment. To these great leaders, sin is no light thing; it is no matter of simply a theological doctrine that is good to know about and be able to tell people about; it ~~is~~ is a matter which, from their ~~own~~ own personal experience they are able to say with the apostle Paul that God was merciful to me, a chief of sinners. I do not mean that these men had any of them been, from Paul on through the list I have named, there is no one of them of whom you would say, were in a number of ways among the worse men of their age. From the viewpoint of ordinary morality, from the viewpoint of ~~is~~ simply a humanist, a man looking at human life and comparing ~~people~~ people, only one of these men would be thought of as a pretty good sort of man as a young man, a man who had his youthful follies, yes, but a man who was certainly far better than the great mass of the young ~~men~~ men of his age. Every one of them would be. Every one of them is a man who saw his youthful life, and saw in his natural life something which he realized to be utterly below the standard that God requires, and so much below that only the grace of God would keep him from eternal hell, and he wonders all his life at the marvelous grace of God that would save a man such as he was. From a human viewpoint, you might say he was one of the best men. If God was

going to save anyone, you would expect Him to save these men. But from His viewpoint, he looks at more from the Divine viewpoint, and he sees how terrible his ~~sin~~ sin is in the sight of God, and he sees how little he ~~deserves~~ deserves anything good at God's hands. And so, the great experience of the grace of God, which Paul had, Augustin had, Luther had, ~~and~~ Luther and Calvin and Wesley had, is something which is necessary if one is to be greatly used of the Lord, and it was present to a supreme degree in the case of A. And so we have these different factors entering into his life, and we have him a man who, in his latter days, seemed to have almost superhuman energy, and almost superhuman interest in every~~thing~~ phase of the life of the church, and he was ready, and he was ready on any phase that seemed to him to be of importance, ~~that-seemed-to-him~~ to make a great study and write several big volumes on them, and to write them as not intellectual (11) which somebody would wade through if he was interested, but which were full of such strong presentation and such interesting presentation that they would win people to read them and to study them. He had then a tremendous influence in the early church. His interest was so great that there ~~were-~~ are many people who almost idolize him, and ~~think~~ think that most anything he did is just right, and that is the wrong attitude to take toward any human being, even the apostle Paul. Paul certainly made his mistakes. But that which God caused of the apostle Paul to be included in the Scripture, and which ~~Paul~~ God inspired Paul to write as part of the Scripture, is, of course, infallible and free from error and true for us. Now, God did not inspire anything that A. wrote, or any writer except those who wrote what is included in the sixty-six books of the Bible. And those were his writings, like those of all writings aside from those which the Holy Spirit specifically inspired to be part of the Word of God, writings which have truth mixed with error. And there are points on which A. may have made a decision which seemed very wise to him in the light of a situation, but which, as we look back, I think we should say was unwise, and which might have done great good in their immediate situation, but which may have done great harm in its

outreach and in its later development. I think we must recognize that it is by/^{no}means all good that is ~~ta-~~ true of A., but everything that is true of him is important, and the ~~great~~ bulk of it was good. And one of the great things that Luther stressed in his ~~conflict~~ conflict in his early days, before he broke with the church, was the authority of A. and the greatness of A.'s work, when most of Luther's contemporaries preferred Jerome's work to A's. Not that Luther opposed the wonderful learning of Jerome, and the great contribution that Jerome had made to the Christian church, but he ~~fi~~ felt that there was a stress on the grace of God and of the ~~of~~ unmerited favor which God shows to those whom He redeems in A. which was not similarly emphasized in Jerome, and therefore Luther brought A. more and more to the fore. And Calvin also preferred A. to any other of the church fathers. So ~~much~~ ^{much} for his importance. Now,

2. His Early Life.

Now it is interesting that A. was not a man who ~~bre-~~ born in Rome, and ~~rei--~~ raised in the school of the bishop, and eventually grew to be bishop of Rome. The greatest character in the ancient church is not one of the bishops of Rome; in fact, up to point we have reached, there has been no one; in fact, up to the death of A. there is no one who occupied the position of bishop of Rome who was one of the ~~great~~ characters and ~~gra-~~ great leaders of the early church. They were men of important administrative ability, but the ~~grae-~~ great leaders whom God raised up in the church did not occupy that particular position. And A. wasn't even an Italian. He was from the ~~of~~ Latin-speaking area. He was born in a little ~~two~~ town south of Carthage in North Africa. And in this little town, forty miles south of the ~~great~~ city of Carthage, the city which the Romans utterly destroyed and later on rebuilt as a ~~thre~~ thoroughly Roman city, forty miles south of that, in the small town of (Tigasi?) in 354 A.D., A. was born. His mother was an outstanding Christian woman. His father became a Christian shortly before he died, but his father does not seem to have been a Christian when A. was a boy. His mother was a very, very

earnest Christian. His mother was one of the great influences in the life of A. A. tells us in his (end of record)

....and refused to have anything to do with the orthodox Christian church. But his mother went to see a (skips) about ~~z~~ her son to try to discuss with him, but the particular man was not in a position to meet the arguments ~~z~~ and the viewpoints that the young A. had, but after a long talk with the mother, he said, "Go thy way, and God bless thee, for it is not possible that a son of these tears should perish." And this she accepted as a voice from heaven. After his discussion with her, he was so impressed with her longing for her son's conversion, and ~~z~~ with the depth of her par- prayers and the sincerity of her interest that he was certain/^{that}the son would be converted, and A. later on was converted and felt that his mother's prayers and his mother's life had had a great deal to do with it. His mother's name was Monica, and the RCC has considered her as a saint, and she certainly was indeed a saintly woman. And it is interesting that in the United States, one of our towns in the southeastern sections of the United States is named after her and St. A., and one of our towns in the southwestern section, on the southwestern coast is named after his mother, Santa Monica. And so Monica, the mother of A., is one of the great influences in his early life. Now, he was brought up there in ; he was well-eduated as a young man. The Africans were people hot-blooded, people who were ~~g~~ tremendously interested in~~z~~/~~z~~ their great circuses, their public games, their athletic enterprises, all these different things. They had Roman culture and Latin culture and learning ~~var~~- very much. They had great stress on the worse features of Roman life, and also they had a good bit of the best features of Roman life. And A. in his upbringing found the life of the young fellows around him not particularly conducive to Christian character, and he speedily seems to have ~~has~~ lost interest in the Christian church. He talks in his "Confession" about his having been bad as a ~~g~~ boy, and not

being willing to study unless he was flogged, but actually it seems that while he was comparatively young he proved to be an outstanding student, and before very long he was tremendously interested in his students, and he learned everything that was available in the schools of

by the time he was fourteen years of age, and they sent him away to another town for trainingⁱⁿ in rhetoric, and his father was anxious to send him off to Carthage eventually for further study of rhetoric. His father thought that he had a very unusual son, and after he finished his primary education, he came back to Tigasti, and he had a year of just waiting around while his father raised money so as to send him on to college in Carthage, but then his father died, but a wealthy man in the area took an interest in the young fellow, and provided the money for his education, and he went off to Carthage. Now A. became a teacher of rhetoric, and he was recognized as quite a good teacher of rhetoric, and rhetoric in those days included the study of the classics, the study of the Latin language, and how to express thought in such a way as to win approval. It was a study greatly stressed then; I think it is far too little stressed in our day. Our young people degrow up, and they may have good ideas, but they can't express them in a way to get their thoughts across. Well now, in that day, they went to rather of an extreme, using all sorts of expedients in presenting a thought in forceful, excellent way, and learning to debate on both sides of any question, and they would have a great deal of excitement over some of their debates over various questions, which to us today you would have maybe a handful of people that would even be interested in attending such a debate. Americans are much more interested in a football game always. But in those days, while they were greatly interested in their games, they also had much more interest in these intellectual things. And so A. was brought up as a young man of high learning, and he studied Cicero's works, and there is one of

Cicero's works which impressed him particularly, a work called, ~~the~~ "The Hortensius", but it has been lost. We have no copy of it today. But as he read this work of "Hortensius", this work written by the philosopher Cicero, he found the exhortation to philosophy, ~~the~~ the exhortation to real wisdom which Cicero gave, and this work had a tremendous affect on him in establishing an ideal before him. In order to find true ~~wis-~~ wisdom, he wanted to become a man of real learning, ^{not simply} a man of barbaric wealth, or a man recognized by people, but a man who had real inward quality. Cicero could express such ideals in a very wonderful way, even while in his own attitude he was desirous of the plaudits of the Roman mob, and anxious to get ~~some-~~ some political advancement, but he was able to express these ideals very beautifully, and it had a tremendous influence on the youthful A. And ~~from~~ this time on, he seems to be a sincere seeker of the truth, and he had the Christian church before him, he had his mother's influence before him, but he didn't feel that that was where the truth was to be found. But he was seeking after truth; he was seeking after wisdom; he was seeking to be one who really had a life of the finest type ~~that--~~ that he could have. Now there was one thing which he looked back at in later years as having been a most terrific sin of these days, and which he always with tears regretted to the very end of his life, and that was something which had happened at about time or somewhat before, that is, before he read "Hortensius". The life of the people of the whole Roman Empire was of a very low grade morally, and licentiousness was extremely prevalent, and the very worse types of licentiousness was all ~~the~~ around him, and A., so far as we know, never seems to have succumbed to any of what we would call the grosser aspects of sensuality. There is ~~no~~ evidence of any such thing. But there is evidence of this: he took a young woman as a mistress at about this time, perhaps a little earlier, but as far as our evidence goes, he lived exclusively with her for fourteen years. You as Americans would consider that as a common law marriage, I believe. She was his mistress for these 8

fourteen years, and there is no evidence of any promiscuity either on his part or on her part. Within a very short time after their intimacy began, she gave birth to a son, and this son, to whom he gave the name, "the gift of God", Adiobaptist, "from God he is given". A strange name to give to a child born under those circumstances. This son she brought up, and A. was true to her it seems during those years. She lived with him in Carthage, and when he went to Rome, she went to Rome with him, and when he went to Milan, she went to Milan with him, and brought the infant along. But he was never married to her, and he always considered the relation as extremely sinful, at least in his later years, looking back on it. What his attitude was in these days we have no way of knowing, but in his later years he looked back on it with terrific regret, and felt that it was one of the outstanding evidences of the sinful nature of his life, and of his lack of any desert of good at the hand of God. Now A. came in touch with a movement which was very powerful in North Africa, a movement known as Manichaenism. We have mentioned it before in our history, but we have not told a great deal about it. It was in the Third Century A.D. when-- that Mani lived, the middle of the Third Century, the middle of the 200s A.D. He lived in Heliopolis, and he claimed that he was the paraclete promised by Jesus, and he traveled in many countries and spread his doctrines, and in Persia he gained favor in the court, but at length is said to have been crucified and his skin, stuffed with straw, hung at the city gate. Meantime his twelve apostles spread westward and won many disciples, and his church was organized in many ways which seem to be copied after the Christian Church, and in many ways, in the Christian area, such as North Africa, it came to be more similar to the Christian Church in its outward organization, but it is not like Gnosticism, a Christian heresy. It has many points in common with Gnosticism, but in many points it is so remote from Christianity that it is definitely a different religion, even though--though-- though imitating Christian forms in many places. And A. may even have considered it as a form of

Christianity. He joined in with these groups, but he never was initiated into ~~th~~-- them. They had their inner circle who were initiated into their secrets, and who had to live the type of life which they felt was the right type of life, which was a very ascetic life, and a life which, from a moral viewpoint was very superior to the great mass of the people in the Roman life. And they stressed certain moral ideas very much, but A. was always among them as what they called "a hearer"/, simply one who attended their services and was interested in what they presented, but ~~was~~ was not actually interested into their inner circle. And he was connected with the Manichaens for a good many years. The Manichaens believed in a kingdom of darkness and a kingdom of light, and these two kingdoms are equal, and life is a struggles between the principles of good and of evil. And there was a great trajedy when ^{an} Satan came forth from the kingdom of darkness bent on destruction and was met by the armed might of light, who suffered defeat from him, and Satan snatched away and imprisoned certain elemnts^e of the spiritual kingdom, and out of this comingling of elements was born the world, and so it was a bad thing that the world came into existence according to their viewpoint. And in the world there is wickedness in control, but the kingdom of light has certain aspects of it imprisoned in the world, and there is a struggle between the two going on. It's on the whole an idea developed with tremendous variety, which is utterly remote from the Christian viewpoint of the world. But they ~~devec-~~ developed it into a very large organization. They had their bishops and their large meetings all over the Romand Empire as well as in Persia and other countries, although it never was anywhere as large as the Christian group. Prof. Harnack has said that it was the most artistic and richest philosophical attempt to ~~disentl-~~ disentangle the knotty problem of the origin of evil, that it brought down to a tangible plain the mysteries of moral darkness and light. Now there is much in it that seems so fantastic that it is hard to see how a thinker like Augustin could be affected by it, but there

are other features which seem to be a philosophical explanation of the universe, and seem to be very satisfactory if you have to proceed on a purely human level in trying to explain the universe, and do not have God's Revelation to tell you what the truth about it is. Well, A. was much interested in this, and he attended their services, but he had quite a disillusionment when one of their great bishops, one of their most famous, came to town, and he went to talk to him to try to get some problems cleared up, and he found that he knew more than this man did, and he found that the man was pretty much pretense, and not of real learning, real understanding, and it gave him quite a jolt in his interest in the Manichaean movement. And so that made him begin to start start to move away from it, but he did not come toward orthodox Christianity as yet. Then he decided to leave and to go to Italy. He thought there would be a greater future for him in Rome, in the capital. It was no longer the capital, but it was the great old famous center of the empire. And so he left Carthage; he took his mistress and his little boy with him, and he went up to Rome, and there he lived in Rome for a few months. And he found Rome given up to the pursuit of pleasure, although in it there were those who were of a very intellectual life also. And of course, the Christian Church was very active in Rome, although perhaps it was more affected by the life around it than in most other centers. That is, the church of Rome does not seem to have made a very great impression on A. at this time. A. in Now, Carthage had been very disgusted with the city because the citizens were full of frivolity, and they would indulge in such 15 , some of which were really dangerous to life, and it was hard to get them down to work the way he wanted them to do it, and the activities....

(end of record)

continuation (16) [21]

Now just why is it that this monster of iniquity so utterly different from the wonderful man who was his father, should give peace to Christianity when his good father had so endeavored to destroy it. It is pretty hard to tell. It is usually thought that it was on account of the emperors Concubine Marsha who for some reason or other showed herself favorable to the Christians. We don't know a great deal about the circumstance. It is easy to guess any sort of thing which it might be because, Yes, Mr. (Student) Commodus,? C-o-m-m-o-d-u-s He is not particularly important in the history of the church because he ~~is~~^{was} not a persecutor. The important ones are the persecutors, naturally in their relation to Christianity to the Roman empire. But after the great persecution of his father it was a boon to the church that this wicked man succeeded Marcus Aurelius and put an end to the persecution. And so Commodus probably on account of the influence of his concubine Marsha and if you want to guess ^{would} why ~~with~~ the emperors concubine take this attitude any number of guesses could be made. It might be for instance that she had been brought up by the Christians. It might be that she had been associated with them. That she had turned against it and that yet she knew herself were the statements against them that that she perhaps felt some gratitude to them for what they had done to her before. It might even be quite the opposite that she had been irritated by the pagan philosophers and that she wanted to hurt them and therefore was favoring that which was against them. We don't know what the cause was. But whatever the cause was through this incidentally accidentally humanly speaking thing, the persecution was now brought to an end. And you can see what the effect of it is/ If the persecution of Marcus Aurelius was carried on and made more severe severely or more thorough going in a succeeding reign or two you can see how people would be frightened and driven away in from the meetings and from the churches and so on and more and more Christians killed and less and less left to teach it to others. But here you have the tremendous persecution and the great suffering. Many people sent off to the mines and other people observing it and seeing how faithfully and courageously they, the Christians meet their death and begin to wonder what it is that gives these people this

courage and what is that makes them seem so happy in the midst of terrible suffering and ~~then~~ then before the persecution has opportunity to serve- search out the great bulk of the Christians or before there is a chance for the fear to come and be widespread and become an attitude of the mind over a period of decades. The persecution is brought to an end and Christians are released from the mines and from the prisons and they go out and people see them and admire their courage and they of course remember the martyrs and have services in honor of the martyrs and the whole thing becomes an occasion for the spread of Christianity and for the increase of it and a great many people who have never had the courage to face persecution themselves now that the persecution is over how tremendously attracted and the zeal of the consistency of the Christians and drawn in toward them and asking what this all is about and come to hear their testimony and etc. And thus a brief persecution no matter how terrific, if followed by a period of peace becomes a crowd of increase and extension and spread of the church. And so it proves a mistake and under this wicked emperor Christianity had a period of rest and a period of progress. Now Commodus was succeeded in 193 by Septunius Severus. This starts a new series. That is to say that Commodus the son of Marcus Aurelius was a wicked man and aroused such hatred that eventually he was assassinated and after his assassination there was no one who was legally in line for the empire, there was civil war for a period and then ~~there~~ a powerful general succeeded in establishing himself on the throne. And this man Septunius Severus Septimius Severus reigned from 193 to 211 which takes us well into the next century. And we look at him again in the next century. We will only mention about him at this point that he began his reign with a lenient attitude toward the Christian and for the rest of this century there seems to have been no persecution. As we have a period of full twenty years with practically no persecution of the Christian perhaps a phratic instance here and there but nothing at all widespread for a period of fully twenty years. Early in the next century however, Septimius changed his attitude and introduced a very severe persecution at which we shall look in connection with our examination of the succeeding century. At present we are

examining the general, political history and background and along with it the history of the persecution of this second century A.D. It is customary in most classes in church history to take a period such as from 100 to 320 and to run through a PERIOD OF two or three hundred years like that and take one thing and run clear through and take another and run clear through. You trace the developments of government through this long period and then you trace the development of doctrine through, you trace the development of different phases of Christian living through this period. That is a good way to do. But for our present purpose I think it is a good thing for us to get a little more definite impression of the time element and consequently I am taking it up now by centuries. After all a century is a long time. It is two good sized lifetimes as far as the active life of a man is concerned. It is very often a great bulk of people you might say of three generations of as far as the active life is concerned. to be consumed in a century. And so I think perhaps it would be good to get an idea of the progress of Christianity in these early days by taking up each century and seeing what happens in each century. And so we notice the first century with the those 70 years that remained after the death of Christ we notice of how little we know of the spread of Christianity in it and an occasional glance of it here and there. How little we know of its literature and yet the evidence that it did spread very widely. We noticed something of the situation there and then we have taken up this next period of 100 years and looked at the background the history of the emperors. And now I want to look at the history of the literature, but I want in this connection to under this present head to look only, say the first half or two thirds of the period as far as the literature is concerned. Still I am entitling, C, The Apostolic Fathers and the Early Apologists. The Apostolic Fathers and the Early Apologists That is the literature through the first two thirds of the period. The reason I am leaving I believe in the literature of the last third to a later period to a later head is because it deals with a different force which came into affect strongly in the middle of this century. And I wanted to discuss that before I deal with its literature. That the, this dealing with the literature part of the period,

The apostolic fathers is a name which was given later on to a group of writings. It is not very definite exactly what should be included in the group. There are some writers of which there is no question, they belong in this group. The writings on which opinions might differ, not perhaps so much a logical title as a designation for a certain group of literature. Now what do we mean by it? We use the term fathers, often to refer to early Christian writers after the apostles. and the study of classics which is pursued in many universities. A study of the writings of early Christian writers. Subsequent to the apostles and how far does fathers go? Well, that would vary. You hardly call anybody as late as the 12th century 'A.D. as father. But some as late as the 6th or 7th century are sometimes preferred to as Father. Actually of course, all the word means is somebody whose back, who^{is}/one of the early leaders and is truly a manner of convenience how far you are going to take it. But the term apostolic fathers doesn't mean that they were apostles, doesn't mean they were apostles, because they certainly were not. But it means they were the next generation after the apostles. It means fathers who would have known the apostles. Who came in the next succeeding group of people after the apostle. And so there is a small group of writings we call the apostolic fathers. These are usually designated under this title. The earliest of the apostolic Fathers is one which is very clearly proper ~~to~~ to ~~place~~ place under this title. That is the ^{epistle} ~~person~~ of Clement. which you have already ^{read} ~~written~~. It is the only Christian literature that has been preserved outside of the New Testament of which there is any general belief among scholars that it comes from the first century A.D. And this epistle of Clements comes from ~~the~~ near the end of the century. You have studied the epistle and have noted just how much it has to say about the ^{claims} ~~kings~~ of Rome for leadership and after all it is from the church of Rome to another church giving them advise but you notice that ^{what claims} ~~what~~ it makes, ~~if~~ you notice what its attitude is toward this, its rights towards Clements the bishop of Rome, ~~so~~ so far that he on his authority as a pope is telling what must be done, doesn't even mention his name in connection with the epistle. It simply says the church of Rome, ~~it~~ to the church of Corinth. You have noticed what he says about Peter's great authority in which

he is writing and how he seeks Peter in relation to the other Apostles in the epistle. Those were your assignments I gave you for your study of it to write in the paper which you turn in from the ~~the~~ ~~about~~ about it.)13½)

However, I believe in that in question of the fact that while it is not at all in the class

(13½) with the a part of the New Testament. It is not an inspired word

It has occasional un~~light~~ scientific statements in it. It has occasional errors in it. It is not a statement ~~so~~ book worthy to rank with the New Testament

Yet ~~is~~ is an epistle of very high quality. It was evidently a writing of a good man a man who was a sincere and earnest Christian and a man who was anxious that true Christianity be ~~maintained~~ maintained in itself. Now there are other writings supposed

to be ^{by} Clements so much later and there are writing about Clements a century later the figure of Clements ~~of~~ was one, which people like to imagine about.

And we have stories about Clements life and experiences which are doubtless entirely fictitious SThe fact of the matter is that we are not sure who Clements

was except that it is (End of C 5) (Begin 6 0)

The belief of the Roman Church is that there were two other bishops between them and Peter and there were just two others and they were both ^(1/2) after Peter before traditions on that (record squeaks) Ramsay the great English historian

and also peculiar background and interesting experiences in his early life but the fact of the matter is ~~tata~~ they are purely imaginary. We know knthing about

him except what we get from the book and what we get from it is ~~this~~ this. There is not much as to the specific details of his life. Now there is no other of the

apostolic fathers who writes as , of whom we know quite as much about the situation as about Clement unless it would be Polycart and of course the writing

of Polycart is much later. Polycart was ~~much~~ ^{very} active at this time he is one of the last as far as the writings is concerned. As theapostolic fathers. So

next after Clements, it is a little hard to know which to ~~menthion~~ mention next, because we are not sureabout their dates. I ~~máight~~ might mention perhaps, the Epistle of

Barnibus now. The ancient writers believe that Barnaabus, the epistle of Barnabus is by the Barnabus who accompanied St.Paul. That is theri opinion.

We find out mention in several ^{of the early} churches . But of course these churches,

growing, two or three centuries after, they can be completely wrong and most modern scholars believe that the epistle of Barnabus has nothing to do with the Barnabus who associated with Paul or comes from some time between 100 and 150 AD. They base this largely on the contents of the Book. Which does not seem such as we would ~~expect~~ expect to come from Barnabus ~~if~~ the associate of Paul. This epistle of Barnabus was read a great deal in the church. It has some very beautiful statements in it. some very lovely things in it, but it also has a good bit of allegory that is rather fantastic. For instance, an instance of this when he speaks about circumcision, it says in the Epistle of Barnabus. What is the true estimation of the circumcision. He didn't understand therefore children these things more fully, that Abraham who was the first of God in circumcision looking forward in the spirit to Jesus circumcised, having received the mystery of three letters. For the scripture says that Abraham circumcised 318 men of his house. What therefore was the mystery that was made known to him ~~Mark 18~~ Mark first the 18 and then the 300 for the numeral letters of 18 are 10 and 8 are I and H of these we know Jesus, you see the name Jesus is written (3½) yocha acha, the first two letters of the name Jesus So you see the 18 stands for Jesus when Abraham circumcised 318 men. And he says because the cross was that by which we are to find grace, therefore he adds 300, the note of which is T, therefore by 2 letters she signifies Jesus and by the third, his cross. The one that says Abraham circumcised 318 men, the 18 men means Jesus and the 300 means the cross. So you see biblical numerics is not a new thing in this century. It is perhaps more widespread ~~in~~ in this century than it has been in most periods before but even as early as this writing of Barnabus, you find Biblical numerics used. And he has a good deal that is rather fantastic like that in the book and yet some very beautiful statements. It is doubtless written by a good man a man who wanted to advance Christianity and yet perhaps not an overly intelligent man. It is widely read in the early church and it is valuable to us because of its evidence ~~from~~ to scriptural books which he quotes from and to a number of the Christian beliefs of this early day to the observance of the sabbath of the Christian sabbath on

the eighth day instead of the 7th day and various other things which show us a good deal of the life of the early Christian. But it certainly is not in any way to be compared with the books of the New Testament. Another book which is, we call one of the apostolic fathers, ~~the~~ ^{is the so called} ~~the~~ teaching of the twelve apostles. It is a book which is mentioned in the early Christian writers. It is referred to it had a good ~~deal~~ little vogue in early days, but then it was completely lost and through the middle ages, we were ~~not permitted to~~ familiar with the book at all until 1873 when a Greek orthodox discovered in a monastery in Constantinople a manuscript which ~~it~~ had various writings in it and among them were the epistles of Barnabus, first and second Clements the twelve epistles of Egnatius and this, the teaching of the twelve apostles and so this archbishop edited this in 1883 and published it. And that was the first that we knew exactly what was in it so we had references to it in some of the Christian writers in 300 to 400 AD. This teaching ~~of~~ of the twelve apostles ~~had~~ some had described as a sort of church catechism intensely due. The form of it seems to be probably from the latter part of the century, the Roman Catholic insists that it is based upon material from the very beginning of the century and they find in it evidence to support some of their own particular views and doctrines. But the evidence is not extremely strong in it for their attitudes and the claim for its early date is also not very strongly supported. Now the, I mentioned that third didn't I the teaching of the twelve apostles. I think fourth I'll mention another book, ~~from~~ which perhaps ~~from the logic is not~~ chronologically is not fourth but which is more similar to these than to the other books of the apostolic fathers and that is the Shepherd of Hermias. The Shepherd of Hermias is a book of stories. It is found in the Codex-synaticus (7) along with the epistle of Barnabus. As you know the Codex-synaticus is one of our great weak copies of the old and new testament and after the book of Revelation, it includes the epistle of Barnabus and the Shepherd of Hermias. And it was customary ~~it~~ it would seem in those days in Bible manuscripts sometimes to add some of these other books, making them convenient for Christian reading. I have a bible at home which has a lot of hymns in the back. Just ~~the~~ the words of the hymns, And sometimes we have ~~it~~ helps in

the backs of our Bibles. This is does not at all mean that these people thought these were part of the inspired Scriptures. The church has never conceded that to be part of Gods word. But there was sometimes found together in the same volume and that does show however how highly they were thought of by many people in the early church. Now this shepherd of Hermius, there have been various theories as to when it was written the Roman catholics insist that it was written by the brother of a bishop of Rome of about 150 A.D. Written by the brother of a man whom they call a pope. An incidently perhaps right at this point, I might say a word about that word pope. The word pope, in Italian is ^{papa} ~~prophet~~. In our english form we change the word papa, which we use for almost any father into the form pope, but in Italian it is simply papa. and this word papa was used for originally, it would seem for any priest. A man who claimed to have a spiritual leadership and could be looked up to by people as one who gave spiritual council ~~and~~ might be called papa. And then in the western church the word seemed to have been narrowed down to indicate any bishop that is ^{of the church} any head/in a certain area. He was called papa and so the word pope until comparatively late~~r~~ in the western church meant any bishop, not just the bishop of Rome. It was only after several centuries, that other bishops in the western church stopped using the term and they applied it only to the bishop of Rome. In the Eastern church it was used for any priest and is ^{I believe} ^{so} still/used today. It was any priest in the eastern church would be called by this term I believe. while in the western church it was restricted to the bishop and then came to be restricted to the bishop of Rome. The word bishop of course as you know ~~is~~ is one which we protestants feel as at least we non-anglicans protestants feel ~~is~~ the word bishop used in the scripture for any head of a church. We feel that any minister is properly a bishop. But the word bishop or leader of the church in the Roman church and in the Anglican church and in the methodist church and one or two denominations has been specialized to indicate leaders of certain areas of certain sections. Now this Shepherd of

of Hermanius, which the Roman Church thinks and many protestant scholars believe, by no means certain to be written by the brother of Pope Pious about 150 A.d. was really a book of stories. It was a book of various narratives, some of them quite interesting, some just fantastic, which on the whole impressed Christian lessons, Christian morals, you might say just somewhat of the type of Pilgrims Progress, except it is not a continuous discourse. But some rather disconnected story. It is a book which would have on the whole of old familiar. But certainly, in any way a book not comparable to the books of the New Testament. Next we should mention, certainly, the epistles of Ignatius. Those ~~for~~^{we} have already discussed and those you have already ~~it~~ read through. The equables^{way} of Egnatious, as you know were written by this bishop Egnatious on his way to Rome to be martyred. There are seven of them which ~~are~~^{it is} usually thought today are actual epistles of Egnatious. Bishop Lightfoot thinks that they are ~~just~~ genuine in a short form. They have been preserved in two forms. A short form and a long form. He thinks the shorter one is genuine and if you bid your lesson from the book prepared by Bishop Lightfoot, you read them in a shorter form. If you used the book of the Apostolic Fathers, I wish there were two or three copies. You have the two forms right next to each other on the page, in the two columns. A shorter and a longer. But there is not such a big difference between the two forms. There are other epistles which are attributed to Egnatious, scholars who today do not believe to be genuine epistles of Egnatious. These 7 have been widely denied. And a great deal discussion of them. They are among the strongest for the authenticity of the revelation of John and of the Gospel of John as having been written before they were written. And consequently a New Testament criticism, the epistles of Egnatious, are ~~of~~ tremendous importance. and most scholars today agree that these seven epistles of Egnatious are actually genuine. You have already read these two and gotten some impression of the general attitude of the epistles. Now one of the Apostolic fathers of whom a little ^{from whom there is} little preserved, but must be mentioned. because he ~~does this work~~ doubtless wrote Agodena. We have an account in Ucevius, the church Historian of a

little after 300 A.D. referring to Egnatious and quoting from him. And telling^{us} of the difference of (13½) Teupascious and telling us of the difference book which Tapius wrote. Tapius is spelled T A P I A S. He is certainly one who should be remembered even if we do not know a great deal about his writing. Not much of it is preserved ~~but~~ except in quotations in other books. But Tapias was a hearer of ST. John and a friend of Talycon ((14) A statement in Ucevious that he was a very learned man. That this statment some think ~~is~~ is a later intre~~pretation~~ intrebulation than SEucebibus. The reason for that is that they don't think it agrees with another statemant of Eucebibus which is not very intelligent. Then, after all a man may be very learned and yet not very intelligent. The fact that Tapias was learned is kpretty hard to deny because he was, he would seem to have been one whp continually inquired. What was said by Andrew, Petr, Philip, Thomas, James John or Matthew. Every time he met one of the ~~discip~~eslk spostles or one somebody who had known the apostles. /~~End~~/ End of C 6

Begin C 7) He was one who believed just about everything he had heard and wasn't particularlyly intelligent. On the other hand it is equally possible that the reason we speak of him this way is because Eucabius sharp disagreement with him. Becaue Tapisu, like all of the writers of this time who believed that the Lord Jesus Christ was soon coming back to this earth to set up his kingdom of righteousness upon this earth and Tapius wrote more about it ~~than~~ some of the others did. And then Eucebibus was bishop after Constantine had become a Christian and they were beginning to say well, the Emperor is going to become A Christian and all the world is going to be ruled by Christianity and hlere is the kingdom right now and therefore they began to forget about Christ coming back to the earth and they ~~got particularlyly disgusted when they read a statement~~ ~~begin to particularlyly to discuss it when~~ by someone like Tapias ~~when~~ who thought that the only hokpe for this earth was in Christ coming back to it and setting up his kingdom here. And so when Tapias says that there may be ~~an~~ vines with ten thousand clusters on the earth in that day and describes something of the great agracultre

century in 390 the Pagan institutions, the temples, the sacrifices, their forms and ceremonies seemed to be in full swing. Anybody going through the Empire and particularly in Rome would say this is the great force of the Empire in (4½) and in 400 it was almost a menace. Now that doesn't mean that the great overwhelming attack came at that time. It seems that its roots had been stacked and destroyed, its underlying foundations had been moved and only a shell remained by 390. And it was fairly easy to collapse that shell. It was fairly easy to collapse that shell. So really our subject covers the whole century. No. 1, The Situation at the beginning of the Century, We have already noticed that of course, but for logical arrangement, I have put it in here at the beginning of the century, the question was Will Paganism destroy Christianity? Christianity was a minority problem. Though a vital one. No. 2, Constantine, We notice that Constantine gave tolerance to all religions and yet in his proclamations, it was very clear what he thought about Paganism on his superstition. It was very clear that his full sympathy was with Christianity but he did not wish to force people to take any particular religion. Naturally, many became nominal Christians in order to win the favor of the Emperor or of his leader. How many, we don't know. But we can be sure there were a good many who ~~were~~ did this. When you get a movement well underway the people begin to flock into it. One that is a small minority group, they are on the other side. That is always true in everything. And so the favor of the Emperor, naturally brought a good many to Christianity but I wouldn't mean that all of these were simply looking for advantage. It would be true also that there would be many people, many pagans who previously to this had thought of Christianity as only a little despised sect or a group of fanatic people who perhaps had some queer observances in their secret meetings perhaps even in moral observances they didn't know. But they didn't see any reason to get interested in it. And when they thought the Emperor favoring it and leaders ~~and~~ in the community ~~speaking~~ speaking highly of it, they decided that this was something that was worth looking into. That is perhaps wasn't just some sort of queer movement but was something that had claim

to consideration. And consequently, many doubtless were led ~~to~~^{by} that ~~to~~ to look into the claims of Christianity or to go and attend the church service and see what it was like and then there were individuals doubtless who were who became sincerely, sincere believers, And who will ~~to~~ run to a true faith in Christ when the thing that led them to be willing to take an interest in the first place was a trustee which the emperor and his leaders were giving to the movement. No. 3, 'Constantine's Successors.' When Constantine died you have a repetition of what happened after Dioclecian's resignation, except that ~~is~~ is within the family. Constantine dies and the Empire is divided among his three sons. It was really a tremendously large empire. Think of a region larger than our United States. A region as large as that with no telegraph, no telephone, with no airplane, with no automobiles, with no means of transportation faster than horses. Think of an area of that size with foreign peoples in every direction ready to make war or trouble at any opportunity with all sorts of various sects and movements and political view points within it. With trouble apt to spring up here or there, thousand one thousand, two thousand miles perhaps away from your center of government. And you can imagine what a problem it would be to control an empire under those circumstances of that size without the means of transportation and the communication that we have today. It was a very, very difficult problem. And ~~that~~ Dioclecian thought to make it easier. by dividing it into four administered districts, each of which had a more or less a ~~common~~ atomonous (8½) ruling so all to some extent under him. Well perhaps this was in the minds of those who decided that after Constantine said the empire should be divided up among his three sons. At any rate we have that situation appearing. One son, Constantine the Second took Italy and Africa. Constant^{ANCE}, the second son, took the area to the east, or to the west rather, France, Spain, Britian that whole Area. And a third son, Constantious took the area to the east, He had a larger area. It was thought it was to be an easier area to rule. There was less~~to~~ trubluent nations next to it, although it faced Persia which was becoming a great power by this time. now Constantine died, as we

noticed in 337. And the Empire was divided among the three sons and immediately the soldiers seized all the other relatives of Constantine and killed them. Why, who did this? It wasn't just an act which the soldiers took a notice they had to do. There must have been orders. but there is no proof who gave it. Constantine's capital was in Constantinople which he called New Rome and the family was larger in east and so many thought that Constantius, the son of Constantine who was ruler in the East was the one who was responsible for this wicked deed and later on when his character proved to be exactly that of a man who would be apt to do this sort of thing, people were more and more convinced that it was probably that ~~he~~ was the one who had all his ^{relatives killed} (~~10/2~~) or whether that is actually the case or not, we don't know. But the fact is that they were killed and they set out to kill all of the relatives except the three sons. That is all the husbands and nephews and anybody else who might be in any way a threat to the throne. But it so happened however that there were two present who were not thus killed. There was a bishop in the east who took an interest in these two young fellows two nephews of Constantine and he exhorted his influence with the ~~10/2~~ soldiers ~~to~~ to get the two men's lives spared. And these two boys, one of them who was thirteen and the other who was six, they were allowed to live. And they were kept in a fortress in Capadocia ~~and~~ in Asia Minor and they would get occasionally good friendly letters from uncle, from Cousin ~~Constantius~~ Constantius who was the Emperor in the East and he was very much interested in the welfare of his cousins but the way he kept them from having contact with other people and in a rather harsh treatment that they received, made them wonder ~~how~~ how sincere he was in his friendly attitude toward them. Now they are very important a little later. Right at the moment we mention however that Constantine ^{the} ~~was~~ second, who was the ruler of Italy and of Africa soon fell to ~~the~~ fighting with his brother ~~to~~ ~~the~~ west with Constantine ^{ANCE} And the result was that after three years, Constantine the Second was defeated and killed so he was of little importance in Church History. And Constantine ^{ANCE} his brother and Constantius made a new division of the empire so that it was in two parts

And then they ruled over it in two parts for the next ten years and then they fight and Constance is defeated and Constantious has the whole Empire which he rules for another ten years. And so you have the empire eventually again united under this man ~~constantious~~. And he therefore is a very man of importance to church history. These are of much more importance than our later head ? (13)

The matter of the internal situation. The matter of the internal situation of the church than he is a present in the ~~the~~ relation to Paganism. And Constantious was quite diffinitely ~~of~~ against Paganist. But like his father, ~~the~~ he accepted the honor which went with the title of Emperor. Like his father, he accepted the gown which the Roman priest gave him and the title which went with it, (13 $\frac{1}{2}$)

a title which had belonged to the head of the Pagan religion for many, many centuries and which the emperors had taken over right from the start. And when you see an inscription put up by an ancient Roman emperor almost any time it is apt to have \emptyset . P.M. after his name, Constantious chief because the leaders of the Pagan, the high priest always had the responsibility of keeping up the bridges over the Tiger and it had become to be such an important title that the early Roman Emperors took it over and they used it during the century. Eventually however, after the entire end of Paganism the title was taken over by the Popes and is born by them to this day.

And if you see almost any writing of a Pope in modern times or in any times after 400 A.D. or quite apt to see after his name the letters P.M. (End of C11) (Begin C 12) regard the successors of the deity. The emperors who were in this/exactly as the high priests of the Pagan/ Well, Constantine kept the title of Chief Grek builder ?

and accepted the ornaments and they put up their monuments to him and after he died they passed their regular edict that the name of Constantine was enrolled among the gods ~~of~~ of monalymphus, along with Jupiter, Venus Mercury and along with all the Roman Emperors. He didn't stop with this he let it go on. And they had their pagan ceremonies in connection with the meeting in the Roman senate but it was just a matter of form. Constantious had absolutely no interest in Paganism and he was vitally interested in

controlling the Christian church and in making its Bishops and its leaders take the views ~~he~~ wanted them to take. And ~~there were enough of Jews,~~ ^{they were not the views a} a majority of them wanted but he ~~d~~ persecuted those who didn't take ~~the views/~~ the views he wanted and he (1) the authority that he had a tremendous ~~authority/~~ influence on the internal light of the church. So he is much more important in that area than he is in the area of the relations to Paganism. It is important for our next ~~step/~~ section here to mention the relation of Constantious to his two nephews. The ^{older} / of these two nephews, Dallus is not so important for Church History but he is important here in leading up to his much more important brother Julian. Dallus, when he became of age, he was a rather, he was quite a firey sort of a fellow and he resented considerably the way that his father had been, that his cousin had been treating him but he came and stayed at the court for a little and then Constantious deecided to send him off to lead an army and he gave him authority over a large area in the east and there Dallus lead the army and did well and the army was attached to him and he was getting along quite well and then Constantious began to become jealous and wonder if this was a threat to his own power. And so Constantious bent some representatives to Antioc where Dallus was and told them to investigate him and they investigated him in such an ^{arogant} ~~eleant~~ manner, carrying out in their attitude the attitude they thought the Emperor felt for this fellow that Dallus say that he was, he would not last very long with this attitude and so he called on the people of Antio~~che~~ to protect him and they rose up and for their Caezar who was living ~~h~~here and they seized the representatives of Constantious and they killed them. ~~There~~ Well this didn't please Constantius very much and so Constantious however wrote a friendly letter and wouldn't say anything

The statement of our Lord, you must eat my flesh and drink my blood else you have no part in me, is a very strong statement. For our statement which we hardly think can be interpreted by those who heard him in the sense the Catholics believe them. They must have taken them as some way a figurative expression, you would think so. And especially when in the very same chapter he says that the letter killeth and the spirit quickeneth, now of course there are various interpretations of that verse, but at least as they heard that statement made and put it with what had been said before it would ~~discourage~~ discourage them from saying that we must actually eat that flesh of his and drink that blood, however you put it together with the communion service where he says this is my body and his is my blood drink ye all of it, and it is certainly a possible inference, that he means his body must actually be eaten and flesh must actually be drunk. I think the thing that is overlooked all too much is when he was sitting there pointing to the bread and saying this is my body and the common sense would seem almost inevitable the people considered he means that is a symbol that is a representation that conveys a lesson rather than that is actually there very body that was sitting there talking to them. It ~~is~~ seems such an impossible conception, when we take the verse out of context and we take a verse from scripture and this is my body we say if you are going to take that literally well it is his body but that is not the way it was given, it was not given as an isolated verse, but as what the Lord Jesus said as he sat there at the table, and we must consider what impression it would make on people as they listen. Now then in the scripture we have these two things, we have the very strong and previously a spiritual relationship, there was a definite relationship there was a personal relationship they had to have actually a close relationship to him and they could be spoken of as eating his flesh and drinking his blood, they had to have that if they were to be saved. And that the communion was the very definitely connected with his flesh and blood, and it represents what he does for us in pouring out his blood on Calvary's Cross, that is very definite in it but it seems to be a conveying lesson of personal relationship between us and him rather than a matter of physical relationship to that particular body and that particular blood. So we have the two sides, take one statements literally and it is easy to see how these gross, sen-

usous physical impressions can be derived from them. Take them in their context, and we cannot escape the feeling the conviction then must have understood them in this spiritual, ~~the Bible~~ in this real sense, the real relation but a relation to him as a person, naturally and not a relation to specific bit of matter. Well now as the time goes on, it is important to realize that as people ~~as~~ discussed it they have a naturally a tendency to use the very words he used, and as we quote his words we interpret them either explain them or we have an idea in our minds that can be gathered from what we say. And if some body among the disciples had thought he meant a physical eating of that very body you would think somewhere in one of the epistles it would be made so clear that there would be no question about it, if somebody in the early church had felt this means that when we have a communion service the ~~people~~ priest has the power to actually change the blood and wine into the very body and blood of Christ, you would think that surely you would have from the early church a clear definite statement, of that remarkable and astounding idea, we don't have such a statement. But we have statements from the early fathers that used the terminology found in the gospels, and that terminology being used as it is used in the Bible, it is possible now to go back to their statements as it is the statement of Christ and to make the argument one way or the other. But it is not until the ninth century that we find anyone making a clear statement of the view that the priest has the power to perform a miracle and to change the bread and the wine into the actual body and blood of Christ, there is no way to know it except by faith, the the action is a fact. That is ~~is~~ his body and that is ~~is~~ his blood. The actual body and the actual blood. Now of course yes, (question)(5) NO No. Oh, well I don't know about that, you ~~wouldn't~~ want to naturally get good bread and good wine for the purpose, but yet anything of a physical taint in it would most likely disappear in the course of the change, I don't know whether physically or not. But the thing is what the priest holds in his hand is not a piece of bread, it is the body of Christ

it is not bread any more at all. The essence of it the actual reality of the bread has gone, all that remains of the bread is superficial accidents, the taste the smell the feel, by which we know the bread, we cannot, if there is such a thing of real bread as opposed to the superficial appearance of it we have no way of getting at it. And of course the fact was the bread which they took tasted like bread and felt like bread and smelt like bread and there was no indication the physical matter of anything different, but Christ said this is my body therefore it must be his body and not be bread anymore at all and therefore the priest must have performed a miracle, it must be his actual body and the fact you cannot tell it, doesn't ~~prove~~ prove it, it is a fact it is his body. Merely the accidents of pure bread. (Question)(7) Of course the word molecule is a modern word which I don't suppose they knew in those days, my guess would be that today they would say the actual molecules are changed, that would be my guess today. I do not know, this is a modern word which was not used in the middle ages. But they did say this that if the actual substance of it, that actual thing is changed there is not bread there anymore, the body of Christ is there, the actual body, (Question) (7½) Yes, Not invariable, but as a rule, they say that the bread and wine are the body and blood but neither one of them is exclusively, the bread is not the body and the wine the blood the bread and the wine are the body and the blood so you can take both of them when you take either, that is their theory I can see a real difficulty there, if that is their theoretical way of getting around it. (Question)(8) There is no evidence, yes you are right, they said how can this man give his body to eat, and that simply shows that the Jews did, what the disciples took it as we are not told. But some of the people listening said this is a crazy statement, how could we eat of his body, and they so the attitude toward it many people taken today was even taken by some in those days and it shows how easy it is understand the words and yet when you think of him sitting at the table there and pointing to the bread and saying this is my body why it is pretty hard to think that those disciples had

any toher idea than I would have than if were illustrating a foot ball game to you and put down a piece of bread and saythis is the captain and this is thecouch, and so on, I was illustrating a point ~~at~~ rather than saying that actually was the captain. (question)(9) Yes, No, the body of course was capable of course to indefinite enlargement, just like he took the bread and made it enough to feed 50000 people, It is a physical thing according to them. And of course the result of that , this result developed not as a result of logical argument but in the course of the years, the thing came about , the people said this is the boudh of Christ , and therefore the priest finished his going through his forms and is susposed to make the change ~~y^ou~~ he will hold it up and when ~~the~~ holds it up ht e people adore and worship and the ~~adp^rat^rl^on/ot/lye~~ holding up of the body of Christ for the people to wroship came to be a ~~know~~ more important thing than the communion, and it is ~~o~~aday, partake the communion accasionally but week after week and if you are particularly religous day fafter day you go to the cathed^ral and you bow and you adore that which is lifted up and as the priest lifted up and all the people bow before it and tremendously impressed and when I was in Paris in 1929, I happened to drop in the church of the Madeline just at the time when they weere doing it and it was so impressive I went back the next tow days when ~~at~~ I was there . (laughing) I wnet back to observe it as it was extremely impressive when it was done right and it can have a tremendous religious impressinon on people, ~~at~~ and it gets, $\frac{1}{2}$ you can see how easily these assume a place in the religion to really change it into magic rather than relignon, it become no longer a pmatter our seeking to become such as Christ wants us to be and to have a personal relation to him , it bevomes a matter our taking advantage of the wonderful mirlacles that can ne wrought, procuring the benefits for us in this life and in the next and forour deceased friands in pugatory to or from that time. And so the performance of the mass becomes a repetition of the sacrifice of Christ it is an unbloody repitition of the sacrifice of Chirst , the priest

takes the body of Christ and places it on the altar and there is a sacrifice which has merit in itself and when a pope dies you will find the order of masses given and thousand and thousand of masses are performed all through the world for the soul of the pope, this sacrifice of Christ being repeated over and over again for the benefit for this pope, only a few hundred years instead of a few thousands years in purgatory, before he reaches the point of being good enough of going to heaven. If that takes that for a deceased pope think what an ordinary one would take, you see how it develops something that is magical and it is easy to see where it comes from, the vital thing for us to know is that it is never expressed in clear fashion as a dogma until the ninth century and when it was then expressed there were others then who were highly respected in the church who denied it and said it is not so and said it is a spiritual relationship and this remains bread and they said that and they were not condemned for so thinking, two centuries later people were condemned for it, two centuries later if you had denied the dogma which was necessary to believe to be considered orthodox, this time it was not, at this time it was discussed as to what is the correct interpretation. The general body of attitude had moved so far in this direction that the magical view had the greatest acceptance in this time, but this is the first time it is clearly presented. (Question (13))

yes, yes, yes, yes, we find no evidence of it, that is right, yes, that is right, these people who were hostile to them, said how can this man give of his body, to eat his flesh, they thought are we cannibals, are we to eat the body, or what, there are two answers, the one answer, is no, we are not supposed to be a cannibal, you are supposed to have a close spiritual relation to him, you are to for, you are supposed to have your new life given you a new creation given you by virtue of his death on the cross.

(end of record)

This is a new record and at the beginning it was not too clear.
c 53 2s 35

Who shall be consecrated as priests, give them the power to perform
the miracle and to change as to what we think the answer is
and we have not time to absolutely that ~~the~~ the Roman Catholic
and the Greek orthodox view on this was never enunciated in any clear form
until 800 years after ~~and~~ did not become a dogma which would
result in a person being expelled from the clergy until two centuries later
after the time of Christ. That is the thing that I want to get now. As to
the full interpretation of it that is a matter for discussion in theology
classes, I would like to do it here but we have so many other things to do
we can not take the time for it, and of course the relation to the Lutherans
was a matter we look into next year a little bit in connection with the
reformation, but it is a matter on which I anticipated slightly, how
Lutherans could not get away from those who said this is my body even though
there is not "is" in the Greek, there is in Latin, he was accustomed to that
Latin so much though he fully realized the Greek was the authority, ~~the~~ he could
not get away from that to this point, he said this is my body and it must
be his body, yet he denied the miracle, it was not changing the body,
so he said it must be that the body of Christ is everywhere, as the spirit
is everywhere, and if the body of Christ is everywhere than the body of
Christ is in with and under the elements. When we eat the bread and wine it
is only bread and wine, but as you take it you take of the body and blood
of Christ which is in with and under the elements, that is, that seems to us
quite different to us from saying this is my body, that is in with and under
the elements, and everywhere ~~is~~ else is my body, and it does not seem to
us to be any more literal than the interpretation of Zwingli which said this
is a symbol of my body, or the interpretation of Calvin which said is much
more definite than that of Zwingli, which said this is in a dynamic in a
real sense, it is the body of Christ, it is not the physical body but there
is a spiritual relationship whereby I really come into close communion
with Christ as I do partake of this bread and wine. The bread and wine are
nothing but bread and wine, but there is an actual dynamic partaking of Christ

as I partake of it and that is Calvin view and when Calvin view was expressed to Luther in his later years, Luther said if they thought this way in the first place, ad great deal of controversy might have been prevented and you get the ijpession Luther felt that if they thought that way in the first place they culd have gotten together and we could have been spared the sharp division between Luther and reform which senters around the interpretatn of the Lord's supper. ~~That~~ After Luthers's deathe many of his floolwers took this point and made it a very rigid point of doctrine and changed it consideragly, reform faith almost as infidels, and there ~~was~~ a very sharp and strong attitude on the part of the Luthern which exists to this day in the Missouri Synod in America. The Missouri Synod in America is themost orthodox group of Lutheras, and they are very fine Christian people, and we feel very very close to them. But on this one point they don't feel at all close to us, ~~it~~ (laughter) they consider us as pretty bad heretics and many of them consider they would much rather have their child go to any worldly amusement than go to one of our churches they ~~wre~~ very very strict in thier in their insistance on the importance of this particular point and now ~~we~~ feel that the~~r~~ actual believ on this point is wrong but we feel it is a hundred times nearer our belirve than it is to the Roman Cathlic belief, and we feel their teaching iseasentially Christian and we feel very clsoe to them. ~~But~~ But they make this line agianst us on which they stress tremendously, they also stress other points but no where near as much as this one. (Question) (5) God ~~performs~~ it but the priest has the power to have it perfomed. The individual priest when he is ordained as a preist is given ~~that~~ power and he has the power, ~~the~~ he can perform the miracle, of course all miracles God performs, but the miralce is not perfomed if the priest does not say these words and it is if he does and he can do it any time he wants and the priest can be the worse scoundrel and utterley wicked man in the world, but neverthe less he has this power andif he does this a man can receive eteranl blessing through it and if he does not a man can not receive a blessing. So

to then it becomes a matter of tremendous importance to bring this on and in England when you in the early days of the reformation in England after you had had the Roman Catholic ~~controversy~~ s counter reformation in England in which the bishops were burned at the stake then when Elizabeth came into power and the pope excommunicated Elizabeth and said that any one who killed her would be doing God a favor, the protestant of England then was so afraid of the R. C. attempt to destroy the nation and reduce it to servitude the R, C. were deprived of any vote in England until the next 200 hundred years and they , and the R.C. Priest was forbidden to come into England at all and to hold a mass in England some of those protestant leaders in England said they would rather see any terrible ~~happen~~ and calamity happen than to have one mass performed in the nation, they considered it one of the worse ~~idolatrous~~ idolatrous things that could possible be done and yet in that situation you find Jesuit priests at risk of their lives at disguise penetrating the country and going to a place where in utter secrecy they can perform mass for some R. C. thereby bringing him the possibility of eternal life. It was real heroine in the risk they take to bring the sacrament because to their mind that is a magic means which can make a difference between eternal life and eternal death for the person and now of course we don't, our belief is utterly different, we think that they are completely wrong but admire their devotion. We will go into that next year. (question) Yes there is you see a vital difference, I should not have said yes, but I see your point, there is a vital difference between R.D. view and the Luthern View, in the R.C. this is the body and the blood of Christ and now the reason they do not give the wine to the layman is because of danger of spilling it, to spill the body of Christ, or the blood of Christ, it would be a terrible thing, they think of this, they would not think of throwing away this material later on, they think, for fact it has even been a discussion what happens when mice eats some of this bread that has been consecrated that is left over, what is the result, a

big discussion in the church, and a man told me he was down in Italy and he saw a little church and he , and Englishman told me and he saw a bright brilliant glow about the church at night and the reason is because there was consecrated bread in it. It had not been used up, it had been changed into the body of Christ and it is actually the body of Christ, and it is a wonderful thing it is a tremendous thing, well the Lutherans do not hold that at all. The Lutherans hold this is ordinary bread and wine , a friend of mine was telling me about a Lutheran minister after the communion service was over of stepping into his church and seeing the sexton picking up what was left of the material and he took, they use one big cup there, one big cup which they all took from instead from little cups, and he said he saw the sexton pick up the stuff and throw it out the window and he said he just shuddered at the thought of it and he thought why do I shudder , that is just ordinary bread and wine, it has no meaning whatever, / now for a Roman Catholic to do that would be the height of sacrilege, and utterly inconceivable a R.D. would throw out what was left of the communion , it is precious it is wonderful it is the very body and blood of Christ, to the Lutheran the body of Christ is every where and it is in with and under these elements to the Roman Catholic let anybody whatever partake that stuff and it is the body and blood of Christ he is eating. NO matter who it is, To the Lutheran unless you are a believer it is nothing to you. It is just ordinary bread and can mean nothing to you. It can have no effect upon you. But the believer by faith partakes the actual physical body of Christ which is in with and under the elements, and so it after all a spiritual relation which the believer has to Christ. And a nonbeliever - there is nothing to it, it is just ordinary bread. The Lutherans view seems , we who are not Lutheran find it rather illogical, and find it hard to understand it and those who are thoroughly indoctrinated in it become extremely

but when you get away from the point they stress in it and down to the point what does it actually mean, what does it signify, we can not see a great difference, we believe we have our spiritual relation to

Christ and which is symbolized and which is in expressed when we partake of this bread and wine which represents his body and blood, they believe as you take of the bread and wine you partake of his actual body which is every where and which the bread, which is merely in connection with the bread, it is in with and under the element and you partake of it at that time and you thus feed upon Christ and ~~the people~~ associated with him and so we can not see much difference. We can see no reason for any we can see great reason for opposition to the R. C. view and little reason for any sharp line in the Lutheran. (question) (11) That is a discussion which has been carried on in a good many different groups. Some protestant groups lay a great stress on that. It is not a fundamental because the R.C. I believe would recognize any possibility of doing it with something else which is impossible to get. I think they would recognize the possibility of using it. They ~~do~~ use orange juice or ordinary water if it was impossible to get the juice of the vine, after all ~~the~~ it is not the stuff it is the miracle that is performed. God could perform the miracle on something else if he chose. The R.C. recognize that you can baptize with sand if there was not water absolutely available. They recognize it is God performing and it is not the elements. ~~^~~ We had better move on we have other important matters here and so we pass on from C the Rise of Transubstantiation to that was B to C Photius now if we had finished this up 10 minutes before the last hour instead of this time I would incline to take about 20 minutes on Photius but as it is you have all studied as it is your lesson for Wednesday, but I shall do it in about 2 or 3 if it is possible, it is difficult to do because it is a bit subject, it is not nearly important for us as transubstantiation, because it is not a controversy which involves us directly. The important thing however to remember about is that the non-protestant section of Christendom is divided into two parts sharply, and it is not only protestant who decline to recognize the pope as the head of Christendom, it is also the Greek orthodox church which was at one time the larger of the two halves of the churches and which is

still a very large and important section of the church and this section has divided off from the Roman Catholic church , there is what the Roman Catholic church calls a schism , they never represent the Grekk orthodox , they represent them as schmatics there is a schism between them ~~and many~~ and many enter into the schism but the primary one is that the Greek Orthodox , the eastern half of the church refused to recognize the pope as head of Christendom, they say the pope is a ~~patriarch~~ patriarch and we have three or ofour diffeent patriarchs and they are all equal, and the pope os an honouable patriarch and when he says he is head of Crhistendom he is utterly wrong, and we can have nothing to do with him , that is the promary thing and now there are other tings that enter in to it , the leading doctine matter that enters in is the flioque

(end of record)

Proceed of the father and the son, both churches

spiritis which proceedeth from the father, and it is generally taken that he will send that is a temporal mission, well now as to the mission of the Holy Spirit, we all agree as to his person but in the structure of the Godhead can he be spoken of as proceeding only from the father or does he proceed from the father and the son. My personal information is to say is that you are getting into matters that we know nothing about, in the nature of the Godhead we just don't know. But the Nicene Creed simply said he proceeds from the father and in Spain they decided that he proceeded from the father and the son, and they inserted the words filioque and that gradually spread through the western world and it was an addition to the Creed which had been made by the great council which were ~~primarily~~ primarily eastern most of the bishops and most of the leaders are from the eastern church but there were very few from the west but they were accepted by the west and these Creeds of the four great ecumenical councils said he proceed from the father and the west inserted the words son. Now the Greeks would seem to be right in saying that a great Creed which had been made by an ecumenical council cannot be tampered with by a local body and changed, you say the Nicene Creed must include this word, what right have you got to tamper with the Nicene Creed, another ecumenical council and consider the matter by for you to tamper with it is rather arbitrary, and so they have a strong point there as to the actual doctrine most of the us are inclined to think that the western church is nearer the truth, and protestants have generally agreed with Roman Catholics on this point, we have never laid any great stress upon it and many doubtless agree with me that it is a matter of internal structure of the eternal Godhead and which we are hardly competent to discuss and we have not enough evidence to know anything about it. But the act of the western church in inserting this word, ~~which~~ led the eastern church to think they were doing a rather arbitrary thing, the thing of it was they never tampered with the Creed and changed them, if you want to see that I do not accept the

~~The/Nicene~~ creed, that is one thing, I will make a new creed of my own, but to say I accept the creed and then make a change in it, that they objected to violently and Photius stressed this matter. Photius / the causes of division between the eastern and western church and wrote them up in clear language and Photius was a great writer, even the modern Roman Catholic books speak of him as one of the great writers of the middle ages, one of the great Christian writers. He was a great a scholar, he seems to have been a great administrator and a great man, but he came into sharp colision with the western church because Nicolas I of the west said, that I am the pope and I am the authority, I will decide your difficulties in Constantinople, and Photius said, you are a patriarch and I am a patriarch and we have difficulties here and we would like your friendly help, but when you set yourself up as an authority over us, you make yourself anti-christ and so Nicolas said, Photius is wrong and I excuminate him and Photius said, Nicolas is wrong and I excuminate the Roman bishop and all of those who recognize any authority in the Roman bishop and so they excuminated each other and so you ha/d a scism, a scism which with some intermissions has continued from that day to this and the Roman church vilifies Photius and while they recognize his great gifts and his great ability they represent him as treacherous and arbitrary and underhanded and they consider him as a very low type of man while in the eastern church he is considered a saint and recognized as one of their great saints and the details about Photius and of his activities would be very interesting to go into, but we will have to pass it up for lack of time. It is very important that you be familiar with his name and the century in which he was active. the pope who had to do with Photius was the greatest pope of about 4 centuries. He was not as great as Gregory I, he is not as great as the later Gregory VII, but he is far greater as a man and a leader than anyone in between. He was an active energetic man of high character, he intervned in the immorality in the life of one of the important princes, a descendent of Charlemagne, so affectively that he forced this man to give up, this man had put aside his wife and made his mistress his queen

and had her in a very public position and he forced him to change that back again and to take his wife back and to express penitence for what he had done and his influence was cast on the side of morality and right in that instance and he opposed the overbearing claims of some of the higher officials of the church of France and was able to carry through his claim, but as against Photius, his attempt did not succeed but instead resulted in the two groups each considering the other one as definitely wrong. Now, one time when a new emperor seized control, Photius was cast out and a different man put in as patriarch in the east and this new emperor who had murdered his predecessor ~~did~~ sought the help of the bishop of Rome and the papal ~~came~~ came and presided at an assembly held in Constantinople which the Roman Church calls the 8th ecumenical council, but the Greek church does not recognize, and this council condemned Photius and decided that the Roman church is right and the pope is the supreme head and that they recognized as the 8th ecum. council, but the Greeks do not and from here you have your sharp divisions and the pope has never been recognized by any substantial portion of the eastern church as anything but one of the patriarchs of which they had three. Today there are three different patriarchs at Antioch, one of them being the one whom the pope thinks is the patriarch of Antioch under him and the others being from two different groups, but at that time, you had your five patriarchs, four important ones to whom the pope was only one according to their view, according to his view he was supreme. Now we go on to D~~is~~ which is the papacy at the end of this century and that is not nearly as important as the papacy at the beginning or during most of the next century, the 10th century, but it leads up to it and it is something with which we should be familiar. If the church of Rome was one of many Christian churches, we would say the church ^{fell} ~~degraded~~ at different times into great degeneracy. Any human organization may do that and may come back, but if the Roman church makes the claim and makes it in our country and wins many great important leaders in our country to acceptance of his claim, that the pope is the supreme and

divinely, the divinely ordained head of _____, that God established this organization and has been so through the ages, then it is vital that we know something about the history of the organization and know if it had always maintained a high standard and we must say at the end of the ninth century and during the greater part of the 10th, the institution of the bishop of Rome fell into such a degeneration as has characterized very few human institutions at any time in their history. In fact, during the 10th century, there was a period which goes by the name of fornacrazy, and you know fornacrazy, it is magazines and writings with lude pictures which is illegal to sell and that is spoken of as phonagraphy, well for fornacrazy, is government by the people and ~~forhabrasy~~ aristocracy is supposed to be government by the best and fornacrazy is government by wicked and indecent women and that is the name which is applied to the church of Rome during this greater part of the 10th century. Now there are protestant books which will describe the pope and tell you most terrible things about them and in these books you will usually read that there was a pope Joan, a woman, in disguise of a man as a pope at one time. Whether there is any truth to that, we don't know, but at least there is no proof of it and personally I feel that there is no point in repeating against the papacy any story which cannot be thoroughly and completely proven, there are plenty that can be and there is absolutely no need of ~~any of the~~ it in any event, but in dealing with a subject like this, I would like to use as my authority Roman Catholic books and I like to base my statements upon the statements in these books and then if you have something in a book approved by some leading Roman Catholic bishop, who has given his approval to the book, it means that some Roman Catholic scholar recognized as a fact and some bishop thinks it is so clearly proven as a fact that there is no use denying it, but the interesting thing is that in dealing with some of these, you will find that some Roman Catholic writers try to whitewash all of the popes and some of them try to white wash some and to admit the errors of others and therefore it is good to look at more than ~~at~~ one of such books and it is good as you look at

one to see what they may admit in an incidental way so that you don't notice it if you read it, unless you read it closely, but what they nevertheless do admit. Well, now I fear that we will not have time today. I had expected to get all through the period of fornacrazy today, but I fear that we won't have time to even get into the fornacrazy and perhaps it is a good thing not to get into a period like that at the end of the week so we will leave it until next Tuesday, but we will be able to discuss the papacy at the end of the 9th century and that is a very interesting development. During the 9th century Charlemagnes' imperial power degenerated until you had the empire divided up and you had Charles the and Charles the and Douis the Simple and people of that type being the emperors and it degenerated to a pretty low degree and at the end of a century it got to the point where the bishop of Rome would put a golden crown on almost anybodies head and say he was emperor and he didn't necessarily have any power and it got to where it was a struggle as to who was the real emperor and in this struggle naturally people wanted the bishop of Rome to be on their side and so you get a situation where there is a bishop, a pope named John VIII and this man, it is said of him by John in The Fagent of the Pope, the book published in many editions in N.Y. by Roman caht. publishing house and give the bishop of Los Angeles, you will find that in this book it says of John VIII who was one of the popes in the latter part of this century, I will give you his exact dates 872 - 882, it says of him that he issued several hundred letters of Anasima, that he issued hundreds of letters of Anathama, letters of cursing individuals. were produced by the less energy of John VIII and the violence that had so characterized his reign persisted to his deathbed, even a exit from this world would deny to this active man. He was poisoned and then while he was still alive and writhing in agonies incited by the drug, his impatient murderers smashed his skull with a hammer. This crime was ascribed to conspiritors belonging to his household, relatives or servants who desired treasure. Many popes had been martyred before but this was the first to be assassinated, but there were many others in the next century who were

Now there was a bishop of which is the of Rome and is considered one of the subsidiary bishopships of Rome, Formosus, is a name worth remembering. Formosus was bishop of and he had opposed John VIII, but after John died the next pope gave his favor to Formosus, but he died in a short time and his successor. There were two or three successors in fairly brief time and then you have Formosus who is called by the hardy survivor of many
(end of record) was elected pope.

others were quite favorable to him, but he tells you about Formosus relation with the emperors and with the different of the empire including some ~~Roman/Italian/and~~ Italian leaders, we won't go into the details of it, but we note that after he died, the next man, Boniface VI only lived a fortnight and then Steven VI became bishop and he was favorable to the political party in Italy that Formosus had opposed and what did he do? Here is what Farrow says: Stephen VII now is bishop of Rome. At last Lambert, this is the man who calimed to be emperor there, was free to do as he pleased in Rome and before the his mo~~y~~ther, a woman of implacable will and terrible passions and with the consent of the new pope there was a of dreadful revenge, He says, with the consent of the pope, other Roman Catholics say the Pope did it. At least the pope was the active a~~g~~ent in it even if he tries to make out it is the emperor who really was the cause for it. But here is what happened. The body of Formosus was disinterred and once again dressed in the gorgious robes of a presiding conq Before the gloting eyes of Aga the corpes was propped upon a throne around which a conscienceless~~kl~~ assemblage of clergy took their places and went through the motions of a trial. A defender and prosecutor played their parts in the awful trial and he doesn't mention the fact that what they said was you, Formosus, you are bishop of , why was you so covetous as to want to become bishop of Rome when you were already bishop of another place. That was the principle charge against him and it was wrong for a man who was bishop of somewhere's else to become bishop of Rome. Now subsequently many had been transfered, that is no longer considered w~~r~~ong, but that was the charge against him. A judgement was pronounced that declared the of Forgosus to be invalid. All of his acts were annulled and all ordinations performed by him were pronounced to be false and illegal. The whole of the barbaric insident was concluded by a series of degrading insults to the corpse. Richly embroidered vestments were town from the rotting flesh and the fingers which had been used for consecration were chopped from the

right hand. The unsightly remains of the dead and degraded pope were then cast ^{dr} un~~dr~~essed and dishonored into the Tigris, where secretly a monk with the assistance of some hired fisherman rescued ~~them~~ ^{him} and interred ~~them~~ ^{him} decently in burial ground. The pope who condoned such savagery was himself to be a victim of violence. Before he had reigned a year, he was seized, chained to a couch and then strangled to death. Now, the Catholic ency. does not say that about pope Stephen, it takes his part rather than Formosus and it simply mentions that he died of strangulation. Now which was the infallible pope, Formosus, who had performed these various acts, or Stephen the VI who propped up the corpse of Formosus and gave it this form of a trial and then chopped off the fingers and cast it into the Tigris, which was the infallible Pope and the later pope really established what Formosus had done and declared that all that he had done was valid and to day the list of popes include both Formosus and Stephen VI who treated him this way and both of them are in the succession of infallible popes and leadership . It is not at all unnatural that any human organization may degenerate even to such a low point as this. But to say that a whole organization which ever did degenerate to such a low point as this and to an even lower point in the next century, that such an organization was actually ordained of God to be the leader of the church, to be the head of his people, seems on the face of it from its proofs, rather . (end of lecture) but we took up D the papacy at the end of the century and under that heading we noticed the career and the posthumous career of Formosus and then we were ready to take up the 10th century which we had already glanced ahead into rather indefinitely. Now we will take up #10, the 10th century and under that A. A general survey and this general survey is going to be very brief because from our viewpoint it is not at particularly important century as far as the great general movement of history are concerned. This century, the century of the 900, the 10th century, is a century in which the empire of Charlemagne had degenerated quite definitely. It is a period in which the Moslems were still a factor but they were not in

their high point by any means. It is a whole century after , the great leader who was contemporary with Charlemagne. It is a century in which the holy Roman Empire is struggling to be born. I don't know that you would say that, struggling perhaps to get out of what . It was born perhaps with Charlemagne in 800, but Charlemagne's empire disintegrated by the end of the 9th century and the popes were giving the title of emperor to almost any man who was a good soldier who would get control over Rome at the end of that century the title had become to mean practically nothing in Italy and yet it was a title which was much prized ~~and~~ in the rest of Europe and the had degenerated until they were no more a factor but naturally other leaders began to wish for this title and so during this century we have the of strong leaders in Germany who came forward for this title, that is they would unify Germany and then they would seek to get the title of emperor, the title that Charlemagne had taken, and that was still used by the emperor of the east, but which in actual practice extending in his case only to the eastern section of the Old Roman empire. Now that is a very brief summary of the little that is vital in the general historical background. It might be mentioned perhaps that in 911 at the beginning of this century, a Norse conqueror came down from Scandinavia and conquered a section of France in which he established himself as supreme and he and his fierce warriors established himself as supreme mingled themselves with the local people and the section became known as Normandy. It would not be important to us except of its later developments. Also during this century in the middle of the century, a man named Hugh who reigned in a little town called Paris, managed to establish his power over the district round about to the point where you see it assumed considerable importance. He would not be importance to us if it were not for the later developments and he isn't for church history particularly, but from the viewpoint of secular history, from Rollo, king of Normandy, duke of Normandy at the beginning of this century, from him came the line of later kings of England down to the present and from Hugh who established himself in

Paris came the succeeding kings of France and a straight line down to the end of the kingdom of France so that it is not important for us from a viewpoint of general history, these are the background of the developments of modern history in France and England have their small start during this century. But now we move on to what is of interest to us. B Fornacrazy. Some people might object to that as being the main heading of the subject, they would prefer that we say the papacy in the 10th century, but the ~~title~~ describes it quite aptly and had been applied to it by some. This is the period of greatest degeneration of the papacy. 5 centuries later there was a time when there were many individual popes were were at least as immoral I shouldn't say at least, because they couldn't be more than these men, but who were practically as immoral as these men of this century, but there were men of more ability and of a wider influence and consequently it is not thought of as a time anything like the decline and the degeneracy of this century. This is the lowest ebb of degeneracy of the ~~the~~ papacy is this 10th century. Any human organization can fall into degeneracy. Any human organization can decay, can decline to a point where you should erase it off the map and start all over again and we would not want to the memory of some of the fine men who were bishops of Rome previous to this time by connecting them up with the wicked and vicious men who occupy the seat of bishop of Rome during this century. We would rather cover it over and forget about the sad era. Were it not for the claims which are today so widely circulated throughout the world that God established the institution of bishop of Rome to be head of all of His church and the fact that millions of people give at least nominal allegiance and some of them extremely fanatical allegiance to this idea and that being the case, it is important that we know something of the history of the institution and that we realize the fact that during this century it sank to such a point of degeneracy that it is hard to see how any institution could survive such a situation and, of course, Farrow, the Hollywood director who has written the book, The Pagent of the Popes, a book which is highly recom-

mended by the R.C. press and has the of R.C. bishops, has been published by R.C. publishing company and gone through many editions, Farrow says that it is one of the great proofs ~~that~~ of the fact that it is a divinely established institution even ~~throug~~h it sunk to such a very very low point of degeneracy it still continued and went on and it shows how from anything at all you can build an argumetn if you want to. Whether this way or that way, or the other way, you can build an argument and so I do not recommend to you that you try to get R.C. to read this book. I don't see that there is any great accomplishment in that, because he tells all the terrible things about these emn and yet he puts in those little rationalizing statements now and then which if a pe~~p~~rson thinks clearly and carefully he will soon see the irrationality of it, but most people don't see it that way, but I would recommend this book very strongly. I personally feel that every protestant minister ought to have a copy of it. It is a book with the of the R.C. church, a book published and widely distributed by the R.C. church, a book which consequently is in no sense protestant p~~ro~~paganda and I would not recommend a R.C. to read this book, not at all, but I would recommend becoming familiar with some of the statements in it and some of the things in it and then if it comes to the point where you are having discussion over the institution of the papacy with a R.C. who is sincerely interested in finding out whether the situation is true or not, you could present him ~~wth~~ these facts contained here to him and of course, his reaction immediately would be to say that is absolutely false, such an institution divinely established could never sink to such a point, it is absurd to think that men who were popes could do such things and you are describing that, of course, it is simply protestant lies and then after he has said this and has committed himself to that point that those must be protestant lies because no divinely established institution could possibly have men who could do such things, then I would suggest that you give him this book, and simply show him the statements in it and I should think that you, in that way, it would be something that would start ~~to~~ a man thinking as to the question as to whether it really is a divinely established institution

Of course, I do not think that you win a R.C. fundamentally by criticizing the papacy or by criticizing the R.C. church. The way to win them is to get him to read the Bible and to get him to learn to know Jesus Christ as his Saviour and his Lord. That is the vital thing, but in the course of it, the time is pretty apt to come when this matter must be faced as an important question. (end of record)

ch 56

the divinely established authority on these things and I think that this book can be very useful at that point in helping to remove prejudices and ideas that have been established by dogmatic statements by those whom one has a good deal of confidence in. I think that these statements here would go a long way towards removing that and so I wish that every protestant minister might have a copy of this book, the Papent of the Popes by John Farrow. Now, of course, some R.C. would say, well, what is Farrow, after all, he is no great authority. Well, maybe not, but at least, he is a man who felt as a R.C. when he investigated that these were facts which he must face, there was no use trying to hide, these were facts and the censors and the critics of the bishops felt that they were sufficiently established facts that they saw no objection to giving them ~~the~~ to the book and the R.C. press is publishing the book, this copy that I have here is the 6th printing, Oct. 1945. So you see, it is a book which has been used a good deal and my guess that it is 95% copies have been purchased by R.C. Now during this period he goes into the account of these individuals and he tells us a bit about their wicked deeds. He takes up one after another of them and tells of the sort of life they live. For instance, I open here to his account of John XXI. He says, and the anti-pope was driven from the during the end of the life of John XII and the disreputable John was welcomed back as a hero, that he had learned no lesson from his experiences was rapidly manifested by his conduct. With barbaric cruelty revenge was reaped upon those of his antagonists who were unlucky enough not to have escaped. One ~~of~~ had his right arm struck off. Another was publicly scourged and the third high official

lost his ears and nose. Once again debauchery stained the , the lateran was the place where the pope lived in the Middle Ages, replaced at the time of the renaissance by the vatican where they live today. The lateran today is the second most important papal church in Rome and it is a church in the heart of Rome which belongs to the vatican and is part of the vatican estate, even though it is just a very small area separated from the main portion of the vatican estate. During the middle ages it was the main headquarters fro the pope. He says, once again debauchery stained the lateran, but only for three months with volition to endure. John XII breathed his last in the month of May 964 and even the circumstances of this inglorious and despicable man were not free from a disgraceful shadow for it is the popular belief that he died at the hands of a wronged husband. The only happy fact that will emerge from his dreadful reign and it is remarkable ~~that~~ is that amongst the innumerable villainies perpetrated by the consecrated mystery there was ~~never~~ any pronouncements against the dogmas or moral teachings of the church. Isn't that fine? Though he broke them all in his personal life and in his actions, he never issued an ex cathedra statement that adultery and murder were all right. Consequently there has never been any pronouncement against any of the dogma or moral teachings of the church by this man. Now that gives you a taste of how frankly Farrow speaks of these men who he recognized as consecrated popes, as heads of the Christian church according to the view which they hold. Now, let me read you the different general impression which you get from this book here which is McSorelie's Outline history of the Church. Hear his account of John XII. At the age of 18, he became both civil and ecclesiastical ruler of Rome. He proved to be the most unworthy man who ever occupied the papal throne with a possible exception of Benedict IX. There are some who think that Benedict IX was worse, but it is hard to chose between them. Meeting with opposition in Rome, John XII called to Rome and crowned him emperor in the year 962. John and the Roman nobility promised allegience to OTTO and the emperor in a document

stamp renewed the donation of the territory made by . As soon as Otto had departed from Rome, however, John entered into a conspiracy against him and when Otto returned he fled to a town a few miles away from Rome. The emperor summoned John to trial before a Synod on charges of sacrilege, , purgery and murder and incest. John threatened to excommunicate all members of the synod if they should elect another pope, but they nevertheless opposed him and elected as his successor Otto's secretary, a Roman layman, who was ordained deacon and priest and consecrated pope with the title of Leo VIII. After Otto's departure, John reentered Rome, severely punished the emperor's supporters and a synod in St. Peter's which revealed the decrees of the synod that had elected Leo and excommunicated Leo with all of his electives. Shortly afterwards John died and the Romans elected a cardinal deacon Benedict V. Now you see what a different impression you get from this than from Farrow, and yet there is no contradiction. McSorely is familiar with the facts as given in Farrow, but he tries to cover them over a bit and when he simply says that the man was perhaps the worst man who ever occupied the papal throne that doesn't give you anywhere's near the impression as it does to read from Farrow some of the things that he did and when he tells about these terrible acts, he simply says that he was accused of them and, of course, you can say a man is accused of a thing and it still leaves you wondering if there is any truth in it or not and some very good men have been accused of some very bad things. So you can get a great many of these facts in McSorely's Outline History of the Church, but you don't get the same impression that you do when you read in Farrow which is somewhat fuller and which also tries to present it in vivid language rather than to cover up the facts about these things. Now, I won't go into the details now in class of these different popes of this period. John XII was perhaps the worst of this period, but he was by no means unique. There were others if they were not quite as bad as he was, would be at least near enough so that it would be difficult to find any tremendous difference. The. I am going to give you an assignment

for next week in Farrow to look up certain men whose names I will give you and to find the facts about them. They are all in this same period and so it will be fairly easy to do. But this is material that I believe a protestant ought to be familiar with. So for the present of this very disgraceful situation of the papacy during practically this whole century, the pornocracy. But there is one thing that you notice as I read from McSorely here which perhaps should have attention called to it at this point and that is that this pope here was supported by Otto, the German emperor, Otto I. Now, the German emperors at this time, as I mentioned, the German kings were seeking to secure the title of emperor and this is the fact historically and humanly speaking is the fact that lifted the papacy up out of its degeneracy. We notice that Charlemagne had found and kept them before him, great advances in friendship with the bishop of Rome because the bishop of Rome had a name and a standing throughout western Europe and if the bishop of Rome would give the title of king, it was easier for to take it than if he took it on his own initiative and if he would give Charlemagne the title of emperor, it was easier for it to be recognized than if Charlemagne simply did it on his own initiative and so there was an advantage to them from the name and the standing of the bishop of Rome. Now in this century 150 years or more after Charlemagne we find kings in Germany who are anxious to use the title which Charlemagne had taken, the title of emperor and there are kings who held a sizable part of Germany under their control and who were recognized by others as being the leader in Germany and they were men of high quality, men of good character, men who were anxious to establish a government on a foundation. That is, not all of them, but the bulk of these men at this time and consequently these men saw a great increase of standing and prestige which would come to them if they had the title of emperor and the easiest way to get the title of emperor wasn't just to say, I am emperor, then other people would hesitate unless they were very well inclined to them, but to get someone to give it to them who had already given it to the

great Charlemagne and so we find German kings beginning during this century and more during the next century leading armies down into Italy in order that the bishop of Rome should give them the title of emperor and thus there was an advantage which the German kings would get from the bishop of Rome and so they went down to get this advantage and they found the church in Rome plunging into this terrific degeneracy and they tried consequently to improve the condition of the church and for a time they tried to pick one of the various candidates for the position in Rome because at this time there were different groups in Rome fighting among themselves. One would be bishop and then the otherside would win and they would kill this one, although in general it was this group of wicked women who controlled it and put either their lovers or their sons into the position of bishop of Rome, but the kings of Germany tried for a time to select one of these Romans, after all naturally a Roman could be bishop of Rome, to select one of these Romans and put their power behind him, but when they did this, the natural result was that the other Roman's who opposed this particular one would use that as an argument against, he is supported by foreign arms, he is simply the candidate of a foreign soldier, he is supported by the Germans, he is not our real bishop of Rome and they would unite and rise up against him and when the king might come down and might put down their resistance and reestablish a man like John XII here as bishop of Rome, as soon as he left, the man himself would turn against him and would ~~be a~~ proceed to do these terrible acts described here and then finally in disgust the German kings began to make Germans bishops of Rome and so we have a brief period in which at the end of this century, and the beginning the next at which Germans of high character, who were considered by the emperor as men who would do honor to the position of bishop of Rome and help establish sound conditions throughout western cristendom were put in the position of bishop of Rome and strange as it may seem they found it easier to support these Germans as bishops of Rome than they had to support the men they selected among the Romans as bishops of

Rome and that leads us into the next stage of the papacy which we take up in the next century. But I think it is important to see the natural development, the historical development through which the papacy was out of its degeneracy and ~~the~~ the institution maintained even though the Romans for a time lost all hold upon it and the group of Germans were put in as bishops of Rome and how it was for their own advantage that the kings of Germany did it, or you might say that it was because of what he thought was for the advantage of the empire. (question 13) A man who was bishop of Rome was head of the Roman church. You would expect that the Roman people would find it easier to rally to a Roman than to a foreigner, and the great argument that they raised against the R.C. was that they were after all, they weren't true Romans because they were supported by a foreign king and it was foreign arms and it was foreign soldiers that enabled him to remain and just as soon as the king of Germany would go back and in those days it was a long tedious trip to go back and an expensive trip, as soon as he would go back and take most of his soldiers with him, the Romans would rise up and drive out the pope that he has established, but there is this in addition to that that these Romans were very very wicked men and when they began putting Germans in there was the compensating factor that they were very good ~~men~~ and that helped. And then there was another factor also that we will mention next time, but it would seem to me that the British have usually found that they can take an Arab and make him king over sections of Arabia and an Egyptian in Egypt or some native in a country and they can support him and keep him in power pretty well. They said that was much easier than to put an Englishman in (end of record)

(question) The German emperors selected John XII as the most likely, John XII was a real Roman -- John XII was only one of two or three that were supported at different times -- but made him worse in the eyes of the Romans because they looked on him as a man supported by foreign power and the Romans drove him out as soon as the emperor was gone, but then he would get back in, the emperor would come back and put him back in power and after he was in power, once the emperor left, then John through off all allegiance to the emperor and turned against him and then won Roman support, but then he proceeded to live the sort of a life that Farrow describes here after that. It was the beginning of the effort of the German kings to improve the condition of the papacy and they began by supporting two or three different Romans but they were typical of Roman society at the time and no better than their associates and if anything were worse, and it didn't help them and then the Germans began selecting Germans of high character and putting them in as bishops of Rome and that movement was into the next century and we find that it eventually succeeded, but eventually having an effect quite different from what the German kings originally had in mind when they started. Well, this you see is the terrible degeneracy of the Pornocracy of the 10th century from which the German kings in the latter part of the century tried to rescue it and they succeeded in the following century and that was the very end of this one, but their efforts were present in the 10th century, but the results of their efforts were hardly noticeable until of course, the very end of the century. The degeneracy was pretty complete and it lasted well over a century. Now that is a long time. It is not a matter of one wicked pope. It is a matter of perhaps twenty, perhaps twenty vicious men who occupied the seat of the bishop of Rome, it is a matter of a period of over a century in which the institution sank to about as low an ebb as any human institution can sink and still continue to exist. And then C. I want to mention Pluny, but I am not going to take time with you for Pluny because it ~~is~~ is quite a simple subject and you have had the assignment for today to look it up and to get the facts about it. It would be interesting if we had time to take

a long time in looking at Pluny and if Pluny were a century or two ago instead of 11 centuries ago, I would think that it would be well worth our while, but as it is, it is a movement which rose and carried on and disappeared eventually and it is long ago and in the course such as this, is it not necessary to go into detail on it, but it is vital that we know of its existence and the part that it plays in the history of this period and Pluny was the reform movement of the church as a whole and Farrow speaks of the godly of Pluny and the great influence that it had in the church and he will say at one particular point speaking of the influence of the of Plunay, he will say, at this time there was no help in the reform movement from the lateran which had more the atmosphere of a than of a Christian church and he will make statements quite as strong as that in showing the degeneracy of the papacy as to this movement of Pluny which was coming forward. God did not leave his church simply to sink into degeneracy, but it was not through the papacy that He brought about a reformed movement in the church. The papacy was sunk into degeneracy and was itself reformed by the German kings, but in France, an Abbey was founded at in 910 and this abbey or monastery became a place in which interest in theology study of the Bible, interest in moral movements was lifted to a standard not at that time known elsewhere in western Europe and from which its influence went out to other places and people were so impressed by it that they began starting other monasteries subject to the monastery of Pluny and eventually you had a thousand monasteries, all bound together under the leadership of Cluny and that is a tremendous movement for improvement morally and spiritually, a movement which had no connection with the papacy but from which eventually maintained who came to be put in as bishop of Rome, but it took over a century before it reached that point. (question) Yes, well suppose there were 314 monasteries scattered over an area, that would be a very very sizable movement. As a matter of fact, it is pretty hard to measure it in terms of the number of monasteries because one monastery might have ten monks in it and another might

have 300 in it and so there was such a diversity among monasteries that I don't think the number means a great deal. We will take the smaller figure given, you still have a very large and important movement. You take the larger number of thousand, it makes vivid to you the fact that it was a large and important movement, but if you take a thousand monasteries or thirty or 314 of 150 and of course they weren't uniform, some would be large and some would be small and I don't know that statistics are available today to figure the exact number and even when you get into that you will find individuals, if you have thirty monks in a place, you have five men who are spiritual giants and you might have 25 who would be pretty much average men who wanted to do something good and who weren't particularly outstanding and another place out of 100 you might only have one, so that it is pretty hard to compare statistically, but at least it was a movement which was very widespread and very influential during a long period and the matter of whether 1000 is exaggerated or not, I am not in a position to say. I readily see the possibility that it may have been exaggerated, but it is also possible that it may not be. That wouldn't sound as if a thousand were exaggerated would it? Now, of course, Schaff might be wrong there too, we just don't know? (question)

7 3/4 Yes, and of course, there again, it is hard to make statistics because something may be founded through Cluny and something else may be reformed by, but the reform might be very superficial and on the other hand there might be still going. Sometimes those that come over are more loyal than the ones who actually have formed, so it is hard to make statistics on a thing like this and for our purpose here, the vital thing is that we see that there was a strong spiritual movement at this time which had nothing to do with the papacy and which kept western European christendom from degenerating into utter rottenness which kept it from it and which in fact, meant very real improvement in many areas, although it was the dark ages in general, though there were doubtless many individuals among these Cluny monks that were real Christians and there were doubtless many individuals were very

fine young men, although there was doubtless in general, not the emphasis on the evangelical note on the Scripture that should have been there and that would have resulted in having a far greater spiritual effect than it actually had, but it is a good force and a force that in general was, did much that was tremendous, but it was a movement that began in France. It is not connected with the papacy in any way. Eventually some of its men came into the papacy, but the papacy never became an instrument of the Cluniac reform, it never did. There were individuals who were greatly affected by it, but the papacy always was quite distinct from the Cluny movement. Well, now, so much for Cluny then, let us go on to the 11th century. You see we have skipped over a whole century very quickly, but it was just as long a century as the others we have been looking at at different times. Now the 11th century that is from the year 1000 to 1100 and it is a period historically is of some considerable importance. It is a period which in the history of the various men of importance who came forward is of good deal importance, but it is not a period over which we need to linger very long. There were very few movements which in themselves were tremendously vital as affecting us except that they perhaps are the continuation of something earlier or the beginning of something new. Now during this century, from a viewpoint of general history, people in the Anglo-Saxon world find a date in this century which is very vital and that is 1066. From church history it is of little importance but from the history of England, it is one of the three or four most important dates in its history. It is the date when the Norman marauders who had conquered a section of France and held it for a century and a half became dissatisfied with that and moved over and conquered England also and so William the Conqueror conquered England in 1066 and from him the line of English kings is considered as beginning. Previous English kings are spoken of as the Anglo-Saxons rather than English kings and historically it is thought of as a sharp break between them. And from this time on, though there is a change in dynasty, there is a continuous pretty much line and they all trace

their power back to William the Conqueror 1066. From English history then, this century is a very important century, but it is of no great importance from the viewpoint of church history because the English church was not greatly altered. Previous to this time the church of England and the church of France was very much the same and there was no great change made in the English church. Gradually Anglo Saxon and leaders were replaced by Normans, but it didn't affect the teaching, the doctrine at all. Now during this century the German empire which had begun during the previous century came forward to become a vital force but it always had a great element of weakness and that element of weakness which had been present in the previous century and which continued right up to the end of the Holy Roman empire, was the element that when it began the empire in Germany, there was no one man like Charlemagne, of strength and power in himself to establish himself as emperor by his won great right arm and his army to the point that people would recognize that he and his descendents had the right to be emperors and of course in Charlemagnes case this didn't produce a permanent empire because his descendents degenerated. Well, in Germany there was no individual out- regardless of the question whether his descendents were degenerate or not and so in the establishment of the holy Roman empire in Germany there were a number of men of considerable power and prominence as leaders of sections of Germany and they didn't want to simply fight among themselves to see who would become supreme and so they made an arrangement whereby they would meet and elect one of their number to be emperor and he would be the head of the Germans but he would be after all, more or less or a , he would have authority in his own section where he was king, but in the rest of Germany unless he was a man of unusual strength, he was only , they recognized him as emperor and honored him, but the king in that area actually ruled. Well, this meant that a system of election was established. A system whereby there were kings of different areas of Germany who had a right to take part in the election of the emperor and theoretically it was not fixed in any one fami.

it has a lot to say for it from the viewpoint of that when a family degenerates they can elect an emperor from another family, but it has the disadvantage that it means that there is always uncertainty as to who is going to be the emperor and it does not provide for the building up of strength and firmness and so there was always a great element of weakness. (end of record) ch 58 at times under very powerful leaders it became for a brief period an element of real force and strength. Now the German emperor as we notice in the previous century try to reestablish the bishop of Rome as a man of real respectability in order to have his support for their and of course they didn't think that consciously, purely selfishly like this, they thought of it as the welfare of Europe to establish authority with a leader of the political sphere and the leader of religious sphere and they wanted both of them to be on a high level and they wanted the bishop of Rome is the only man who had such claim to such leadership in the religious sphere by virtue of position and they wanted him to be a man of real leadership religiously and so during this century, during the 11th century, this became a reality, this establishment of the bishop of Rome as a man of real leadership in the Christian church in western Europe for it was necessary to put a few Germans as pope to break this vicious line of wicked men who had been holding the position and one of these men, one of these Germans hit on a very remarkable idea. He was chosen by the emperor, he was to be the pope, the bishop of Rome, the Romans knew that if they didn't make him bishop of Rome that the emperor would come in with his army and kill a good many of them and destroy whoever they made bishop whether they succeeded in making him bishop or not, but this man hit on the idea that he would declare that his authority came not from the emperor, but from the church of Rome, and so he dressed himself as a pilgrim and he came down to Rome as a pilgrim dressed simply as a pilgrim, came into the city there and worshipped at the various shrines and as he did this the Romans knew that he was the man of whom the emperor was supporting and whom the emperor was going to put into power eventually anyway, but his attitude

lead them to think that he really venerated Rome and venerated the position, venerated the leadership and didn't recognize the emperor as really the great authority and so they saw a simple and easy way to capitulate with the emperor's desire without actually capitulating to his actual claim to authority and they proceeded to elect this man as bishop of Rome as the emperor wanted them to but did it seemingly on their own initiative and this to some extent helped to break the vicious situation which the Romans were resisting the attempt of the emperor to force bishops upon them and so Leo XI became the bishop of Rome and in 1249 he became the bishop of Rome and he was a reforming pope and a man of high character, a man who tremendously changed the situation in Rome and who began a series of men in the position who were actually interested in raising up a religious leadership in Europe and not simply in their own personal pleasures and enjoyments in the city of Rome. (question) No, he was not a German emperor, he is a German individual, that is he was on the border of Germany and France originally, but he was a man there that was recognized as a monk of high character and the emperor desired to make him pope. He went down to Rome as a pilgrim and came in simply as a humble pilgrim and worshipped there in Rome and left it up to the Romans to see what they would do and if you want to, you can say the Romans were tired of their bishop Roman leaders and decided that here is a good German man and we will make him bishop or if you want you can say the Romans knew that if they didn't make him bishop that the emperor would march in with an army and kill anyone who would be made bishop and try to make him bishop and they said he looked like a man that isn't going to be a strong supporter of the emperor anyway and he looked like a pretty good sort and we might as well bow to the inevitable. Now which is true, we have no real goal of the opinions of the individuals and consequently we can form our own judgement as to it, but that is what happened and he began a series of men who brought their power from the part of the German emperor, but who theoretically had been elected by the Romans, by the Roman clergy and not by the emperor and who

were interested not in the enjoyment of de life in Rome as the predecessor of the previous centuries had been but who were interested in establishing their control in the religious world and as they proceeded to sestablsih it and people would say, well you are just the emperor's puppet, he has put you here, and he would say I am not, I am the leader of the religious world, I am superior to the emperor, it is I who crown the emperor and so during, you have the papacy during the rest of this century and the next raising, being raised up to the highest position it has ever held in power in Europe, and you have these men who got their power, originally thru the emperor's support, taking a position, actually I am more imporatant than the emperor is and for a period of many centuries aftdr this you have parties developing supporting the emperor and parties supporting the pope and you have a constant clash between the two as each tries to maintain that he is the supreme one of the two and yet you have them to quite an extent working together ggainst all other because the popes couldn't have continued their power very well if it weren't for the emperor's support in the long run, and the emperor secures his title theoretically from the pope and so for a period of many centuries after this you have two of them there helping each other to be supreme and still fighting each other as to which one is the leader and of course, the result of that is that during the next many centuries Italy is/~~is~~ torn apart as some support the pope and some support the emperor and army after army marches down to Italy and it was a terrible thing for the welfare of the Italian people. It tore Italy between these different forces, but it was probably a good thing for Germany and France proceeded its own way and ~~separate~~ was separate form the empire from this time on, had its own king who theoretically was under the empire, but very very theoretically, never admitted in the actual control of the emperor in any event. Sometimes the French king would try to get elected emperor. So that is the development which came as the bishop of Rome went down into this terrible period of pornocracy and then was lifted out of it by the influence of the German emperor and proceeded in the latter

part of the century to claim to be superior to everyone on earth even to the German emperor himself. I will quote the lesson for next time. (end of lecture). We were speaking at the end of the last hour about the 11th century and we took up A, the survey of political history, and we noticed that from a viewpoint of political, modern political history, the 11th century of considerable importance because it was then that the French kingdom began which continued to become a great power in the middle ages, even though it was a continuation of previous development and actually this century is when it began to assume the form that later became so important and also ~~that~~ it was the century in which the Normans conquered England and that began English history in its modern sense, the Anglo-Saxon kingdom before is usually rigidly separated from it while English history continues considers a period as beginning at 1066 which continues more or less to the present. However, these are not particularly important in church history because they did not affect it greatly. Its successor's of course had a very great affect on it, but from the viewpoint of church history, the 11th century is a very important century because it is the time when the papacy was transformed and it was changed from the plaything of the Roman nobility to a real force in Europe. And so we will discuss that under B. The Papacy. ~~The~~ Now, the papacy at the beginning of this century was still sunk in the situation of the pornography. It was, however, somewhat by the attempts of the German kings named Otto in the previous century to establish it, to clean it up and to free it from the control of the Roman nobility and to change it into something that could be, have some sort of spiritual leadership in Europe. There was throughout Europe by this time, quite a looking to Rome for leadership. This was, of course, the result of the reputation of the old Roman empire. The German king was anxious to take over some of that universal respect to himself by considering himself as a Roman emperor and it was pretty hard to take this authority unless it in some way was connected with Rome and the one way to connect it with Rome was to have it affirmed by the

bishop of Rome, the man who claimed universal authority in the spiritual sense. from earlier centuries had been very strongly made by various , but in this century they still were occasionally made but most of the popes of the 10th century and the early 11th were so busy with their debauchery and their wealth and their terrific immoral lives and with their fighting over the spoils of Rome itself, that they had little time to pay attention to things on a larger scale. The pope possessed principally during that period, a prestige as being one who had previously been considered the spiritual leader of Rome and Rome, of course, had been the leader of Europe. Politically and some of this was carried over to the spiritual sphere. Now the German king, then tried to get an advantage by his relationship with the bishop of Rome but he couldn't get this advantage from such men of such low type as occupied the position of the bishop of Rome practically all of the 10th century and the early part of the 11th and so we find in the 10th century the attempt of the German kings to put in a good man, a good Roman man as bishop, or at least a Roman man who would owe his power to the king of Germany and we found that these plans did not work very well, but they gradually got the Romans used to the idea of the control from the Germans of the bishop of Rome. During the 11th century, early in the century we have it swinging back and forth rather violently. We have Benedict IX whom some think is the very worst of the popes. We will discuss him in detail in your assignment for next week so I will not go into the details of the lives of these men. The evidence that I am giving you about them comes entirely from the book by R.C., published by R.C. press and distributed by them with the of the bishop and consequently you can consider things might be worse in these books but hardly could they be better than the way he states it. I have recommended you all to get copies of this book eventually. There are three in the library and this assignment is one of the four assignments for the next two lessons and I think by Wednesday everyone can get to use the books sufficiently to look up the information I have assign.

so we won't need to take time in class to go into the character of these men except to mention various Roman Catholic books consider that perhaps he was the worst of the popes and Gregory VI the following one, they call him a good man but he saw the only chance of cleaning up the papacy was to get rid of Benedict IX and so he offered him a big sum of money in order to become pope in his place and when Benedict IX received this sum, he then resigned and appointed that Gregory (end of record)

but-having received the position not by an election but simply by appointment of his predecessor and by an appointment which everybody knew was hired by the payment of a large sum of money and therefore you have a good man doing an immoral and wicked act buying a church office, simonizing, it is called all through the ages after Simon in the book of Acts, universally recognized as a wicked act, he did a wicked act in order that ^{good} ~~ppg~~ might come in order that they could get rid of the very wicked man who calimed to be pope. No sooner however, was he established and the people who didn't feel that this gave him a valid title put up another man as candidate and claimed that he should be the real bishop and then Benedice IX came back and said, he had changed his mind, he was going to continue as pope and so he and in the end, the Germans, the new German king intervned and disposed of all three of them and appointed a new man and Benedict IX, this very wicked man is recognized in the list of the popes as one of the infallible leaders of Christendom and Gregory VI who bought him out of office is recognized in the list as another of the infallible popes of christendom. Gregory VI confessed his sin, declared that he had done it for a good purpose and declared that as a result it was a very wicked act and as a result of it he certainly should resign from the office and he did so resign, but the real change was made with the election of Leo IX and Leo IX was a very vigorous ruler, a very fine administrator and a man of unusual insight into what would be affective and so Leo 9 in 104~~8~~9, he was german bishop from the border of germany and France and in 1049 when the German king said he would make Leo 9 the pope, Leo 9 proceeded to go to Rome as a pilgrim and walked in there with no German army with him, there was no force, he walked in dressed as a pilgrim and knelt before the different churches and worshipped there, he had a few other monks with him, but all of the Italians knwe that he was the man whomé the german emperor was making pope and that if they didn't support him doubtless the German emperor would come with a big army soon and as they saw his attitude towards them, they decided that probably he was, it was better to accept him than to take one of the Roman men and face a fight over the matter and they had known so many of these men

that the German emperor had put in who they had gotten rid of ~~it~~ fairly soon that it probably didn't seem a particularly vital matter and they proceeded to go through the form of election and elected him as pope and then the German emperor, Henry III stood by him and Leo III ~~approved~~ to be such a man of ability that he soon put the papacy on quite a different basis and he had a very close man working with him, a man named Gildebrand, whose career is discussed in one of these four assignments for next week, but Gildebrand, was very influential from this time on, though Leo 9 was doubtless a man of real ability in his own way. Now from this time on, the papacy is increasing in power. It has been cleaned up to the extent that such terrific scandals as covered the previous century and a half do not occur to any great extent in the course of the next two or three centuries and it is occupied by a series of men who have the German emperor backing them and who have a great influence in making it a real institution, they are not the type of men who occupied it during the previous century and a half and there is some influence on these men by the reforms of the Cluny movement. How much, varies with different individuals, but we have the papacy then from its very low point from the beginning of the 11th century during the next century and a half constantly increasing in power until in the beginning of the 13th century you find that it is at the very highest kind of power it has ever achieved and that is the ~~14~~ high point of the power of the papacy is in the 13th century, two centuries after this time, so these next few centuries are a time of constant increase in the power of the papacy. The highpoint of the papacy during this particular century is reached when the man, Hildebrand eventually becomes pope, after having been the strong supporter and associate of a number of earlier ones, he himself took the position in 1073 and reigned to 1085. Before mentioning briefly his career as pope, I should mention one other event in the life of the papacy during those previous years, and that is an event in 1059, some state the year as 1058, it is either 1058 or 1059, the important thing is that a decree will promulgate it, possibly

it was written at the end of one year and announced at the beginning of the other and there may be some such reason why you find both dates, the one may be a typographical error, 1059 may be that, but this was in the reign of the pope Nicolas II who had been made pope but by a German emperor Henry III, by his power and Nicolas II instituted a decree which many think that Hildebrand is the real author of which declares that the position is not to be established by any civil officer's word, but that it must be an election of the Roman clergy. Now, of course, that has theoretically been the case all along, but very frequently a king or an emperor or even a petty nobelmen of Rome and even these wicked women had simply said who they wanted to have bishop and what they said was done, but here he made a decree which from that time till the present has theoretically been the position of the church and since that time, no one has simply appointed a pope and it has proceeded to be done. That is to say, they always at least have gone through the form of an election and usually the election has been something which the individuals have voted rather freely. Nicolas II then set down the regulation that the cardinal bishops, that is to say, the five bishops of Rome on the death of a pope should consider who ought to be his successor and then that they should take the cardinal's deacons and the cardinal's priests along in with them to vote on the matter and ~~if~~ ^{that} they would vote, thus the Roman clergy, the cardinal bishops, the cardinal deacons, the cardinal priests would vote on who the ~~the~~ man would be and after ~~they~~ had elected the man, the people of Rome would have a chance ~~to~~ to acclaim their agreement. Now that is rather vague, whether the people have any actual voice in the matter or not, but at least they are given a chance to declare that they agree and then after that the emperor is given a chance to say, I think that is fine, and to oppose, but he is not to initiate the election of the pope. Now since that time, many emperors have vetoed various men from being elected. They have different ones had a good deal of influence but the theory has been maintained ever since that decree of 1058 that it is the clergy of Rome that does it and the title

has been given cardinal bishop, the cardinal priest, the cardinal deacon, which means the deacons of the great city of Rome and it wasn't very long before the deacons of Rome ceased having anything to say about it because other people were nominally priests and deacons of Rome and they would come together to say not by virtue of influence in any other country, but simply by virtue of the fact that nominally they held the position in the Roman clergy. They were called together. Now this decree had as its object freeing the papacy from the control of the emperor, freeing it from the control of a political officer. It was pretty much free from such control in the previous century but it was subject to the whims of the wicked ones of Rome and was in a very bad situation. Now the emperor has raised it up and strengthened it to this point and now it wants to throw off any control by him and so this *calixtus* made as against the emperor and a claim that could now be carried out to some extent because of the strength that he had given them in his reformation. Now Nicolas II is quite important on account of this decree, even if Hildebrand is the real authority in the ~~de~~ decree. But Hildebrand himself became the bishop of Rome in 1073, reigned until 1085 and Gregory II had helped tremendously in the reorganization and reformation of the papacy, but all though he had been using the help of the emperor simply as a means of getting what he wanted, which was a free and independent authority on the part of the Roman bishop. Not only over the spiritual life of theoretically the whole world, actually only western Europe, not only over the spiritual life, but also over everything that could have anything to do with morality or with spiritual conditions in general and once you include everything that has anything to do with morality or likeness in the authority, you have everything' included naturally. (question 11) Gregory 7, he reigned from 1073 to 1085 and Gregory theoretically held that the church was supreme thus in every aspect of life and that actually the emperor while he was supreme politically, the church is absolutely supreme religiously, yet anything that the emperor does that the bishop of Rome thinks is wrong, he, of course, can be condemned

for doing it so actually it makes the bishop supreme in everything. (question 12) Hildebrand became, took the name of Gregory 7 when he became bishop of Rome. Now when Gregory 7 was bishop of Rome there occurred an event which has ~~sp~~ stirred the imaginations of the world ever since. Henry III had died at about the time Nicolas II became bishop and his son Henry 4 was just a young boy. Henry 4 was now in his prime when Gregory 7 was bishop and Henry 4 felt that he should be a real emperor. He knew that the bishop of Rome had sunk in degradation and corruption before his father and the predecessors had changed the situation and had cleaned up the corruption and had given them permanent power and he felt that the bishop shouldn't interfere too much with what he wanted to do. On the other hand, Gregory felt that the king should be absolutely free to do whatever he wanted so long as he didn't do anything that the pope disapproved of. And Gregory is the first pope who proceeded to say that if the king does what is wrong, he must be deposed and I have the right and the authority to depose him. Now others may have claimed such a right, but he was the first to actually push it hard and he pushed hard this insistence. He could depose any ruler who proved to be an unjust or immoral ruler or any ruler who seemed to him to be not doing what was in accordance with the betterment of the church. Now Gregory issued in 1075 a declaration of which McSorley says it demanded for the pope a type of supremacy never acclaimed by Gregory's predecessors including the right to use imperial **depose** emperors and to release subjects from their oath of allegiance to unjust rulers. He says there were ~~neither~~ **neither** of these extreme views, he says, neither of these extreme views, papal or imperialist were represented of the common practice of the time. The average practice conformed more closely to the compromise later formulated in the council of 1142. In other words the pope declared in this big (end of record) ch 60 and nobody at that time thought it is only since 1870 that they say that a pope is thought of as infallible if he speaks and only if he speaks and so now he has to tell us when he is speaking ex- but

back in those days it is pretty hard to say we like what he said so therefore it must be ex-cathedra and ~~if~~ if they don't like what he said, he was speaking cathedra and he wasn't infallible, it is pretty hard to it in quite as a way as that, but here is this official statement which he issued with 27 propositions in it claiming this tremendous supremacy over all civil officers and McS. says it was never claimed by his predecessors and his successors didn't go as far as he did in it, but he officially calimed it. Now Gregory was aBel to carry out his claims to sme extent. He was able to carry them out to quite an extent because the young man Henry 4 went so far in some of his actions and so far in some of his steps of opposition to the pope that most of the German nobles turned against him and when Gregory 7 excumunicated the emperor, he was left without any supporters and so this young man, he wasn't so young anymore, Henry, of course, who was the German emperor was excumunicated by the pope, he was left without practically no support and Gre/gory declared that he was going to depose him from being emperor and being king and that he would appoint someone as his successor. In this sttuation Henry 4, the emperor of Germany, theoretically, emperor of the whole Roman empire, at least the western half of it, saw it was necessary to remove the stignent of excumunication before he could get any support from his, in Germany sizable enough to put down the people that were opposing him and so Gregory 4 started south, Henry 4 started south to meet Gregory 7 to try to get the excumunication withdrawn and Gregory 7 went north toward Germany and was in a place called mosa in Northern Italy in the mountains and there at this place he met Henry 4 who had come abandoned by his support practically alone, he came with a small group with him in rags, he came down there to see the pope and to beg his forgiveness and there at the castle of mosa Gregory 7 heard that he wanted to see him and the pope is said to have said, well, let him wait until I am ready and kept him waiting out there in the snow for three days before he finally let him in and received the emperor of Germany bowing before him asking his forgiveness. Gregory seems to have rubbed

it in pretty hard on the occasion that he was absolutely subject to him and at his mercy and that if he didn't do as he said, he would never be free from the excommunication, he would lose his kingdom and Henry 4 in tears was willing to do just anything at all to get the pope's withdrawal of this and the pope's support and so this scene at Mosca has ever since been remembered by the Roman church as a great occasion in the history of the church when the emperor, the ruler of Germany, bowed down before the pope and ~~waited~~ waited three days outside in the snow in order to get in to see him in order to get the excommunication removed. On the other hand, protestants in modern times, have always remembered Mosca as what they have considered an exhibition of the arrogance and haughtiness of the pope who would make the emperor, the head of the civil authority of the western world go through this great humiliation. (question 4½) That is a little more detailed from what I gave, I don't think that it really changes it, but it is interesting to have that little further light on it. Henry was doubtless very shrewd in what he did. He was in the position where his enemies in Germany united with the papal power would have meant his utter destruction. The only way he could recover from it was to get the papal band removed from him and it was worth any humiliation on his part to get it at the occasion and as far as the pope is concerned it is altogether possible that he had rather Henry hadn't come, for he must prefer to depose him and put in a man that he thought he could trust as emperor. Now whether he would have had him just over half of Germany or all of Germany may be a thing on which evidences differ, what was in his mind, there may be some question about, but he very likely would have been happy to have a man of much less power, than the emperor but it is even possible that in the situation the pope didn't know what to do and waited the three days trying to make up his mind whether to forgive him or not but at any rate, the affect of it was to leave the fellow waiting out there in the snow and there was about as bad a humiliation as a man could put on another and it doubtless made Gregory feel very happy when the ruler of the world came

in and bowed before him and admitted the supremacy of the church and Henry was ready to admit absolutely anything if only he would get the removal of the excommunication. He was ready to promise anything. He was ready to do anything that he wanted if just he would get that removed. For once that he had it removed he went back ~~to~~ with the popes favor and blessing which the pope could not under the circumstances decline to give him. ^{he} went back with that. He was the son of the previous emperor, he was a man who had been properly elected. He~~y~~ was a man who had the authority, people gathered around him, some of them said, isn't that awful the way the pope treated him, others said he was completely removed of his wrong in the past, he has seen his error, he has confessed it and he has the pope's blessing and at any rate he managed to get himself a very strong position and once he had he then declared that the pope was absolutely wrong in what he had done and began to take the same position exactly he had before and then the pope declared that he was excommunicated again, but Henry was now too well established for the pope to do anything about it and he had been able to convince his people that the pope was trying to claim an authority which he had no right and that the pope had shown a terrible arrogant spirit in the way he had treated him and he marched south with an army and the pope had to flee for his life and eventually the pope died in the course of the flight and when he died, he said, I have loved righteousness and hated iniquity, therefore I die in exile and in poverty and, of course, the fact of the matter was that Hildebrand had stood for~~the~~ the supreme authority of the bishop of Rome through his life and he more than ~~any~~ other one individual changed the position from one of weakness to one which was ready to move forward to higher and higher power over the kingdom of Europe and his influence was tremendous, though his life seemed to be an utter failure when he died and the end of his life is quite generally more or less forgotten although of course it is all stated in history, but the event at ~~mosa~~ is remembered and remembered by those who support the pope as a great victory and

remembered by those who detest the pope as the great example of papal arrogance. (question 9) Canossa. Nowadays you will hear over the radio almost every day or two somebody will speak of Armageddon, but it is a word if a person has never read the book of Revelation, it doesn't mean anything to you, but it is used in political speeches constantly now a days and has been now and then off and on in times of crisis for the last forty years. Now this name Canossa is a name which will be used similarly. When you have discussions about the power of the pope and his relationship to civil authorities you will find that even when there is no mention of Gregory 7 or of Henry 4 or anything like that the name Canossa is a symbol and you will speak of a ruler going to Canossa or of the pope descending to Canossa because it brings up the true situation, it is one of a few words like Armageddon which have come to have a tremendous meaning just in themselves which the name of the place would not in itself give, but on account of this event which happened at that place. And so Canossa is a name which should be remembered. It is very important, not so much as what happened here, but what was symbolized by what happened there. Well, Gregory the 7th is one, if you were only to name 4 or 5 popes of most importance, Gregory 7 would certainly be one of them. He is one of the men who are most influential in raising up the power of the papacy and he was a very able man, a man who had a very definite idea and who walked toward it all through his life and succeeded in accomplishing a great deal in that direction. Now I will mention C, The summary of the papacy. I am not going into the lives of the succeeding popes mentioning just the facts of the gradual rise which continued from this time on to the 15th century, 2 centuries later. C is Transubstantiation and I don't know that it is necessary that we say much about it here because we have already discussed it rather fully under the 9th century, but there were important developments in connection with it during this century. In the 9th century as we noticed, two centuries earlier, the theory of transubstantiation was presented and it was opposed and there was a good deal of discussion about it. It was not a

new theory then, it had grown up in practice in superstitious veneration which had come to attach itself to the elements of the communion but it was first presented as a theory in the 9th century. Now ~~at~~ in the 9th century, those who opposed it were not in any particular danger, they were not considered as heretics or anything of the kind, they were great leaders in the church who just didn't agree with this theory, but the theory was held by a larger number than of those who opposed it and it came about as the movement continued two centuries later in the 11th century, the transubstantiation had become most generally accepted that when in this century, a man opposed it, he was generally considered as a heretic and this is brought into clear light due to the life of a man named Berengear, and this man Berengear, who was a director of a cathedral in France, highly esteemed in his early life, a man of rare learning and piety, a man who was very well thought of by most of the leaders of the church came in 1044-1045 to the conclusion that the theory of transubstantiation which had advanced from 2 centuries before was utter superstition, contrary to the Scripture, to the and to reason and when Berengear came to this theory, he began to give his view to his pupils, many of his former pupils scattered throughout France and Germany were informed by him on it and it created a great sensation because by this time Radburtus' theory was usually considered simply as a fact. The priest had the power of the supernatural act of changing bread and wine into the actual body and blood of Christ and people generally considered that was the case and now this great teacher, this leader in the church, this man of great learning makes the declaration that that is not true, that that is a theory originated two centuries earlier, a vulgar superstition contrary to the Scripture, to the Fathers and to reason and ~~so~~ many of his pupils who thought so very highly of him when they began to hear about this didn't know what to do at first and when they saw how strong the general feeling was on the matter, it was after all one of the things that gave the monks and the priests their strong hold, they had the power of working this

miracle and without this miracle there was no spiritual (end of record)

because you receive your life from eating of the body and blood of Christ and you couldn't get the body and blood of Christ unless the priest performed the miracle for you and that, of course, is at is today, and there was value, not merely in eating of it but in being present at the mass when the body and blood of Christ was lifted up and presented to God and you had the repetition of the sacrifice of Christ, and so you had an actual offering made by the priests and no one without the priestly ordination could make it. Well, Berengar's theory was a something that struck at the root of the viewpoint which is now held all thru the western church in the 11th century even though in the 9th century, a person could have opposed this theory and it was simply a matter which people could discuss one side or the other and have their particular views about it, but now, it had become so deeply rooted that some of these pupils of Berengar began writing back and saying, Well, now Berengar it is interesting that you have come to these theories, but you have got to go slow. You are striking at something that is very vital in our whole life here and if you want to hold this theory you had better keep it to yourself, don't start talking about it, you will get into trouble. But Berengar wrote to a former pupil of his named L and he expressed his surprise that a man of such intelligence as L... would hold this theory that the bread and the wine were changed physically into the body and blood of Christ, it just showed an utter ignorance of Scripture and it involved a condemnation of Ambrose, Jerome, and Augustine and all of the great fathers. He said, I am amazed at you to hold such a theory and he wrote in such strong language that L.... ^{Who} ~~was~~ by this time had begun to feel that after all he was just as good a man and just as good a scholar as Berengar anyway and it was about time that people recognized that and sent the letter on to Rome and showed it to the pope and said, isn't this terrible. Shouldn't something be done about it? And Leo 9 April 1050 issued a condemnation of Berengar at a Synod attended by mostly Italian bishops and they summoned him before another Synod to be held in September the next year and when he didn't appear to that, wasn't able to get there, they condemned him without a hearing and the book of R....

a few centuries earlier, which had said that it was purely a spiritual presence of Christ and not a physical presence of his body was publicly burned. And soon after that he was called before a Synod in France which Leo 9 conducted and there Hildebrand, that is Leo 9 through his representative Hildebrand and Hildebrand was an old friend of Berengar and Hildebrand tried to prove that Berengar actually was not as bad as they thought, and so he, as papal representative listened calmly to his arguments and persuaded him to admit that the consecrated bread and wine are at least in a spiritual sense the body and blood of Christ and he got him to say words that went far enough that Hildebrand thought, well, he is all right, it is not so bad as they think ~~it~~, and the man, and he seemed completely satisfied and he said, now come down to Rome with me and we will get this matter all settled up and so Berengar thought that he was safe now that Hildebrand saw that he was all right and Hildebrand was very close to the pope and he went to Rome and there in the Lateran they held a council with 113 bishops under Nicolas 2 and Berengar said later the 113 bishops, he said, were like wild beasts. He said, they wouldn't listen to his idea of a spiritual communion, they insisted upon a actual senseless participation of the body and blood of Christ and they said that he must either be destroyed ~~and~~ as an utter heretic or they said that he must accept a formula of recantation and declare that he had been wrong in the past, that actually it was not a spiritual matter at all, but that you actually chew the actual physical body of Christ. They insisted on those exact words, the literal mastication of the body of Christ, a literal swallowing of the blood of Christ, that his body was literally eaten and torn with the teeth and so when they insisted upon that and Berengar, this great scholar, this man who didn't hesitate in his writing to declare the utter ignorance of the people who opposed him, their ignorance of the fathers of the church, their ignorance of the writings of Scripture, their ignorance of true reason when he was faced with this situation he didn't have the courage to go on and so he fell on his knees and agreed to the statement and threw his books into the fire and he said later his human ~~weakness~~ ~~weakness~~ extorted from

human weakness at different confessions, but a change of conviction can be affected only by the agency of the almighty God, that is what he said later, but he made this complete confession, complete submission, and they said, all right then, you can go on, we understand you have completely given up this wicked heresy and when he went back to France he went on writing just as strongly as ever again and he used language of Leo 9 and of Nicolas 2 just as strong as Luther used 5 centuries later in his writings. He condemned his views and he condemned the popes who were maintaining it and L..... wrote very sharply against him and Berengar wrote very sharply against L....., he began to think that he would do like Henry ~~4th~~^{4th} did later on, when Henry 4 after complete submission went back to Germany and got the support of people, but Berengar found that it didn't work that way. His friends gradually withdrew from him and the wrath of his enemies grew so intense that he was nearly killed at a Synod in in 1075 and now Hildebrand who had befriended him and who thought so highly of him became pope as Gregory 2 and he summoned Berengar to Rome. He had defended him against the fanaticism of his enemies, he summoned him to Rome and he wanted to protect him, he thought very highly of Berengar, but when Berengar got there he found that most of the bishops were so strongly on the subject that it was absolute recantation of death and the Lateran council held, presided over by the pope, Gregory 7 who was his friend. He expected Gregory 7 to defend him, but Gregory 7 found himself just about alone in it, because after all he was really supporting him as a friend rather than that he agreed with him. And so at the council when it ~~looked~~^{looked} as if they would condemn him absolutely, Gregory got them to write a formula and say if you will sign this formula, your life can be spared and they wrote a formula which was pretty strong for transubstantiation and Berengar, said, why he said, this isn't what Gregory 7 told me in private conversation. He said my views were all right on this, I don't have to sign this extreme statement, and the pope saw his own reputation was in danger and he rather strongly said, you sign and confess your error here or you are in danger of life and Berengar spoke later, he~~y~~ said, confounded by the sudden madness of the pope and because

God in punishment for my sins did not give me a steadfast heart, I threw myself on the ground and confessed in a pious voice that I had erred, hearing the pope would instantly pronounce against me the sentence of excommunication and that as a necessary consequence the populace would hurry me off to the worst of deaths. And so he completely surrendered his view and the pope after he did this, the pope after all was a very good friend of his and the pope gave him two letters of recommendation, one to the bishops of and' one to all the faithful in which he threatened with the anathama~~x~~ and with the papal anyone which should do any harm in person to Berengar or who should call him a heretic and it is an interesting thing that once you find extreme men like Gregory 7 you will nearly always find that they have someone or two people to whose faults they are utterly blind. It is interesting that in Germany, the great of the Jews had one or two Jewish teachers he studied with ⁱⁿ the university of whom he thought so highly that he protected them right through everything, even kept them in their positions up to the very last and you will find that it is a weakness of human nature that none of us are entirely consistent and friendship is apt in some positions to make us inconsistent in our attitude to one or two individuals and that is the case with Gregory here. He protected him, He even said that anybody should be cursed who would call him a heretic and so he returned as an old man, he spent the rest of his life in strict seclusion and he died in peace in 1088 in France and many thought that he did penance for his heresy and his friends held an annual celebration in his memory at his grave, but he wrote the report of his trial after his return and so it is quite evident from it that what he really regretted was his cowardly treason to the truth as he held it and he concluded his account of the trial with the words, with a prayer to God for forgiveness exercise of charity and he said, pray for me that these tears may procure me the compassion of the almighty. Now Berengar, if he had stood by his view would have died and been cursed by everybody for the next few centuries and

would have been honored by protestants now as a great martyr for the faith. As it is, nobody particularly honors him today. He escaped any physical results of his views and he was not particularly disliked in subsequent years and the important fact about it to us is to show how the idea of transubstantiation has changed so that that which could be freely opposed two centuries earlier as simply a matter of opinion, now had become so much a matter of conviction that even the pope himself could not protect a man who held it no matter how much he wanted to. It had become established as a basic truth of the western church and continued that way with some opposition but very little strong opposition until the time of Martin Luther and it remains one of the outstanding points of difference between us and the R.C. church, altho the Greek C. church has also adopted it so that the Greek C. church which is a member of the WCC holds exactly the same view as the R.C church on this very vital matter which is one of the vital differences between protestantism and R.C. ~~the end of the record~~ (pause in record) ~~the end of the record~~

conquered England in the beginning of the French kingdom and the various general changes in political condition. We noticed the papacy with the change from the position of degradation which characterized the end of the pornography and the whole history of it up to the reign of Gregory 7 who made his great stand against the emperor Henry 4 and ~~the emperor~~ won his great victory at Canossa when Henry 4 stood barefooted in rags out in the snow for three days waiting until the pope permitted him to come in and appear before him. But there was no sincerity to his penance, which was readily made clear by the fact that as soon as he had the papal support and got back into a strong position he turned against the pope again and Gregory died in exile. The conditions changed though from the pope as simply small town toughs you might say of the previous century and the early part of this century. People were now influenced beyond Rome and people of the lowest possible life of cruelty and licentiousness and of no special ability. Here is a situation when a man of strong personality and dominant convictions like Gregory should challenge

the power of the emperor of the west was a tremendous step upward and it was brought about as we saw by the desire of the emperor to have a strong leadership in the spiritual realm and their rescuing the papacy from the situation.

(end of record)

ch 61

natural tendency to exalt the authority of the papacy as high as the emperors wanted it but also past and so it comes that during the next two centuries we have a constant struggle between the pope and the emperor as to who would be dominant. Now we notice C. is transubstantiation. Two centuries before advanced as a theory and opposed as a theory, not held as a doctrine. Now Berengar was forced to give up his opposition to it. He would have lost his life, he would have lost all of his standing in the church, he would have been utterly thrown out if he had not admitted transubstantiation even though he did not believe in it and he wrote against it constantly, yet on two occasions he completely submitted and it showed the tremendous strength that it had acquired ~~by~~ by the 11th century. (question 1) Well, I wouldn't say there was a complete change regarding the view, I would say there was a complete establishment of the view. I would not be at all surprised if in the very earliest days of the church when people were brought into the church and were told that they must eat the flesh of Christ and drink his blood, some of them would naturally wonder if this was actually this body and his blood, and superstitious ideas about it may have been in some minds in the first and second century. We have no evidence, however, of such an attitude being accepted by men of intellectual leadership prior to the 9th century, and previous to this we have words that sound as if the man may have held this, but no proof of it, but we have no proof that it was not held. We do know that it was not accepted as something that must be, but the views of different people on this were and in the 9th century the thing comes prominently to the front when some scholar writes a book defending the view and when others write books attacking it and it is a simply a matter of discussion and when something emergest o the point where it becomes a matter of

discussion, even if the discussion dies out there is apt to be a crystallization of thought on it after awhile and after the situation of the 9th century and during these next two centuries there is a crystallization upon it. People have to take one view or the other and the viewpoint that holds as the priest performs a miracle is something that ~~exalts~~^{alts} the powers of the priest, exalts the power of the church and which exalts, I mean it would appeal ^{to} the natural human pride in such a way that any man without thinking a great deal about it would naturally incline in that direction because it appeals to their authority and pride and influence that it gave them over other people. It could even possibly have been used by some men who desire to improve the moral conditions of the people and who perhaps had some doubt about it, they weren't quite sure, but they had been trying to enforce it and the insistence on this would give them a greater authority and a chance to enforce their moral ideas upon the people and so some men could have been pushed into it through entirely a desire to do good, ~~others~~ through a desire to exalt their own authority, others through a desire to emphasize that which is wonderful and we find that last tendency even in protestantism today. Many people have the idea of the Bible, the more wonderful and fantastic and bazaar you can make everything in it, the better. The remarkable thing is, if we have a book that tells how God caused Polar bears to walk through Egypt or something that is even more tremendous and contrary to nature than that, that is the thing that makes the Bible really worth while. And that is a tendency in protestantism today among evangelicals, it is a tendency and of course, we should exalt the fact that God can do anything He wants and God could change the bread into the body if that is what he chose to do, he certainly could, but we have a natural tendency to try to make it look as if everything he did was just as fantastic and contrary to ordinary natural circumstances as possible. And this tendency is something which you will find widely expressed in your churches and I even find in students in the Seminary sometimes. This tendency naturally in the middle ages could show itself in that other direction towards the development of

such ideas as this of transubstantiation. But the important thing for us to know is that the first evidence of a clear presentation of it as a doctrine was in the 9th century A.D., but we had no clear presentation of such a view by anybody before that time. There was an occasional something that would sound like it and an occasional something that would sound the opposite and in the 9th century it was possible for men highly valued to write against it and to speak against it and be considered as good Christians and men well accepted in the church and yet it was only in the 11th century A.D. that we find the evidence of a situation established where this belief of transubstantiation had come to be so widely accepted that a man was condemned for disbelief. There were many other things for which men were utterly condemned centuries before that, but in the whole history of the Christian church, ^{for} less than half of it has this been accepted as a major doctrine by of the 6. Now today that is the point to which the Roman Catholic church holds more tenaciously than just about any other point of doctrine and it is the point which brought the wrath of the organization upon the reformist in the reformation ~~path~~ more than any other point. (question 6 1/4) The eastern church holds the same view as the Roman Cath. on this. They accept ^{trans-}substantiation. There is no difference in them on this. In fact the Eastern church had a tendency to exalt the miraculous in and in some ways it went even further than the western church. In this particular doctrine there is no difference that I know of between the eastern and the western and, of course, this is one of the primary differentiations between protestantism and R.C. but the world council of churches ~~includes~~ the eastern church which holds exactly the R.C. view and most of the doctrine and most of the vital matters. (question 7) Well, I think that a great many people face a situation like that. Find it very easy to, a great many. When here is a man who faces death and torture and he gives up his view and changes, I find it much easier to be sympathetic with him than I do with a man who gives up his view and subordinates himself to people who he considers utterly unChristian simply for the sake of saving his pension or

of having a little larger church to preach in. I don't think there is any comparison between the two and yet when we find the attitude so common and on such lesser matters, I feel that we should regret that he did not have the courage of a martyr, but I don't feel that I strongly condemn him. I think that we should pray that God will give us the strength and courage to really stand for His word when the time comes and to face death. On the other hand a great many people find it much easier to face death ^{and} ~~than~~ to be killed for their convictions than they do to give up something of the material nature. A great many do. It is a strange thing. Well, I can understand how that is. A man ~~had~~ robbed me of \$60.00 once and I felt so miserable about it that I was awake nights for two or three weeks and then right after that something happened that caused me to lose many many times as many nights and very often we can take the bigger things than we can the little things. It is too bad that Berengar didn't have the strength of martyrdom, but you will find a great many people don't. I think that we should be very charitable about it along this line. (question 9) Well, on the other hand he had to go back on what he believed. I should say that it might be excusable for him to evade the issue to such an extent so that at this particular point he wouldn't have to appear before the but when he had to stand before them and deny what he believed to be true and the statement that he believed was false, even aside from the doctrine of the issue, it certainly was giving up of all intellectual integrity, but alas, we find many people who will do that very thing. (question 10) Yes, the only difference is that today in the Roman Cath. books he is mentioned honorably as a man of scholarship and able rights, but a man who fell into a heresy and was condemned. They mention him honorably and in protestant books he is more or less passed over and only incidentally touched upon. We would consider him a great martyr if he had died at that time, I think undoubtedly. Well, now that was C and D is the final break with the eastern church and I do not think that we need to take the time to go into the details of the relations of this time of the eastern and the western church. You have studied the life of Photius and Photius was a

man who crystalized the difference, who wrote it up clearly, who made the eastern church realize what its differences were from the western church and yet the differences of the eastern church from the western church were not great except on one point. Now the eastern church practiced triune immersion of infants was their form of baptism. They immersed infants three times in honor of the three persons of the trinity. The western church did not do that. The eastern church allows its clergy, at least its lower clergy to and they condemned the western church for forbidding the clergy to marry and the western church on the other hand criticized them on this point, but neither considered it such a prominent point of doctrine as to make the other a heretic. The R.C. books refer to the break with the eastern church not as a heresy but as a schism. They consider the eastern church as an orthodox church even though it differs in these points which are not points of great importance. This one about the R.C church ex

12

in many sections would lead you to think that they almost considered it a heresy for priests to marry, but in the eastern church the priests marry and they do not consider them as heretics, they consider them. There was great controversy over the matter of whether the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son as the western church says and as the protestants have taken over from the church of Rome in this regard. That is they have not ever had much discussion about it, we simply have accepted it in the western church as it came to be. Now in the eastern church they insist that the protection is from the Father, not from the Father and the Son. Well now it is a point on which we really don't know. We are not sure that we can say great essential matters of the very nature of the trinity in a way that means anything. We don't have the data with which to deal with and it is hardly a point with which to make a division over, the big thing that the eastern church objected to was that after the creed was made by an ecumenical council, the western church simply instead of waiting for another council to decide it one way or the other and as a matter of

procedure the western church would seem to have been wrong on that point, but it is hard to see why there would be a split in the church over that. The real cause of the split was that the western church that the pope insisted that they were supreme over the church and the eastern half of the church never admitted any such claim to supremacy. That was the real reason for the split. That was the thing that eventually caused it and so when the bishop of Rome claims to be the divinely appointed head of the church, it must be said that his claim has never been accepted by more than half of the church, that the whole eastern church always considered it as one of the five patriarchs but never supreme except in one case, the case of the one emperor Photius, that great leader of the church recognized the pope as the head of the whole church and we studied his character and his brief career a short time ago but he is the only one of the eastern emperors who did and the eastern church insisted our leaders are here and . Well, now, of course, the pope said the bishop of Constantinople has no apostolic succession (end of record)

We are the successors of Peter and Paul. Now in the eastern church they had much better claims to succession to Peter in Antioch and Jerusalem than Rome has. Everybody knows Peter was at Antioch and Jerusalem, whether he was in Rome is at least questionable. It is probably that he was, but it is not certain. The claims to apostolic succession in the eastern church are much greater than in the western church, but in the eastern church the claim is divided among different headquarters and the leading city of the eastern had no such claims and so this you might say balanced so that in the end they broke. Now in 1054 the final break came and so I mention this as D, the final break of the eastern church, I don't think that anybody then realized what an important date it was. It wasn't important to them. There had been separation between the two and reunions several times. There had been scisms when they would be for ten, 20, 40 60 years, no communication between the eastern church and the western church and then they would get together and that has happened repeatedly. During the century or two before this time, the pornography was in control in Rome and there was nobody there who had much interest who was over the eastern church or not, they were too busy with their voluptuousness and their wickedness to take an interest in such things. But now when you have got men of real personality and power in the position of bishop of Rome again, they began to assert their ancient claim that they were the head of the church and it came to a crisis in 1054 when you have a strong man as head of the eastern church and he refused to admit these claims and declared that the western church was wrong and said that the fact they had Latin churches in Constantinople where they performed the western ~~w~~right was something that could not be tolerated and ordered the closing of those small churches in Constantinople. In Constantinople they must do the way the patriarch of Constantinople did and not as the bishop of Rome. That was his statement and ~~at~~ of course he might have said that and the other patriarch might have changed it. It might have gone on as before, but the bishop of Rome said this is absolutely insufferable, we cannot stand this and so he sent two cardinals who went to Constantinople and went into the great church of Santasophia, the

leading cathedral in Const. and they went into this church and at the time of the service they went up to the high altar and there they placed upon the altar a declaration from the pope that they church of Const. was excumunicated for its wickedness fro having stopped people from worhipping in Const. in accordance with the western practices and when they placed this upon the high altar, I am sure they never thought that anything would happen and that there would be further disput e about it, that there would be an agreement on this matter and that the thing would go on as it had in the past and they hoped that eventually the pope would win complete control in this regard, but there naver has again been a unity between the two. And so the final break starts from the year 1054 and since that time you have had the two separate churches, wach of which considers the other as ~~h~~-matic, but neither of which considers the other as heretical because their differences are after all on minor points. (question 4) The bishop was bishop Michael. I hadnot given his name, Michael CAerularius. He said the poeple in the west are eating things , they are failing to fast on Saturdays, they are not saying hallelujah during lent at the proper time, they are not using the undavened bread for the , they are following practices which are forbidden by the council of Jerusalem in Act. 15 and he said that they are wicked and they should be condemned for it and we won't allow these things in Constantinople and then when he wouldn't allow them in Const. pope Leo 9 and 2 cardinals who negotiated with him when he didn't give into him, they marched up to the high altar and just as the service was about to begin and they laid on the altar a papal excamunicating the ~~p~~atriarch there and then immediately Michael excamunicated the bishop of Rome and the whole church of Rome and so the two excamunicated wach other and from that time to this they have not been . Each have exc. the other, but they consider each other as erring churches, not as heretical. They agree on most things that matter, and they recognize that fact and the bishop of Rome considers that they others are pupposely in the fact that they don't recognize as head. If they would recognize him as supreme head, he would

them every other point of difference. There is no other point of difference that he would not grant to them if they would recognize him as head. (question 6)

There have been very definite attempts to bring them together and, of course, there would have to be real attempts for this reason that during the next few centuries the Moslems were coming forward and conquering more and more of the greeks and that area and it was threatening Constaniople and under those circumstances they would want to get help from the west and so it was through their interest to get a reunion and they would give up just about anything except to give up the ~~fact~~^{claim} that they were equal. To say that he was actually supreme over them, they couldn't go quite that far and they made various attempts. They had agreements made that would compromise all the other differences, but when they came to that point they just couldn't go quite that far and so the agreements which their representatives made up have failed to be by both men and the union has never been re-established. In the last few centuries there has not been much of it, but during the time, the next four or five centuries after this there were a great many. (question 7 $\frac{1}{2}$) Well, the greek church, the eastern church after this was successful in winning Russia and that tremendously increased their area so they had Greece, and what was Asia Minor they still held and they had all though the Moselm territory they had some and they had Constantinople and they had the eastern and then, of course, they got the great empire of Russia which was a tremendous increase in territory. Well then, of course, Const. was taken in 1453 and the result was that the eastern church was reduced in wealth and in strength and the result of loosing its headquarters, losing so many of its cities so that from a viewpoint of the intellectual standing you might say, and that sort of thing, they sank, and you will find in Palestine today, you will find Greek churches, eastern churches, all over Palestine, but their standard is much lower than that of the Roman church in Palestine. You will find monastaries and churches of the R.C. all over Palestine and the people from the Ro C. in Palestine

are on the whole people of scholarship, people of character, and people, they are among the best of the R.C., the people of them who go to Palestine and I have met some very very fine people among them in Palestine. The Greek church, while it has some very fine people among them, it has a great many who represent from a viewpoint of education and of superstition and all of these viewpoints and are much inferior to the representatives of the R.C. church in Palestine. Now to say that that is due to an inherent difference between the two churches would be pretty hard to prove. I think the difference is largely the fact that they had been subject to Moslem control and had so much of their property lost and they lost their opportunity and while they have had, there has been a tremendous building to the church, it has held long, held its strength all through this time and the vulshavicks hadn't been able to destroy it yet, they have lost that which would enable them to maintain their standards of scholarship and in many areas it has sunk to very low superstition, almost a god. (question 10) The comparison is greatly affected by the fact that the bishop of Const. were right in the same town with the emperor and that was the great advantage of the Romans, the Roman bishops that the emperor moved to Constantinople, and so with the bishop right in the town with the emperor, he was always having association with him and consequently many of them were removed by him. They were either for the emperor or against. The bishop of Rome was further away. He could be more impartial. They had to be his close friends or his enemies and the result is that there was constant friction, constant bickering back and forth between them, you get a good emperor, he would get a fine man in as patriarch, you get a fine man in as patriarch and he might be able to influence the selection of a good man as emperor or to influence the character of him. You get a bad man in either position, he would have an influence on the other and the whole history has been greatly affected by that of being right in the city with the emperor and while they had, I imagine they had just as many men of really high quality as they had in the bishops of Rome, perhaps never had they sunk

to the point to which the bishop of Rome sank because if they had ever gotten too low the emperor wasn't way up in Germany having to come with an army before he could do anything, he was right there in the town and could step in and clean the thing up, so they probably never sank so low, but they never had the chance to develop the independent power of their own. And, of course, another thing that hindered them was the fact that you had Antioch and Jerusalem and Alexandria right near with their bishops who thought they were equal with the bishop of Const., although there was no one in the west who had any such claim. (question 11½) No, that was the patriarch, the head of the church, it was Michael C. This particular thing was between the two patriarchs, the bishop of Rome and the patriarch. Of course, the emperor was favorable, sympathetic or it couldn't have been done. (question 12) There is not the same unity, there is not the same type of organization that there is in the west. The patriarch has authority in a certain area, with a certain number of people who owe allegiance to them, and there will be other patriarchs and their relation is one of mutual honor rather than of authority. (question 12½) They got, in time, they had their own patriarch in Moscow who claimed authority over Russia and his relation with the head of the Greek church was merely one of friendship, not one of either of them being supreme over the other. (question 13) Fairly close, except that I think that the Bulgavicks tried to destroy the church, they did everything that they could but it was too deeply rooted and then during the way I think they began to try to use it as an instrument of and make its leaders swear allegiance to Stalin. I read in the paper a few years ago that the churches of quite a few of them the ~~western~~ Russian orthodox church in U.S./that the Russians were bringing action in court to force the leaders of the Russian Orthodox churches in U.S. to swear allegiance to Stalin or else give up their property and in view of the way property has been taken away from other people on as unchristian grounds as that, I was afraid at that time, in view of our friendship with Russia, that they might succeed in doing it, but I guess it was taken up with other matters and they didn't prosecute in the courts then and probably now they

wouldn't be able to do it. It suggested a very unfortunate development which could easily . Now there is a Greek church still open just a few blocks from here. (question 14) Yes the Metropolitan was a bishop in a Metropolitan city in the tropics. He was a bishop in a large city who exercised authority over other bishops. (end of record) ch 64

bishop is the highest position in the church. Above that it is just a matter of authority and in the western church they had Metropolitans for many centuries, then they stopped calling them Metropolitans and they began calling them archbishops and today in the western church they term archbishop is equivalent to metropolitan in the eastern church and formerly in the western. It simply means one bishop who has authority over ~~another~~ bishops in a certain restricted area. Well, so much then for this final break. 1054 was just the date when this one incident occurred. There were many similar incidents, but it happened to be the last and never again did the two get together. They have been separate from that date to this and so the claim of the bishop of Rome to be ~~the~~ head of the entire church of Christ has never at any time been recognized by more than half of the church, never at any time by more than half of the professing church. Even when emperor B.... he could not compel all of his people to leave though~~x~~. Maybe if he had lived a hundred years instead of a very few before he was killed, why if he still had been of the same mind, he could of perhaps carried it through in his empire, but this represented the attitude of one man ~~and~~ of an emperor, it did not represent the attitude of the eastern church or the leader of the eastern church, so that it is a claim that they held only in the west, although they claim it for the whole world, of course, and subsequently they have sent representatives throughout the world. You will find today R.C. missions all over the world and in Palestine, as I said, you have very fine R.C. churches in many sections of Palestine and you have monasteries there, you have schools there and I think that the R.C. church, I think you can say, at its best, is represented by the R.C. church in Palestine. It is just about the very best there is anywhere and probably the U.S. comes next to it. That is

to say, its standards in the U.S. are far superior to those in most other countries. The standards for its clergy, its standards for its people, its standards for education and so forth. Now let us go on to E, The Beginning of the Crusades. Now in world history, the Crusades are an extremely interesting and vivid picturesque series of incidents. In the history of the middle ages, they are very interesting, but in the history of the church they are a series of events which lasted for a couple of centuries and which as far as the church today is concerned have not left any great results, and consequently for the purpose of our course, it is not one of the things that is necessary that we spend a great deal of time. It is important that we recognize the fact that for this era of about 2 centuries, perhaps nearly 3 centuries, there was a series of crusades and though you have these series of crusades, yet you have other movements in between, you can call it the crusading epoch, because the crusades which we call the 1st, 2nd, 3rd, and 4th are big movements but in between there was a constant effort on the part of the west to reconquer the holy land so that you have a period of about 2 centuries which is characterized by constant crusade and effort, with some great crusades and some smaller movements in between. It is a movement which during that period greatly affected the whole life of the east and which during that period greatly affected the whole life of the west and when you study western civilization you would have to recognize the part that the crusades took place. For instance, in this little book visualized church history, written by Sister Mary Loyola, published by the Oxford book Co, mentions in it the results of the crusades and it says that we mustn't think that though the crusades did not achieve their primary objective that they did not good at all. Indeed the crusades were one of the most fruitful and beneficial of all the events of the middle ages and then it says that the most important of these beneficial results were as follows and it gives you ten of the important splendid results of the crusades of which #1 is the Crusades renewed Christian faith, charity and fervor. #2. They strengthened the influence of the church and the pope. #3. They promoted Christian knighthood. Well, I won't read you

all of these, but #9 is an interesting one. Europeans adopted Arabic numerals, that is the numeral we still use today, to replace the unwieldy roman numeral. This was a great advance in science and business, though it is wonderful that thousands and thousands of people were killed and terrific battles took place and these armies marched across Europe and Asia because they brought us our good numerals and helped our business world of today. Well, of course, it is a great advance that we give up our cumbersome numerals and adopted this arabic system, it is a great advance, but I think it would have taken place anyway. I think we had sense enough to see and have proven it and adopted it and it certainly would have come to our attention even though I wonder if we had sense enough when I see the crazy systems of measurement that we still use in our country, but as far as the crusades are concerned, their results were in civilization, in interrelation of people and as far as our church is concerned it has not been greatly affected by this. The Crusades, I think had one affect which was wholly bad and that was the affect of enabling people to think when they went out and fought the infidel that they were thereby doing a great christian act and thereby they turned a great deal of energy and of fervor which should have gone into sound Christian activity, they exerted it in these means and now that was a thing that was, of course, very important over these 200 years. Now the crusades we don't need for the purpose of our course to go into the causes of them particularly, you have already done that in connection with your study of the first crusades. But, of course, the primary cause was the fact that the church gained control in the Moslem world. The Moslems had always given a great deal of freedom to the Christians. The ^{Turks} ~~Christians~~ cut down this freedom and as the Turks gained control in Asia Minor and in Syria, they began making it ~~it~~ more difficult for pilgrims to go to the holy places and so Peter the Hermit aroused by the indignities that came to many pilgrims and the difficulties that were coming into the Holy Land as the result of the Turkish control in the Moslem world, Peter the Hermit preached his great crusade all through Europe and with tremendous

fervor he urged people to go and to win back the Holy Land from the church and to gain it back for Christians control and it was a hermit, an individual's man's great zeal which aroused people to carry on this and then the pope, Urban 2 gave his support to it and sent out people to carry the message and to call upon people to win back the Holy Land and so the first crusades came, but before the first crusade, you have a large number of people who started out for the holy land under Peter's leadership and a great number of people, poorly armed, poorly equipped, poorly trained, but filled with zeal started out for the Holy Land under the leadership of Peter the Great. The Turks met them, killed most of them, took others into slavery and it soon came to an utter and ignominious failure, so Peter escaped himself to come back to preach and get further more people to take part in a real effort. Now the first crusade was as successful as any of the crusades ~~that~~ were. In the first crusade Jerusalem actually was conquered and a large section of Palestine was seized and held for a number of decades. A Latin kingdom of Jerusalem was established among its leaders were men named Count Baldwin, one of the leaders. I went to an arabic village this summer called , it means the village of Baldwin, but the name still persists in Palestine and there is much influence left in Palestine from the period of a large portion of a century. The Latin church held the greater part of Palestine after the first crusade, then a portion, the norther portion was reconquered by the Moslems and the second crusade went about to win that back and then the whole of the Latin kingdom was taken by the Moslem, Jerusalem recaptured, you have the third crusade, the one which is perhaps most famous of all, the one that Richard the Lion hearted of England was in. I don't think it is quite as well known as the children's crusade which took place over a century later in 1212, but in 1212 some youths who were filled with enthusiasm began calling on the children to win the Holy Land and thousands of children left their homes in different parts of Europe and followed these leaders and they marched all the way over land towards the Holy Land. Some of them were taken in boats part of the way, but these thousands of children went down into the

Holy Land, large numbers of them died from hunger and fatigue, survivors were captured by the Moslems and sold into slavery and so a tremendous movement of people with very fine zeal and enthusiasm resulted in death and slavery, thousands of these children. And it is just one of the various movements which we are not going to take time in this course to look into further detail, but I just wanted you to get the general idea of how for a period of two centuries there were groups of people, like these children and like that first group who went before the first crusade, and large armies lead by different leaders of different sections of Europe or groups of them together, made one after another, expedition against the Holy Land and one fifth of the total effort was put in in these two centuries would certainly have been sufficient to have conquered and held Palestine if properly organized and directed. There was a tremendous lot of enthusiasm and zeal that went into it, but a great many of the people in it, of the leaders, particularly were looking for renown for themselves, were looking for absolution for themselves, for some of their sins for taking part in a crusade were looking for military prestige, were looking for opportunity for personal advance and it never was organized in such a way as to accomplish its direct objective and, of course, any war has a ^{whoring} affect on morality and this series of crusades had a very bad affect on the general morality of the Holy Land and also of ~~the~~ Europe, but it did introduce the objects ~~which~~ of culture and commerce of the east into Europe and brought the arabic numeral for which we should be thankful. (question 13) The general dates began in 1096 and they run until nearly 1300. It sort of petered out towards the end and it is hard to say just when they actually ended. (question 13) Well, I don't think that anyone would have admitted that that was the purpose, not publicly, and consequently to say that that was the purpose ^{of any of these popes} would require reading his mind and there were a great many popes from this period. I wouldn't be at all surprised if some of them did feel that from this viewpoint, the crusades were a good thing, but I certainly don't think that it was their main purpose at all. Well now, the crusades then. We have made this brief survey going on to the next

century and we go on to #12, the 12th century and the twelfth century is a century which in a way is in between. The 11th century begins the stepping forward of the papal power. The 13th century finds its climax. The 12th is in between. The great monastic development comes in the 13th century. There is a beginning of them in the 12th century. The strife between the papacy and the emperor reaches its climax in a certain century. It goes on all through the 12th century. (end of record.)

scholarship is prominent in the 12th century, but goes higher in the 13th. The 12th century is in between. It is a very interesting century. We could take a semester studying its details with much interest, but for our purpose here, it is good to know just what the situation was in between the 11th and 13th and notice a few of the important individuals concerned in it. And so much for a general survey. (laughter) One thing might be mentioned in this general survey politically that the Normans were an important factor and they came up from southern Italy and conquered a large part of Italy, but that is not so important from a church history view, it is important from political history viewpoint. The Normans conquered England, the previous century, another group of them conquered all of southern Italy and the popes were on the whole friendly with the north. Now B. the Papacy and the emperor and I have already given a general idea of that but as to a couple of particular details, one big subject of dispute between the papacy and the emperor was what they called investiture and it is a matter of who was going to make a man a bishop and give him his sign of his authority. Now, the emperors had put the popes in their position and they certainly thought they were entitled to put bishops in also, but the popes felt that they were the ones who should make the bishops, who should determine who they were and put them in their position. Now Pascal 2 was bishop of Rome from 1099 to 1118. He was according to McS... and a man of deep spirituality and what he did look from that direction. He was eager to end the long contest over investiture... and so in the year 1111 he proposed a plan by which all the churchmen would surrender to the emperor all of their material powers, estates, castles, all of their positions and be simply spiritual leaders and in turn the emperor would relinquish his claim to the right of investiture... and they say the emperor has no long any say as to who is bishop and neither does the bishop have any political authority. It sounds like a very excellent idea. Pascal hoped to set the church free from control by the acceptance of poverty and

to support religion by tithe and voluntary offering, but immediate protest from powerful churchman began to pour in and sensing the popes inability to carry out the , the emperor seized the pope and forced him to give up everything to the emperor and then when the pope did this, the church turned against him and a series of council denied what he had done. They pronounced excommunication against the emperor and in the end a compromise was made, but it is interesting to see the attitude which this particular man took and to see how it utterly failed. We will look at it a little more tomorrow. (end of lecture) and who was a man who seemed to have an interest in spiritual and religious things rather than secular and political things proposed a plan for to put an end to the dispute ofn the basis of ~~the/ptpt~~ our present between church and state on the basis of letting Ceasar have that which belongs to Ceasar and God have that which belongs to God. It is, of course, absolutely right that the emperor should be ent one to determine who will be the authority under him over a large section of . But it is absolutely wrong that the emperor should have the right to determine who shall be the spiritual leader over and Pascal 2 took this postion, this position which we hold in America today, but the church had the right to its won affairs (skip) to exercise political control act as an ordinance of civil government. Now Pascal 2 took this postion so when an infallibale pope took this position (indis- tinct) but the other infallible popes generally opposed him both earlier and later and Pascal, as we mentioned at the end of the hour proposed a plan in the year 1111. He actually proposed a plan that clergy were to surrender to the emperor all of the material political possess- ions which they had, all control as monarch over dukes, over states, cattles, right to recive taxes, and to turn that back to the emperor to whom it properly belonged and then insisting on the other that we give unto God what belongs to God and then in turn the emperor would relinquish all claim

to the right of inves..... (record sounds far away)

(question) In the Middle ages the Roman church had statues which were supposed to eat food every day and which were supposed once a year to talk and all that sort of thing. The R.C. literature of the middle ages is just filled with stories about that type and in more recent years, the literature of South America had a great many stories of that type. And even today, I believe two or three years ago, wasn't there a statue near Camden somewhere that was supposed to have had some supernatural power and thousands came to see it. That is rather typical of many parts of the R.C. church, but before a person is officially declared a saint, they make quite an investigation of it and you cannot be declared a saint just on very very flimsy evidence, you have got to have a certain number of people who they have confidence in to certify to it. (question 1½) Well, I would incline in such a case to differ

. That is, I would not for a minute deny that the Lord might work wonderful providential acts in connection with the life of Bernard. I am sure that I have had contact with some in my own experience. I believe the hairs of our head are numbered, that the Lord controls everything in our lives and I believe that He works all things together in wonderful ways for his own purposes, but that He in these days does anything similar to making the axhead to swim by purely supernatural power in the time of Elisha or cause the fire to fall on Carmel, we do not believe that there is evidence of activities of that type since the apostolic days. The healing of a withered hand, I would say, the Lord can heal any illness and the Lord may choose to heal any illness. We have no right to demand that the Lord heal any particular illness. Paul prayed that his thorn in the flesh be removed and the Lord did not take it away. He left it with him and we have no right to say the Lord will heal us of any particular illness, but we have the right to pray that He may and, of course, normally He will use medical aid, and He will use whatever is available as His needs, but the Lord certainly could cure any disease whatever, if He chose and in fact He could do it without using what we would necessarily consider supernatural. There are any number of forces within the body that we know nothing about as yet. The Lord knows fully about

them and can utilize them in such a way as He might chose. Well now, if a hand completely changed in a when Bernard was standing in front of it, I would want to have pretty definite evidence about that, but if a man's hand was just useless, paralyzed, absolutely useless, and as Bernard talked to the man, the hand became able to work again, I would have no difficulty in considering that such a thing might happen. I believe that you find that such things happen wherever the Lord's power is manifested today. I was reading just the other day about how Gen. Grant the night before that he met with Gen. Lee in Virginia in 1965, how the night before he had a throbbing headache all night long, a terrific headache that he couldn't sleep. He walked around in his room, he walked out in the yard from 2-4 in the morning, he was in most miserable condition all through the night, and he would lay down for a couple of hours without taking his clothes off and then he would get up and walk around and so on and then when he received word that Gen. Lee would meet him, they said, just instantly his headache left him, instantly, and he felt perfectly good through the day. He went and had a four hour conference with Gen. Lee and they say that Lee was dressed in the most splendid clothes and that Grant looked like a beggar, but the reason was the condition that he had been in all night with that terrible headache and he hadn't had his clothes off or anything. Well, it just left him like that and that would happen with any of us. Sudden mental and emotional experiences can have a tremendous affect on our ability to see or ability to use our muscles or anything like that. So it would not involve necessarily anything similar to the divine healings of the Lord. The healing of a hand which was paralyzed and that is probably 5 . (question) Yes, well, I would think that probably was the same thing as a headache leaving immediately. It was a hand that could do nothing and then suddenly those muscles begin to coordinate and begin to work again, but that a hand which was just flesh and bones, suddenly became quite normal, I don't think that the Lord worked that way in our age. I would want to actually see it. I read a few years ago a statement by a man who calimed he knew, he was a presbyterian missionary in Syria and he had met

the anti-christ over there. Of course he is not yet revealed to the world, but he met him and wrote a little booklet on him and he told about the various evidences this man was the anti-christ and one of them was that he was able to do miracles. And he said, of course, not just ordinarily miracles such as to point at some trash with his finger and it suddenly lights afire a few feet away from you. Many of the holy men of the east can do things like that, he said, but he went on to tell how much greater things he had seen the man do. Well, when he made a statement like that, why immediately

6½ it is easy for stores like that to spring out. (question 6½) Oh, the Lord can work in any way He chooses. I heard a medical paper on T.B. not so long ago in which the doctor told of a new treatment that they had worked out. This was about 15 years ago. It was a treatment involving cutting a certain nerve which seemed to have remarkable results in T.B. and he said in the sanitarium he was head of, there was a woman there who was getting very very despondent and the reason was that they were operating on other people and they weren't operating on her and she thought it meant that they thought her case was hopeless and they did, as a matter of fact. She was in the last stages and they felt that it was utterly hopeless, there was not a thing in the world that they could do for her, but just in order to help her feelings and to make her feel a little happier he said, they performed this slight operation on her. They took her in and they cut this nerve which had helped other people so much and he said, to his amazement, she immediately after the operation she began to improve tremendously and shortly after, she was able to be released, cured of t.b. Well, now, if a thing like that could come unexpectedly as the result of a simple operation which a doctor performed. There are a hundred simple things the Lord could do if He chose in connection with any disease and the Lord certainly could cure in a providential way any human sickness if He chooses to do so, but not meaning that He comes in such power as when the fire fell upon the sacrifice at Carmel, or anything like that. I surely would not deny that the Lord can and does heal when He chooses. I only deny that we have a right

to demand the Lord to heal in any particular case and I say that ordinarily the Lord works through such means as are available in the period which we are in. (question 9) Our protestant view is that a saint is anyone who is set apart to the Lord. Anyone who is saved through the Lord Jesus Christ. We consider that any such one truly is a saint, but their interpretation is that a saint is a special person whom the Lord uses in a special way and through whom He performs miracles. We do not believe such a thing. There is a definite difference between us. Now how early it came into the Roman church is hard to say. There was doubtless ignorant people who held it very very early. I met a priest from Wis. on a plane last summer going from Rome to Damascus and he was anxious to go to Palestine as I was but he said before he did he wanted to go back over land to Baruch because he said in Baruch there was a monk there who had been dead 60 years and his body had not been corrupted in the least. There had been no decay in the 60 years. His hair was still growing. They had to shave him and cut his hair just the same. He had been dead 60 years and he wanted to go over and see him before he went to Jerusalem and he said that this was going to make him a saint one of these days, this monk. Well, that is the attitude today of the Roman church. But it is not, we believe, the attitude of Scripture. (question 10½) Yes, well anyone who would like to write a Ph.D thesis on three or four years thorough investigation of the details in connection with one of those, I think would find it a very interesting thing to go into and see just how much the actual evidence is, but without actual evidence thoroughly investigated, it is pretty hard to prove anything and in many cases a superficial investigation causes the thing to prove to be purely somebody's imagination or something like that, in many cases. (question 11½) Well, I would like to see signed statements from about 6 or 7 of them about that. It would be very helpful. I mean, we have to have evidence on a thing like this. We cannot jump to conclusions otherwise, but in most cases they do disintegrate. (question 12) I don't think that any of these men, that Bernard claimed to raise anybody

from the dead and certainly not to be raised from the dead (still talking) but I say, it all holds together, it is all one big ^{that way in him}, there are certain things that cannot possibly be sufficient to justify the belief that he had the power in the lesser things which would be much harder to believe. That is it all holds together as one big point. If you just had the little

13

why I would be just as skeptical, that is

I would say that we have no reason on the statements on a book written by men of whom we know nothing of 2000 years^{to} to believe that Christ healed a blind man and did these different things, there are such stories told about all sorts of people, but we do have the evidence that He was raised from the dead and we have the strong historical evidence for it as a fact of that tremendous miracle (end of record)

ch 68

we have such tremendous evidence about it as to lead us to feel that he is absolutely and I think there is a difference. I think that we must be careful in all of these things this extreme or the other extreme . Well, I won't go further into Bernar'ds life because you have studied it and our time is short, but I want to mention two new orders which were formed. During the 12th century, these tow orders, one of them is very well known as a result of a book which most people read. I believe that it is Gen. Bradly, one of our generals says that he reads it every year and has for many many years. That is, Ivanhoe, much is made of the knights and so most people in America are familiar with something of the existence of that organization. Well, now during the 11th century the so-called knight hospitalers and the knights templers were founded and they are two organizations which were rather unique. The thing that lead to their foundation was the crusades. The crusades brought large numbers of people to Palestine, many of whom felt that they were serving the Lord very definitely, but serving him in a warlike wayand it brought the two ideas of the middle ages together, the idea of knighthood, and the idea of the monastery and so the first of these orders, there were three orders founded at that time, the first was the knights of St. John.

That is the hospitaliers, the knight hospitalers. This order was originated during the first crusade. It was men who built a hospital in the Holy Land and ministered to the sick and wounded and also defended people as they would come in to Palestine. It was an order which the men were in a way knights and in a way monks and so this order was founded as the knights hospitalers. Centuries later its name was changed to the knights of a name which is still held by some who continue to maintain the same order. Now the second is the more famous of the three, the knights templars. Now in 1118, nine french knights at Jerusalem at the palace of Count Baldwin formed an order. They got St. Bernard to write a rule for the order and the pope gave his approval to it in 1128. It was an order of men who were dedicated to the monastic vows of not holding individual property, that is poverty as they called it, of chastity, of obedience to the order, but men who were knights and who fought for what they considered to be right and this order was founded in 1118 and it continued for 200 years. It was an order which became very wealthy as an order and it doubtless had good men in it, but it had many who proved to be evil men. In 1314 the last grand master and the last 54 members of the order were burned at the stake at the order of the pope. We will look at that under the 14th century. It only lasted about 200 years but it was a very important order while it lasted. I notice that this little book, Visualized Church History, says about it that Philip the F of France who coveted their wealth accused them falsely of heresy and persuaded pope Clemen V to suppress them. In 1314, their last grand massacre of 54 members were burned at the stake. Well, that doesn't speak well of the infallibility of the pope, if when they were falsely accused of heresy he caused them to be burned at the stake. It was done in France and it was done in Paris and R.C.s like to put the blame on the king of France for it, but they have to admit the pope was persuaded to at least give his consent and approval to it. But to burn 54 men at the stake for heresy is a pretty drastic thing to do and it is pretty difficult to give your approval to it

and then say that actually it was a false accusation. Well, now the third order of the ~~onic~~ knights, an order of German knights followed in Jerusalem during the third crusade. They built a hospital in Jerusalem, they were active in the Holy Land during the crusades, but later they went up into northern Germany, aided Hungary and Prussia in the wars with the heathen slavs and ~~and~~ and they served well during the crusades but this Visualized Church History points out ~~h~~ how very sadly their religious fervor degenerated, so sadly that in the end, they joined the cause of Luther eventually. (question 5 $\frac{1}{2}$) It pointed out in this Visualized History that they were a very great order during the crusades, eventually they degenerated, she says, the religious fervor of the organization degenerated sadly in the 16th century, the grand master ~~joined~~ joined the cause of Luther, and eventually they gave up the order, and became leaders in the reformation movement under Luther and she says that shows how greatly they degenerated. Of course, that also is somewhat later. This time I am now speaking of their foundation. It is Scholarship during this 12th century. In scholarship and in the power of the papacy and in monastic developments, the 12th century would deserve a great deal of attention were it not for the fact that it is leading up to the greater century in all of these regards. The 13th century is the high point of the history of the papacy and so we will only speak briefly of these scholarship next Tuesday. The assignment will be posted, we will not meet this Friday. We will meet O.T. history at 8 but not church history at 10. (end of lecture) Last time we were looking at #12, the 12th century and under c we noticed the three monastic orders which were formed, the three new orders which were formed during this century. That is these three military orders and of course the crusades had something to do with the foundation of these orders and it was connected with the general military attitude of the time. It combines the two ideals, the monastic ideal and the religious ideal and we said something about the characteristics of each of these three orders and about the end of each of the three of them.

The burning of the knights templars in 1314 makes a real problem for the R.C. Here you have one of the outstanding orders of the middle ages. One of the most prominent, one of those which was perhaps most characteristic of the church at that time. You read the book of Ivanhoe by Scott and you get a rather unfortunate impression of the character of them, although I don't think that it would necessarily reflect on them as a whole a picture of the grand master in that book shows him as at least a very earnest and sincere man, even though doubtless mistaken in many of his views. The picture he shows of ~~it~~ is, of course, something which could find its way into any group of people and therefore would not be a cause of condemnation of the whole order. I have heard it said, however, that R.C.s don't like to read the book Ivanhoe because of the picture it gives of the ~~nonhostile~~ temper in it who were one of the great orders of the church at that time. Well, now a little over a hundred years after that time, we find that the grand master with 54 members are burned at the stake under the direction of Pope Clemen V and they are accused of heresy and of witchcraft and of all sorts of terrific wickedness. Now, did this great prominent order, this outstanding arm of the R.C. church fall into such terrible immorality, heresy and wickedness that it was necessary to burn its grand master and 54 others at the stake? If that did so, you would think that it would be a pretty bad indictment of the church of which it was so prominent a part. And I believe that the reaction of most R.C.s is to try to defend the order and to say that they were wrongly burned and you will find that in most R.C. histories that they are rather treated as having been falsely so charged. Here is this little book by this Nun and in it she says in 1314, their last grand master with 54 members were burned at the stake, but she says just before that, King Philip the Fair of France who coveted their wealth accused them falsely of heresy and persuaded the pope Clemen 5 to suppress them. Well, if you defend them, you get on the other side of the dilemma which is even worse it seems to me with the present claims of the church. If pope Clemen 5 was the infallible leader of the church, if he

was the one ~~final~~ divinely appointed to be the head and director of the church of Christ, the church had fallen pretty low, if he would condemn 54 prominent leaders of the church to be burned at the stake when falsely accused of heresy. It shows pretty poor leadership and so that it is necessary of course to say that he persuaded pope Clemen 5, put the blame on the king of France and say he persuaded the pope to suppress them, and yet if the pope is subject to such persuasion as that, after all it is a pretty serious matter to take an order which was possessors of perhaps millions of dollars worth of property and to take its leader and 54 of ~~the~~ other leaders and burn them at the stake and seize all of its property and declare that for terrible crimes and sins it is worthy of this treatment. You would think that a man who was worthy of the name of being leader of the whole church would do almost anything before he would give such a conviction unless he were personally absolutely convinced it were true. (question 12 $\frac{1}{2}$) Well, of course, I am not speaking right now about him as an infallible ~~teacher~~ teacher of doctrine. When you go that far and say that he is able to speak ex cathedra as an infallible teacher of doctrine as they go today, why this would seem to be quite inconsistent with such a claim as that, but I was speaking rather simply as his being a divinely appointed administrative head of the church. Now you would expect one that was divinely appointed to a position like that would at least strongly resist such a terrific action as this unless he were 100% convinced he was right and the answer that they all say is that he gave in to the king of France. They say he was falsely persuaded to do this. Actually that when the grand master of the templars was standing in front of Notre Dame's Cathedral in Paris and the flames were beginning to sweep up around him, he called out with a loud voice and he said the wrath of God will descend upon the wicked king of France and the wicked pope of Rome who have been guilty of this terrible act and he said that within two years they will both be dead and they did both die within the next ~~two~~ two years and I don't

think he is considered as a martyr by the church, it is pretty hard to considering he was condemned by the pope, but certainly saw how he could be amde for it in view of the fact that his prediction did come true in that way. (question 14) There are far more things in the universe than we can understand. I would not know at this point. There are poeple who occasionally
(end of record)

or to have much confidence in anyone like that only in rare instances, but to say simply that it was a coincidence, I would . Well, I have heard similar stories about other people and there would seem to be enough evidence to make it seem right but not enough to prove it happened. Well now these three orders then, I have mentioned and the knights templars, I will tell about the suppression when we come to it, but I thought right at this point perhaps it would fit equally well, and I may just refer to it there. Now I just want to call your attention briefly to D. Scholarship During This Century. There were leaders of the church who were greatly devoted to scholarship at this time. There were some bishops and archbishops who were, though many of them were worldly leaders. There were also men in monasteries who were devoting themselves to scholarly studies and there were a few universities were coming into existence from attracting students and in these universities the primary subject of discussion at this time was theology and philosophy. Now during this century any full study of the century would require examination of the great conflict which raged during it and the succeeding two or three centuries over Nominalism and realism. A catholic which is today quite out of date. Today this particular philosophic discussion is no longer of any great importance and we won't take time over it, but I think you should know what is meant by nominalism and realism. Any discussion of the period will enter into that. Realism is not used in the sense in which the term is used today in modern philosophy. It is an entirely different thing. Realism and Nominalism in the middle ages referred to two views regarding universals. It is actually a high theoretical discussion. Here you see a horse or a cow or a chair or a book. Is the horse simply a representative of the horse and the is the thing which is real and this horse is just one of the . Is chair a and the is real, that is the general thing is chair and here is one chair and here is another and here is another and their are just manifestations of that class which is real. If so you are a realist, but you see the word could just as well

be used to mean you are unrealist as you are not holding that the real thing is the chair or the horse or the cow, the real thing is the cl... This is just a manifestation of the cl.... It is a highly theoretical philosophical approach with you can prove anything in the world if you have a blank enough mind and when you get a particular discussion under way, it is very easy to get all sorts of distinctions which are purely theoretical and which lack any basis or solid objective base and that is the difficulty with a great deal of the philosophy of the middle ages. It was purely theoretical. Well, now this was the great question. Are these classes real and the object merely individual illustrations of the class, or the objects real and the class is merely a name. The word horse is just a name which indicates different things which are of that type. Well, then chair is just a name. It is not one great chair which has these manifestations, it is just a name which applies to all the things which are similar. If you believe that it is just a name and the actual thing is the reality, you are a Nominalist. If you believe that the class is the real thing then you are a Realist. Actually the terms could just as well be reversed, just as well, but that is the way the terms were used and there was great heated discussion over nominalism and realism and later on R who denied Transubstantiation, Wyclif was a realist and John H. followed Wyclif was a ~~realist~~ and Wyclif and John H. declared that transubstantiation was an illusion and that which mattered was faith in Christ as your Saviour from sin and your personal relation to Him and for this he was burned at the ~~stake~~, in C and when he was burned at the stake by one of the great councils of the R.C. church, as he was burning at the stake, they say some of the nominalist philosophers said, what can you expect of a realist, naturally his realism leads to these heretical ideas and they blamed it on his realism ~~that~~ the fact that he believed in salvation through the blood of Christ and that alone and not in any magical way in which you get the salvation through partaking of the sacrifice, but a century later about,

philosophy had changed its general , that is to say the realists had come into their own and most of the universities of Europe were teaching realism and there was strong objection against it and Martin Luther was one of those who objected and Martin Luther objected to the realist philosophy which was one of the great strongholds of the great R.C. church of his day and took his stand on nominalism and people said, what can you expect of ~~a/nom~~ nominalist, naturally he gets off into these heretical views of salvation through faith in Christ alone instead of believing in the teachings of the church and so at one time they considered that the man who followed the Bible was off because he was a realist and in the other case because he was a nominalist. Well, naturally you can take almost any philosophical view and you can go on from it and you can reach Christianity or you can reach

christianity. Christianity does not rest upon philosophy, it rests upon the teaching of the word of God and human speculation and human philosophy once it gets away from factual evidence of the world to factual statements of the Scripture can lead us most anywhere, but it is interesting to see how these men in the middle ages thought that it was the philosophy that was the thing that was wrong. With Husk and with Luther, their philosophies were exactly the opposite, so that I don't think there is any need of our spending a great deal of time on this conflict of nominalism and realism, but it raged with great fury during a period of many centuries in the schools and in the monasteries and in the end it was the nominalists who stood on the side of the reformation though in the middle it was the realist who stood on that side. Now I am just going to briefly mention three scholars of this period whose names should be remembered, and whose names are important in the history of philosophy and of theology. The first of these is Anselm and he was a practical churchman. He was a student of L.... the man who had opposed Berengar on transubstantiation and L..... had been archbishop of Canterbury, the head of the English

church and Anselm succeeded him. Anselm, then as head of the church of England incarnate of all England, archbishop of Canterbury in the midst of all of his great activities here to become one of the great students and theologians of the middle ages and on the matter, particularly of the atonement, the study of the atonement. Anselm was one who did work that was very vital from the viewpoint of any theological study. R.C. or protestant. His name is often mentioned in our theological consideration of the atonement and so it is vital that we know this much about his career. That is, that he was an active man, and archbishop of Canterbury, though the thing that is important to us is his thinking and his writing rather than his actual administration. Then, a second whom we should know something about is Abelard and he was considered to some extent a heretic, although just how great his deviation was is much disputed. He was strongly opposed by St. Bernard and his life is a very romantic and interesting life. From the viewpoint of philosophy, some thing that Abelard originated the method of thinking which became characteristic of the Roman church thereafter, even though he opposed some of its teaching. Now a third one who is much less known than these two but just as important in a different way is Peter Lombard and he was not an originator. He was not a thinker like the other two but he was a compiler and a ~~clear~~ clear writer and he wrote the work on theology which became the standard textbook for a long time, for a period of well over a century. He called it four books of sentences and these were sentences about various theological matters arranged after careful study of the Fathers and arranged in such a way as to present the theology of his day in good clear form and they were the standard textbooks for over a century and were studied everywhere in the Roman church and were commented on by various writers. Instead of writing commentaries on the Bible, they would write commentaries on the sentences of Peter Lombard and so his work became of great importance although it was superseded by other works, the other works were based upon his. They took over his organization and general structure and order of his

work. Now E. Independent Religious movement. I hesitated about what to call E. I didn't want to call it separate Christian movement because not all of those that I want to speak of under this header are Christians. I didn't want to call it heresy because some of them are definitely Christians. I perhaps shouldn't have said some, perhaps just one, because I am only going to speak of two movements during the period, two movements which appeared to outsiders as very similar. There are one or two smaller ones that I won't bother you with now, but there are these two main ones that are very important for later development. One of these which we cannot call Christian. Albigenses they originated in the previous century and became very strong during this century and lasted into the next one so that I am mentioning it here under the 12th century. We will tell of the destruction of it during the 13th century, the bloodiest destruction that perhaps any movement has ever suffered in history. This movement of the Albigenses is named because it became very common around a place called Albi in southern France and from that it was given the name of Albigenses. People preferred to call themselves the Catheri's which means the pure ones and they are actually a survival of the old Manicheanism, somewhat changed. It is the Manicheanism of the time of Augustine, the idea that it is a dualism, it is the idea of the good god and his wicked opponents, the two were about equal in power and the tendency to think that matter is evil, is related to some of the old agnostic system, it departs far enough from Christianity that it is pretty hard to consider it a Christian movement and yet it uses quite a little Christian terminology and it puts a great deal of stress, however, on purely , in fact almost asceticism at points. It is matter is bad, per se. There was much in it which attracted people in contrast with some of the worldliness of the established church and of its leaders and the movement gained great headway in southern France and in northern Italy, particularly in southern France and soon there was a district there where the people, the Albi. were numbered in the hundreds of thousands

in fact there were districts there where you couldn't find anyone that wasnt an Albi. The movement grew through the period quite a bit in the 11th century, very strong in the 12th and in the beginning of the 13th perhaps a third of France was almost all Albi. Now another movement which began about the same time is the and that we should call a Christian movment. The Walgenses were a movement which began under a rich man of the French town of Leon. His name was Peter Waldo and he destributed his wealth and organized his followers in a group (end of record) ch 70 went about from place to place advocating a return to evangelical Fathers. They denounced the wealthy clergy and they said the personal effort and renunciation were more effacations than teh reception of the sacrament. They protested against all wars. Before long according to McSorley they were preaching a sort of puritan protestantism denying the authority of the church and holding that every just man could absolve, consecrate and preach the gospel without sacramental ordination. So when the church refused to give them their sanction, they were greatly opposed by it and persecuted and driven from place to place and under the circumstances we do not have material by which we can make a thorough examination of what their views were during that period, except to some extent, but at the time of the reformation they thought that that was the sort of thing that they stood with and they took Luther's book and studied them a great deal and alligned themselves solidly with the reformation. They are today a protestant group which is strong particularly in the mountains of northern Italy, where despite persecution and opposition they have persisted all thra the centuries. It is difficult to feel at all certain that we can call them really protestants at that early time, or really evangelicals, simply because of lack of sufficient evidence, they may have been thoroughly evangelical and very close to what they are today. We have no proof that they are and yet we do not have some of the that we would think we might have if they really put their emphasis where they put it and where

we put it today, but at least they felt that that was where they belonged and what they had sympathy with and at the time of the reformation they aligned themselves with them and ever since the reformation they have been the strongest protestant group in Italy, although that is not saying they are very strong because the imposition was very far from Italy. (question 2 $\frac{1}{2}$) Well, the question just is, did they put their emphasis on poverty and not having goods and opposing war and general ethical standards or did they put their emphasis on salvation through Christ's death. Now we don't have enough of their statements from the times before Luther to be sure just how clear the understanding was and how definite their answer was, but there must have been some at least, there may have been a great deal. There must have been at least some, because they so quickly aligned themselves with Luther and so immediately accepted his teaching when it came out, but if they held it before they didn't express it clearly and strong enough to make a great impact upon the people outside their movement like Luther did. So that is why I wouldn't say the protestant movement began with the Waldenses, that came later, but it is possible that they did have a very definite idea, we just can't say for certain. They doubtless, though were a really Christian group. The question is not of their Christianity, but of their understanding, while in the case of the ^{re} ~~t~~heir doubtless were real Christians among them were called by the worldliness and the hypocrisy of so many of the leaders of the church, but the teaching of the movement was definitely no interest, its emphasis was contrary to the Scripture and doubtless its leaders became to be more and more contrary to the real Christian teachings, but it was the Albigenses movement did encourage purity of life, in fact 4 more in the direction perhaps of abstinence in a way although they used a great deal of Christian terminology. (question 4) They certainly were protestant in name, but whether they actually started out that way is also a question. That is Peter Waldo, studying the Scripture came to the conclusion that the things for the Christian leaders to do wasn't to be riging

around ~~on~~ a fine horse, richly and going to the emperor's court, but to be out helping the poor people and preaching the gospel. Well, now if he had stopped taking merely the positive emphasis, the church might very well have given him his paproval, but he stressed his negative emphasis of his opposition to the ~~htat~~ that is in the church and not about ~~where~~ where they opposed him and when they opposed him it caused this movement to go further away from them, anturally, but it didn't start as a protestant movement, but it developed into that and the church learned something from it which changed its attitude in the enxt century quite a bit. (question 5) From what period was this? As early as that, yes. Well, that is fine. (laughter) Now I am sure there were individuals among them of whom that would be true and they were a very good movement, but whether it was characteristic of the movement as a whole, I just don't know. (discusion) Well, I want you to be familiar with these two movements, the Waldenses and the Albigenses, but from our present ~~blewpoint~~ viewpoint, they are neither of them of great importance although they are both of real interest. Then we will move on to the 13th century. Under the 13th century after speaking of the beginning of the Waldenses to speak of A. The beginning of the Friars. I am not starting with a survey of the century. I am not starting with the papacy, but I am starting with a movement which began early in the 13th century and which changed the face of the R.C. church in Europe, changed its general outward appearance, and which is very important right up to the present date and this was a new type of manasticism, a type which had much in common with the external aspect of the Walgenses, at least in their beginning. And it is altogether possible that the church and its attitude toward the Friars was somewhat affected by the way it had opposed the Waldenses and seeing them become more and more hostile to the church. With this new movement, the church took it over instead of opposing it, the movement of the Friars, but in its external features, in the beginning it was very similar ~~to~~ to the beginning of the Walgenses. Now the beginning of the Friars centers around two men.

two men whom the R.C. church recognizes as saints and of whom it would seem that they were men of very fine qualities, both of them, as far as our evidence goes. They certainly were men of very unusual character and men of very great sincerity in their attitudes, but they were men very different from each other. The two men are Francis of Assissi and Dominic the ^{uzman} ~~Gópp~~. Francis is an Italian and Dominic is a Spaniard. Practically never used, they speak of him simply as Saint Domic. St. Francis is much more common, from Assissi, the town where he was born. Now $8\frac{1}{2}$ something of the life of both of these men, so we won't have to take time to go into them here in class but what we are interested more here is the result and activities. They were not men who started out simply to follow the church and to fit into a groove in it. They were original individuals who had their own ideas much as Peter Waldo did. They struck out new lines for themselves. Now Francis, the son of a very rich man, a man of a rather ungodly life as a young man, turned his back on everything associated with his previous life and went out and lived in poverty and devoted himself to helping people and he tried to work with manual labor to secure money for his needs and to help people in any way in which he could and he went about from place to place and he seems to have been a man of very attractive character and people were won to him by the charm of his personality and by the self-sacrifice of his life and soon there were a large number of people who were following him and other people naturally when they saw the attitude of these men who were anxious to live in poverty but to earn their own living with manual labor, they began giving them money and soon they began receiving gifts quite widely and they developed to the point where many of them no longer tried to work for their living but simply to live off the gifts of other people and the activity of begging on the part of the friars came into their life, but it was not the original idea. Now Francis desired that his brothers, as he called those who came with him, should be men of great humility and so he organized them into a group and

he called them the lessr brothers, the Friars and today when you see a book written by a man after whose name there are the initials O.S.M. they mean the order of lesser brothers (). Francis thought of himself and his friends as simply people who were to take the most menial position and simply to be helpful, to be self-sacrificing and helpful to others. Naturally many of the church leaders suspected them of heresy. They were persecuted to some extent and mistreated, but they were not particularly interested in doctrine. They had no opposition to the doctrines of the church, they were simply interested in doing good and showing a ~~life~~ life of self-scarifice in themselves and the church may perhaps been influenced to some extent by what had happened to the Walgenses movement when it opposed them and instead of its being destroyed, it had become something of a power against the church and ~~it~~ had taken positions against the church very strongly and its followers were living in the mountains in different places and spreading their doctrine to some extent and the church eventually decided that Francis and his men were harmless and the pope gave them a charter to be an order under the church and so they became a new sort of an order, not an order of monks like the Benedictines who lived in a monastary, and did their work under direction, but an order of men who would go about from place to place and who would do good as they went from place to place and lived off the gifts of the people and do manual labor if they felt so inclined, but who would take a very humble attitude and simply be helpful and they promised to support the church and to do everything they could to help the church and Francis wrote his plan for the order by which no member of it was to have any p~~ro~~property of his own. They were to all be very very much removed from anything worldly and they would have no properties but simply to devote themselves to doing good and living very humble. However, even before his death, people began giving gifts, large gifts to the order and some of the headquarters of the order began to have a great deal of money and some of the monks though they had

nothing of their own theoretically, they were using the very fine things that came into the order and Francis is said to have become very disgusted with the way the order was developing, ~~but~~ prior to his death. There had been several attempted reformations of the order since that time. You will find groups of them who call themselves Friars minor conventuals, that is they live in convents, more like the Benedictines. And you will find others who stressed the going around and you find some of them who stress the poverty aspect and eventually there were groups of them who became scholars to some extent and a good many books have been written by Franciscans, though they are not the great scholarly order as called, and a group of them later developed who called itself the . A Jesuit said to me in Rome last summer, the man who was with me there asked this Jesuit, what order to these people meet. Throngs that were coming towards us and the people had these long brown robes with a rope tied around and the Jesuit said if they have beards they are , if they don;t have beards they are Franciscans, so the are a development of the Franciscans and they carry the rules a little further and doesn't permit any shaving and try to be a little stricter in the order. The order suffered a great blow. (end of record)

..... Now of course the Bible tells us that God's Holy Spirit was with them and was directing and was leading and blessing¹..... but there is another point which we find in the book of Acts and which we do not find in any way in any later time. to a great extent. WE find reference in later periods ~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~ as claims of such a force, but most of these claims are very questionable, and there are comparatively few of them. While in Acts, we find a good many. That is, the claims that there was supernatural power given to them in their spread of the Gospel. That is taught in the book of Acts. Not merely that the Holy Spirit was there as he is with each one today who is true to Christ, illuminating our minds, encouraging, us, helping us to go forward accomplishing what success the message has (it is the Holy Spirit which does it) but that with them in addition to that there were miracles wrought. That there were not merely acts of wonderful appearance of the problems such as as everything good that he had in the course of his life, but there were mighty supernatural miracles wrought such as rarely ever/ appeared in our day. That is/^{taught}~~not~~ in the book of Acts that these things occurred in connection with the spread of the Gospel. Yes? Student.....AAM:.... It is a fact that as you read the account of Christian leaders ~~XXXXXXXX~~ let's say 250 A. D., you will once in a while find that one of them claims that a miracle has been a(problem) in connection with his work. But it is very very rare. It is no more prominent today. We do not have plenty of historical documents at a later time than the book of Acts, which presents supernatural activities of God.present as it is found in the book of Acts. That we do not have⁴.....and it is not there in Christianity after 300 nor in any time before which we have record after the close of the book of Acts. (St. Augustus) believed very thoroughly in miraculous activity as something which might very naturally come any time, but I believe there was only one or ~~XXXX~~ two cases in his whole life where he had⁴₂..... and those are somewhat questionable when we examine. In the

course of dozens of years of active work for Christ what he would think was a miraculous4½..... We do not have it. Its quite rare that people even think of it. But the book of Acts describes it as having5..... Not then it is a fact that according to the teaching of the book of Acts, the spread of Christianity was then greatly helped by the supernatural intervention of God. That is taught and it is not5½... /Well, now why would it be a fact at that time if it is not at later periods. There are those who say "You open the Bible at any place, and you find a miracle". The Bible is a work of wonderful works. Just ~~XXXX~~ constant miraculous things.~~XX~~ It's sort of like Uncle Wiggelly that my little boy is so fond of reading. There is always some remarkable thing and some thing that is fantastic and out of the ordinary. Well, that is good reasoning for a child, but we don't believe that those things actually happened. Well, now you come to Acts and you find all these things and they don't ~~XXXXXX~~ happen in our experience. These are books of somebody's imagination. Somebody sat down and made up a story or somebody was carried away by his ~~XXXX~~ allucinations, and he imagined all types of things that never actually happened and that's what he wrote down. Now, that's not what we believe as Christians. We don't believe this. We believe that what is described in the book of Acts is true, and we believe that everything in the Bible is true; and, therefore, we believe that these miracles did occur, but how can we reconcile that with the fact that they do not occur today. Now, I'm not saying that miracles never occur, but I am saying that if they ever occur today, it is very very rare in comparison with the book of Acts. It takes the very first public manifestation to the Christian Church in Acts. The apostles all stood up there and they spoke, tongues of fire rested on their heads and they spoke as the Spirit gave them utterance and the people round about said as you remember in Acts 2 The people who saw them who were there in Rome from many different sections said, "These people are all from Galilee. How can we hear every man in his own tongue wherein we were born what they are saying? Parthians, Medes,

Elamites, the dwellers in Mesopotamia, Judaea, Cappadocia, Pontus, Asia, Phrygia, Pamphylia, Egypt, all these different countries, Cretes and Arabians, we hear them speak in our tongues the wonderful works of God." That miracle which ~~XXXXXXXX~~ occurred on the day of Pentecost, there is no record that anything similar has ever happened since either in the book of Acts or out of it. There is no record that God permitted such a thing ever to happen at any other time. There is speaking in tongues recorded in other places in the book of Acts and in the apostolic writings but there is no evidence to suggest that it was similar to the speaking of tongues on the day of Pentecost, because on the day of Pentecost there when these were ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ 12 men/speaking, there were people who talked perhaps 25 different languages every one of them said, "We hear them talking in our own language" Well, now how does that happen? Were these 12 people each of them saying one sentence ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ in Russian and one sentence in French one sentence in German, one sentence in Spanish, or ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ was each of them talking in let's say two languages --- two minutes in one, two minutes in another, two minutes in one, two minutes in the other, till 25 different languages could be recognized from what they were saying. Or were there perhaps a larger group involved in this than the twelve apostles. Was there perhaps a much larger group and there was one of them talking Russian, one French, one Spanish, one Italian, all these different languages. I don't mean these modern languages, of course, but the languages mentioned in Acts. One was talking each of these languages so that somebody standing over there would hear all these different languages here and he couldn't make anything out of it, but he thinks he heard of work of Arabic over here, and sure enough there was a man talking over here in Arabic. Another man over here will think he heard an Egyptian talk. He goes running over there. Or was it that/^{as} they spoke wherever these people were, they didn't have to run to the particular man who was speaking, but they heard what their own language being spoken. It doesn't describe the details of it, but it is clear that what Acts says

... they found the Chinese couldn't understand them. (Laughter)

It must XXXX

is at least 25 different languages were understood by the people who were listening and they said, "We hear them speaking in our own language." Now, there is nothing like that in history anywhere. It is a miracle which God wrought. I heard of a group in Los Angeles a few years ago who (this was Mrs. MacPherson who became very famous in L. A. twenty~~9~~ years ago) Well twenty years before that, before she was well known, she and a group of her friends were speaking in tongues in their meetings and they decided they were speaking in Chinese, so they got someone to raise money and went over to China in order that having this wonderful gift of speaking Chinese they would present the Gospel in Chinese. Very excellent idea. If you ever get the gift of speaking Chinese, you ought to go to China and use it so people will understand what you're giving them. But when they got over there they found the Chinese couldn't understand them. (Laughter) It must ~~XXX~~ have been some ancient dialect of Chinese they were talking for it was unknown to the people there. At any rate, none of the people there could understand them, and they were there utterly destitute and the missionaries raised a collection to send them back to this country. There is no case ~~✓~~ on record in history where a group of people not knowing a language have begun to talk in this other language. There are claims in early Christian writings of an individual miraculously learning another language, but no claims that I ever heard of a whole group of people beginning to talk in ^alanguages they didn't know. And not even a suggestion any place that I have ever heard of that a group of people spoke and people around could understand them in 25 different languages which was the languages of those people and which were unknown to those ~~XXXXXX~~ speaking ~~XXXXXX~~. This is a miracle which has nothing possible to it in any way in later history or even suggested elsewhere in the book of Acts or in any of the epistles. This is the Pentecost, speaking with tongues. Now was it a miracle of speaking? Was it a miracle of hearing? If God ...ll $\frac{1}{2}$ that the air waves would be changed around so that when they struck the ear drums of the different people each one would hear in his own language.

Is that the way God did it? Or did he cause that each one should speak a different language. ~~XXX~~ We don't know, but we do know that what happened there was a miracle which never so far as does the slightest evidence/^{been}repeated anywhere ---- Student? ----- AAM: That's right. On verse 7 we read that these people said, "Behold, are not all these which speak Galilaeans? And how hear we every man in our own tongue, wherein we were born?" A simple explanation of it is that the people who were listening who thought they were all Galileans were simply mistaken. They weren't all Galileans. There were people from ~~XXXX~~ many different countries. It's a simple explanation, but if that is the case, the author of Acts has deliberately deceived us in giving it in such a way as to show that they all thought that they were all Galilean people and not explaining the fact that actually the people were mistaken and some of them were from their own. If that is the case, the author of Acts either deliberately deceived us or was greatly mistaken. That is any believe in the inspiration of the Scripture ^{must} ~~XXX~~ hold that when the ...13 $\frac{1}{2}$... they marvelled saying "Behold are now all these which speak Galileans? How hear we every man in our own tongue, wherein we were born?" They actually were all Galileans. So that to anyone who reads this and studies it from the viewpoint of the belief in Biblical14..... this was a very very tremendous night. And it is presented as a miracle here..... End of 27

Beginning of 28

..... Well, now why did God cause this wonderful miracle to happen on the day of Pentecost? and not ~~XXX~~ have it happen a month later? or not have it happen two months later? Why didn't it happen when the apostle went to Rome? Why didn't it happen in Greece? Why didn't it keep on happening? Why did he have it happen just once? Why did he have remarkable miracles described in the book of Acts happen in those early days in connection with the beginning of the church activities and not happening ~~XXXX~~ later on as far as there is any record? ...1 $\frac{1}{2}$ Well, we don't know. Therefore, we can make up a good reason why. It may be wrong. God has a reason. Now, of course, one possible explanation

is that as long as the Christians were true to God, they had these miracles. Once they turned away from God, they didn't have them. If that is the case, then nobody has ever been true to God since 100 A. D. when the Christians2..... under the Roman Empire, they were true to God2 $\frac{1}{2}$ He said the Greek old Roman world committed suicide.2 $\frac{1}{2}$ when the Roman Empire hadn't even begun yet and it lasted for 700 years, and so it is that the Christian Church has always been on the2 $\frac{1}{2}$ And we have no record, no dependable record, of any ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ individual of importance prior ~~X~~ to 100 A.D. except those3..

Yes? Student----- After this there was a number of times when there was speaking in tongues and something which was retained through the Apostolic age, but that it ever was on any scale such as this where 25 different languages could be recognized, I don't think you'll ever find it, and in fact Paul says "Let a man not speak in tongues unless there is an interpreter for it" He says, "I would rather speak five words in an intelligible language than a hundred words in ~~X~~ an unknown tongue." Well, now, in Acts here they were speaking in tongues but not in unknown tongues, because there were people present who could understand. The evidences in speaking in tongues was something different, for if it was like this, it was on a far smaller scale. Suppose that Cornelius was speaking Chinese and there was nobody there to recognize it....4 $\frac{1}{2}$ different from having 25 different languages . It's the same thing, perhaps but it was always on a very very much smaller scale. There is a great unique miracle at Pentecost. There is a similar thing which when taken through the Apostolic age4 $\frac{1}{2}$ Well, now that is two of the various miracles. Now, why ~~XXXXX~~ was it? There is a perfectly reasonable explanation, an explanation which is in line with the facts of the scripture, because though the unbeliever may think that the Bible is simply a book of fantastical events, that you open it to any page and you find something contrary to nature, that is not the case. You can read page after page and find no miracle, no remarkable extraordinary occurrences. You

can go through periods of the history of the Bible, decade after decade, and find no mention of any miracle. Then you come to a period when miracles are poured out in great profusion, ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ but these are only a few periods, only four periods in which you find miracles poured ~~XXX~~ out in profusion, and it would seem as you go through the Bible that God poured out His miracles in connection with great crucial epochs in history. Then there were times when it was crucial and vital that the work go forward and then he poured out supernatural works. It was God's will to raise up a great nation which would be the background from which Christ would come into the world. He rocked the Israelites out of Egypt with a mighty hand and he performed tremendous miracles bringing them out of Egypt and intaking them into the land of ~~PALESTINE~~ Palestine, performing these miracles in order that ~~XXX~~ God's witness which was restricted to this little group should not die out but should be reserved and allowed to get well established itself. Then we find period after period with hardly a miracle ever performed. Hardly one. Then we come to the period of the great crises where it looks as if the ~~E~~ pagan worship was going to completely destroy the true religion, and there God poured out his great number of miracles under Elijah and Elisha. And then we go along for a long time with hardly any miracles. Then we have the period when the Children of Israel were in Babylong and they might succomb to idolatry. There God poured out the miracles under Daniel. Then we have Christianity beginning with one man in a little group following him and God poured out the miracles in connection with the beginning of the Christianity until it gets established. He does supernatural works so that the little thing will not be snuffed out. But when the little flame becomes a dozen flames in a dozen different countries then he chooses not to intervene supernaturally to prevent any one of them from being snuffed out. And we have great countries in which Christianity has been tremendously ~~XXXXXXXX~~ important and it has been completely wiped out. We have ...8..... ' ✓

that a third of the people opposed were Protestants very devoted to the scripture and the leaders in Polish life, most of them were Protestants, and it looked as if ~~XXXX~~ Protestantism would completely win out in that land. And the (Jesuite) came in ^{and} ~~in~~ succeeded in wiping it out so completely that the nation became 90 per cent Romans and there is hardly a trace of8..... There was a time when I personally am convinced that if Poland was the only country in the world where the knowledge of the justification by faith was present God would have intervened.....8½..... But it was then in a number of different countries and he permitted it that in the course of events some of them to go forward and some of them not to. He did not intervene with these remarkable miracles except at crucial points in the history of the worship of God. Student----- No, at the time when Christ Himself gave his preaching to the Jews there were certain Greeks came to see him and he solved it, but ordinarily he restricted Himself to the Jews. However, the Jews at that time were active in9½..... and there were a good many Gentiles who had become Jews circumcised and become Jews, and many of these became Christians at the very start. They were of Gentile background, but they were actually Jews. Now, Cornelius was not. He was very much interested in the Jewish belief that worship but he had not become a Jew. He was not circumcised and not become a Jew and Peter, this was at least ten years after the crucifixion of Christ, that Peter was asked to go and talk to Cornelius. He wouldn't go because these were SS Gentiles. They hadn't been circumcised. They hadn't become Jews, and God gave him a vision to show him that God wanted him to go and so it was very slow to go to the Gentiles, and the first one to do it on a large scale was WX Paul, although Peter did it on a small scale. Yes? Student-----

AAM: As the days went on the apostles received new understanding11... The church on the day of Pentecost was just as true as the church of today. Student----- In God's sight 11½..... The only thing is the apostles did not realize that it ~~is~~ was possible for11½..... They didn't realize that. And when these uncircumcised people came and

still being uncircumcised became Christians then God revealed through Paul the fact that it was not essential to the character of the church whether the people be either Jew or Gentiles, that in Christ they were all one.

Well, in the church at Pentecost God saw them as Christians. Student -----

AAM: Or the resurrection of Christ, Christ restricted His ministry to the Jews. He did not go to the Gentiles. He did when some of them came12 $\frac{1}{2}$ And you remember when the woman came and she asked Christ to heal her child and Christ said that He would come and she said it is not right to take the children's bread and give it to the dogs. And Christ said, "I have not seen such ~~things~~ faith." Thereby he expressed His approval. His approval that they might be received but it was God's method of proceeding in orderly fashion and he built a solid foundation.

~~Why~~ Why didn't he send Christ 3,000 years ~~XX~~ earlier. He built up His solid foundation through the Jewish people. Had the word of God given them, had the people ready to go out and carry the message, and when the time came when he sent Christ and it was not His will that13 $\frac{1}{2}$

Well the supernatural work then we find present in the book of Acts given in the early church to nurture this new organism, to protect the little flame and to help it till it grew to the point where if one part of it was snuffed out there would still be other parts. It was God's will that through at least 200 years up to 300 years after the time of Christ, the spread of Christianity in the Roman Empire should be carried simply by personal example and personal witness from one person to another.

End of 28

..... The specific revelations of God, the supernatural interventions are mostly in the early chapters. We find more of them in Chaps. 1-10 than we do in the whole ~~XXXXX~~ remaining 20 chapters. We find much more of them in connection with the early activities of ^{Peter}/~~XXXXXX~~ than we do with the long missionary journeys of Paul. They would seem as far as the picture in Acts is concerned to have been gradually decreasing but there is no evidence that the light of the Christian in the last chap.

of Acts is on any lower level than the light of the Christian in the early part of Acts. So we do have at the beginning ~~XX~~ supernatural help, but it's easy for somebody to say, "Well, God simply worked a miracle and by supernatural means spread Christianity till it conquered the Roman Empire!" That is now, however, the case. The evidence is that these miracles were just to help them on the way. It was the act of preaching the work of the Holy Spirit to convict their hearts. He did most of the work even in the Book of Acts and by the end of the Book of Acts these supernatural works had been reduced to where there were very very few. Jesus could have said at his death that everybody on the earth now suddenly could be Christians instead of unChristian. ~~XX~~ He could have caused this miracle to occur instantly, but that is not the way He chooses to work. He chooses to work upon our hearts by the Holy Spirit, leading us, winning us,2 $\frac{1}{2}$ And he does not ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ do it in spite of3..... by supernatural activity.....3..... as he did at these few crucial points but comparatively rarely is it even claimed that such a thing has been done since. And in the life of great men of God like Calvin, Luther, and Wesley, these men whom God has used far beyond what the normal, in the lives of great missionaries and great evangelists of today, you will find some of them who will occasionally that they3 $\frac{1}{2}$.. supernatural work may be done, but even with them it is rare, and if you take them all together3 $\frac{1}{2}$ God ordinarily works in other ways, but this ~~XX~~ is a of course a definite course in the book of Acts in the beginning of the spread of Christianity. Now in connection with the spread of Christianity here we should notice the effects of persecution. Persecution seems here to have been a means of spreading the message to some extent. It calls attention to it, and it caused that the disciples were spread abroad and they were scattered. We find even when the time came that Paul was converted, he was on his way up to Damascus, - a long journey a journey of perhaps six or eight days of ~~XXXX~~ walking, more than that walking, six or eight days on horseback to Damascus, in order to hunt for Christians up there, so that by that time4 $\frac{1}{2}$ The people fled

before the persecution had broke out, but as they fled they carried Christ. And when Paul got to Damascus, there was already a group of Christians there to receive him and to help him. ~~XXXX~~ You occasionally hear it said that Christianity was just a religion of slaves. Now that is definitely not the facts at all. Christianity was not a religion which was put down from above by an emperor or a ruler saying that everybody should become Christians. It was not ~~in~~^{His} order that it be taught in the schools and people required to accept it. That is not the way Christianity works. Christianity spread more among the ~~poor~~ poorer people than among the ~~wealthy~~ wealthy, but there are more of them. Proportionately I doubt if it spread more into one class than into ~~any~~ another class. We find right in the very early days among the disciples, Dr. Buswell is quite convinced, that John and his family were well to do fish merchants. He was not just a man who went out with a hook and line catching fish, but they were men who had an active and successful fish business in Galilee selling to Jerusalem and they represented something. When Peter went to the first Gentile convert, he was Cornelius, a centurion, a position of known importance. When Paul went to Cypress, he preached before the counsel immediately and it is not ~~long~~ long before we find Paul writing in his ¹Philippian letter and saying "They of Caesar's household send your greetings." There were Christians among the highly trained Paul himself. There were Christians in ~~all~~ all classes of Roman society right from the bottom, but it was not a religion which took the leaders and they give it to the others--it was one which penetrated all classes. We'll say a little more about that tomorrow morning. We mentioned the remarkable thing that a religion which began as just a little group of people comparatively obscure people in an obscure corner of the Roman Empire within three centuries became the Gospel religion of the Empire, and we notice that it is impossible to account for ~~the~~ the fact that these disciples went out with such steadfastness and determination and absolute confidence that Christ was God apart from the fact that they really were utterly convinced that he had risen from the dead and had seen him and talked with him and was absolutely sure that

this was the one they had known who had died on the cross. The chains of this little group of disconsolate, frightened, disappointed men, grieving for the death of their master, the change of them into the men who stood up on the day of Pentecost and stood against persecution and ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ difficulties declaring the fact that Jesus was God and that only through Him could we be saved is impossible to account for aside from this group of men, not just one person, but this group having the absolute conviction that they had seen Jesus Christ. They did not go out as lawyers to reason with people they didn't go out as philosophers to present a new interpretation to the universe; they went out as witnesses to tell of what they had seen as Peter said on the day of Pentecost "We are witnesses to the fact that he was raised from the dead, and we have seen him, and we know that these things are true." And so the resurrection of Jesus Christ is the great supernatural fact which stands at the beginning of the spread of the Christian religion. Now, aside from that, we notice there was other supernatural help, but it was easy to magnify the miraculous, the unusual, the things contrary to nature, which occurred in connection with the spread of the Gospel, it is easy to get an exaggerated idea of how much that there was. There definitely were times in connection with the book of Acts starting with that great miracle at Pentecost, when wonderful things contrary to all human expectations ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ occurred in connection with the work of the disciples, but ~~XXX~~ these are far from being the main things in the spread of the Gospel. Jesus said when they asked him to do a miracle, he said, "A wicked and adulterous generation ask for a sign, and there shall no sign be given them, but the sign of the prophet Jonah." The sign of the resurrection. They had that sign. They went out and told about it, and other miracles occurred occasionally, but not extremely frequent in the book of acts. They were comparatively rare, and as time went on they would seem to decrease in number until then we have historical evidence about the church the number of such miracles is practically non-existent. In the book of Acts, we have the angels taking these disciples from ~~XXXXX~~ prison when there was just a little group and its leadership ^{if} destroyed the whole thing would have gone

to pieces. This little group of leaders when put in prison were taken out by the angel supernaturally through the prison doors. That happened a couple of times in the book of Acts, but in all the long series of Roman persecution later on, we don't find this happening again. We do not find that God intervenes to take the most righteous people out from the prison doors by supernatural means. We find him working on the hearts of the Romans, working on the hearts of the officials in such a way that when he still had a work for a man to do, that man's life would be spared. Not through a supernatural intervention. We have few of them in Acts and we do not have them afterwards. This was a definite factor in the original spread of the gospel. At this time when the little ~~light~~^{light} ~~XXXX~~/was very small, God saw to it that it would not be quenched, that it would grow until there were many lights in many places and when that had happened, then each one of those lights had the opportunity of being true to Christ and following Him and growing into a big light, but if they failed, their particular light was quenched and the witness of Christ went on in other places. Yes? Student..... AAM: Yes, Particularly in the early days. ~~AX~~ You'll find that in the early days the people would get out into the street and hope that just the shadow of Peter would fall on them. There was evidently great deal of remarkable healing being done in connection with the early ministry of the disciples there in Jerusalem. On Paul's journeys we have him driving an evil ~~spirit~~ spirit out of a person occasionally. We have occasionally a wonderful healing described that he did, but we have no suggestion that those things were being done constantly on Paul's journeys. In fact, by that time they would seem to have been comparatively few. But in the earlier times they were ~~XX~~ much more common and in the early times we have the statements about their occurring other miracles not here described. We don't have such things later on. The great emphasis is given to the raising up of Dorcas and to two or three miracles like that would not suggest that they would constantly happen but these were very remarkable. Yes? Student..... / AAM: I would say that before the beginning of Paul's missionary journeys, and mostly back in the very beginning

Student..... AAM: End of Record-----Beginning of Record 30

..... 1 to 5.....

The Roman Catholic Church today claims that every priest has the power to work miracles, that every priest can take a piece of bread and a little wine and can change it by saying certain magical words to the actual body and blood of Christ so that it is no longer bread and wine, but is actually the body and blood of Christ. And, of course, the Roman Catholic church today5½..... uncertain conditions one of which is that they perform miracles and proved that a certain number of ~~XXXXXX~~ miracles had been performed by a person before they will recognize him as a saint.6½...

But we must get on Yes? Student..... AAM:6 3/4.... wrote a book called, the Origin of Paul's Religion, in which he took up that matter and looked into the evidence of the ~~XXXX~~ divine rights of God and saw how many cases he could find that7..... The evidence is that at least a century or two after and it may just as well be the other way around.

.....7..... Well, I'm glad you mentioned that because that is a good point for everyone to underline. Well, now the supernatural help God gave at the very beginning , but it seems to have decreased rapidly through and towards the end of the book of Acts. Then we mentioned the effects of persecution that the people were spread abroad by the persecution. I

don't think that was a major point, but the disciples--Jesus told them: You will be witnesses in Jerusalem and Samaria and all Judea and they had plenty big job to be witnesses in Jerusalem and they were going forward for some years, and then when the persecution broke out violently, then they were scattered in the other areas and they proceeded with ~~XXXX~~ their witness there. And yet people do not set out to be witnesses, but people simply going in the ordinary course of travel and trade wherever they ~~XXX~~ went they carried the gospel so that even when Paul, before he became a Christian, he heard that there were Christians as far away as Damascus and he went up there with the intent to persecute them. Now, you sometimes ~~XXX~~ hear the statement made that Christianity was just a religion of slaves. Now that is an overstatement. It is looking at one aspect of the

matter. I mentioned yesterday. Christianity spreads among the whole population. It did not spread simply among the lower class or simply among the upper class, or simply among the middle class. It seems highly probable that a century after the death of Christ the great strength of Christianity was in the middle class, rather than in the poorer class or the wealthy class. That seems highly probable, but it cannot be proven. That certainly was the case two centuries after Christ, that the strength of it was in the middle class. But as it spread, Paul was no ~~xxx~~ respecter of persons, and neither was Peter; and they would take the time to go to the poorest person, the most insignificant person, to tell them how to be saved by Christ and they didn't hesitate to go to the counsel or the centurion or the most prominent, highly educated, wealthy person to tell them of their need for Christ, and many of all classes rejected the gospel, but some of all classes accepted the Gospel. And gradually it spread in all classes until before the end of the time of the writing of the ~~xxxxxxx~~ N. T. you have ...10 $\frac{1}{2}$.. withing Caesar's household. I don't say how important their positions were but there were some by the end of the first century we have evidence that a ~~xxxxxxx~~ cousin of the emperor may very likely been a Christian. It seems most probable although the proof is not absolutely certain. That's within 60 years after the death of Christ. One of the first Gentiles to become a Christian was the centurion, an office considered of most importance, with authority ~~xxxxxx~~ over a fairly wide area. And so Christianity spread among all types of the population, although very slowly, but occasionally a big step forward like at the day of Pentecost, but mostly very slowly. Somebody has said Paul, you remember had a dream that he saw a man of Macedonia saying "Come over here and help us" /^{Does} That represent the great cry of the Macedonians that if only he'll bring us a01 $\frac{1}{2}$ Paul went over there, and we don't know whether he ever found this man. He went over to Macedonia and started preaching and it was the woman who was the first one. And it was very slow, very gradually the dream that he had showed that they needed a God. "Come over and help us" was the cry of the Holy Spirit to bring help to the need. It was not the cry of these people. There are

very few in any land, here or elsewhere who want God. They all need Him, but they have to be12.....In most people's lives there is a time when they will gladly receive Him--some particular time in the life they are glad to, but those times are very few. The apostolic age then is the time in which the apostles were active, and about all we know about it is book of Acts and the Epistles. We have not other reliable knowædage about this time. A few years ago I read a book by the Jew13..... and I was amazed of the study that he had made of the book of Acts and the Epistles. I was amazed at the little statements he made in relation to people. Things like ~~XXX~~ I've never noticed that looking into Acts and the Epistles I found pretty good evidence of them. He made a remarkable study, and he made quite a study of the general background and he gives a picture that makes that time really live. There are a few things in it which I don't like like the suggestion that Paul was subject to epileptic fits. There are a few things like that which I don't like, ~~XXXXX~~ but there are very very few. The book as a whole is one which will inspire you and will make this time seem more real. It is only in the Acts and Epistles that we find true evidence of those days. Now so much for A then. Yes? Student....

AAM: End of Record 30

Record 311 to 4½..... The first century A. D. 70 years after the time of Christ, during that period material book N. T. is extrememly scanty. ~~XXXXXX~~ Our first church history was written about 331 A. D. And in this church history he gives an account of certain events in the first century. Most of what he gives is taken from the book of Acts and from the Epistles. Most of what he gives is taken from that and then he picks things from others writers and one thing about is when he deals with this early period, he gives us his sources.....5½.... we perhaps ~~may~~ pay little or less attention to what he says5½..... simply gave us a statement. In the first century Peter came to Rome and Peter was the first bishop of Rome, and was the second and

and was the third. simply gave a statement like that and that was all. we would tend to say; Well, says it. He must have some reason to believe it. He must have some evidence, but when we find that says Peter was the first bishop of Rome. We have pretty good reason to think this was the case ~~XXXXXX~~ because we find that, the bishop is writing to the Romans ~~XXX~~ in a letter at the time when the emperor was promoted6..... And you will find that this bishop to whom he refers lived in 200 A. D. Now a man 200 A. D. thought that 150 years before that Peter as the Bishop of Rome. Now, what does it prove? AND gives evidence of that type, so when he makes a statement you are reasonable in saying What evidence is he ~~GIVING~~ giving? And if he doesn't give evidence you can think if he had some good evidence he would have given it. Therefore,7..... if he wanted to pawn something off on us he would have done better not to give it at all..... And we find that most of the statements that makes about events during the first century have very very little evidence for them. Now, if I were to ask any of you who have not made special research or written a manuscript or a document on the subject to name me the five leading ministers of Philadelphia in this city 150 years ago, I doubt if there is anybody here who could name a single man who was a minister in Phila. 150 years ago. You probably could even tell me who was mayor 150 years ago to say nothing to name some of the ministers here at that time. 150 years is a long time, and it was nearly 150 years after wrote that..... quotes as an authority for what was 150 years before his time, and you see there is very slight evidence. And so our evidence for anything in this period aside from what is in Acts and what is in the Epistles is very slight. We find that some of the churches which such as ~~XX~~ at Rome when Peter and Paul had been there and Alexandria John Mark.....8½..... The evidence of that is perhaps better than a good many others because if they were just picking ~~XXXXXX~~ somebody to be the head of their church they would probably ~~XXXX~~ pick one of the apostles ----- not one of the most outstanding men.... there is more reason to think rather

than some story somebody has enlightened There were traditions like that in some of the churches 150 years later that the particular apostle had founded the church9..... And there are traditions which spring up as to where the apostles went and some of the traditions are of value but it's pretty hard to tell. Actually whatever the book of Acts says and the Epistles say we know facts. Whatever is beyond them it is of interest ~~XXX~~ and it may be true but we cannot be sure. We have this material from Now, it's hard9½..... we have more material from is much nearer. He's about 170 A. D. About 170 A. D. he made certain statements about the church at Rome. (Irenaus) These statements are not given in order to give us a church history, but he is saying there are all kinds of beliefs and viewpoints around. Why these views they don't go back to the apostles . He says to go to a church like Rome, and where there ~~has~~ been a succession of men who knew them who led the church10½..... He says go there and see what they believe and find out that these sects don't have any foundation10½..... so you see these statements are worthy of attention, but they certainly aren't truth and it's interesting to see says the first Bishops of Rome after Peter were you'll see their pictures in Rome ~~Y~~ in St. Paul's church and yet it's interesting Church History, a Roman Catholic book two men or two names for the same man. Nobody knows. It shows how little we know after all about those days. God put a stake between the dependable ~~MISTYF~~ history he gave us of the foundation of the christian church in which he showed what the things ~~are~~ that he wants stressed, what the things ~~are~~ that are vital, and he gave us the foundation and the teaching 11½..... between that and the first reliable ~~X~~ historical evidence we ~~XXX~~ have in order that we should not confuse history or position with what the church with God's inspired word at the beginning of the Christian Church. Now in this first century there is only one man aside from the apostles and the early Christian leaders who had left us any writing of which we are quite certain. And this one is the Epistle of which comes just before the end of the century. Very shortly before 100 A. D. writes

and was a man who lived in Rome. The epistle has been handed down by tradition as the epistle of (Clemens) and this tradition goes back to a very early time. What the epistle doesn't actually name and he doesn't claim to speak in his own name at all. It's a very interesting thing. He says the church of Rome to the church of Corinth. The great English scholars thinks that it is extremely unlikely that (Clemens) was actually the bishop of Rome. He says he must certainly been a man of importance and influence in the church to be entrusted with the duty of writing such an epistle, but that he was bishop of the church we have no evidence in the epistle. But this epistle from the church of Rome to the church of ~~XXXXXX~~ Corinth rebukes the people at Corinth for divisions among them such as existed in the time of Paul for which Paul advises them in His letter and gives them good advice and good support. And this epistle we are told many years later the church of Corinth read every Sunday. They read it to their people. ,.....14..... It was a good one written by a good Christian man. It is our only other one in the first century on which we can be quite certain that it actually comes from this first century. There are some other writings which most ~~XXXXXX~~ scholars think came in the ~~XXXXXX~~ early second century which might possibly have been before that time, but most scholars do not think so. But this one, most scholars agree, does come from the first century. Now, I ~~EX~~ want to read you what this Roman Catholic writer

End of Record 31

Record 32

..... Sometimes called Clement of Rome to distinguish him from Clement of Alexandria, the first of the early writers called apostolic fathers. Concerning this book little is known for certain.1 $\frac{1}{2}$ But says it is probable that the ancient buildings discovered by excavation Some people ~~XXXXXX~~ think he was a man of high standing in the community. Others think he was a man who had been slave and freed. We don't know anything about it except that it seems quite probable that he actually was ~~X~~ the one who wrote this epistle and that he was at least a man of considerable standing

in the Roman church whether he was a bishop of it or not. The Roman Catholics call him Pope St. But says in his letter to the church at Corinth still preserved and unquestionably authentic he reproaches the Corinthians for having allowed system to exist in their church and urges them to submit to the divinely establish hierarchy to which all Christians hold obedience. ... I wish you would copy those words. M..... says in his letter.. urges the Corinthians to submit to the divinely established hierarchy to which all Christians owe obedience. Before the year is over I have covered every one of..... And I want you to see whether you think that is the verb. Also, I want you to see whether Clement in the letter said that he is the head of the church..... Does he say that he is the head of the sure foundation? Yes? Student..... McSorley is how you spell it. I want you to see whether Clement said I am the head of the church. I want^{you}/to see whether he bases his authority on being the successor of Peter. That's what the Roman Catholic church will say that the pope has his authority because he is the successor of Peter. I want you to see whether Clement says that. The only authentic writing we have from the first century. Does he say that? Then McSorley has a quotation from a German ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ Lutheran scholar.....from the Cambridge Ancient History. I don't want you to copy this quotation, but I want you to listen carefully. He said ~~EX~~ "But the Roman community is nevertheless unmistakable" When he said nevertheless makes me think we ought to know what he said just before that, but McSorley doesn't quote whatever he says just before that. It is nevertheless unmistakable5.....Rome imparts profitable instruction to the Corinthian community and regards them as her right and her duty, but one gets the impression that the Romans would have been greatly surprised had Corinth let us think in similar circumstances to such a letter of admonition to Rome. Now that is quoted ~~EX~~/by McSorley as leading opinion. This letter is from the church of Rome to the church of Corinth.. Well, the Roman Catholic church denies that the authority of the Roman church is based upon the fact that Rome was the capital of the ~~EXXX~~ Roman Empire

or the counsel... of the heathen world. They say it is based solely and entirely upon the fact that Jesus Christ appoints Peter as head of the church and Peter was bishop at Rome and so the bishops are his successors. That's what they say.....6..... Whatever the Roman church might say..... Well, you will read better..... and you will notice that it also contains certain illustrations that it gives from natural history which are interesting illustrations. They illustrate what he wants to illustrate, but the trouble is science of it is wrong. You do not find such things in the books of the Bible. ~~XXX~~ Clement is a good book written by a good man giving good Christian advice, but that he as the head of the church is laying down his authority to other parts is the question I want you to answer. And that he writes under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit so that his words are kept free from error is a claim which he never made and also7..... But it's a good book a book written for a good purpose and rightly treasured by No part of the Christian Church has ever held that this was a part of the Bible, but it's our only other authentic writing from the first century. Now C is persecution in the first/~~XXXXXXXX~~ century. Persecution in the first century. Now during the first century there was no ~~XX~~ attempt on the part of the Roman Empire to destroy the church. There was no such thing., during the 70 years after the death of Christ. We can carry it on to 140 years ~~XX~~ after the death of Christ. There was no attempt on the part of the Roman Empire to destroy the Christian Church. Persecution began from the Sadducees not from the Jews as a whole. Now Pharisees maintain the right of the Christians to spread their ideas, but the Sadducees feared that their authority as high priest and heads of the ~~XXXXXXXX~~ temples and their great incomes would be injured by the rights of too much enthusiasm among the people which might rouse the Romans to the point where they would take away and it was the Sadducees who began the persecution of the people. You will remember that when Paul was seen there and they asked him to speak for himself he called out "I am a Pharisee" and for the resurrection of the dead I am called into question. He did that in order that the Pharisees ~~the~~ who were not a part of the persecution but some of them had been counted in

the stories and in the action which was being taken without knowing that they should stop and consider9..... There were great evils among the Pharisees, but the evils were evils of individuals rather than of the group as a whole as Jesus Christ condemned individuals of the Pharisees for the hypocrisy..... The Pharisees, as a class, were the truest ~~of~~^{to} the scripture. All the Jews claimed to believe the book, but the Saducees explained9½..... Student.....AAM! Yes, Paul was a Pharisee. ~~NW~~ I'm not meaning to say the Pharisees never persecuted, but we have good evidence that the tendency of the Pharisees as a whole was against them. Now in his book, The Apostle, has got an interesting theory. He has Paul as studying at the feet of Gamileo, but one who decided that the Saducees were ~~XXXX~~ right in this particular point and went and got in touch with the Saducees and worked with them and came under severe criticism like Now, he may be wrong there; I don't know, but at least there is no evidence at the time. Now, we won't have time today to say any more about the persecution of the church in the first century. We want to finish ~~XXXXX~~ that up rapidly and get on with the second, but unfortunately, we will not be able to until tomorrow. So it will be next Wed. when we will take that up. We don't meet tomorrow. We continue next week with the same work that we have been doing. We had Acts 13 and 14 for today and the next chap. 15 is a very very important chapter in the question of the organization of the church I want you to ~~KX~~ note in it how Peter the divinely established head of the church gives the decision upon the church goes forward in Acts 15. Be sure and note that very carefully in your consideration of Acts 15. We will take Acts 15 and 16 for Wed. and 17 and 18 for Thurs. I think you will find ~~AKX~~ a fair amount of material in each, so I'll only give two chapters instead of three, but it is not necessary to study each verse in close detail. (End 32) Beginning of ~~3~~ and that brought an end to the persecution. According to tradition, Peter and Paul both ~~KXXXXX~~ killed in Nero's persecution. There is no proof of that. Our statement of it comes from but it is extremely possible that Peter and Paul were both killed in the persecution of Nero. After Nero's persecution the idea you can see could easily become

widespread that..... people who held the disgraceful superstitions
 people who had time1½..... Yes? much sympathy was aroused for
 the Christians by the fact that however bad they might be they weren't guilty
 for the thing for which they were ~~XXX~~ being punished and it aroused sympathy
 for them.....it aroused interest, and once the persecution was removed
 there was an ~~XXXXXX~~ increase in the number of people who were interested
 and wanted to know more ~~RE~~ about it. And we have no evidence of any further
 persecution though there may have been some people who were radical.
 We ~~XXX~~ have no evidence of any further persecution for another thirty years.
 Thirty years2½..... a man 25 until he was 55... there is no evidence
 and ~~XXXXXXXX~~ during this period we have the3..... Both good emperors,
 both able rulers at the time which Jerusalem was destroyed but
 thing that distinguishes between the Jews and the Christians there - The
 Jews were revolting against them and were put down3.½... The Christians
 were ~~XXXXXX~~ bystanders as far as that goes. They took no part in the ~~XXXXXXXX~~
 defense of Jerusalem Yes? StudentAAM? There is no
 evidence that was persecution of the Christians and according to the
 record in Acts There was no distinction in the mind of Claudius....
 Well then this period of thirty years we know practically nothing about
 anybody3.4..... two popes immediately following Peter nobody is
 sure whether they are two different men or whether they are the same man. It
 is pretty clear how little is really known of that period. But then at the
 very end of the century we have the third of the ~~XXXX~~ ruling the
 brother of Titus and the son of the and he was unlike his father and
 his brother. He was a wicked man, and(Domicion) we have evidence from
 and others that he persecuted a few people, but it was not a widespread
 persecution. It was nothing like Nero's persecution. But a striking thing
 about it is that these people ~~XXXXXX~~ who D.... persecuted included some
 cousins of his, included some people who were very high in the ~~XXXXXX~~ family
 that was ruling the Roman Empire. Now the pagan simply say that it
 was on account of atheism and the charge of atheism was made against them
 and many others also who had adopted the customs of the Jews were

condemned. No specific mention of Christianity in the pagan reference to this persecution. Some individuals who put a man to death who was his cousin and sent his wife into exile6..... in his church history says that these individuals were Christians. He is writing 250 years later. There has been discovered in the catacombs a section of burials of Christians with the name (Flavious) That has led modern people to think that ~~that~~ tradition is correct that Christianity come actually into the family of the emperor. Not in the immediate family but to people who were fairly close relatives of his--his cousins whom he put to death had been ~~XXXX~~ consuls, the ~~XXXXXX~~ highest office in Rome and ~~XXXX~~ it would look as if it came right into the family by this time, but we have very little evidence on it, and it was nothing like the Roman persecution. So you see during the first century persecution was a thing which might break out radically--it might come from the opposition of individuals or individual groups not an effort on the part of the Roman Empire. There was one great terrific persecution, and that was due to motives altogether unrelated to the desires of destroying Christianity and so Christianity had 70 years of growth during the first century in which there was a constant fear of real persecution and people killed occasionally right from the very beginning but no great number of them except the one terrific persecution which only lasted three or four years. Well, we go on to the second century. II. Christian History in the Second Century A. D. -- Now a word here about this century. You will notice that I'm dividing it ~~XX~~ into centuries. I think there is something to be said about that because it helps you to keep ~~XX~~ in mind the length of the periods. After all, we are interested in how Christianity moved through human life and it doesn't mean much if you don't have an idea of the relationship of the time. We're for the present thinking of these centuries as divided into three parts. Now the first third of the first century all we know about Christianity would be contained in the Gospel. And so if I were to ask you the name of anyone mentioned in the Gospel you could immediately say the first third of the first century A. D. And the book of Acts is our only solid evidence for the second third of the first century, and the book of Acts is entirely within the second third. It might

go back just a year or two in the first third. Then the third third of the first century A. D. there ~~IX~~ are only two people we know of of whom we are sure of many facts about them who were active during this last third of the first century. One of them is ~~X~~ (Clement) of whom we have already spoken. The other one was one of the 12 apostles. The only one who lived, as far as we know, in the third ~~IX~~ third of the first century, and he lived almost to its end. Now the next century then is a period which can pretty well form a unit by itself in Roman History because it is a period during most of which there was one group of emperors reigning. We've already mentioned them. People call them the (Antonine) And the A.... were quite different from the family which reigned during the first two-thirds of the first century the Julius Caesar line. They did not have the cruelty that the latter men were characterized by--Nero and some of his immediate successors. The A.. were in succession of men unrelated to one another, but of whom each one adopted his successor. It was a very convenient ~~IX~~ way of designating who will be your successor, simply to adopt him. Julius Caesar had done that in the first10 $\frac{1}{2}$ the first emperors had done this. (Nero) who only reigned a couple of years adopted (Trajan) the fine general, excellent statesman, and T..... was the first emperor of this period. On his death he adopted (Hadrian) the Spaniard, and H.... adopted A..... who succeeded him and he adopted Marcus..... and as long as he kept on adopting they had fine emperors and magnificent rulers. Only at the end of the period that Marcus had a natural son, and he became the emperor and he was a11 $\frac{1}{4}$ but through most of this period you have a succession of very fine men who from all evidence tried to rule the empire in the way that was just and right and averaged much better than the emperors of either the first century or the third century. Now we will take No. 1 or A under 2 here. A is the spread of Christianity/ I'm not going to say the spread of Christianity in this century because we're going to look particularly at evidence of how it had spread during the previous century. We have no evidence except Clements ~~IX~~ epistle for the last third of the first century. We know very little about what happened in those 30 years, but now this new century begins and it hasn't gone very long before

we find the first contemporary pagan evidence of the power of Christianity-- of how much it has spread. Our first contemporary evidence. What I read you from12 $\frac{1}{2}$ we're looking back sometime before. This is the first evidence we have from a pagan referring to Christianity as active in his own day. And giving us evidence that he considered that it had become quite a prominent movement, a movement which was quite wide active. This evidence comes from a man who is called, I won't give you his technical name--his correct name,(Pliny the Younger)--- this is the name to which he is usually referred to because his uncle, (Pliny the Naturalist) who was wealthy Now this Pliny was a good man of the emperor(Tragan) Very close friend of T... and he sent him as a governor to the province of G....., which is in Asia Minor, and there he wrote letters to T.... a great deal asking his advice on all sorts of things and matters. He was a good friend of the emperor and instead of doing what most governors did, doing the best they could or the worse they could to govern and being judged as they were true he kept in close touch with the emperor and was anxious to have the emperor's advice and help in being a good governor. And in this letter to T.... he showed that he considered that Christianity had become a very important movement in this place. He said that it had so spread that the temple became practically deserted.....End of Record34

Go back to Record 33..... We are at present still on the first century. The history of Christianity in the first century A. D. We were still on B I believe. A was the material from the N. T. And Had I begun C, persecution in the first Century? Well, persecution in the first century. We have mentioned it under other heads, whether under this particular heading or not. Persecution in the first century was not a matter of a determined effort of the Roman Empire to wipe out Christianity. We have no evidence of any such thing during the first century A. D. During this century we have a great deal of persecution, but it is not a ~~systematic~~ systematic continuous persecution. It is a sporadic sort of thing. It begins as a persecution by the Sadducees, by the leaders of the Jews who are afraid that there will be enough evil and they will lose their influence and their leadership on the Jews. And then the

persecution is taken up by others who are Jews devoted to their own doctrines and particularly to the traditions of the elders who find the Christians more and more departed from these traditions. At first there was not much departure from them. Christ ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ criticized the Pharisees for ~~XX~~ taking the word of God as no effect by their traditions, but the point which he criticized which was quite obvious to a great many people at the time. They were points either of hypocrisy of taking minor points and exaggerating them. They were confined to individuals. They were not attitude, an official attitude, by any means and they probably were not characteristic of the greater number of the Pharisees, but they were characteristic of many of their leaders, and Christ had criticized that very strongly, but there were certainly many who had not accepted Christianity who could agree wholeheartedly with all the criticism that Christ is recorded to have made of the Pharisees. When the church began the apostles went regularly to the synagogue services. They went to the $3\frac{1}{2}$ regularly. They went. To the outward eye they would simply seem to be pious too, unless one found that they presented doctrine, but the official leaders of the country did not accept. But as they went on and particularly as Gentiles came into the church, they began to be more evident existent from the mass of the Jewish. They did not require their new disciples to be circumcised, and they did not require them to take the law of Moses, and they cut down the barriers which ~~XX~~ rigidly upheld the pious Jews and Gentiles, and this, of course, aroused piety against them who were not like the Saducees who $4\frac{1}{2}$ The persecution then in the first few years came from various individual Jews or ~~XXXXXXX~~ groups of Jews. And the Roman Empire took the position of an arbitrator standing on the side trying to keep peace and not concerned with little squabbles among some of the people unless these squabbles threatened to ~~XXXX~~ disturb. You remember that the book of Acts tell us how there was the beginning of what ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ might have been a very serious attack on Christianity in the city of Ephesus. It was aroused by the fact that the people there in the business of providing souvenirs and providing instruments in connection with the services of Diana The goddess of Ephesus, found that there business had been hurt by Christianity

and so they began to write and protest that the Christians were interfering with the worship of Diana of Ephesus, and they had a tremendous gathering of people there in the arena there, you remember, and they were determined to destroy all the Christians because of their interference with Diana. And then you remember the attitude of the Roman officials that the ~~XXXX~~ Roman official came in there to the place, and he addressed the assembly of people and he told them that everybody knows that Diana of Ephesus is one of the great deities of the world.. Everybody knows this is the great capital. Nobody has interfered with her. What is all this protest you are making? He says, "You'll get in trouble with the Roman authorities for having a big riot like this. We may have real difficulty with it. You'd better disperse quietly to your homes." And then it says so saying he dismissed the assembly. It's interesting that ~~XXXXXXXX~~ the Greek work there translated assembly is the same Greek work that is normally translated as church, which evidently was used for any kind of a gathering. Here it is used for just voluntary gathering of all these people to protest ~~XX~~ against Christianity, but the attitude of the Roman officials was one of indifference. They wanted peace maintained, and that ~~was~~ was all. The Romans recognized Judaism as a permitted religion but the religion.....7... they were allowed to keep their religion. They would even permit it not to have to make the sacrifices to the emperor, which others had to do, so long as they were loyal to the emperor and ~~XXXXXX~~ did not make sedition. But that was a treatment given to a nation. Now, as Christianity spread among non-Jews the Romans found it difficult to understand it. Were these people simply people who had a particular philosophic or ethical ~~X~~ idea or were they people who were actually in a seditious movement. We do not have any contemporary Roman writing from the first century, which tells us anything about the Christians. There is no pagan writer of the first century A. D. who makes any reference to it, so we have no actual evidence of the attitude except from the book of Acts and from sources from the second century looking back on the first century, of the attitude of the Romans during that century. We do have a statement by the Roman writer~~XX~~ Suetonius, a historic who lived in the second century, writing about the history of Rome during the first century.

we have a reference to the time of the emperor Claudius the predecessor of Nero. And you remember that in the book of Acts when Paul met Aquilla and Priscilla, they had come from Rome, the two having been driven out of Rome by Claudius. Suetonius mentions the fact. He said that the Jews aroused by Prestus made.....8½..... and consequently were expelled from the city. Now, that's all he said. What does by (Prestus) ~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~ Christus means the Messiah. (Prestus) is a Greek word meaning good, but the Greeks got Christus and Crestus confused9..... and very often it's quite the usual thing for them to say (Crestus) instead of (Christus) and as far as Acts gives us any evidence, it is merely a out of the Jews. Nothing to do with Christians, but Suetonius says that the Jews were aroused by (Crestus) ⁱs that a reference to the beginning of Christianity in Rome? Or is it perhaps in reference to something entirely separate and perhaps even some individual meaning (Crestus) We know nothing about it. It seems to similar to be a coincidence, but we don't know. That is not the earliest reference from the pagan sources to Christianity, but that is the earliest time to which we have a pagan reference to Christianity in the first century, but you see this is sixty years later. The first time of which we have definite pagan reference to the rights of Christianity relates to ~~XXXX~~ Nero, but even here the pagan references are written fifty years later. Suetonius refers to it some more particularly however, the writer ~~XX~~ Tacitus, one of the leading Roman historians. He also was in the second century A. D. And Tacitus says that Nero ~~XXXX~~ when he burned the city of Rome. Tacitus doesn't say he burned it, but it says it is commonly thought that he burned it, and he said that Nero tried to throw the blame for what he did on to a group of people who were a clear and a disagreeable group of people and he.....I'll read you exactly what he says from his He said after he tells how Rome had been burned in this terrible fire that lasted for over a week, hundreds of people were killed and a tremendous amount of property destroyed, he says about the suspicion that the people had, he says "Neither by works of benevolence nor the gifts of the prince nor means of pleasing the gods is a shameful suspicion cease, so that it was not believed that the fire was caused by his command." He says that

Nero was unable to convince the people that he wasn't the causer of the fire, but whispers were circulated, despite all that he tried to do to make them think he didn't do it. Therefore, to ~~XXX~~ overcome this rumor, Nero~~X~~ put in his own place12..... and punished his cruelty men who the common people hated for their shameful crimes and called Christians. Now this is Tacitus writing in the second century. Fifty years after the time of Nero. He ~~XXX~~ said men whom the common people hated for their shameful crimes were called Christians. Nero put the blame on them for the fire. from whom the name was derived had been put to death during the reign of Tiberia by the Pontius Pilate. The deadly~~XXX~~ superstition having been checked for a while began to break out again. Not only throughout Judea but also in Rome, where from all ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ sides all things scandalous and shameful meet and become12 $\frac{1}{2}$ Therefore at the beginning some were seized who made confession. Then on their information a vast multitude were convicted, not so much a part as of hatred of the human race. And they were not only put to death but subjected to insult in that they were either dressed up in the skins of wild beasts and perished by the cruel mangling of dogs or else put on crosses to be set on fire and as day declined to be burned using the lights at night. Nero had to open his gardens for that spectacle and gave a circus play, mingling with the people dressed in a costume. From this arose men who were indeed criminals and deserving extreme~~X~~ penalty, sympathy on the grounds that they were destroyed not for the public but to satisfy the cruelty of an individual. Now you see this man who writes has no sympathy with the Christians whatsoever, and so what he said is certainly not the ~~XXXXXX~~ attitude of any Christian who might be prejudiced and anxious to increase the idea that no matter how much these people or the idea of their being innocent in the suffering. This is written by a man whose remarks are very hostile toward the Christians, but he says it was done simply by Nero by his attempt to remove the iniquity from himself and the result of it was that the Christians received sympathy from the people as a whole. Well, Nero carried on his ~~XXXXX~~ persecution not only in Rome but he sent orders to the provinces^d and Christians were cruelly killed in various places in the provinces and then

Nero himself died at the age of 32. End of Record 33

Beginning of Record 25..... And he shows that Christianity was a problem to him. He didn't understand it. It was considered to be a bad name. It was not recognized and a Roman citizen or a Roman subject who was a member1 $\frac{1}{4}$ had a right to worship regardless. The Jew had a right to worship the ~~NEWXXXXXXXX~~ Jewish god. But here was a movement which was not a ~~XXXXXX~~ racial movement at all. It was some sort of a spiritual position. He did not understand it and he didn't see any reason why it should necessarily be persecuted as far as he could see they were law-abiding citizens. And so he wrote (Tragan) and he told him1 $\frac{1}{2}$ and asked his advice about it--how to treat the Christians. I'm going to read to you right from his letter. "It is my custom, my Lord, to report to you all questions about which I have doubt. Who is he that can better direct me in hesitation or2..... In the examination of Christians, I have never taken part. Therefore, I do not know what crime is usually punished or investigated or to what extent. So I have no little uncertainty whether there is distinction of age or ~~XXXXXX~~ ^{whether} the weaker offenders fair in no respect otherwise than the stronger. Whether pardon is granted on repentance or whether when one has been imprisoned2 $\frac{1}{4}$... in that he cease to be such, whether the mere name is without crime or that crime is connected with the name are punished." He recognized that something was against the law, but he was rather curious "Meanwhile I have taken this course for those who are accused before me as ~~XXXX~~ prisoners. I have asked them whether they were Christians. Those who confess, I ask them a second and a third time threatening punishment. Those who persisted I ^{execution} ordered led away ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~, for I did not doubt that whatever it was that ~~XXXX~~ whatever it was that they committed3.....X There were others of the like insanity but because they were Roman citizens I noted them down to be sent to Rome. Soon after this as it often happens because the matter was taken notice of, the crime became ~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~ widespread and many cases to Rome, an unsigned paper ~~XXXX~~ was presented containing the names of many, but these denied that they were or had been Christians and I thought it right to let them go since at my dictation they prayed to the gods and made supplication .

with intent $3\frac{1}{2}$ and to your statue. And in addition to this they cursed Christ. None of these things it is said those that are really Christians can do. Others who were named by an informer said that they were Christians soon after ward denied it saying 4 All these also not only worshipped your statue and the images of gods, but they also cursed Christ. They asserted however that the amount of their fault and error was this. They had been accustomed to assemble on s fixed day before day light $4\frac{1}{2}$ and that they bound ~~themselves~~ themselves with an oath not but to commit neither theft, nor robbery, nor adultery. not to break their word, not to denyAfter these things were done it was their custom~~s~~ to depart and meet together again to take food And they said that even this will cease after by which according to your command I had forbidden the existence of $4\frac{1}{2}$ These people said that they were good Roman citizens and they wouldn't attend Christian meetings. On this account I believe it the more necessary to find out from two maidservants who were called deaconesses, and to find out from them what was the truth. I found nothing else than the excessive superstition. I therefore adjourn the examination in haste to ~~consult~~ consult you. The matters seems to me ~~worth~~ worth deliberation especially on account of the number of those Many of every age, of every right $5\frac{1}{2}$ The contagion of that superstition had penetrated not only the city but also the village and country places, and yet it seems possible that At any rate it is certain enough that the temple began to be frequent that the ceremony of religion long are restored and the comes to market 6 From this it may easily be supposed that a multitude of men can be and here you see the Roman Government seeing this superstition and how tremendously it is spreading and tried to figure out how to deal with it. And he is quite amazed to find that the people aren't criminals....., but they swore to do good and to ~~have~~ have good attitudes. This is what they claimed. He thought there must be something more back of it, and he simply gave this order. Now you can see that Pliny here is On the one hand, if this is just superstition why bother with it?..... and yet, it's

it's not a permitted thing to ~~have~~ this kind of a religion. The people are assembling together and that is illegal, shouldn't he try to break it up? Well, now Trajan seems to have another idea in mind. T.... answered Pliny. He said "You have followed the proper course of procedure in examining the case of those who were accused of being Christians. For indeed nothing can be laid down as a general law which obtains anything like a definite rule of action. They are7 $\frac{1}{2}$ If they are accused and convicted, they are to be punished. Yet on this condition that he will deny that he is a Christian and make the fact evident by an act, that is by worshipping our gods shall obtain pardon on his repentance however, Papers however, which are present in any accusation, for they are not worthy of our time. You see Trajan;..... isn't nearly as concerned about Christianity as a danger as Pliny is. Trajan..... says yes, it's against the law, and if a man is a Christian we will ~~have~~ to punish him, but T.... is more concerned with this. that these people be reclaimed. He says8..... if they will worship the gods that's all right. Take their word for it and but T/.... is concerned about people anonymous accusation, and about informers who think they can get somebody ~~IX~~ property by accusing a person of a crime and then when ~~WX~~ he is killed in getting his property, and he wanted to put an end to that sort of business. So T..... says don't take any anonymous accusations, and he tells them to be very very mild on anybody who will give up his Christianity, but of course they stick to it and you mustn't seek them out, but if they are brought ~~XXXX~~ before me and it's clear they are Christians and they don't deny it well then there is nothing we can do but kill them in that case. Well, this is very interesting. This evidence from the beginning ~~FB~~ of this second century A. D. of the tremendous spread that it had up here in Asia Minor in a pagan territory a territory where while there were Jews they were a very small part of the population, evidence of the attitude of the Roman Governor no conscious great opposition to it, but enough understanding that it's wrong and that it should be put down and not knowing to what extent to do it and the attitude of the Roman Emperor here. He's afraid of any kind of a conspiracy, but he doesn't have much reason to think that this is of particular importance. He's more

anonymous

interested in avoiding ~~ANYMORE~~ charges. Well now we're interested in this under persecution but now under A the Spread of Christianity and it certainly is very ~~EX~~ important evidence of the spread of Christianity and I want before going on with persecution to mention to you ~~an~~ evidence from the middle of the century and one from the end of the century of the way in which Christianit has spread. In the middle of the century we have a man named T.... Martyn. His name is Justin, and he /.....10 $\frac{1}{2}$ and Justin Martyr, we will read some of his writings before the term is over and a very interesting man-- one who wrote some very interesting works about Christianity. He was a philosopher and following the customs of the Greek philosophers he traveled from place to place discussing philosophy and giving lectures, but he had become a Christian and he devoted his self to the spreading of Christianity and writing about 150 A. D. about the middle of the century, J. Martyr says there is not a single race of men whether among barbarians or ~~EXX~~ Greeks or by whatever name they may be called ;of those who live in wagons or nomads or living in tents among whom prayers and thanksgivings are not offered in the name of the crucified Jesus through the Father and making of all men. Little of the second century 120 years after the death of Christ Justin Martyr in this dialogue with a Jew in which they are arguing about the ~~EXX~~ claims of Christianity makes this sweeping statement that all the world Christianity has increased. There is not a single11 $\frac{1}{2}$ among Greeks or among Barbarians anywhere but what you will find some Christians among them. That's a tremendous statement. Just 120 years after the deat of Christ. Now, of course, he may be exaggerating. There may have been ~~XX~~ many sections of the world he didnt even know existed, but he had traveled through a large part of the Roman Empire and it isevidence of the way that Christian ity had spread by that time. Now there is one other statement I'd like to give you from the very end of ~~XX~~ the first century. This (I mean the second century) is from a man in the, we'll have a good deal to say about him later, he lived in the section which is now12 $\frac{1}{2}$ That's the central part of the Northern part of Africa where it projects farthest North, and we speak of it as North Africa because it is so much further north

~~XXXX~~ than Egypt, so Egypt is on the coast of the Mediterranean, but a good bit further south. And up there in this end of the country, we have this writer named Tertullian, a lawyer. The first Christian to write at length in the Latin language of anything that has been preserved. ~~XXXXXX~~ Even Clement of Rome wrote his epistle in Greek. This man in North Africa at the end of the second century wrote13½..... in the Latin language. He was a man with a very very brilliant style. His writings are just thrilling. And he made the statement, one of the places where he said to the Romans to whom he is writing in his apology or defense of Christianity he says: "We are but of yesterday. We are but of yesterday and yet we ~~XXXX~~ fill your market places, your cities, everything but your temple. We fill everything but your temple." Now that's a tremendously strong statement. That the Christians are found everywhere. They fill every place ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ but the pagan temples. Now that is only 170 years after It's a strong statement end of the record 35

Beginning of Record 36..... This century was a century in which begins with Christianity recognized and something not permitted by law. How did it become that way. We don't know. I1..... that they gave permission to races and nations to hold their religion, but here were the new religions not restricted to a race and a religion which denied certain things which they thought made for the unity of the empire. The recognition that though each could have their own god, their own god..... They did not disobey the Roman emperor. They paid him all honor, but they refused to worship him and to worship his statue.. And consequently they were recognized as ~~XX~~ a group that was contrary to the welfare of the state by the beginning of the century, and yet they were not sought out. Persecution during the first few thirds of this century is a sporadic thing. It is found occasionally like ~~XXX~~ when Pliny killed so many of these people and tried to do away with Christianity there and Tra..... said not to seek them out. And this was simply the attitude of one governor in one area. On the other hand our church history between 100 and 200 years after this time don't even mention the persecution of Pliny, and so we can imagine that there may have been other persecutions but this

in certain regions where a government may become quite active in carrying out these provisions of the law against the existence of Christianity. There may have been a good many of them, but they were not ~~K~~ widespread. There were individual nations where an emperor would hear of a leader of the Christians who was determined by his loyalty to Christ ~~he~~ would cause that man to be cruelly killed and try to get others to turn away from him. There was not any large attacks on Christianity during the first two-thirds of the century, but the last third of the century we find the last of the good line of the emperors, perhaps the best Marcus determining that Christianity was a menace to the state and setting out to destroy it. So we have more of a mass persecution from 170 on then we have at any time before that time. Now, there are however, some very outstanding instances of persecution during this century. ~~XXXX~~ while there were too few to be a really serious effort on the part of the emperor to destroy Christianity yet had two effects. One thing they would scare away timid people from Christianity and make people think pretty seriously whether they really meant it because of the risk involved and on the other hand they would inspire people by the courage and by the loyalty of those who were killed and thus would attract many brave souls to the movement and to looking into it and finding what it really stood for. The first of these to mention in this century is a man ~~XXXXX~~ named Ignatius who was the bishop, the leader of the Christians in the city of the Empire, the city of Antioch. Antioch in Syria, north^{of}~~XXX~~/Palestine. This man Ignatius was ordered to be put to death by ~~XXXXXXXXX~~(Trajan) Tra..... came to Antioch and the leader of the Christians here was seized and brought before him and Ignatius declared him as a Christian and who refused to worship Tra.... and he said he must.....5... and so they took him to Rome and on the way he wrote letters to all the churches along the way. He was met by the Christians all the way, and when he got half way to Rome, he wrote a letter to the Christians in Rome in which he plead with them, don't use your influence with the authorities to try to get my life spared. I've had a long life of usefulness and now I want to the crown of martyrdom. Don't interfere with my chance, and as he plead with ~~KXX~~ them not to interfere with the authorityes..... and we have these letters

preserved, and we have what is thought to be the actual letter, and then we have another edition of it which is twice as long, and which is thought by scholars to be the letters $5\frac{1}{2}$ and then we have several extra letters which are thought But it is quite generally agreed that at least the shorter version of the main set of the letters are actually and they give us an interesting picture of the prominence of the Christians at the beginning of this century on the way to be martyred, and there in Rome, they threw him in the arena and the lions pounced upon him and utterly destroyed untiled there was nothing left but a few scraps of bone, which were picked up by the Christians and taken back to Antioch..... of the memories of their great bishop who was martyred for Christ. We won't meet tomorrow.....

..... you will have the Julius emperor, that is the family of Julius Caesar. The first emperor is his adopted son, Augustus, and was reigning when Christ was born. This group with about eight members run from about A. D. 68 when Nero died. Then you have a period of a year and a half with three rulers but then ~~K~~ come the Flavian emperors. They were Titus and O..... and the first century ends approximately with the end of the Flavians and then the second century is almost exactly $7\frac{1}{2}$ The main division of Roman history at this place. And it is interesting that the first century ends with the last and far the most wicked of the Flavians .. that is O..... was an evil man, and the second century ends practically with the last and most wicked of the Antonines , that is to say,~~XXX~~ all the Flavians were good emperors except this last one, and all the Antonines were good emperors except this last one and the last one came just before the turn of the century. Now that is a coincidence, but it happens to remember the situation. Domicion, ending the first century and the son of Marcus ending the second century. Now that is a coincidence which makes it easy to have in mind the general run of the history during this period. During the first century as we've noticed, we know very little about Christianity aside from what is contained in the book of Acts. The ~~XXX~~ history, our principle source for knowledge in the first century is and it was written about 330 A. D. which is a long time after the first century, and when he gives you

his evidence, it is very valuable, if the evidence he gives is valuable. If he ~~XXX~~ quotes a writing.....9¹/₄..... If it is a writing that is not authentic, it is poor evidence. And if he doesn't give any quotation or any evidence then you'll know he had not way of getting what happened 250 years earlier. So the first century our knowledge is very slight of Christian history aside from the tremendous amount of material that we have in the book of Acts. The second century our material is considerably more than the first century, but it is still is a period of great darkness as far as Christian history is concerned. It is only toward the end of the period that we begin to know more detail about Christian history and even there we are in a period in which there is a great deal of that we know nothing about at all. And so the second century is still a period very dark though there is a good bit more material in it. Now we found three evidences of how Christianity spread. Once in the beginning of this century how widespread it is becoming. One from the middle and one from the and we began to look at B Persecution in this century. And under that we noted the attitude of the The Christianity is illegal. If a person admits he is a Christian and refuses to sacrifice to the emperor, he is to be killed. Why? They ~~XXXXXX~~ should not be sought out as long as they obey the law and as long as they perform, are good citizens, they are not to be hunted down as Christians. / Well, of course the empire at that day did not have telegraph stations, radio, television--they didn't have means of the totalitarian control which you can have today, when a man can sit in Moscow and can order what is to be sought in the world, can have his orders in the heart of China and in a thousand villages in Russia. There was nothing of that kind at that time. And therefore, ~~XXX~~ no matter how much an emperor might want to be a totalitarian ruler, it was very difficult to do so, and these didn't seem to want to be totalitarian rulers. They wanted to be men, it would seem, who directed the course of events in such a way as to give reasonably good light to their people. They were a very good class of rulers. ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ I doubt if you would find in the world's history of any country a whole century practically in which all the rulers of the nation were of as high a character

as the Ant..... I doubt if you would find it in England, France, Germany in any country I know of a whole century in which the average of all the rulers , these five, who took up practically a century all men of such high attitude, such desires to be good rulers, and from a viewpoint of government in general this second century was about as good as you will find anywhere in the world, but of course these men has an influence from ...13½....., but not a complete control by any means and the customs~~X~~ which had been established were norms within all the sections. The ~~XX XXXX~~ appointed the governor and the governor did what they thought was good. If they were able to find good men as governors they tried in the way that he thought was the best. But naturally you can't find as many good governors as you want and sometimes you are deceived. They turn out to be And so you have a great deal of variety in the application of the and it would seem that there may have been local persecution of the Christians. There may have been individual rulers who for one reason or another did seek out the Christians and did try to destroy Christianity in there areas. But that was not the command. The command was14..... but require real complete and convincing truth that the man really is a Christian.....

End of Record 36

....Beginning of Record 37..... of a large household who had a son, very fine man perhaps who became a Christian and whom the father killed, and there may have been men of1.... . but devoted to the ,..... of paganism and his father felt so grieved that and so even despite the generally good attitude of the emperors individuals of different places were subject to a great deal of difficultées and often You must remember that Christianity was looked upon as something harmful and something wicked whether it was active..... or whether it was only mild. And, of course, among the slaves the condition was particularly bad. An owner could kill his slave and nobody at all had any right to object and when a slave became a Christian the master might not be much concerned with what the slave believed but he was to what the slave did and of course if he found that the slaves were honest and ~~XXXX~~ would work harder he might be pleased with that.

But on the other hand if the slave would do wicked things and that he might very well do and the slave refuse that would be a different thing. Wherever you have slavery, wherever slaves are looked upon as chattel inevitably, I don't care whether it is in Rome or in America or where it is the breeding of slaves becomes a business. A slave is of great value and therefore it is a very profitable thing to raise slaves for sale and any slave owner was interested in the children born in the slave household. And it naturally was customary for them to pick out the strongest ones of the slave men and use them simply as they would animals. Children ~~XXXX~~ who would be strong and who would sell for a good price and they persecuted slaves no matter how honest and dependable he might be that how true to his master's service, naturally could be. ³/₄..... were killed and tortured for their refusal to engage in what to them was wicked immorality was from the master's viewpoint simply a part of his business in producing other slaves. So you see something of the misery which was paid by Christians when they were slaves as a result of the fact that Christianity was illegal. That also was the fact of the immoral and wicked customs of slavery which was followed in the Roman Empire at this time. Now the--under Trajan we have as you notice at that time a very outstanding martyrdom. T.... coming to the city of Antioch, the second most important city in the Empire. There was denounced before him Ignatian, the Bishop. And T... ordered ...⁴/₁..... He was given every opportunity to deny it, and he refused to deny it. And he was given every opportunity to prove that it is not true. All he has to do is take a little bit of incense, and burn it in front of T..... statue or in front of T.... himself as proof that he is ready the emperor. You can think what you want. All you have to do is go through this form, but I.... cannot deny his Lord, and not only that I... is asking to have the opportunity of martyrdom. He knows that the deaths of Peter and Paul, and he feels that the crown on a long life of service to his Lord. It will be to suffer martyrdom. So as I mentioned last time on his way to Rome he wrote a letter to the people at Rome, to the Christians at Rome begging them do not use your influence with the ~~XXXX~~ leaders of the court. Some of you may have great influence, but do not use it to try to intervene in

my behalf. Donot do anything that will ~~XXXXX~~ deprive me of the crown of my martyrdom. Now these letters which I..... wrote are the earliest Christian documents we have, except for the letter of Clement of Rome. They are the earliest Christian documents that we can be fairly sure of. There are one or two other writings that could perhaps be earlier, but most likely a good big later, but these can be definite, dated; and they give us a very good authentic of certain attitudes of Chrisitaa life. Student..... AAM": It is all together possible that he did. We know there were many who did. We have no probf that he did, but it is possible. W^E know that he was considered as a great to end his life with martyrdom. He felt that it would ~~have~~ been wrong and wicked for him to have fought ~~XXXXXX~~ martyrdom at a time which would interfere at the time of his carry ~~XX~~ -ing on of the great work. He had been ~~XXXXXX~~ for maybe 50 years the leader of the Christians in this great city, and had a tremendous influence in the spreading of the Gospel. His work was his doom, and for him to interfere with it by seeking martyrdom was wicked but now he had had a ~~XX~~ long life of service andthe of martyrdom was something greatly desired, and whether he took steps to bring ~~XXXXXX~~ himself ~~XX~~ to the attend~~o~~n of T..... or not, we have no evidence, but we have other of whom we know that did at a later time. So it is not impossible. Well now I..... letters we will speak a little more of later. I want you to get their place in the history, and the one thing that is natural about them is there have been many copies of them. We had them in Greece and we had them in ~~XXXXZ~~ Syria, and we had them in Greek in the longer form and in the shorter form. And naturally scholars wonder which are the true letters. The general attitude of scholars today is that the Greek letters in the shorter form are the two letters of I..... And that the Syriac letters are simply a condensation of the Greek letters. Therefore, not the original. Though the Greek letters are ~~XX~~ (in the shorter form) are thought probably to be the original. Much study has been made of them and they are very important in N. T. scripture because their quotations from the apostle Paul show clearly that he considered Paul writings to be inspir~~ed~~ scripture, and his attitude is one with reference to the scriptures. His allusions are such to be of very great value to the

New Test.

criticism in proving the genuiness of the books of the N. T. One extremely interesting thing about I....., of course there were extra letters which were written which people do not think are original. They think that seven are original. Now some of the others maybe. It's pretty hard to prove, but the usual attitude of the scholars ~~XXXXX~~ today is that seven of them are the original. One thing that comes out clearly in the letters is his idea of the authority of the bishop. That comes out very clearly in his letters. Now that9¹..... the whole question of church government. Still we find in these letters evidence of the acceptance of the Roman Catholic view that the pope, the bishop of Rome is the head of the church. All of the bishops ~~XXXXXX~~ derive their power from him and they areIf that was the belief of I... how strange indeed that in his epistle to the church of Rome he makes no reference ~~XXXXXX~~ whatever ~~XX~~ to any bishop at all as being in Rome. Would it not be strange if writing to the very church of the man who was the very head of the church he did not at least pay his respect, and it needs apology for giving advice and admonition to the bishop of Rome's own ~~XXXXXX~~ people ~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~ if the bishop of Rome is over him. He makes no reference whatever to the bishop of Rome, so his epistle cannot be used as evidence for a claim of authority for the Roman bishop over other bishops, but they are a strong evidence of the fact that he believed that church order was vital and that in order to have church order you should be submissive to the bishop of the church. Now the word bishop is a word which they today has certain connotations as it is used in certain organizations. But the word he uses is simply an old greek word meaning overseer or ruler and it was used of civil officials. It is not an ecclesiastical word originally. It simply means the one in charge or the director, and it is used for political officials. So that how much you are to draw of a particular office and so on may be subject to debate and to discussion but this is clear. I.. believed that there was a man in his church who was in authority over that church and that the people should be submissive to the ~~XXXXXX~~ desires, to what he thought correct. Now we should mention that in the development of any organization you will find two tendencies. You will find there is the tendency to ~~XX~~ suggest that an ~~XX~~ organization may be run by

all its members with everybody having an equal voice. This was the opinion which was expressed by Pres. Roosevelt at one time. I was listening on the radio when he received his degree from the University of Pa. and he said how much better everything would be run if all the people ...12..... He said take the railroad for instance instead of a Board of Directors and a Pres. running the railroad all the men connected with the railroad own it directly. Suppose that all the conductors and the fireman and and the porters had equal say with the President and the directors in the conduct of the railroad how much better the railroads would be run. Well, now I can't help but wondering whether Roosevelt in those words which I have heard him say was appealing to the emotions of some particular group rather than expressing his own opinion, because it seems to me utterly inconceivable to hear a man say that. That if you had to give a thousand Pullman Porters to get together and vote to decide on whether the train ought to leave Phila. at a certain time, or whether they should use certain engines, that you wouldn't have the most utter confusion and pretty soon you would haven't any railroads at all. It is utterly impractical to run anything in that way and nothing has ever been run that way that has succeeded. In fact, the more you have power entrusted to an individual or to a small group of able men the more successful an organization is, provided that these men are really able men and provided that they are men who are sincere in the welfare of the thing that is being done rather than in simply what they can get out of it. Now those are mightily..... and no matter in any totalitarian group no matter how able a man you have running no matter how splendid his abilities and how excellent his ideas inevitably in this wicked world it is not long before ~~ixix~~ you find a man in a position who is either shiftless or ~~lxxx~~ and inefficient and the thing goes to pieces, or a man who is personally selfish in his attitude and not interested in the welfare of it, and so a totalitarian thing while the most efficient sort of an organization it is is one which is bound to weed to decay and destruction is continuous. The most wonderful example in history End of Record 37 Beginning of Record 38 who at the end of the I World War saw his ~~xxxxx~~ country ~~xx~~ going to pieces ready to sit down and do nothing about it and

seize the power in the nation, and to seek absolute power. Nobody could ~~XXXXX~~ lift his hand without added for approval. I've heard someone telling a story of being one night ~~X~~ in Constantinoble and they were sitting having dinner with and they said to him, "Isn't this strange. Here we sit in this ~~XX~~ hotel with this jazz bands $1\frac{1}{2}$ and out through the window you see that what a picture of antique How contrasting it is! ~~XX~~ and they went out and cut it off, and his authority was absolute ruthless. and would have been utterly destructive. Along with it he had a genuine desire to make this nation a modern nation, so he looked at conditions in the nation and he decided the railroads should run better and he gave his orders and saw to it that it was done. People had a type of writing they had had for hundreds of years. It wasn't well adapted to the $2\frac{1}{2}$ It's pretty hard to get people to change. He ordered them to and he said I'll teach you to , , , , and for three or four years they were instructed. Then the time came when said the time for learning is at an end. ~~XXX~~ Two months from today everybody must know how to write latin letters or he cannot hold any government position. You cannot get a marriage license; you cannot transact any governmental business of any kind unless you know how to write latin letters. but ~~X~~ he changed the writing system of Turkey. All that happened in the last thirty years. He.....the remarkable thing is that Adam Turk was not succeeded by a man who without the desire for the good of his nation. said if men go on ruling the way I do ^{you're} ~~XXXXX~~ going to get the $3\frac{1}{2}$ He says we don't want that. We want a democratic nation in which the people vote to elect able men to rule. We want a democracy. Up to that time anybody who would say anything against A..... T..... would be ~~XXXX~~ killed. Now, he says, we must have an opposition party. So he ordered them to form an opposition party. (Laughter) They formed the opposition party and he ordered them to make speeches against his policies. Well, but they did it and he ordered the newspapers to print them. The newspapers questioned whether his policy was the last word in wisdom. The editor would throw them into prison. Now they were forced to ~~XXXXX~~ print all speeches attacking his

his policies, but they did it and he forced the of an opposition party and ~~it~~ it proved to be a considerable and ~~XXXXXXX~~ After A..... death his followers ruled and the opposition party was a real party; it was considerable powerful, but the time came when during the last years the opposition party the majority. They now rule. A.... party is in the minority. But the opposition party took over in the course of it a great deal5... ... And so you have a nation which jumped over from one of the most backward and medieval nations into an advanced nation. It made a step which in ordinary history wouldn't be done ~~XXXXXX~~ in less than 400 years and they made it in less than 30 years; and they did it because you have a totalitarian ruler who exerted himself to see that it was done but they had something which perhaps never before existed in history. A man who was a totalitarian ruler who wanted to develop a system which would be the end of ~~XXX~~ totalitarianism. Both naturally wish to continue, and I say there is no parallel to its exploration. But you have these two attitudes. you can have everybody beside. What time shall we have a test in this class? Let us all discuss it. We could discuss it for three hours. One person would like to have it a certain day another one another day and another one another day. We could spend three hours discussing and perhaps never reaching an agreement to it. It is far better ~~XX~~ for somebody to try to decided what is best and get the best he can and set a decision. If you're going to have progress you have to have control not too widespread, but if you're going to have progress for a long time you have to have something that insures that once those in control get the or lazy they can be moved out and others put in in their place. So when you come under the ugly heel of a mean dictatorship people immediately ~~XXXXXX~~ shift to the idea having everybody an equal voice which is utterly impracticable. Usually it means going backward. And when people experience the situation of everybody having equal control which leads you backwards pretty soon then they say give us a leader who is smart -- just to one extreme and to the other. Now in church government then we have the trend going both ways. We have the reaction one way and the other. Our ~~XXXXXX~~ Presbyterian system of church government is an attempt to have ~~XXX~~ a middle

ground between the two. It is an attempt to give the individual leader the authority and power in his individual area to move forward without any ~~XXXXXXXX~~ ~~XXXX~~ control from above and without having to submit all his ~~XXXX~~ ~~XXXX~~ policies ~~XXXX~~ to every detail to a large number of people who are not in the position of leadership. But at the same time with the great number of people able to express disagreement ~~XXXXXXXX~~ to withdraw their gifts or to even ask that he be no longer the pastor in such a way that there is a check on it and at the same time with the Presbytery having a right and a duty to keep a general watch over his preaching that it is not and to intervene ~~XX~~ if it becomes necessary.. There is in it though a constant struggle . There is the struggle of individuals without power to try to get the power so distributed that everybody has it and the able leader is only one of the last and nothing can be accomplished worthwhile. And you have the struggle on the other hand among leaders in larger groups who try to get the totalitarian control over the whole. You always have that and The Presbyterianism is an attempt to get a position between the two. The Baptists, the Congregational churches in theory go to the democratic extreme. Every church ~~XXX~~ absolutely independent in actual practice Congregational and Baptist churches which are effective usually are churches in which the pastor is a man of such ability that he leads his church and makes the greater number of decisions, and the result is that very often in Congregational and Baptist churches you get a totalitarianism which goes to an extreme which in a Presbyterian church would never be possible because ~~XXXX~~ there will always be the Presbyterians who would be against it. But that which seems to be working toward one extreme can easily be pushed against ~~XXXXX~~ the other extreme. There is that danger. There is that situation. A church ~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~ government is not anything that you can say this is the ideal system. We have it..... It is an ideal to work for. People have to try to make it work. Well, now Ignatius being an ~~X~~ effective leader, a man who accomplished ~~GM~~ much naturally found it necessary if work should go forward that an order should be recognized, and when he had conflicts and difficulties with individuals who didn't want to go along with his excellent ideas and ~~XXXXX~~ tried to overcome them it pushed ~~XX~~ his thinking in the direction of more and more authority on the part of the bishop.

Now if he had been in a different situation or he had come in contact with a difficulty which come when you get the wrong man as bishop or when you get a bishop over others who exerts authority which is harmful and which produces too much centralization10 $\frac{1}{2}$ in the other direction. But the fact is that I..... epistles with their stress on the power of the bishop probably exerted an influence in Church history toward the development of a control which might lead in the direction of a hierarchy as we have in the Roman Catholic today. And of course his epistles today are there for the Roman Catholic church to appeal to and say look here. Beginning of the second century here is a great leader and his writings show the tremendous authority which he held that a bishop should have. That is the attitude of ~~XXX~~ his epistles on his part; but in opposition to that is very well that we know that there is not in his epistles. That even the bishop of Antioch owed the least subordination whatever to a bishop of Rome or to any other bishop anywhere so ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ that it is-are epistles which can be strongly in argument with the Roman Catholic position ~~XX~~ against those who are not familiar with it, but if you know that there is no point in denying the proper use as but to point out that there is not a suggestion of a hierarchy over the bishop. Student AAM: Oh, yes, ever since Peter went there. This point is very important It is important that we have a definite understanding of what the R. C. position is, because it is one of the largest in the religious world today one that is actively moving and one that we must be familiar with and the actual feeling of the Roman judge is not though it is perfectly understood in their writings.. My guess that would be that a great number os R. C.'s themselves have little true understand what there position. But there position on authority as held today is this. That Jesus gave to Peter authority over the church. You are the rock on which the church shall be built. To you I give the keys of heaven. What you lock is locked and what you openis opened. on earth and in hea~~v~~en. There claim is that Jesus gave this authority to Peter and to Peter's successors, and so the pope has the authority as being Peter's successor. Now they hold that Peter then was a bishop of Jerusalem in those days, but that Peter left Jerusalem to go to Antioch and he was the bishop of

Antioch for a while and then when he left Antioch he went to Rome and then he was bishop of Rome and therefore when he died his authority ~~XXXXX~~ ...13¹..... as bishop of Rome and that ever since the bishop of Rome is head of the church with absolute final authority over the government of the church not because he is bishop of Rome but because he is the successor of Peter. Certain ones might wonder why the successor in Rome would be rather than the successor in Jerusalem or the successor in Antioch. They would all three correctly be successors of Peter, but their belief is that Peter took this authority with him as long as he lived and when he died he was bishop of Rome so it is the man who succeeded him as bishop of Rome who received his authority. The fact that Rome was the head of the ~~XXXXX~~ empire according to their theory has nothing whatever to do with it--with the authority of the bishop of Rome--it is

End of Record 38

Beginning of Record 39..... And in fact during the middle ages at one time it was ruled..... in Southern France, and for a period of about a century the pope was in Southern France and not in Rome. They were still called bishops of Rome but it is not because they are bishops of Rome but because they are the successors of Peter that they get their authority. Yes? Student AAM: Perhaps we might take a second to mention another fact. The Roman C. church is absolute totalitarian. There is no.....whatever in its theory, and the R. C. church has maintained in Italy carried out the viewpoint of the R. C. church. Now in its ...2 $\frac{1}{2}$ U. S. the strongest nation in the world today. And the worst part....., but R. C. in this ~~XXXXX~~ country are very anxious to prove and sincerely that they are good Americans. The right.....and desire to be good Americans. Well, the result is that in order to be effective and successful with their people the hierarchy in the U. S. has to stand for a great many things that would never be acceptable in Italy at all. And has to claim to believe in freedom of speech and various other American things. The result is that the hierarchy of the R. C. church in Italy looks with great suspicion on the American Roman Catholics, and when I was in Palestine 20 years ago there was a fine church which had been built with American money at one of the sacred sights of Palestine and American money had been bought for it and it

was already dedicated, but it was4..... and in case of emergency I have no doubt that the R. C. church would have it's headquarters in the United States but it would be a very very serious emergency, because the Italian leaders ~~WM~~ wish it to be over there.....not simply because of ~~XXXXXX~~ wanting their own people to have it but because their viewpoint--that the Viewpoint of the American---that the Roman Catholic church in American is different--not theoretically~~KX~~ not in the attitude of the believers but in the attitude of the ----.....5..... .But this point is important. The trend today is that Peter gave this authority to his successor. Now it is rather strange that I..... of Antioch rightly would not give some reference to his to the man who was over him who was the bishop when he was writing to the church. But we have no trace of it, not even when he was writing to the people of Rome. He believed in the authority of the~~XXXXX~~ head of the church in a particular area, but as I pointed out that is something which can easily ~~XXXXXX~~ develop in an effective and ~~XXX~~ successful man who finds thatthe principal difficulty he has if that of little groups of but who want their ~~X~~ ideas to be just as effective as his. He can push it in the totalitarian direction, but you put the same man in a situation where you have an inefficent or shiftless or selfish bishop and you will find that he was the leader of the group to get more bishop Student. Mcr: The church at Rome was not a church of slaves. There were slaves in it, but it was a ~~x~~church which represented a cross section of thepopulation and it included people from the poorer class and people from the ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ well educated, and it included. The church of Rome clearly contained men of influenced as ~~XXXX~~ shown by ~~X~~7..... Student.....AAM: I... . has been the leader in the second largest city for many many decades and anybody could have found out who was thehead of the church at Antioch very easily. I doubt if you would talk to any Christian man very long before you would hear him mention I.... Now at the end of ~~XXX~~ his life he received the crown of martyrdom, but perhaps through he went into this before the emperor presented Christianity..... We don't know what he did, but I still8..... Student..... AAM: I doubt if it is stated anywhere but it is plain to see that in the latter years of his life he was the bishop of Rome.

But there is no proof anywhere. There are references a century after the time of Peter tobut the fact of their having been that condition.....

Student:.....AAM: The difficulty of a hierarchy is that it soon becomes selfish and often shiftless. Now in the R. C. church the - for the last 300 years ~~and~~ the R. C. church has had the influence of the Jesuite movement which is something which is almost unparalleled ~~in~~ in the Bible. We take a good bit of time on this next year. My first suggestion is that without the Jesuite movement the R. C. church would completely disintegrate in two or three hundreds years, but it is a powerful ~~force~~ force within it and ~~EX~~ but the Jesuites combinein a most remarkable way. One one hand they have absolute authority in the head of the Jesuite order. Absolute complete control, but on the other hand before anybody can even have a vote as to ~~who~~ who is to be the head of the Jesuite order, he has to be in it for twenty years and during that twenty years and constantly investigate to make sure that he is 100 per cent devoted to the loyalty of the R. C. -- to the good of the R. C. system, and this pretty well rules out getting into leadership those who are They have a tremendous idea there but not a Christian one. It is ideal for which they stand. The point is that every member to keep hold you are suppose to be ~~like~~ like a stick that somebody picks up in the hand of your spirit. If he tells you that a thing is black when it looks white you're supposed to say of course it is. You're supposed to be absolutely and completely in his hands. But that man in whose hands you are is cannot be a shiftless lazy person because he has to be 20 years under observation before he can even get in a class ~~from~~ from which they are ~~selected~~ selected. And he can't be a man who is looking out purely for his own purposes because they are under such observance for 20 years. And of course there is another thing that the father of very ~~cleverly~~ cleverly did was that he made a rule that Jesuits can't be popes. He can't even be a bishop unless he has ~~special~~ special permission from the superior. Other orders want ~~their~~ their ~~men~~ men to be bishops and popes and rejoice in how many they have had, but the Jesuites order their men not to take position and authority in the church because they can't have any ambitions. Ambitions They are working to

increase the power of the pope and that is their object in life. To increase the pope's power and influence, but if the pope as an institution and not of a man, and if the pope does what they don't want him to do they just ignore him and he doesn't dare contradict. That is a strange development. It's ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ unparalleled as far as I know. Student..... AAM.: That's a big subject. We could take a lot of time on it. (Laughter) Well, our American system of government is to have a president with tremendous power but the people four years from now have a right to vote whether they want him to continue or not. It's a combination of the two, and that's the---if you can give the leader the power to go ahead and use their brains and their ability which the like a lot of people don't in deciding what to do but give the rank and file a right and an opportunity to judge whether the leaders are really sincere and earnest ~~XX~~ and industrious and unselfish and to throw them out. That is your ideal, but it's difficult to get that. Well, we -- I have to take another minute before ~~XX~~ we stop to mention about the assignment. I posted this End-of-Ree. 39 Beginning of Record 40 I trust you all got in the statement Mon. night - I haven't added them all up, but looking at the you probably all did. If any of your, of course, have gotten any of the reading lessons done that's all the better..... $\frac{1}{2}$ I do not have naturally enough books for all the faculty at one time, but the assignment--I asked you all Mon. night to let us know how far you were in that whether you had turned in a reading assignment or not. The reading assignment we postponed one class hour, ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ so that during this hour there will be put up a notice that makes it a little more which lesson you have for tomorrow and for next Wed. and of course for next Thurs. to cover all three assignments. Please do them in the order given. There are sufficient books for everyone to be able to get the book in the library if you use your books. You're supposed to use in a particular time the only one of which there is less than of the others is..... On that there are sufficient but barely sufficient copies. The other three ~~there~~ are ample books. Now we will meet today and tomorrow we will not meet Friday in this class. Neither will the Prophet class meet Friday at all. We were speaking last time about persecution in this century. We know that the attitude of Trajan

~~XXX~~ and then we noticed the fact that in T... reign there was one very out-
 standing martyrdom--the martyrdom of I... and we said a little about his
 writings, about his epistles which have been sovery important in the N. T.
 criticism and which also had a part in the history of the ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ development
 of the power of the bishop. He was so convinced with the very great importance
 of the power of the bishop. You notice that he has nothing to say about any
 bishop at Rome so far as from admitting ^{inferiority} ~~superiority~~ on his part to any bishop
 of Rome. He never even mentioned any reference in his Epistle to the Romans
 about any bishop at Rome at all. During the seventeenth century when King
~~XXXXXX~~ Charles I of England was trying to fashion a governmental control upon
 the people of England to the church of England is Archbishop L... who was
 emphasizing the great authority of the bsshop and archbishop made ~~XXXX~~ ^{much} of the
 epistles, and at that time there were 12 long epistles considered to be
 from I... Archbishop made a study of the epistles and on the basis of
 textual evidences he maintained that actually only seven of them were genuine
 and these in a somewhat shorter form. Later on a manuscript was discovered
 having exactly the seven which he said and in a shorter form. It is unfortunate
 that that great student of the Bible, that great Christian leader, Archbishop
 should be known to the modern world simply through his guess as to the
 date of the creation which is one of the least of the many fine things that he
 did and that the many great excellent things that he did are so largely
 forgotton in the Christian Church, but he showed remarkable critical ...4½....
 dealing with the epistle. Today most scholars agree that of the 12 epistles
~~XXXX~~ we have five of them are later imaginary writings and not genuine but the
 seven of them are genuine and that of those seven the long form have in the
 Greeek is enlarged and later find that the short form in the Greek is probably
 correct. On the other hand the still shorter form ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ which we have in
 Syriac is a condensation that somebody made at a later time. Now if you can
~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ a great deal of study and there are many considerations that
 go into it.
~~XXXXXXXXXX~~. We won't have time to go into it here but it is worth noticing
 that that is the attitude of scholars today and certainly is well accepted
 that the genuine are seven in their shorter form is quite generally agreed, and

they of course are strong evidence in favor of the5 $\frac{1}{2}$ Now the after T.... we notice Hadrian who succeeded T.... seems to carried out the same policy that T. carried out. He recognized that Christianity was illegal but though it was illegal most of the Christians were pretty decent people and nobody was to be sought out for being a Christian, but if somebody would make formal accusation that a man was a Christian he was to be given a proper hearing and if it was found that the accusation had been given maliciously or from the desire to get some property the man who had made the accusation would be punished but if the man on being brought before the court and accused of being a Christian admitted it and refused to sacrifice to the emperor then the man was to be killed. T.'s declaration on this was sent to one of his governors and it carries on the policy of T., but makes it a definite law rather than simply a suggestion. There have been many who have tried to make this rescript was not actual that ~~XX~~ Hadrian never wrote it, but most scholars today say that it probably is authentic and that he probably did write it. During his reign and during all this period there was an occasional uprising by the people in some area against the Christians and there might be a good deal of the slaughter of Christians in a particular area or some slave owner might kill a good many of his slaves for being Christians, but the attitude of the Roman State was one of holding back attack upon the Christians and only punish them when there was formal accusation and definite proof given. So that the Christians during this period began to write to the emperor trying to tell them why Christianity should not be considered illegal. They ~~X~~ began to write books addressed to the emperor trying to convince the emperor. Whether the emperor ever ~~WX~~ saw these books or not, I don't know, but it was the beginning of a class of literature of which we will speak of later. Which we speak of as the Apologies. Perhaps we might say just a word now about this type of literature. The word apology is used here ~~XXXXXX~~ in a different sense that we use it today. There is nothing apologetic about the ^UA. apologies of the early Christians. Apologetic in the modern colloquial sense. The modern theological sense of course they were apologetic. The Apologies were written addressed to the emperor often, but meant for anybody to read them to show him that it was not unreasonable to believe in Christianity.

And that it was unreasonable to persecute Christians and a number of men, some of the very learned men wrote these Apologies presenting the reasons for their faith. I will delight ~~to~~ to assign you all reading in the earliest Christian writings immediately, but most of those are in the one volume so I ~~don't think~~ have to make the assignment in Clement of Rome be the only assignment this week in that volume, but I want to give you a typical ~~of~~ apology so I am assigning you, I believe, Assignment B, is the Apology of Tertullius. Now that is written about 200 A. D. So that is not one of the earliest Apologies. I'll give you one of the earliest later, but it is a good sample of one of the very finest of the Apologies. In fact Tertullius was in a class by himself. He is one of the finest writers that the Christian world has ever seen, and it is worth your reading at any time and it is not out of place now, because it is ~~not~~ typical of this class of writing, though we get to Tertullius a little bit later. Now Hadrian was succeeded by A..... whom he adopted as he had been adopted by T..... and A.... in the years in which he reigned in the 23 years in which he was emperor carried on the same policies of Hadrian. There were occasionallo....., but largely caused by the fury of the people and the attitude of the people had perhaps become very bitter against them. Sometime there were great riots. We find that at the beginning of this and of course even in the book of Acts at Ephesus where they had that great riot there roused up by the soldiers against the Christians and if some disaster came if there was a drouth, if there was a ~~war~~ war or something like that there would be many who would because the gods were angry at the threat of Christianity. Christians should be killed and the gods will be and the disasters will stop, and so whenever they had disaster there was apt to be that feeling against the Christians, and of course many people whose businesses were interfered with by the people who were engaged in wicked and defensive businesses and the people who were engaged in businesses that depended on idol worship for their success they naturally would raise a stirred-up feeling towards the Christians and the Christians had no defense from the law. The law would try to interfere with riots or with disturbance of any kind, but the Christians were an illegal organization even though not shut out by the law and that put them

under serious A very interesting instance of an individual persecution in this case occurred in 156. It was in Asia Minor that it occurred where the popular feeling was roused very strongly against the Christians and some of the Christians were seized and were accused of being Christians by the governor and admitted the charge and it was declared that they would be killed and~~X~~ thrown into the lions or some such treatment, and some of the people here-some of the Christians became thrilled with the enthusiasm for martyrdom. One man forced himself forward taking some others with him and saying let's go forward and get martyrdom and they came forward before the governor and declared that they were Christians and then one who was the ring leader of this when ~~XX~~ he saw the lions filled with terror and held himself back, declared that he wasn't a Christian after all, filled with fear, and this rather displeased the crowd which had enjoyed seeing the previous one eaten by the lions and which was all stirred up with the hatred of the Christians that when this one went back and ~~XXXXXX~~ said that he was not a Christian the governor then refused to throw him into the lions and of course that was good tactics upon his part if he wanted to destroy Christianity because it would make it easy for others to give up Christianity then the crowd called Away with the13 $\frac{1}{2}$ and Po..... was the man who was the leader of the Christians in that area. He was a man who was now 86 years of age . He had been a friend of the apostle Paul. His name is spelled Polycarp. I spoke wrong -- He was a friend of John. He knew John when John wa^S an old man-he was in his early twenties. So he knew John quite well. John is said to have made him bishop of and for a period of 50 years Polycarp had been known as one who was telling people about his contacts with God repeating to them the messages of the apostel John that he had given exhorting them to carry on^e..... End of Record 40

Beginning of Record 41..... accept the O. T. with seven extra books and the N. T.1..... They do not consider with the writing in the Bible. They consider that the pope is inspired and infallible interpreter of the Bible and he may state what the true meaning is of something in the Bible or of something in their forlorn position. Now, we don't admit there is a but they would not think that a pope today had any authority to

give something as a new idea, but simply to give the right interpretation which was either in the Bible or That is very important. I hope you all have that in mind. That is the theory of the R. C. church. Now, of course, it is difficult to understand of the rank and file that this theory may not be clear, but that is the theory that they express. Now, the apostolic fathers ---- we might say this----the R. C. church puts a great deal more attention on fathers than we do., because they consider that a church is the source in extremely important in our knowing what to do. WE consider the Bible is2 $\frac{1}{4}$ they consider that the Bible has been given to us by the church and preserved by the church and therefore the words of the Church.... and they are tremendously interested in ~~the~~ Christiansand so they are interested in all these writings and they are very anxious to show us how these writings support their.....I'll be interested to know how very very many find no support at all. Well now the apostolic fathers. The first of them in point of time is Clement of Rome. of whom we have already spoken of at some length. We should just say that nothing is known of certain about the life of Clement. 50 or 100 years later other epistles were written claimed to be by Clement, but nobody today knows. There is only one epistle which is considered today to be by Clement. What is called the second epistle of Clement is written 50 years later by some unknown writer.....there is only one epistle which we today believe could be from Clement and as to who C. was some people say he was a Roman consul, a leader in the Roman government. Others say he is a slave who came to Rome there are all kinds of beliefs and stories which ~~we~~ rose 50 or 100 ~~or~~ years later about C. but they contradict one another and the fact of the matter is all we know about C. is that he is a man who wrote this epistle and he was a member of the Roman service. We don't even have proof he was a leader of the church, though it is quite likely that he was a leader of the church and of course, the Roman theory that he was the bishop of Rome. Well, the Clement of Rome when next mention Barnabas. Now the epistle of Barnabas. That is called that because it is quite generally recognized that it was written after 100 A. D. the second century; we don't know who wrote it. Some say the name Barnabas got attached to it, but it has not been proved whether Barnabas..... It is a work in which a man

tries to show that the O. T. ceremonies is done away with . He has got some good evidence.....4½..... and there is Ignatious. Certainly they are one of the best of the apostolic..... is not the man who wrote the epistle of Barnabas, This epistle, somebody called thie epistle Barnabas thinking it had been written by the apostle Paul, but nobody today believes that was the case. I don't think anybody would say that it was written by a different man named Barnabas. They just say that we don't know who wrôte it. Probably he thought more people would read it, because nobody believes....., but that's the name of the book. And Polycarp he was mentioned in Epistle to the Philipians Well we will mention the others in the morning when we have more time.

..... I have already started another but I want to refer back to that for a minute. That was in 170 A. D. That was 147 years after the death of Christ. That is a long time. The church/~~s~~ very very early. Actually it is just as far after the crucifixion of Christ as we are from 1803. My wife and I this summer visited a place up in Mass. where they have found some old houses from 1800 and they have brought them to this place to put them together and tried to construct a village just like villages in the U. S. were in 1900, and you go in there and you see the types of transportation. No automobiles, no railroads, no airplanes, no telephones, no telegraphs, the road such that when a horse and buggy comes along ~~the dust rises~~ the dust ~~SSSS~~ rises ten feet high. You can just hardly imagine that it is what they were accustomed to then. That's just 150 years ago. You see the places where they sat for their meals. The fire place over in the corner.....and you see the notice up which tells about an apprentice has run away and anyone bringing back this apprentice will receive a reward of 10 cents, and then this apprentice left him a very nice bit of which he stole from ~~XX~~ him and anybody bringing that back will receive a reward of \$3. That is how different the cost of labor was in those days from this day. Differences in so many many ways. We just can't conceive of what life was like in this country 160 years ago, and that is--we don't know anybody who knows anybody who knew anybody who lived at that time. There have been a large number of cycles gone through. I dont imagine there is anybody in this room who could give me the names of all of those people whose blood is actually

flowing in your veins who were living at that time. That is of your grand-
 parents or great grandparents - whoever it was that ~~was~~ is actually an ancestor
 of yours who was living at that time. Now, it was a long time and it was the
 very early church. It was a long time after the death of Christ. And during
 this period Christianity as a religion had been considered illegal and occasionally
 persecuted with terrific rule, and always was thought of as something that was
 contrary to the law and something that was could reflect what people were suppose
 to10..... Yet we find that persecution over in France so far away there
 from Palestine we find that the people who were killed among the first were
 a lawyer the great in the whole area who was killed. Another one the
 bishop there, probably a man of education and a man of standing in the
 community, a man who had many years of service to Christ was killed, and then
 we have this10 $\frac{1}{2}$ in some way was able to stand it longer. She was
 the first one taken and the last one to die. I read of the account of the cruel
 torture and treatment of the people. The thing of great interest was not the
 cruel way they were treated so much as the fact that they had the to
 stand such treatment and remain true to their faith and if ~~that~~ THIS treason
 did not put an end to their faith. And we have no evidence of any supernatural
 works of God (I mean works outside of the ordinary process of nature)occurring
 at that time. God gave them power to give them.....His holy spirit was in
 them and helped them as He does people today. But the sort of miracle that
 occurred in Bible times there is no evidence of any such thing. But these
 people 150 years after the time of Christ which is actually as far as
 is concerned about as far away as we are. In fact many of us no more what life
 was like in Palestine and about the events.....12.....After that length of
 time the movement had grownthough it was a small movement according
 to the whole population-it had grown such that as far away asin many
 other areas there were people that were so devoted to Christ that they were
 ready to submit to this terrible persecution rather than to deny Him. Now the
 second century, as we know, and it was who put an end to the first
 persecution, purely not because he was a good man, not because ~~he~~ he favored
 Christianity. He was a bad man, but the good man who preceeded him felt it was

his duty to destroy Christianity. I was just thinking this morning. I wonder if any country anywhere in the history of the world has had a succession of such good rulers as N.... Trajen, There are five rulers and for goodness of character and for excellent ability as rulers, I am sure you could not find any three successive presidents of the U. S. who compare with them. I am sure you couldn't find any three successive kings of England, or of France, or of Germany who would compare in character with these men, but these men the last of them the most logical of the groups said Christianity is a menace to our empire13 $\frac{1}{2}$ We don't know why. We don't know anything more about it. She liked them and she asked him to stop the persecution.....continued to tolerate Christianity for the next, for the rest of this century. When we say the first century we mean the 200's We are now in the 20th century, and it's good you all know that
 (Unable to make out the rest of record)
 (There doesn't seem to be a Record 42) Beginning of Record 43

..... For Monday's Apostolic Fathers I will assign you some from time to time to read. I could not assign you any thusfar because they are all in the same book, and there would not be books enough to go around. But later on. All Christian~~s~~ writings practically to 200 A. D. were in Greek. The Christian church in Rome had its services in Greek. They wrote their literature in Greek; they read their ~~lit~~ literature in Greek. I spoke wrong. I said "all" I should say all Christian churches in the western part of the empire. In the eastern part Greeks shared with Syriac the dialogue of their nation. The leading language of the Chrisitaa Church. The most extremely eastern section was largely Aramaic speaking, and those of you who have already read the assignment ^{Eusebius} Eusebius notice that he gives you the letters that were written by Jesus of..... the Syriac king of the dessert, and the letter which he wrote Jesus and tell how ... right after the death of Christ. He tells us that of the first century. It is interesting to read what he said about it, but to know the fact that no scholar today things those letters are genuine It is considered that the Syriac, the church of the dessert did not become Christian until at least 100 years after the time of Christ. This is considered

to be a tradition with no foundation, but it's a very interesting position which developed during the second century, and E... thought it was true, and I thought it was good to give it to you as an object lesson of the fact that when you read of anything that happened in "Eu..... own day he speaks of what he knows. When he speaks of what happened earlier, the question is3..... One good thing about him is that he usually quotes, but in this particular thing which he quotes the evidence which he quotes is not considered as genuine by any authority. Yes? Student..... AAM: ~~XXXX~~ Anything that Eusebuis tells about what he saw is very good, but anything that he tells us that took place before his birth, the question is where does he get his evidence? And it would be very valuable to get any tradition you can get and then put it together, but scholars today are agreed that4 $\frac{1}{4}$ Student.... . . .

AAM: Yes, very good. I think it is good that we have an idea and an understanding of this. The people were scattered through~~h~~ the empire. People everywhere were tremendously interesting in anything that they could get from the early times. Anything genuine about Christ, and it was very easy under those circumstances for some things that people wrote/^{without}~~XXXX~~ any intention of deceiving to be taken by somewhere else and read. Here's a fine Christian work he said. Where does it come from? Now there are things that 5 $\frac{1}{4}$, but I don't think that is true of these good books. I think they were done by people who were genuinely trying to help and the misunderstanding continued through an era. But it is easy to see how those errors.5 $\frac{1}{2}$ Somebody says what is this? Who wrote this? Well, I don't know. It seems to me that perhaps it was Barnabas the companion of Paul. I don't know that it was, but it sounds like the sort of thing he probably would have written. Somebody else says it was written by Barnabas. And you will find even in class very often I present a thing three or four times, and then somebody comes up with a question that is very simple. I had that happen last two or three days, and you're all here listening and trying to get this material. Well, you slip up occasionally. Yes? It is easy to see how a group in the church over a period of time could slip up and make mistakes, and The wonderful thing about it is that we have so much that is accurate and can be depended on. Not that there is so

much that can't be. And the extremely important thing is that we have the Bible which is so accurate. There is nothing else that was recopied for so long a time that is anywhere near as accurate. We can find that this is true by the contemporary material that we find. Yes? Student..... AAM: No, If you get a history of the Civil War written this year's the difference is that ~~XXXX~~ a man today who writes a history of the Civil War has got a lot of manuscripts to investigate which people who have looked over very carefully and which there has been a great effort to check. I've read in the last year four different accounts by7½.... .. in which there are very different ideas expressed. Everybody recognized the main people when it comes to the details it's easy for people to be uncertain. But the difference is that today we have more people who are spending time trying to get these things accurate. Now it is true there than in the early days of the Christian Church they were looking for the return of Christ, and they were busy trying to do everything they could before he came back, and there was no great point in trying jto be accurate and careful in remembering history. For instance, you take things in Palestine. Nobody cared ~~XXXXXXXX~~ what things happened Palestine. They were too busy trying to do Chriscitian work that they didn't think But then after Constantine became a Christian and people settled down to know that it might be a long, long time before Christ came back they became tremendously interested in knowing where things had happened in Palestine and they became tremendously interested in knowing as much as they could about precise details about history, and from that time on, we have much more material, and therefore, on many phases of it we can much more solid than we can on this period when they were not an official group, but when they were a little group..... But even so in the time of Constantine we have a great many traditions of that time which nobody ~~they~~ today will recieve. "Student..... AAM: The attitude I want to give the Church History with exactly the attitude..... which is you look at the scripture and hear some things absolute clear. There are some other things which there is a strong evidence that they were of this belief, but there are certain objections. And there are other things which may be torn apart, and you should And I'm trying to teach the attitude of seeing

what the essence is for any particular thing, taking that which is definite and call it infallible, and trying to decided what is the truth on those things that are less accurate. And that is the same attitude that I'm trying10..... And I am giving the opinion that seems to me to be the correct one as I have studied a fair and large amount of the material. But I am interested in your taking the evidence of it and on any opinion I give do not take it because I take it unless you know it. I'd like you to know that it is my opinion, but I'd like you to check it. That is an important thing, I think, in all ~~XXX~~ scientific approach to any subject. You can get the attitude ~~XX~~ ~~XX~~ and differentiate between things ~~XXX~~ that are certain and things that are uncertain. And that doesn't mean you can take the certain and forget the uncertain. You cannot do that because there are many things which are relatively certain which are nevertheless a great importance. Somebody asked me about one of the students. What kind of shoes did he have on this morning? Did he have tan shoes or ~~XXX~~ black shoes. Well, I don't know. Well, did he have shoes on at all? I know he had shoes on, but I'm not sure what kind of ~~XXXX~~ shoes they were. I'm not sure whether the shoes were lace shoes or high shoes or low shoes. I didn't know. But I was sure he had shoes on. I would have noticed if he did not. And so you see there may be regarding anything there are certain things which are certain and certain things that are uncertain. And the more we learn of the things that are certain, the more we are able to tell what ~~X~~ things are uncertain. That is very important in the approach to any subject and ~~X~~ there are some people who become discouraged and it's too much work to try to pick out what is truth and what is not. How much easier to say, "Here is our system God has given to us. It has a thousand points that are exactly perfect. We stand on these and that is all there is to it." I used to have students when I was teaching a few years ago, to come to me after class and say, "Well, why do we have to go into these historical arguments ~~XXX~~ about the accuracy of the Bible. We've got the philosophical argument of our system. What more do we need? Why bother with all the historical arguments? Well, I ~~XXXX~~ don't think that is an ~~XX~~ attitude that is honoring to the Lord. It is true it is far better to take everything God said and that's it and don't worry about it than it is to deny

anything God has spoken. But what is to be understood what God said, it is very important that we differentiate between that which is clear and that which needs further study. And I believe that the sort of leadership that God will use in the Church is a leadership which is able to differentiate and to select among the I think that is very important in relation to all..... and it enters in13½.....Now I will mention and that is the last of the Apostolic fathers in our list. I want to go on to D Another type of writing from this period. The apologies, and the apologists were men who wrote apologies, and they are very different from any present day apology. An apology I mention this in connection with our story, is not in any means telling something of which you are ashamed of or wish you had not done in the theological sense. It is a presentation of a reason for the faith that is in it. It is a presentation of the fact that there is no reason why ~~XX~~ a man of the world who does not believe in Christianity should think that you are rather silly in believing in it, because there are evidences for it which are worthy of the attention and the respect whether one accepts them or not. That is the primary intention of an apology, and ofcourse an apology to the emperor might try to say you are killing all these Christians while they are the best people in the empire..... End

Beginning of Record 42

The next of these apostolic fathers I would like to mention is3.....
~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ (Record very noisy) It tried to show that the O. T. should be done away with. Christianity..... Now the next one I want to mention is Herman. This book is a queer book. It is different from any other of the apostolic fathers. The Shepherd of Herman. Who Herman was we don't know. There is a tradition that he was the brother of a bishop of Rome about ¹⁵⁰/~~150~~ A. D. If the book was written about 150 A. D. it is getting rather late for the apostolic fathers~~X~~. The book is a very peculiar book. It is the account of a ~~XX~~ of a man. I suppose that5..... It was something that was desired and fantastic. Somebody has said that the Shepherd of Herman is the John Bunyan of that day. That is to say in some ways it is a little bit like Pilgrám's Progress. It would be interesting for you to read sometime. You would find some thoughts in it which are helpful. It was--all

of these books were good books and presented generally the Christian attitude. Next of the Apostolic Fathers is Papias. And Papias evidently did a bit of writing, but nothing that he wrote has been preserved independently. All that we have of Papias is what Eusebius quoted from. Eusebius quoted from Papias. Because these passages are of such great importance we can prove Papias as an individual among the Apostolic Fathers. He was a Bishop in Asia Minor. He was evidently a fine leader, and he was one who had known the apostles personally. And his testimony to the authenticity of the Gospels of Matthew and Mark is very important in N. T. history. Eusebius didn't have much use for Papias.

.....6 $\frac{1}{4}$ Eusebius was a friend of the emperor Constantine. Constantine was a Christian, and the ~~whole~~ whole empire would soon be Christian, and we were going to have a Christian world because the Christian emperor was going to make a Christian world, and therefore Eusebius was rather disgusted with these people ~~XXXXXX~~ who thought that a Christian world would only come with the return of Christ, and He would set up a Christian world after his return, and Papias, he felt was a man of very poor intellect, because he ~~XXXXXX~~ had this belief that the world was not going to become Christian because the emperor was Christian, but only when Jesus Christ comes back to set up His Kingdom. And so Eusebius selected ~~XXX~~ from Papias some of the things Eusebius thought were very fantastic and mad delirium of this belief. He said that Papias I said the grapes were going to be much larger and how many grapes there were going to be on the vine. Eusebius thought anybody who would hold such foolish ideas7 $\frac{1}{4}$...

Yet, Eusebius thought that Papias was useful in presenting the gospel who also spoke these statements of his on pre-mil or kil..... as some people call it. Kil..... means that one who believes in the thousand year reign from the Greek word A Kil.... was one who Eusebius did not think much of, and he didn't think much of Papias. And so even to this day there are people who take over Eusebius' attitude and would say that Papias was a man of rather poor intellectuality. He was a pre-mil. But it is interesting that Philip Shaw the author of this series of the history of the Christian Church, about ten volumes which is still the best extensive history of the Church from the time of Christ to the reformation that we have. Philip Shaw who ended up as a professor at

~~XXXXXX~~ Seminary and who was certainly no pre-mil himself. In fact, more or less shares in Eusebius' attitude for pre-mil. It is interesting that Philip Shaw does not think that ~~X~~ Eusebius' attitude for Papias was a very reasonable attitude. Because Eusebius says that if Papias was a man who held this pre-mil view we should not feel too badly toward Papias on account of it because there were others who held the view. He says the most striking point in the eschatology of the A. . . . age is the prominent Milinarianism--that is the believe of a visible reign of Christ in glory on earth with ~~X~~ the risen saints for a thousand years before the general resurrection of judgment. It was indeed not the doctrine of the church and wasn't any caeed of devotion. As far as I know we haven't any ~~XXXXX~~ creed or form of devotion in that period. It has been observed today. So we have no evidence that it was a special creed or form of devotion. But Shaw says it was a widely current period of distinguished teachers, such as Barnabas Papias Then he goes on to name men like All of those came from a century or two later. It was the universal belief of the Christian Church in this century. It would seem this way. But speaking of Papias Shaw said a pious for contemporary of Polycarp entertained an extravagant notion to the hapiness of a mil reign for which he appealed to apostolic tradition. He put into the mouth of Christ himself a highly figurative description of the more than tropical of the coming period of the mil which is ~~XXX~~ preserved by approve by but But then ~~XXXX~~ Shaw goes on and shows that Barnabas takes an explicit pre-mil view that the first of the great apologists took very strongly, that Iraneus the great writer at the end of this period ~~XX~~ of whom we have not yet spoken but will a great deal he strongly took the pre-mil view and that ~~XXXXX~~ Tertullius ~~XX~~ was an enthusiastic ll $\frac{1}{2}$ extra-vagatn to some people and .use.it.as.a.means of attack on pre-mil. It is typical of the fact that was made all through the ages on it and people are still making it today, but it was avery interesting that the leaders of the church all through this time is strongly pre-mil. And in the fourth century when Pontipus became emperor. Well, now, Papias was one who knew the apostles, and his evidence is of real value and importance. Now next to these apostolic fathers I will mention the Epistle to Diogatus. This epistle to D. We don't know who it is by

It was unknown ~~EX~~ till 400 years ago when it was discovered, but recognized to be from the second century, and so it is considered as one of the apostolic fathers. And the manuscript which was found 400 years ago ~~was~~ has been lost. So we don't even have any original, but it was a work which is considered by many as a gem of the apostolic fathers. Yes? Student----- Then the book which is often referred to as the Didache which is the Greek for teaching and the teaching of the twelve apostles. By the way this has nothing to do with the twelve apostles. That is the title given to the book "The Teaching of The Twelve Apostles". It is a little manuscript which was not discovered until less than 100 years ago. In modern times we have rediscovered which scholars agree comes from sometime in the second century.14 $\frac{1}{2}$ ////// and it gives the expression of the belief of this particular small church. Their beliefs, their practices; and it is an interesting work..... End of Record 42

Beginning of Record 44 type of the apologies of a defense of Christianity against persecution. Another type is to point out the weakness of the heathen god. Anything that shows a reasonable ~~XXXXXXXX~~ amount of Christianity in a viewpoint which can be understood by a person who is not himself a Christian is an apology in the technical theological sense, and it is to be said to the honor of the early Christians that during the second century there were men among men who said the emperors are great and good men. They misunderstand what Christianity is and only get the evidence to them there is a possibility that they may change their attitude, and so these men began writing apologies. Now the early apologies which has been preserved by a man by Aristides. I simply mention it because it is the earliest one that has been preserved for us. It is from the time of the reign of Adrian. There are two others from the same reign which have not been preserved, but to which we have reference. I will not..... But the next one I want to mention is a much more important one. This is Justin Martyr. J M is the outstanding one among the apologists. He was a man who was brought in a town called the new city. It is the town of Palestine on the... It was the headquarters of the Samaritans, where Jesus sat by the well. But this man was a pagan. He was brought up in that town, but he was not a Samaritan but a pagan. He was brought up in the town and given a good education and he set ou

to be a philosopher, and he studied philosophy and talked with different people and tried to decided what was the correct interpretation of ^{life} ~~XXXX~~. He ...3½.... And found none of them satisfactory. He tried one after another. He sought good points about them and then he saw weaknesses in them. And then one day when he was walking by the seashore he came across an old Christian couple with general dignity and entered into a conversation, and this man discussed these philosophies with him and showed him what he had already come to believe that no one of them gave a truly satisfactory interpretation of the universe or ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ satisfies man't desires. And then this man said what you need is not somebody who is trying to work out an interpretation of life, but you need someone who witnesses to that which he already has experienced, that which he has seen. And he said of the Hebrew prophets who were long before these philosophers, but who told how God had spoken to them and through them. You'll find their witness and you'll find in them an evidence and a viewpoint of a God who ~~ca~~ created and controls the world which is much more satisfactory than the views of any of these philosophers. And he said more than this, he said you will find these philosophers--that these prophets of the Ancient Hebrew foreold the coming of Christ, and their prop~~h~~ecies were fulfilled in His life and work. They witnessed at the very beginning. The old man left Justin. Justin never saw him again. He didn't know what his name was but he took his advice and began to study the prophets of the O. T. and then he began to study the gospel and decided that here was the truth that he had missed. And the man who had been the enthusiastic student of the Greek philosophers now ~~XXXX~~ became a very fervent Christian, but he did not go into Christian work in the ordinary way. He had been a philosopher... ~~XXXXX~~ a man who traveled around speaking here and there giving lectures in philosophy to people. He didn't need much to l~~â~~ve. He lived on a very simple basis. There were philosophers ~~o~~like that who traveled around talking and discussing things and he continued that the rest of his life only as he went around and discussed thing he ~~was~~ would always lead the discussion to show as the old man had ~~ix~~ that the true ~~XXXXXXXX~~ answer to life was in the witness of Christ, and so Justin spent a long life traveling about. He sought the Society of Christians, he got more information from them, but he went about on his own from place to place this way and some s

that he accomplished as much as any Christian leader during the period which the spread of Christianity. It's hard to say if that is true because we have so little evidence. But he was highly thought of in the early church, and we have from him two apologies and another work which is longer than his two apologies put together. His two apologies were addressed to the emperor trying to persuade the emperor that he was wrong to persecute the Christians. He addressed his large apology to An..... and the small one he also addressed to him. Some thought it was it was to Marcus..... And in these he ~~XXX~~ asks that the Christians be ~~XXXXXX~~ given justice and not condemned without trial just because they were Christians but their character be investigated and the fact be known that the essence of their life be such as one that warranted investigation of what they believed. ~~XX~~ His two apologies are very fine works. They are rather short, but then he wrote a dialogue which is more than ~~twice~~ as long as the two apologies put together. This is called the dialogue with ~~X~~ Trypho. It has 142 chapters in it. It is the account of a dialogue with a Jew who had taken part in B..... insurrection. Jerusalem had escaped from it and in this dialogue Justin tells about his conversion and he takes up the matters of the Christian viewpoint about the prophets and the life of Christ, and takes up the Jewish attitudes of his day, and tried to show that the Christian attitude is correct. Now there were many other works which he wrote which have been lost and there are some others which have been claimed to be from him but are not by him. Some have attributed the epistle to to him, but it is usually thought that he was not the writer of the Epistle to D..... But ~~XXX~~ his works are not elaborately ~~XXXXXX~~ worked out in detail, but they have a freshness about them. Shaw said if the emperors of Rome had read the books addressed to them, they must have been strongly impressed at least with the honesty of the writers and ~~XX~~ the innocence of the Christian people. Justin M. is ~~the~~ earliest outstanding evangelist. He call him Martyr because he was martyred in Rome as we mentioned last time. Now there are three other names I ought to give you, but who perhaps we will not need to go into great detail--three apologists we will name----(Cassian) succeeded Justin Martyr perhaps a little word of detail about him. It is desirable that he was a pupil of J. M. He wrote an apology but the thing he is most remembered for is his harmony of the gospels

which he called the He took the four gospels and tried to make one book out of them doing away with all parallel passages, and his was copied and recopied until there were hundreds in use all over the Roman Empire. Eventually it was discarded and for quite a while people read the life of Christ in the edition that Tatian brought out combining the four gospels unto one book. At the10..... should be mentioned. Aphenheoras---a Christian philosopher at Athens--His apology has been preserved. And then Naletto perhaps could be mentioned a little bit more. Bishop of Sardus. A man who was of brilliant mind and very prolific He is quite interesting to us, because in one of his apologies he gives ~~the~~ the first Christian list of the Hebrew scripture, and it omits the Apochraphy which the Roman Catholic church accepts but which the Jews never accept. It omits that, but it is the first Christian list of the Hebrews. Now Hegesiptus ^{an} orthodox Jewish Christian began to write a history of the Christian church and it is said to have still existed in the sixteenth century, but it is now lost. We do not have any copy of his history, but Eusebius occasionally quotes from it. If we have it we would say that he was the first Christian Church historian. We don't have it. We consider Eusebius the first Church historian. But Eusebius quotes a number of passages from ~~the~~ Hegesiptus who traveled extensively and was very interested in gathering the early traditions about the beginning of Christianity, and who wrote an apology. Then I will just briefly mention here ~~the~~ Tertullian who was perhaps the greatest of the apologists, but the reason I am only mentioning him here is because he comes at the beginning of the next century, and he overlaps. You could possibly consider him in this century, but I think we will leave him till the next century. You are reading his apology. Tertullius is one of the most vivid writers that the Christian world has ~~the~~ ever seen. He has a ~~the~~ style that is crisp, and he wrote a tremendous amount of material. The first man with one minor exception to write Christian material of any importance in Latin and he was not in Rome but in North Africa. And ~~the~~ From Tertullian writings have come the bulk of our theological terminology. Most of it comes from Latin, and Tertullian who was a lawyer invented the terminology, so he is a man of ~~the~~ tremendous importance in Christian history and a very great writer, but we will say a good bit more about him ~~the~~ later. I think it is just good to know here tha

it was at the North Africa that he was. Well, I guess our time is up for today and you will not 1.....End of Record 44

'Beginning of Record 45 certain date on the calendar and we observe it on that day and others said no it is a certain day of the week. It should be on a Sunday and there was a split between them over this and a ~~XXXX~~ sharp controversy he made a trip all the way from Smyrna to Rome. There at Rome he had a discussion with the Bishop of Rome which they failed to agree, but nevertheless the bishop of Rome permitted him to lead in the church services there and the two recognized one another as leaders of the Christians and although they disagreed on this vital point they joined together in the bond of Christian ~~XXXXXX~~ fellowship. And Polycarp was a man who had great influence with the Christian world. He had been a great leader in this area. He had an epistle written by him. Well, the people began to cry away with the atheist. Let Polycarp be searched for and when ~~XX~~ Polycarp heard this friends came into his house, an old man of 86 and they said Polycarp the mob is crying out for your blood. Do come and let us hide you and Polycarp said no, I am going to stay here. If they want me they know where to get me, and the crowd said no, you're too important to our leaders, and they said you come out here to a farm outside and stay here for a while until it dies down. Polycarp said well, I won't go and flee from them, but he said I will go out to the farm2½..... but he said I will go out there and perhaps so he went out to the farm and he spent the whole night in prayer praying night and day for all of them and for the churches all over the world, and then the people roused so much agitation that they should bind Polycarp and bring them before them when he came to his house they said he is not here and they couldn't find him and they refused to tell them where he was, and so they came, and then his friends came to him and they told him to move to another farm, but a slave was tortured betrayed the place where Polycarp was and late in the evening the people came to the house. His friends said here they are coming for you. He said I am not fleeing. I didn't come out here to flee. He said simply because you thought I should stay ~~XXX~~ here until the fury was over. I never want to.... and so he refused to flee and they came in ~~XX~~ and said the will of God be done and went down and talked with him and asked him to allow him one hour to pray, and so they agreed t

to this and he prayed there for about two hours and they were so impressed with the general attitude those who heard him were astonished and some of them were sorry that they had come out against him such a venerable old man, but when he had finished his prayer, they took him and they put him on a donkey and started for the city. Already the morning was dawning, and ahead of the police-----they ~~WE~~ were coming in and they asked him to get into their carriage. He got into the carriage and then they said Polycarp, why should you have this trouble? Why don't you just sacrifice just a little bit to the emperor. What's the harm in that? Just say Lord Caesar and offer the sacrifice and offer it and then you won't have any trouble. He didn't answer them, but when they persisted, he said I am not going to do what you advise, and they became quite angry and they stopped the carriage and told him to get out. They put him out with such haste that he ~~XXXXXXXX~~ scraped his chin, but he walked on quickly and it wasn't much further to the arena. When he came there was such an uproar that nothing could be heard. And they brought him before the council, but he said are you Polycarp? We respect your age. Don't put us in this situation of having to hurt you. Just swear by the emperor. Offer a little bit on sacrifice in front of him. Just say away with the ~~XXXXXXXX~~ atheist. Well Polycarp says away with the ~~XXXXXXXX~~ atheist. But that wasn't enough. Just curse Christ and I will release you. Polycarp say, I served him 86 years, and he has never done me wrong. How can I blast thee, My King and Saviour. And the counsel said I have got wild beasts here and I will cast you to them unless you change your mind. Polycarp said, call them. and the counsel said, if you despise the ~~XXXX~~ beasts I'll have you burned. And Polycarp said, you threaten fire that burns for a moment. You know nothing of the judgment to come, the fire that burns for ever. Bring what you will. And the counsel tried to persuade him but couldn't. He was astonished6..... Polycarp has confessed that he is a Christian. Everybody knew it. He had been their leader for a good many years, but had not been officially. And when this was heard the multitude of the heathen and the Jews living in Smyrna cried out with uncontrollable wrath and a loud shout. This is the teacher of Asia. The father of the Christian. The destroyer of our Gods who teaches ~~XXXXXX~~ neither to offer sacrifices and they cried out that a lion be loosed on Polycarp, but the official said that the game had been legally

closed and he couldn't bring out one of the lions. Then they cried let Polycarp be burned alive. And so they brought the things and the people gathered in order to burn him and he ~~XXXXXX~~ took off his outer clothes and began to take off his shoes and stepped forward and when he was about to be nailed to the stake he said ~~XX~~ Leave me thus for He will give me power to be held to the fire and to endure the fire will grant me to remain unmoved in the fire even without ~~XXX~~ being tied. But he looked up to heaven and he said "Oh Lord God almighty, Father of thy beloved and blessed child Jesus Christ to whom we have received knowledge of thee I bless thee that thou hast granted me this day and hour to share among the number who are martyred through the resurrection of eternal life, soul and body to the immortality of the Holy Spirit. The fire blazed up, but the breeze seemed to carry it away from him. He didn't seem to be burned by it, and until someone came up and they drove a dagger into him and blood gushed out and the body was burned then but the people were permitted to gather up the bones. Some objected to their gathering up the bones. They said they will forget to worship Christ and they will start worshipping him now. People said we could never do that. Christ alone is our Saviour, and he is just a good man who has sealed his testimony with his death. /But you can see how even at this time people were afraid of the worship of saints Well, this is more or less isolated in the reign of But it was indeed a noble end to a noble life of service, and it shows the bravery of some of the Christian leaders and it does show the terror under which the people constantly had to live even though the persecution was slight at this time. They never knew when it might break out. Now the next ruler was a more logical minded ruler than any of those who preceded Marcus..... Marcus the emperor of Rome who was adopted by A..... from his deathbed, was a philosopher. A man who was a student of philosophy-- a man who is held by many to be as fine a man ~~XX~~ as ever occupied a throne anywhere in the world. He was constantly trying to do everything in line with justice and rightness and he was turning himself away from all kinds of sensual places of every sort and trying to devote himself to the study and the thought of what was best for the Roman Empire, but Marcus marks a vital change because he could not see the attitudes of his predecessors. They were practical men. He was more of a reasonal. They said here's a law that Christians are to be deleted. This is

the law. If someone is proved to be a Christian, he must be killed, but they said if they are good people on the whole, we are not going search them out. We 're not going to interfere with them except when there is a formal accusation. Well Marcus couldn't see any reason for this. He said the Christians are either good people who should be considered as legal or he said it is illegal and should be punished. He said the law is on the statute book. It has been the attitude of the for many many years that Christianity is forbidden. Well, then, he said, it ought to be forbidden. He said the idea of patting along and then ignore it is not right, and Marcus said the trouble with the people is that they are wickedness and selfishness and the trouble is they have forsaken their own Of course I don't believe in any of these ideas about but he said these are just symbols of great principles of righteousness and he said if the people won't worship the god ~~XXXX~~ how can you expect there to be some ordliness in the land. ^A And he said these Christians may be individually good people but they tear down the ordliness of the empere and to interfere with the respect people have for their Gods is a bad thing, and so under Marcus perhaps the ~~XXXX~~ best of all the emperors the policy was changed to a policy of deliberate persecuaion of the Christians. Up to this time we have had the two times when the emperors have ~~XXXXXX~~ instituted any large persecution against the Christians. They have been the wicked emperors. Nero and and the good emperors up to this time have either not persecuted Christianity at all or have tried to keep the persecution within bounds. Butthhhhh But now we have a change from this time on in general it is the good emperors who persecuted Christianity and in general it is the bad emperors who don't bother the Christians. From this time on the attitude of Marcus becomes the accepted attitude. The people must give up Christianity. An end must be put to this things. So about 170 Marcus instituted the most severe persecution that the empire had yet ~~XXXX~~ seen and by far the most widespread persecution. Whether it was any greater in proportion to the whole number of persons than that under Nero may be questinned. By this time, of course, there were many more Christians than under Nero, but certainly the number of individuals affected was far greater than under Nero. And it was a persecution not carried by a wicked tyrannical emper_{or} for his own personal attraction, but it was a persecution carried out by a

good men, a man who was interested in the welfare of his people and who was doing what he thought was for their welfare but it actually was an attempt to destroy Christianity by a brutal attack against them. And so under him we have in the year 166 we have a great persecution in which the greatest of the early apologists a man named Justin Martyr of whom we ~~XXXX~~ shall speak later and some of whose writings I will want you to read. Justin is the man's name, but he is called Justin Martyr by virtue of the fact that he died a martyr's death. Justin Martyr and six others in Rome in this year 166 were killed as a result of the attitude of Marcus..... many of those who declared themselves to be Christians were sent off as slaves into the to be forced under cruel treatment to work there in the mines. And 1..... End of Record 45

Beginning of Record 46..... In France. ~~XXXXXX~~ There in France which then was known as Gaul Christians were seized and brought before the emperor's officials. The first of them was a man of high rank, a leading advocate. He protested against the insults which were being made against the Christians there in Gaul, and he was then the first to suffer execution. A number of those who were brought and who were about to be killed could not stand the sight of the death ahead of them and therefore sacrificed to the emperor. And to the great sorrow of the others. And many slaves who were arrested and who confessed all kinds of terrible things about their Christian masters in order to escape. They were so terrible -- people who attended the services and who were much interested in the teaching which their masters had given to them in attempt to win them to Christ formerly accepted Christ, but when they were faced with torture they simply couldn't stand it and they saw that it pleased the persecutors to make up all kinds of stories about the wickedness of their masters and the criminal activity they were engaged in and the immorality all of which was done2..... but they made up these stories seeing if they could get off with the torture more easily. Then the people raged like wild beasts to the Christians. They said you see what these people are We should persecuted and killed and do away with them. There was a female slave named Glandina who was tortured for a whole day so cruelly that the tormentors wondered that she still continued to live, but she persisted in her faith to Christ and her refusal to turn against him in any way, a deacon in the Church at

had placed a red hog brass attached to his body in the most tender places, but he said nothing but I am a Christian. The others were brought and tortured and killed in various ways. The Bishop of L.... was over 90 was brutally beaten and died in prison. A number of others were tortured in the arena. Glandina who had survived this terrible day of torture was bound to a stake and there exposed to wild beasts. Another man was roasted alive. And Glandina, for some reason the animals didn't attack her, and she was on the stake there tied to it with the animals around eating up the other people but didn't attack her. So she who was one of the first to be tortured was the very last of ~~XX~~ all to die. But then they threw her into a net and she was killed by a bulls. He refused to let the bodies of the martyrs be buried, and they finally burned the ashes and cast them into the river. But Gregory of estimates the number of victims as 48, which after all is not such a tremendous large number. It was a very cruel persecution, but it does not seem to have affected such a large number of people. But this was the beginning of persecution on a larger scale than before, more widespread through the empire, of an attitude by the emperor of searching ~~XXXX~~ out the Christians and trying to put an end to the Christianity. And a movement which was considered to be a harmful movement, something that was injurious to the empire. When Marcus..... died he was succeeded by his actual son. He did not adopt a son as the predecessors had done for nearly a century. His own son succeeded him. And he was a man who was given over to false or to wickedness just as opposite from his father as anyone could possibly be. He was ~~so~~ wicked. He was immoral. He was brutal. He was everything that his father was not, but he couldn't see any sense in this persecution of the Christians. He didn't see anything He was interested only in his own pleasure, and he had a concubine named Marcia who for some reason was favorable to the Christians. We don't know why, but she induced him to order the persecution to stop. It continued a year two into his reign and then he ordered it stop and ordered the Christians released from the mines who were in this harsh cruel labor in the mines. Many of them came back to Rome and others places from the mines as a result of his orders and the persecution came to an end. The last Christian who was killed in his reign was a senator. Actually one of the Roman senators. He was killed ~~XXXXXX~~ but the informer who had given evidence and

against this senator ... and so they killed both of them. The senator and the man whom he accused as being a Christian. And so they had a period of about 20 years in which there was practically no persecution. You see the shift around from the evil men who persecuted the Christians. Now it ~~XXXX~~ becomes a matter of imperial policy by those who are interested in the welfare of the empire to try to destroy Christianity. This is about 170 A. D. You see it is over 100 years after the time of Nero that the shift was made. And so gave the Christians a break of 12 years of his reign and then after him the next man who reigned any length of time did not persecute the Christians for the first few years of his reign, but then began it again, and so at 200 A. D. another persecution breaks out. We'll leave that to the next century. Because it actually started 202 when the emperor made a law definitely speaking against Christianity. Did somebody have a question? Well, that is all we will say now about the persecution during this century. Most books dealing with this will trace the ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ persecution right through to the time ofConstantine, but I think it is useful for our understanding period by period. We will stop here at this turning point of the centuries. 100 the year of the end of the reign of who persecuted the Christians on a smaller scale than Nero. 200 just after the end of the wicked ruler who put an end to the persecution of the Christians as long as he was emperor. You see it is a complete turning about in the attitude of the emperors toward Christianity. Mr. Beck? Student.....

AAM; Of those we have discussed in class thus far Ignacius was seized in Antioch by the emperor, but he was sent to Rome to be killed. Often they would send people to Rome, but not all the time. All the persecutions in Gaul took place up there in Gaul. There were persecutions in Athens. Polycarp was killed over in Asia Minor, and my guess would be that there was a little more in Rome than other places but not much more. About the same. The emperor's authority goes all through the empire, and of course it might depend on the attitude of the governors whether they were quite anxious to carry out his policy or whether they weren't quite so anxious, but Marcus or someone near him in command we don't have definite evidence but under his authority that the word was sent to all the governors to carry out the persecution against the Christians and to root it out while previously no such order had been given by any good emperor.

Now Nero had had it carried out in.... as well as in Rome. But under Nero it was not a matter of Christianity itself but purely a matter of arbitrary cruelty. And persecution seems to be directly in Rome. His was directed at a few people who were rather prominent people in the Christian faith. Well now C. ~~XIX~~ under this head. The second century we looked at A the spread of Christianity B. we looked at persecution in this century C. The apostolic fathers Now this term apostolic fathers is a rather queer term, but it is a term which has become established in Christian usage in Christian history. The term the fathers, by the way, is a peculiar term. We use it for any Christian writer of the first six centuries. Any Christian writer. There is no reason they were any more fatherly than later on, but they were early, so we speak of them as the fathers. The is the study of the writings of The Christian writers of the first six centuries. Now and then we call them the apostolic fathers are the first fathers after the apostles. That is they are the first--the apostolic men are men were not but there are men who came right after them. The word probably got started that these were writers who knew the apostles. And we know the next generation the men who knew the apostles. Now in one of the assignments that I have given you I have assigned two ..11 $\frac{1}{4}$ XI..... Now the reading from Clement--we have several books. I think we have six books that it's in, but two of them are the A..... Fathers, and in the A.. Fathers there are two... that I want everybody to read. And because these two pages give a general vision of the apostolic fathers. Somebody has said that Christianity--that the Bible rather, is not like a European city. A city which as you approach it you come to suburbs. You come to little villages, and you come to shopping centers and all that and finally you get in to the great part of the city with its big buildings. It's not like that. It's like a city in the near east. A city perhaps in the desert somewhere where you are right in the heart of the desert, and you step right into the heart of the city. By that they mean you do not have a12..... a lot of other works that are almost as good as Bible writings. There is a sharp contrast between the Bible writings and the Christian writings which ~~XXXX~~ immediately followed. The finest of Christian works were not written immediately after the writing of the Bible. God put a ~~XXXX~~

sharp line of demarcation between them. Clement's epistle is a very nice epistle. It is a good book, but it is not in the category with the Biblical writings, and the other of the apostolic fathers, most of them, are definitely inferior to his ~~epistle~~ epistle. The apostolic fathers are good Christian men with high ideals, but they are not in the category with the Biblical writings at all. Now these apostolic fathers in the earliest of our writings, some of them are very good all of them have a true Christian spirit. ~~XXXX~~ I will name to you what are considered the apostolic fathers. We will not say a great deal about them. I may assign you sometime some reading about them, or I may assign you reading of some of them, but if I give you a quite a bit of detailed information about them here you wouldn't remember it and when you get to writing them down in notes I can assign you to it in the books. According to the theory of the church of Rome the Bible is God's word and no other written material is God's ~~word~~ word. Their only difference with us about the Bible is that they consider seven books to be part of the O. T. which we consider not to be. These books were written before the time of Christ. Those books they include in their O. T. But as far as the N. T. they accept exactly the same books as we do with no addition whatever. These apostolic fathers ~~XX~~ the church of Rome does not consider any more inspired than we do. End of Record 46

Beginning of Record 47 The men who gave a reason for their ~~faith~~ faith presented a carefully explanation that should be understandable to those who have taken the background of the reasons why Christianity was a reasonable viewpoint, and why persecution was not for the best interests of the Roman Empire. We entered that with fair mention of Tertullian, whom we are going to discuss under the next head or the next century, because the greater part of his activity was in the third century, but I wanted to mention in here the because he comes so logically in this series and also because of the fact that it is very good to have. 2. Tertullian at about 200 A. D. At the end of the first century we have Clement of Rome, just before the end of the first century. Right at the end of the second century we have Tertullian. These are two of our outstanding early Christian writers. All the other writers we have mentioned as yet come in between these two. Now we will go on to E. which is a very important

subject in regard to this second century. Opposition to Christianity other than persecution. We have already noticed the opposition of the persecution in this century to Christianity, and we have seen that while it was a constant force sometimes breaking out would be very severe always in the background always a possibility, yet there was no effort on the ~~part~~ part of the Roman Empire to destroy Christianity except for the persecution of Marcus..... And that was something which we don't know a great deal about. We do know that in Gaul it surpassed any persecution up to that time, and yet the total number of martyrs there was well under 100 in Gaul. We have evidence that it was also present in other lands. It was a real effort to suppress Christianity, but I'm not so sure that Marcus was filled with a desire to put an end to Christianity as that he felt logically that the law should be enforced. And logically Christianity was a view different from that of the Roman Empire and ~~it~~ it ought to be put down and he proceeded to make what under the previous emperors was rather hit and miss and make it a real effective attitude, but it only continued for a brief time, because after his death his son lost interest to enforce the law, so persecution was not the great tremendous thing against the church in this age that it was during the brief period of Nero or that it became at sometimes later on. During this century. But there was other opposition to Christianity also during this age, and under this ~~is~~ is pagan literary attack. The opponents of Christianity were not satisfied simply to try to kill and to torture the Christians in this century. There were those who did that. And there was a good deal of that in certain times and in certain places. There was probably on the part of most of the leading thinkers at this time knew ~~nothing~~ nothing about ~~Christianity~~ Christianity. They paid no attention to it. But there were those ~~who~~ who looked on Christianity as a serious development which needed an answering and during this century there is more of this type whose name is very well known. His name is ~~Celsus~~ Celsus . He lived about 150 A. D. He wrote an extensive and carefully reasoned attack on Christianity and many of the attacks ~~of~~ of modernists and unbelievers in this century were already ~~present~~ present well expressed in the writing of Celsus. He went in to the beliefs of the Christians he went into the pattern of the Bible whether the Bible was true, whether it was

~~terrible~~ dependable. He took up the vital points of Christian doctrine and Christian belief and he assailed them. He was an able man and he did a good job of the attack and the attack seems to have been an attack not in ridicule or a test to use unfair arguments as many attacks are but a pretty well reasoned essence to take the Christian viewpoint and to tear it to pieces. Celsus's work had not been preserved, but we know a great deal about it. We know many parts of it because of the fact that 100 years later a great Christian thinker of the century later ~~XXX~~ wrote a ~~work~~ work against Celsus in which he took up his book section by section and answered his arguments. And this writer of a century later was called Origen. We will say a good deal about him in our discussion of the next century. At the present point, our interest being right now in subjects rather than Origen the reason I mention Origen here is two-fold: It is to tell you how it comes that we know much about Celsus, but more than that ~~X~~ it is to stress the fact that Celsus writing must have had considerable influence. If a man a century later would think it worthwhile to take it ~~X~~ up and examine it in detail. You will find books which are written today attacking Christianity which are widely distributed, and sometimes you look at them and you think well now, this is an answer that means the end of our religion and 30 years later people have even forgotten that the book ever existed. They don't know anything about the man that wrote it. They just disappeared. I don't think anybody is asked today to sit down and write a book to answer Ingersoll about the Bible. although he during the last century went over this country for many years lecturing on the mistakes of Moses and trying to tear down people's faith in the Bible, and there was a period of a good many years there in which it was worth while and important for people to answer Ingersoll and to show the ~~fallacy~~ fallacy of his viewpoint, but as a living today he has disappeared. His writings are not reprinted and distributed today, but a century after Celsus wrote Origen felt it important enough to answer him and to distribute this book, ~~XX~~ so that would be pretty good evidence that ~~XXXX~~ Celsus's book was distributed to some extent at least although a century after he wrote it. And if some people were considering his arguments as having enough importance in the Roman world that they thought it was vital that an answer be written even at that late date.

But we don't know what answers may have been written before that, but we have no answers preserved before that. It is possible that a good many Christians early in Rome answered Celsus, but they were average men, and their writings were read and had an influence and were forgotten. Origen was an outstanding scholar. A man of tremendous influence, and what he wrote has been preserved, but it shows the importance and the influence of Celsus writings that Origen would have answered it a century later. So much for pagan literary attack. The fact that Celsus's attack would be so important leads us to think that there may very well have been other attacks, that have not been preserved. No. 2

Ebionism p----- Now Ebionism is a movement within the Christian church. It is the movement which is $\frac{1}{2}$ --- we find very important in the book of Acts, which is there spoken of as the Jud..... The Ebionist movement is the movement of those who emphasized the Jewish teachings to so great an extent that they tend to make Christianity become simply a branch of Judaism. Now some of these of course were Jewish Christians who were attracted by Christianity and came into it and perhaps were sincere believers in Christ, but who nevertheless, did not take their understanding of Christ and carry it over to their understanding of the whole Jewish system, and consequently had a mixed belief which was partly Jewish and partly Christian with an emphasis on the Jewish element in it to such an extent that logically ~~it~~ carried out it would mean the end of the distinctive Christian emphases and simply a branch of a sect of Judaism. They insisted on the necessity of keeping in this present age those important rights and ceremonies which had their vital place in looking forward to Christ but which are no longer necessary now that we know more details about Christ and about his what the things that were pictured in advance. It is interesting however, that Shaw in giving ~~four~~ ^{Ebionites} characteristics of the common/whom he says are more numerous give as the fourth characteristic that they believe that Christ is soon to come again to introduce the glorious mil reign of the Messiah. ~~with~~ with the earthly Jerusalem

..... He gives that as the four views of the larger class of the12.... Now that certainly shows another misunderstanding on his part, because the views of practically all the Christians at that ~~time~~ time were definitely pre-mil but it was part of an attitude which came in not very long after Constantine when

those who opposed pre-mil tried to make out that it was a Jewish viewpoint that represented old Jewish Well, it does if you take the hope of Isaiah and of Micah and the other great writers of the O. T. as old Jewish hopes. It is true that there were Jews who were building on these great teachings of the O. T. went on in their imagination to develop ideas about the Mil which was not taught in the O. T. some of which speculations are entirely possible that they may be true but others of them are rather fantastic going beyond the facts just as some Christians have done in many parts. And when people oppose pre-mil they pick out some of the ideas which have been developed by tradition going beyond what is in the scripture and say it is a Jewish idea which has been kept or developed in church practices of Christianity. But the history of the early church shows Shaw's statement right here is completely false. That it was in any way a particular of Judaism because he will show in other parts of the book that it is also held by men who It was the predominant belief in the second century. I think we could say without fear of any successful contradiction that 95 per cent at least of the Christians of the second century were definitely pre-mil and practically all of the leaders at this time were. There are many of the leaders of various groups for whom we have very definite and clear statements and there is none from this century of whom we have any statement of opposition of pre-mil, but he gives that as one of the ~~XXXX~~ characteristics. Now the others are different from this. The more common Ebionite he says their views may be reduced to the following: (1) Jesus is the promised Messiah, but he is a mere man, not God himself. Origen speaking of this compares this 14½..... Thou son of David have mercy on me. Their second view was that circumcision in the observance of old ritual law is necessary for salvation. Their third however, that all Paul is an apostate and heretic and all of his epistles are to be ~~XXXXXXXX~~ discarded. End of Record 47

Beginning of Record 48 because it was held by all believers at this time There was a second class of Ebionites. There were various sects who held the views of speculative measure in which they would take their various elements of Christianity or Judaism and develop them philosophically they were much smaller than this 1½..... Student:..... AAM: There is a book in

the library by a man named Ayre. It is called Sources for Early Church History. He has about three or four ~~g~~ pages in which he quotes from several of the apostolic fathers their statements from pre-mil. Another good ~~g~~ source would be the second volume of Shaw's church history where he deals with it. He mentions the fact there he is not dealing with the second century. He is dealing with the whole period up until 300. And he says among the greatest leaders of the church were those who were strong and then he names about ten of them and then he says it was opposed by them, and then he gives a list of names most of whom come at the very end of the period long after the second century. Student AAM: I don't remember specifically at the moment but the statement that there is to be great tribulation just before the coming of Christ is referred to at least in some, because They all agree to that.....3..... Well the Ebionites then did not become a great movement which threatened the church. It was rather an emphasis which in some areas would become rather strong, and which was a great force to be met in the days of Paul at the council in Jerusalem which the Ebionite tendency was met ~~etc~~ Those who accepted Christ as the Messiah as the Saviour, but did not realize it is tremendous importance to the point where it met a changing of the ~~XXXX~~ relationship of the O. T. Law, and Paul met th--s4..... and finally there was the council of Jerusalem, but the attitude is still continuing. And we have this Ebionite movement which is important during this age in which I put as opposition to Christianity under the persecution as opposition within the Christian Church of men who do not fully understand the Christian teaching some of whom were thorough going Christians, but since they put an emphasis on certain phases which were logically carried out ~~XX~~ with the contradictions to Christianity others carried these emphasis to the point where in their belief they actually were not truly Christian. But there was very a variation Student..... AAM: The emphasis on the ceremonial law. I think you're dealing with a different subject ~~that~~ than what I was talking about. It may be a subject of great importance and it might have given that impression. I was speaking of an attitude toward keeping the Ten Commandments. I was ~~XXXXXX~~ speaking of an attitude toward keeping ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ circumcision and the very different phases of the ritual law. Now it is true

that at all periods in Christianity and in Judaism there have been individuals who have thought that salvation was a matter of being a good man rather than being saved by grace. But this has never been true Judaism or true Christianity. The O. T. never says anybody can be saved by keeping the moral law. Nobody has ever been saved in that way. If a man truly kept it, he would need salvation, but no man has ever been truly kept it. The law was given to show the kind of life God wanted his true people to live. And to show them how far short they had come before they were saved of the kind of life which would be necessary for a man if he was able by law by living for Christ to become a child of God, and the law is just as important for that purpose now in the moral law as it was then. I think that Mr. Smith has a real point that we are not that there is something which was right in the Jewish time and became wrong in the Christian time. Not at all. But there were certain ceremonies which in the Jewish time looked forward to Christ. And these ceremonies were very important and anybody who would knowingly squirm circumcision and the sacrifice, and the various prescriptions of the ~~MOSAIC~~ Mosaic law would put himself outside the of the possibility of salvation natural because he would be that which God had given him. But God gave it not as something which of itself could bring salvation but which could point those people to Christ through whom they as well as we could be saved, and through whom and apart from it no one ever has been saved or ever will be saved. But this Ebionite movement was a movement which came from ~~XXXXX~~ either a great sentimental attachment to these things without realizing that they were tremendously important in their place..... $7\frac{1}{4}$ it comes wither from that or from the understanding of the true Christianity and it was sometimes carried to the extreme as to deny the deity of Christ. Or to deny scriptural of Paul's epistles, but I believe these were rare. It was a force to be recognized, but not nearly important as the next movements which I will mention. The next which was tremendously important. Student:..... AAM: That is Tertullian was perhaps the first to wonder about it. Tertullian said that there must have been a man named Ebion who was the founder but we don't know anything about it. We know there must have been such a man for it to be called Ebionite, but that is Tertullian's theory. Shaw says the name comes not of Tertullian first intimated

from a supposed man be the name Ebion of whom we know nothing, but from the Hebrew word Shaw says it may have been, originally like Nazarene of Galilee a designation of all Christians, the majority of them living under these circumstances.9..... Nobody knows where the name came from. Maybe there was a man Ebion. Maybe it comes from the Jewish word since it is so similar to Ebion. It's a good guess. Well, how does it come from the word poor. Blessed are the poor in spirit, they think they were the poor and the meek, or did somebody else say poor worthless people. Nobody knows. It is like the word one of the greatest groups of wonderful Christians in the world history are the The Calvinists of France who stood for their faith and hundreds of thousands of them died for their faith and a third of France became thoroughly until Christ died in treachery and in a course of a century it was destroyed. But nobody knows where the word came from. There are a lot of guesses and none of them have much real The ~~XX~~ name which sprung up within these last four centuries and where did it come from? We just don't know. Somebody's guess is that it comes from the German A person who is united with you. Well, why would they be called that particularly? Yes, this is what Paul was attacking in his epistle to the Galatians. movement which came to be called the Ebionites, and it may have been more important in the first century than in the second century. It was a movement which continued on from that time and was found to some extent for a long time and Origen goes into it to considerable length. Well, then, No.3 is a movement which was so great and so strong and so powerful during this century that it threatened completely to put an end to a real Christian movement, and in fact, some people looking at this second century think that true Christianity came about as near to being wiped out and overshadowed by this movement during that century as it has been in this century by modernists, and some people point many parallels, but the movement is one which has come to be called Gnosticism. You might say that it is the other side from Ebionism, because Ebionism might be saying here is a Jewish background of Christianity ; let's12..... Now this is more the Greek background. The Hellenic background--the background of the thinker, the reasoner, not going by tradition, but going by understanding. That of course is a very

important thing to understand what they mean, but we ~~XXXX~~ probably find the Gnosticisim beginning as early as the writings of the apostle Paul. If Paul wrote his epistle to the Galatians in order to know the following of Ebionisim as he undoubtedly did is not quite as certain but ~~is~~ highly probably that he wrote the epistle to the Colossians to show the error of Gnosticism. At least there are statement in the epistle to the Colossians which make no sense unless they are interpreted with the understanding that Paul was aware of a tremendous movement which was springing up among the Colossians which had to be met, a movement which was putting emphasis in the same direction in which they were later puã by the development which we call Gnosticisim. Paul speaks about the danger of being spoiled. He says in Colossians 2:8 "Beware lest any man spoil you to philosophy and vain deceit after the traditions of men and the rudiments of the world and not after Christ." And he says in Verse 18 "Let no man beguile you of your reward in a voluntary humility and worshipping of angels intruding into those things which he has not seen vainly puffed up by his fleshly mind, and not holding the head from which all the body by joints and bands having nourishment ministered, and knit together, increaseth with the increase of God." In Colossians we find Paul facing a group of people who say we have a philosophy which the ordinary Christian does not understand, but we know what things we mean. We have the understanding. We have the background of ~~it~~ it. And if you've got our philosophy then you have got the truth, whereas if you just have what the Bible says about Christ and salvation through him you've got some valuable things End of Record 48

Beginning of Record 49and understand the thing not revealed in the scriptures which gave them a viewpoint of Christianity which the ordinary Christian would know nothing about, and very soon they went on from that to develop various aspects to the point where became more important to them that the things which are revealed in scriptures. And then the next thing is to go on and deny certain of the Christian teachings. It is a tradition that there was a man named in the latter part of the first century who was one of the early leaders of the Gnosticists. We don't much about it. It was very early.

But we do have tradition that Cerinthus came in conflict with the agent of

In fact the story is told that once John went to the public bath in Ephesus

and when he went there he saw in there he said I better get out of this place in a hurry The Lord's ~~judgment~~ judgment may fall and the whole thing would be destroyed. I better get out of here, and he rushed out of the bath thinking it might fall in with a man like C..... in there. Now, that is a tradition and whether there is anything to it as to the particular incident, we don't know but there is pretty good evidence that the apostle John felt that the views of C.... were nothing to take lightly, and it is undoubtedly the fact that in the epistles of John there are very very strong statements. Take the ~~XX~~ second of John. If any one come to you and bring not this doctrine receive him not into your house neither have fellowship with him. If you want separation from unbelief or apostasy I don't know any better place to go for it than to the writing of the apostle of ~~love~~ love, the apostle John in his epistles. Statement after statement in emphasis on the terribleness of unbelief and for the willingness of having fellowship and working in cooperation of those denying the blood of Christ and turn down the teaching of his deity. Well, of course, those statements in John's epistles show his attitude toward unbelief with very very strong attitude toward apostasy, but they do not bring out anything of the part of this Gnostic development his attitude to it as his tradition does by relation to the Corinthians Paul's epistles do $3\frac{1}{2}$ We find that the feeling of this development as time went on there were people who accepted Christianity but who said well, that is very good, but you must understand. And as they went on to try to understand it they got rid of a good many of its basic teachings, and the Gnostic movement came to be a movement found in all parts of the Roman World, and there were many branches of it. There were all kinds of views. One thing that many of them were much interested in was the attitude towards the body. What about the human body. What is our attitude towards it. They found sensuality all around and wickedness and some of them said first the Bible speaks of the sins of the flesh and it speaks of that which of the flesh does not.... and they took the word flesh as to mean the body. Now the N. T. does not use the word flesh in the meaning of the body. The flesh is the selfish man, the carnal man, the man who is interested in his own feelings, rather than in God's personal will. The Bible never presents the human body as ~~being~~ being evil in any way. It is

something which a wrong emphasis on it as anything God has made become evil, but the body itself is a wonderful good thing which God has given us and which when rightly used is good and not in any sense evil. That was the Christian teaching but among the Gnostics there were those who said the body is evil. We want to get away from the body. We want to live a spiritual life and not a bodily life. The Bible ~~is~~ never says that the spiritual life is divorced from the bodily life. It is spiritual following the Holy Spirit as divorced from fleshly following our individual fleshly attitude and instinct of person desires. It is God living in us and not spirit living in body, but they took this attitude and a large groups of Gnostics went to an extreme of the The less we pay to the natural desires of our body, the less attention we pay to it the better, the more we put the stress only on the spirit. And then there was another groups of ~~gnostics~~ ~~gnostics~~ gnostics who went in the other direction and they said the body is entirely evil Therefore the quicker we destroy it the better. Let's go into all kinds of sensual excess , and we can get rid of it much quicker. And you have the two extremes. A small group going in sensuality and a large group going into neither of ~~which~~ which is a Biblical teaching. The Bible teaches that the body should never be the end always the means, but a good means which is to be rightly used and not to be and so we have among the gnostics this great emphasis on the attitude toward the physical and toward the body. And then ~~there~~ there was a great emphasis on them in the understanding and trying to understand what was facts of the Bible trying to understand the real nature of the angels as Paul says here Going into things and shooting into things that they don't know about. Paul doesn't say they may not be true, but they are truths which God hasn't revealed and for every such truth they grasp they may ~~grasp~~ grasp ahold of a hundred things which aren't true, and we find among the gnostics many many different groups with many different ideas and interpretations of the universe. Some of these ideas holding Christ in a very important part of their system of belief/ some of them pushing Christ back to the point where he is hardly more than just a name in the course of their belief. One of the great leaders of the early Gnostics was a man named Marcion. Marcion was a man who would seemed to have become a real Christian in

his early life. He is one who was tremendously influenced by the teaching of salvation of Christ. He was the son of a Christian Bishop in his first fervor he gave his property to the church but when he began going on and changing his views his own father excommunicated him. At least so the tradition says. About the middle of the second century he came to Rome and in Rome there he joined another Gnostic and ~~XXXXX~~ joining together they developed their ideas and they began spreading them. It ~~XXX~~ said there were two or three final forces the good and gracious God and the evil matter by the devil and the righteous world make it. This righteous world maker is the finite in perfect angry Jehovah of the Jews. So the God of the O. T. is a righteous God insisting on the law being kept but he's an imperfect angry evil one even though insisting on good laws and good moral principles and the good and gracious God was first revealed by Christ unknown ~~XXXX~~ before, and he strongly opposed Paul's epistles. He said that they were not to be taken as authoritative. He took an opposition to the O. T. having any authority over the Christians he developed a view as you see that went very far from Christianity. As a young man in Asia Minor he had known Polycarp, and when Polycarp was an old man and went to Rome to see the bishop of Rome to discuss the date of Easter they say that one day there in Rome Marcion sought him and Marcion seeing this old man whom he knew in the early days was very pleased to see him, and he says Polycarp, do you remember me? And Polycarp, said I know you, the first born of Satan, and that shows the attitude that Polycarp had toward Marcion. Polycarp knew of Marcion's teachings being spread through the Roman World and Marcion himself going about presenting his wonderful teachings of the understanding of what Christianity really was, which proved to be something which wasn't Christian at all. Student:..... AAM: He through large portions of the Bible. He considered the O. T. of little value, and he rejected the pastoral epistles and he, but many of these Gnostics got to where they would accept certain parts of the Bible. So you see in the attitude of John towards ... is the attitude of Polycarp toward Marcion. You see how these Christian leaders felt about this movement which was coming to be so widespread until in the city you might have a great and lovely group of fine Christian people and then these Gnostic teachers would come in and they must have felt just the ~~the Jews~~

felt originally when Paul began to come in and Paul was preaching Christ and the people would be leaving the synagogues and following a Paul. In these Christian groups the Gnostic leaders would come in and they would start explaining to them the real understanding of the Bible. The real understanding in the light of real knowledge and real philosophies and they would find that ~~XXXXX~~ perhaps all of these well-to-do people and the educated people in their church would be going off and following these Gnostic teachers and getting the true understanding and only a few of the ~~X~~ poorer people stayed true to the simple teachers of the Word of God, and it was a tremendous force which looked as if the Christianity might just be split up into a great many little sections each with its own particular understanding of these points and many of them rejecting most of the basic teachings of the Bible. It was a tremendous force in the second century. Now, most that ~~XXX~~ we know about Gnosticism comes from the Christian writer who has written in opposition to them, and we will assign some reading from some of them and we'll not take the time in the class here to go into great lengths in details of the views of any of the Gnostic teachers. There were great varieties to their views, some of whom had a few followers and some had thousands of followers, but here in this second century under the constant pressure of Roman persecution you will find this Gnostic teaching coming in as the apostle John says they were not of us for if they would have been of ~~XX~~ us they would doubtless have continued with us. They have gone out from us and these people were going out to form their new groups all over of people who were denying many of the Christian teachings, and some of them holding certain books of the Bible and some to others. Among them there was a great development of a system of ~~X~~ a belief that there is the great unmovable absolute God. He is so great you can't know anything about ~~X~~ him, and he's so great that he is untouched by us and couldn't have anything to do with us and from him came another God and out of him came another and out of him came another and then the last one that came out is Christ, and Christ made the world, and we are thus separated by all of these great..... and the one great unknowable God whom we can't reach or touch. And all these sorts of theories tried to explain the understanding of the universe were developed by the Gnostics, many of them conflicting with one another, but some of them received a great number of followers and how

discouraging it was to Christians and their leaders in those days. After that someone had been won from a life of wickedness and sin once in the love of Christ and coming to the Christian Church and showing great zeal and fervor in his Christian life, then have one of these Gnostic teachers come along and this man would seem to be such a fine Christian for a time think now I'm getting the true understanding And goes off and follows this Gnostic teachers., in spreading this false philosophy This misunderstanding thinking he had a true understanding not contained in the scripture and leading people away from Christianity instead of toward it. There is very little of the problem we have to face in this century that the second century Christians didn't have to face. Well, I just want to mention No. 4 here. The reason I just want to mention No. 4 here is because while it was a very important factor ~~XXXXX~~ in the next century, we find little more than the beginning in this century. So I want to mention it here for completeness in the century though we will deal with it more in the next century, and that is14..... It is very strange

End of Record 49 and Beginning of Record 50

IN THE IDEA OF two gods the god of Christ and the God of the old Testament. Opposite to each other, and all this sort of thing, but the main came to be used for people who identity of the Bible to the point where they said the fact there is one God to such a great extent that they denied the deity of Christ, and some denied it by saying Christ is a mere man, but the majority of them denied it by saying Christ is simply God the father under another name. Christ is simply God the father under another name. There is one God there are not two gods or three gods. There is one God and the movement as you see begin where they stress the unity of the Godhead, but it goes on to a point where it denies the trinity. Student:..... AAM: There are many today who hold similar views. And there were many different ways in which this view was held, but it is a penalty which begins as a good thing. The fact that there is one god, but which in stressing certain aspects of that goes on to point out it is denying the very heart of the Gospel, and is very very dangerous and very wrong. Sometimes it is called which would be more exactly what you are speaking. The different moods in which God manifests as the Father, as Christ the Son, as the Holy Spirit. Now that is not true to the Christian teaching. The Christian Teaching is that God, the one god,

is in three persons which exists through all eternity as three distinct persons but one God. Student:..... AAM: I haven't mentioned him yet because he is in the beginning of the next century , but it comes to be called sometimes and sometimes Unitarianism. There are different names used for it, but that was the name used at that time, so that is the name I have given it so far, and we'll say more about it in the next century in the first century it becomes an important movement as the very end of the century, but throughout the century Gnosticism is a ~~XXXXXXXX~~ tremendously important movement. And it is an important movement not only in the fact that it led people away from the church, but in the reaction which it had upon the church. Well, now writers. And now P is (Pelencic) writers and plenty of the apologists wrote against various Gnostic groups which had not been preserved and we know these men as apologists because their apologies have been preserved. Now Tertullian who wrote a great apology also wrote ~~X~~ extensively against the Gnostics which has been preserved, and under these writers here there is one I want to mention who wrote about many different writings, but the ones which have been preserved are principally the ones against the Gnostics. And so I mention them particularly under this heading P writers, and his name strangely as a P... writer is the name of peace Irenaeus. Irenaeus was a man who was a man who was in Asia Minor, and there who Polycarp and Papias and other great leaders from the early Christian church in the age just after the death of the apostles. He spread his views there in Smyrna and then he ~~was~~ went west and he made a trip which was a much bigger trip than it would be today from here to California. It would be more like going from here to Japan. He went way out West to France and there in Gaul he became a leader among the Christians. I ~~XX~~ mentioned to you how under Marcus the Bishop of Leo was martyred. Irenaeus was chosen as his successor and he was the Bishop of Lyons in Gaul. And he wrote extensively and his works are very important, so important that we have to pay a few words to him in addition to what we have been able to say ~~XXXXXX~~ today, but he is remembered particularly for his anti-Gnostic writings, and so I put him here under these writers. The very ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ important leader in the church during the latter part of the second century. We'll speak more of him tomorrow. The opposition to Christianity other than persecution and then we began to mention

pagan literary attacks of which we don't know much in this century, but the answer given in the next century dealt with the writings of this century. I mentioned Ebionism which was a strong force in the first century, considerable force in the second century. I mentioned Gnosticism which was the great opposition movement of this century. A movement which looked for a time as though it would completely over run the church, because all of these different groups of the intelligent people thought that they could understand things and know what they were all about and make their explanation of the universe instead of taking what the Bible says. And they got different types of explanations so in general they agreed on thinking that the God of the O. T. and the God of the N. T. were opposed to one another. How similar to much of this modernism of today! And some of them thought the God of the O. T. was an evil God whom the God of the N. T. was fighting. Some of them thought the God of the O. T. was one who was used by the God of the N. T. for his purposes and yet a different one, and the God of the O. T. with his strict law was not what they wanted, and some of them said the God of the N. T. is the right God and therefore all the bad people of the O. T. are the good people, because the good people of the O. T. were the servants of this God who is not the one we want to follow, and one of the larger groups called themselves Cannites, because they would glorify Cain and they would glorify Esau, and they would take all the people that were not represented as good people in the O. T. and they would glorify them, most of them would claim that they were following N. T. teaching. There is no opposition between the Old and the N. T. The apostles make it clear. The N. T. is built on the Old and carries on the teachings of the Old, makes them more explicit because Christ had come. The two form a unit, but Gnosticism tried to make the two opposed to each other. Now, Gnosticism is such a big movement it will be worth a lot of time, and I'm going to give you some reading to do on it about one of these days, but there is not great value in learning a great many details about the view of these different sects. The vital thing to learn is what is right and these views are definitely wrong. The fourth of these M..... we barely talked about. We did not go into it because it is a movement which comes just at the end of the century and is very important in the next century rather than this one, but we have to mention it because it did begin at the end of the second century. Other writings

A number of the writers we have mentioned wrote against Gnosticism. Justin Martyr, for instance, was the writer I'm mentioning particularly of the P writers and by the way I don't know if you are all familiar with the term P.... It is one of the technical theological terms just like apologetic in theology doesn't mean to be apologetic at all. It means to be forthright in defense of the faith. It means to present the evidence, and P..... however if the word exactly what it means etomologically. It comes from the word and P..... is one who is attacking false doctrines. A P..... is a writing assailing that which is wrong, and so there were many P... writers in this century, but the one whom we think of particularly under this head is I..... and the reason that we think of him ~~XX~~ under that head is his great Polemic work against Gnosticism has been preserved while many of the other works have been lost, and much of what we know of Gnosticism we learn from Iremaeus. Iremaeus was a man who brought up in Asia Minar at the feel of Polycarp. He often heard Polycarp tell about the apostle John, his contacts with him and what he had learned from him. Iremaeus knew others there who had known the apostle. He was there for you see just one step removed from the apostle in his contacts. There are some who think that Iremaeus may have gone with Polycarp on his trip to Rome when they discussed the time ~~of~~ of the Easter celebration. It is possible that he did this. We do not know, but we do find I... in the center of his life living over in France, and we wonder how he got there and it's not only possible though nobody knows that he made the trip to Rome with Polycarp and there in Rome heard about France and decided to move up there. But any rate, we find that the time of the terrific persecution in France under Marcus I is already a~~3~~..... there in France. There he is in Gaul in the city of Lyons, and when the Bishop of Lyons was killed inn the persecution, I.... was selected to be the successor, and so he became the head of the church in this city. He was a very active Christian, very energetic, a man of great leadership and influence, and according to tradjtion just about everybody in Lyons was converted as a result of his efforts, and he sent missionaries unto other parts of Gaul, and became a very influential leader there and was also very active in writing and we have the names of a large numberof the books which he wrote. DEFENCES OF THE FATTH, DISCUSSIONS OF THE MEANINGS OF

OF VARIOUS BOOKS OF THE SCRIPTURE, but one great book that has been preserved, the outstanding one of those that are preserved is this book of his against heretics. I. . . is very important in connection with our study of the N. T. its genuiness because he makes specific references to it. He is also very important from the Roman Catholic view of their defense of the claims of the Bishop of Rome because he's the principleforce from whom we get names of early bishops of Rome. I read to youk this statement from a R. C. textbook on church history it said, whether the second or third popes are the same man or whether they are different men..... Beginning of Record 51 truth of the Church of Rome. And the Church at Rome likes to take the words from him as evidence of their..... church. As a matter of fact, I think here under F. Polemic writers, this is as good a place as any to speak a little bit about the effect of heresy on the organization of the church during this period. This is a matter on which we do not have any explicit statements from ancient times, but on which most writers of church history are ver..... on. They believe, and probably from the logic stem correctly, that the church was greatly affected in this century by the necessity of maintaining a position against the Gnostic movement and the Gnostic views which were coming in. If you were going to have all the groups of Christians as soon as people were converted to the Lord have people coming in and presenting Gnostic speculation and new interpretations which would do away with some of the books of the Bible and which would push the doctrines around in such a way that as many of the Gnosti held Jesus was just a phantom ~~utilizing~~ utilizing what looked like a man, but wasn't a man at all or that it was a combination of the man Jesus2½..... with the two of them working together, actually not one person at all, but the divine Christ/ using the man Jesus or some other such unChristian view, if all of these other views would come in and just leave the people with all tangled ideas you wouldn't have anything left to the Church, and the leaders, and the thinkers, and the Christian church found it necessary to combat this and of course one of the great ways they combat it was by writing like ~~Irmaeus~~ Irmaeus, but there were others. Now most books on church history will tell you that a N. T. became established as a result of the opposition to Gnosticism. I think that is going much too far, but I would say this that the Gnostics coming in an

disputing some books made people ask the question What are the real books that God has inspired? What are the true books of the Bible? It increased interest in that question and led people to inquire about it. I don't think it led them to make the decision. I think God makes the decision, but the people -- the liberal writers and writers that were slightly liberal will say the church selected the books which they would make their authority in opposition to Gnosticism. I think The church decided to make absolutely sure that they had the right books in the time of Gnosticism. They determined that their people should know what was in tune with God said they would not be misled. Now, you find a different in the expressions. For instance, Justin Martyr speaks about the of the ~~the~~ apostles. Now that is a general term. We believe he means the four gospels ^{and} ~~of~~ the ~~the~~ Acts. But it's quite a general term. Justin Martyr doesn't tell us precisely what books he means but then when you have the Gnostics coming in and sayind here is a book that tells you the real truth about Christ. It's a secret book and it is kept among the well informed people and not given out to the general public, but it's a good book and when it contradicts the gospel of John, you take it instead of John and when they would say you must accept the gospel of Luke and not the other gospels, and such statements you find I. . . . in his writing, there are four gospels. There are four books which God has inspired and are the true record of the life of Christ and of course there would be four. He says there are four winds. There are four points of the compass. There are four faces of the cherub in Ezekiel and there would be four gospels. Well, now his first two arguments I don't think have any weight whatever. His third argument about the cherub. I believe the cherub was a true of the gospel very definitely. I think it is a valid argument, but we would have to study Ezekiel to see just how it is. I am sure the other two arguments ~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~ affected more of the readers much more than this. Very often false arguments will affect people much more than true arguments, but you see the difference in attitude. Justin Martyr says we have the memoirs of the apostles and we read about what Christ did and said. He presented Christianity to a pagan world~~y~~ that knows nothing about it. I. . . . thirty or fo~~ur~~ty years later is dealing with a world in which Gnostic teachers are coming all around and presenting new books and deny

ing some of these books and I... says there are four gospels. There must be four. It's absolutely necessary that there be four. there are four directions in the world. There are four winds; there must be four Gospels. Well, people get excited about6... b.ecause of their insistance on the point they are tremendously excited about, and this is a point worth being excited about. It is vital to know just exactly what the scriptures say. And I... is a testimony to us that at his day the leaders of the Christian Church were convinced that there were four gospels. That there were four and there were only four. And I... goes into various books and shows it to make it clear just what are the correct books of the scriptures, so that the people would not be mislead by the Gnostics. I would say then that Gnosticism forced the church to make its position clear, and to make definite what were the two books to make it understandable to people. I don't think it made them excited. I don't think they had the right to make them excited. I think the Lord had given them the inspired books and those were the books they had, but it made them determined not to get confused on the matter and to get other books mixed up with them. Now the other thing which many writers talk about the influence of Gnosticism on the church is the organization of the church and it must have had an influence here. As long as you have a church where everybody believes and everybody ~~K~~ who that comes into the church is thrown right in his doctrine you don't care much who speaks. Here's a man who wants to give a message. Let's hear him. You don't care what it is. You know it's all true and that is absolutely the way in the church in the heathen areas. But after a little while you find people coming and they say I want to give a message, and they talk as if they ~~KNOW~~ believe exactly the way you do and they give up and give the message and pretty soon you find that they are undercutting the very things which you believe. They are attacking what you think is vital and you soon decide that it is necessary before you that a stranger give a message in your church that you know something about where he stands, and what he believes, and I'm sure that we have this effect in the church the coming of Gnosticism. It lead the people to determine they must be more careful about the leadership of their church to keep it sound and true. And so we find I... using as one of his big arguments about Gnosticism. People said, well, what are we going to believe. Here is this man

that says ~~there are only two gospels~~ Luke is the only true gospel. And there is a man who says the O. T. is a lot of foolishness defending that which is not true and not in line with Christ, and here you say the O. T. is true and is God's Word that points to Christ. Who are we going to believe? What did I... say? He says, do you want to know who to believe? I know it is a difficult problem for you. How are you going to tell? Are you going to select the man that has the best voice or makes the best appearance? That seems to be the most pleasing personality? That's not the way to decide what truth is. Well, I.... says, I'll tell you the way that will be helpful. He says, you go to a church which has been established from the time of the apostles. A church in which the apostles were there and gave the truth and there is a continuous history of Christian leadership in that church since that time, and he said you see what they teach in that church, and he says, you will find that the churches that have a history you can trace right back to the apostles' time are agreed on the ~~xxx~~ teaching of the scripture and on what Christianity is, and he says, Naturally there is a good reason to think that is the true teaching of the scripture, rather than what is held by a lot of churches that have just sprung up recently and don't have the deep roots that these others have. And so, he said, go back to Polycarp over there in Smyrna. Go back to Antioch where you have the bishops who go right back to Ignacius and right back to Peter, bishop of Antioch and Paul the Apostle leading in Antioch. Here you have a record a place where there has been the teaching of the doctrine right through this century and a half. He says, go to Rome and in Rome you will find that Peter and Paul the apostles were in Rome and he said I..... was leader ---- you have these men one from the other and he said see what these churches believe and see what these churches agree on, and that's a good way to know what the truth is. Well, it is a matter of trusting people to get their feet on the ground and decide as between the ~~of~~ the Gnostic sect ~~of~~ and the orthodox Christian viewpoint. And probably there was real value in the argument he gave. But the Roman church today says see what I... says. He says the truth is in the Church of Rome where Peter put it. Peter, the head of the church. Then Peter passed it on and so on.. I... Does'nt say that. Then, he says, I.. . is a witness to the fact that the Roman church is the head church I. never said it is the head church He said it

is an important church. He said they are people who have a history reaching back to the time of the apostles, and it is reasonable to think ~~XXX~~ that there will a preservation of the truth there. It may be just as true in some churches started last year, but it's a little hard to prove that it is. Here you have a continuous record of the leadership of the church. Now, the Episcopal Church today made a great deal of the doctrines of the Apostolic succession, and they will base this on I.... The apostles appointed these men, and they appointed others, and they appointed other, etc. Well, now, that is not EX I.... argument. He is simply arguing so people will know what the true doctrine is against the false and one method they can use to try to determine it to see how the true doctrine has been preserved in these various churches that have record going way back. The people take his language and get an idea of apostolic succession, and they say the fact that Christ put his hands on Peter and Paul and others gave them a special authority to put their hands on successors, and in the Church of England today they will tell you. Archbishops that have been consecrated by bishops who were consecrated by bishops could go right back to the days of the apostle Paul. Now in the days of the Reformation in Denmark the King of D... simply swept aside the R. C. leader and put in a ~~XXX~~ Protestant leader and you have Protestant teaching in Denmark ever since, but there was a with the former leaders. In Sweden, they did a different thing. In Sweden, he told the leaders of the church to ordain new men whom he designated, and these new men were trained under Martin Luther, so the leadership of the church in Sweden gradually changed while Denmark was suddenly changed and both the people were in favor of what the King did, and the King carried out the wishes of the people. But it was done in two different ways, and the result is that the Church of England today will tell you that the bishops of the church of Sweden are men who have the apostolic succession. If any one of them comes to him, he can preach in our church. He is recognized as a true bishop, but a man from the bishop of the church of Denmark will ^{not} be recognized in the church of England because there was a break 400 years ago and they were not consecrated by the man who had been consecrated by those who had been consecrated by the apostles originally. Well, now that is a magical sort of an idea which we find no more of whatever in the Bible. We find no more teaching of the early

Christians, but you can see how it developed from this effort of I... and others to convince people that they should hold to the true doctrine rather than to the new doctrine of the Gnostics, so this idea of apostolic succession developed, and the idea of the primacy of Rome, did not develop as early as that, but a step was taken in that direction, or at least the writing of I... and others are used today by the church of Rome to make us think that it was held at that time. So you see Gnosticism had an effect on making the church its organization....14½.....

Naturally as long as everything was going along nicely in the church everything is smooth, somebody wants to do something one way and somebody wants to do it another way everything is very easy doing and nobody cares much. Who has the say?

End of Record 51 and the Beginning of Record 52 What shall we do? And they are apt to follow his ideas not only on the big things, but on the little things. And so in times of crisis or emergency inevitably you get control by a small group. For any sort of efficient operation you have to have a unified control, but the danger of unified control is that eventually it falls into wrong hands. You get efficiency with small centralized unified control. You have a danger, and so democracy means not that everyone runs it, but that the loyally support their leaders as long as the leaders are true to the ideas that the group believes. And if the leaders turn aside from those ideals or prove inefficient they throw them out and get new leaders and then loyally follow those new leaders. Now the question of course was ~~but~~ how are they agoing to throw out the leaders? What was the method used to determine how the new leaders were chosen and this ~~leade~~ method there were many different varieties even in the selection of the popes of Rome. There has been a history of many different methods being used before they can determine2..... which they have used for some centurées now. So you see how there was a development in the church which would have come inevitably for the sake of efficiency you're bound to get a greater centralization and then when the centralization falls into the wrong hands, people instead of blaming the wicked leaders are apt to blame centralization, and then you get a development where everybody wants to run everything himself and not to have any leadership and you go into the other extreme. You have the practice of one extreme or the other in every type of organization. Over in England in the seventtenth century the arch-

was trying to control the Church of England with an iron hand. And the Pilgrims and the Puritans were so disgusted with that attitude of these archbishops who were trying to our main teachings and to destroy the former testimony of the ~~the~~ church of England that when they came over to the U. S. here they said we are not going to have any authority over us. Each of our churches absolutely supreme in itself, and so you have the Congregational systems develop in New England with every church a law unto itself and in the history of the U. S. although the Congregational churches have the first start and they were in those days very very true and loyal to Christ ~~XXXXXXXX~~ continued so for a couple of centuries. The right of the congregational church in this country have been a fraction of the other churches because the Congregational churches have this lack of any unified direction. On the other hand individual churches of them remain true long after other groups went completely into Modernism. And even today you'll find an occasional Congregational church that is absolutely loyal to the faith, although by this time most of the Congregational churches have been taken over by modernism and unbelief. On the other hand the Methodist church came into this country a century and a half after the Congregational church was here, but it had a control. It had godly men who as Bishops having absolute control would say/^{who}would ~~be~~ be allowed to preach and who wouldn't preach, and these men were godly and efficient leaders and the methodist church spread tremendously and when they would ~~find~~^{find} the wrong man to the wrong place, they would pick him up and put him in another place and they would put another man in that place, and they used intelligence in planning the development of the church and the church spread at a tremendous rate and the word of God went throughout the people all through this country through the Methodist church far surpassing anything that was ever done by the Congregational church. The time came then when the bishops became modernists and with the control once they became modernists they began to turn the church over in a few years to where the church is absolutely under their control and it is almost impossible for evangelical teachers to become very far extended in any branch of it because of this control which was the very means that made it spread and gave it efficiency. You see there are dangers in both. There are advantages in both and we have to try to find the means to get the good leadership without the dangers of wrong

leadership. Well in this day then you have the church in the second century going through this period of drafting different methods. We have no definite teaching in the N. T. as a specific type of church government to be used. God left us to use our intelligence in figuring out methods of directing his work in order that ~~XXXX~~ the most may be accomplished. And in that second century they probably struck a pretty good means between them. They had the leadership and yet they had the voice of the people of the church in trying to keep that leadership right. And so it was probably a pretty good average that was maintained, but the development of the writings against Gnosticism stressed leadership in such a way as to give the able to be used by ~~wrong~~ leaders in later years in the way that I... and other leaders have been using it. So this whole matter of the development of the church is perhaps $6\frac{1}{4}$ but it is not so foolish because we have very little evidence of it. What we know about it is largely based on what we find in the existence two or three centuries later or on the writings of these men particularly Irenaeus. So it logically goes under I.... Student:..... AAM: Well, there is a very.....There are many factors under this. I don't know what you mean because The Congregational Church was a unified group which was established in one section of this country which had a great history of loyalty for a couple of centuries but which has now fallen almost completely under modernism. The Congregational churches were here for a century and a ~~XXX~~ half before there were any Baptist churches to speak of in the U. S. It's a much newer movement which has been affected by all sorts of influence, and you will find sections of it which are as modernistic as anything. You will probably find that the Northern Baptist Convention is about as modernistic as you will find anywhere. On the other hand you have groups that have come out of that who in rebellion against it have sought to get an absolute freedom and ~~IX~~ yet, if I understand correctly, about a sixth of the Northern Baptist Convention have come out of it, and of this six about maybe a third of it is in the GARB and the other two thirds are scattered individual churches. Well those individual churches, many of them, are taking the extreme attitude of individual.... but the GARB you are getting developed a more central control. A committee of 14 has a tremendous..... to the church and which is a tremendous force increasing rapidly. It is growing faster than any other

branch of the Baptist church. But all that we have to take up next year. Now the so much for I... then. G. Now sometimes it is difficult to be sure what movement belong under E which we included..... and what should be under G. It is true for instance that there might be people who turned in the Ebionite direction, but not far enough to be They would belong under G. There k.....

But I am putting here a movement called Montanism which the church of Rome ~~was~~ considered as being a heretical movement like these others. But which most Protestant scholars today do not consider to have been so, and I think they can be proven to be correct, because the views of the Montanists are the essential doctrines of Christianity were definitely orthodox. You cannot prove a denial of any of the orthodox doctrines of the church on the part of the Montanists. Now the Montanists were a group which began in Phrygia, which is a part of Asia Minor and mentioned in the book of Acts. There was a man there named Montanus who was converted and became a Christian and became a very ardent Christian. Accordingly to the accounts of his enemies he was a heathen priest of a peculiar ... before he was converted. We don't know whether that was true or not. We do know that he became a Christian and became a very ardent Christian and it was during the time of the persecution under Antonine in the middle of the century that he and two associated with him, who he called..... went out as and reformers of the Christian life and claimed the reproach of the of the Holy Spirit to the Mill reign.. in little villages in Phrygia, and they said that the New Jerusalem was going to come there. Now they may have had some rather fantastic ideas, but these ideas were not contrary to the scripture as far as there is any evidence. They simply were saying certain things were going to happen which did not happen. Now it may be there is a similarity with the beginning of the Russelites. Pastor Russell said was it 1888 that Christ would come back? And then when the year came and he didn't come back, he said that he had come but people hadn't recognized him on account of their wickedness, and Russell was succeeded by Judge Rutherford, and he was succeeded by people who call themselves Jehovah's Witnesses, and they have changed so many of the doctrines of the scripture that they deny the deity of Christ. They deny a great number of the essential doctrines of the scripture. They are very definitely heretical. Well, now whether Pastor

Russel was heretical in the beginning of the movement or not, I don't know, but the idea that the scripture says Christ is coming back. We don't know when he is coming. It may be very soon and he is going to set up his kingdom of righteousness on earth. That is a scriptural teaching. Now, when we say I know when it's going to be we are going against the scripture. And when we say it is going to be right soon for sure we are going against the scripture. People have said that at different times through the ages. They have said it and then they found they were mistaken. But when they find they are mistaken the leader says I made a mistake in setting dates and they go ahead and preach the truth and say we don't know when he is coming, but we know he's coming or else they go off into heresy as the Russelites did and change the doctrines and teach that which is contrary to the word of God. Now in the case of the Montanists according to their enemies there may be certain mistakes in the beginning of their movement, but it is quite clear that they did not go off into heretical views as a result, but their movement spread and soon all through the Roman world there were individuals who were following this man Montanist. They were putting tremendous stress on being very rigidly moral in your life. The standards of which were maintained by them were very very high. They were apt to be rather impatient with people who in the face of persecution would submit and sacrifice to the emperor and then when the persecution was over come back and say, oh, I didn't mean to mean any harm by it. I just couldn't stand the fear of it, but really I believed Christ all the time. Take me back into the church. They were apt to be rather strict, and say if you believed Christ you should have died for him. You are really a hypocrite. We won't take you back in the church. They wanted to take a very extreme strict view on this point, and I might say I don't think we should be too strict or too mild either one, but I think it's easier to be sympathetic 14½ and the truth is in between. But the Montanists stood for a great strictness. Now they stressed the Holy Spirit. They talked much about the Holy Spirit and the enemies of the Montanist^{say} that Montanist himself said that he was the Holy Spirit.

End of Record 52 and Beginning of Record 53 OF Yielding yourself to the Spirit's way. They called themselves Spiritual Christians. They called the others physic or carnal Christians. Now the movement of the ~~Montanist~~ Montanist

Montanists spread through the Roman world eventually it reached its height in North Africa where there was a very strong movement for a time, but eventually it died out. And as the Montanists spread the Bishop of Rome, particularly, did not like them, ~~XXXX~~ and they began to say we should cut our relations to them. They're as bad as the Gnostics, have nothing to do with them, or they would not be allowed to take part in our services. They would not be allowed to commune with us. They would ex-communicate them. I... wrote to the Bishop of Rome urging them not to do so, saying that while the Montanists might be a bit fanatical perhaps a little bit overzealous on some points they were truly ordained of God and they should not be cut off, and you see the question which is a vital question in Christianity. We must make an absolute line of separation with those who deny the deity of Christ. There is absolutely ~~no~~ warrant for working together in fellowship and cooperation with those who are opposed to the simple doctrines of the scriptures. But we must work in cooperative fellowship with those who hold the great doctrines of the scriptures even if they differ from us on certain points. And here was a point where it was hard for them to decide which side are the Montanists of this line and eventually under the leadership of the bishop of Rome the organized church turned against the Montanists, and eventually within the next 50 or 100 years they died out. It was a strong movement of attack, but not one which lasted more than a century or two. The other movement you mentioned here in this connection is a dispute about the date of ~~the~~ Easter. Now on this point there ~~is~~ is no question at all as to whether it was heretical. It is not heretical to celebrate Easter on a different day. But the bishop of Rome on this point became just as excited as on the other and eventually two centuries later that those who didn't celebrate Easter on this day, they were heretical and outside the faith. And the bishop of Rome was going to do that at this time to make that decision and I... wrote and urged him not to do ~~it~~ it. I... said I ~~wasn't~~ agree with you on the date of Easter. This is a date we should observe, but he said, these are true Christians, and they observe Easter on a different day. This is not reason ~~for~~ for a separation from them. He wrote a beautiful letter which Eusebius has preserved to the bishop of Rome urging him not to cut off with people who differed on the date of Easter. Student..... AAM?4.....

They do not claim and in fact on many matters they change their mind but they don't say anything about them. The Roman church declared 200 years ago that was heretical and no Romanists was allowed to read a book which said the sun was the center of the solar system. I doubt if there is a Roman Catholic living today who would say that the earth is the center of the solar system, but after making declaration after declaration on that point, it was just quietly dropped. We will continue tomorrow. We noticed that one of these Montanism . Until about 100 years ago practically all ~~CHRISTIAN~~ church historians considered to have been heresy because the churches that continued mostly cut off relationship with the Montanists and treated them as heretics, but it is now considered by most Protestant historians that the Montanists were not heretics at all. There is nothing heretical in their doctrine of which we have found any evidence. The Some of their opponents accused them of having heretical ideas, but these are not like the Gnostics carefully worked out views of the universe against Christianity but there are statements about themselves. Practical statements ~~XXXX~~ like the claim that Montanist claims that he was the Holy Spirit. That is what some of the enemies claim that he said he was the Holy Spirit, but protestant scholars are quite convinced that he never said any such thing, that he made much of the Holy Spirit and was accused by his enemies of having made such a statement as this. The Montanists were considered by I... who was as strong against heresy as anybody can be as a group which should not be cut off from the Christians. He urged the Bishop of Rome not to cut them off from fellowship even though some of the Asian churches had done so. A number of the Asian bishops had declared that they would have no Montanist taking part in their services and was not allowed to partake of the communion in their church ~~XXXX~~ thus they ex-communicated them from their churches and the bishop of Rome wanted to do the same and I.... persuaded him not to for a time. But eventually the bishops of Rome did the same thing, and the Montanists were cut off from the fellowship of the others. The---I should mention perhaps at this point the development of a turn which developed during this century which we find used a good deal as early as Ignacius. And that is the term Catholic. The term Catholic originally used means all embracing. It is very unfortunate that today many people should use the term Catholic as simply a term

for one particular denomination because the term means something entirely different. Personally, I rarely use the term catholic in the sense of referring to one denomination. I like to speak of them as the Roman Church or as the Roman Catholics. Of course, any term could come to mean a particular thing. Often the very opposite of what the term originally meant, and we have to constantly be pointing to terms as old terms become changed in their meanings, and so it may be necessary on account of popular usage that we should give up the word Catholic and allow it to be the term of one particular group, but I hate to do it because it is a term which has such a great history in those days. The word catholic in those days meant the true great church including people of divergence of the minor matters. It meant those who were really the children of God regardless of their particular organization or the particular group whether they were people of Rome whether they were people of Constantinople, of course it wasn't found yet at this time, whether they were people of Jerusalem, whether they were of Jewish background, whether they were of Greek background, whatever they were so long as they held to the great doctrines of the church. So long as they were truly Christians, they were considered as Catholics; and the people might differ over a point within the Christianity and still be considered to be equally Catholic, but of course the heretics were cut out from them. They were not Catholics. And so the word Catholic was used in that sense in that period, and it is often spoken of as the Catholic church meaning the true church at that time. Now, of course, if we use the word etomological then if we today speak of one group as the Catholic Church we are implying that they are the true church. They and they alone, just as if we were to call them the true church, but of course it ~~XXXXXX~~ is true that a particular church may change its meaning and come to be used to refer simply to a circle, persons or a group of people regardless of its etymology, and the chances are that most people will use the term today and have no thought of the particular meaning simply the reference to a particular group of people, but that is what the term catholics meant at that time. We have it in the apostles creed. I believe in the Holy Catholic church and the great bulk of our Protestant churches say the Apostles Creed with that terminology in it. I believe in the Holy Catholic church and when they say it with that

terminology, we mean I believe in the fellowship of all true believers, regardless to the particular group to which they belong. What we mean when we use that terminology. It seems to me that it was Martin Luther who changed it for his followers to I believe in the Holy Christian Church. I'm not quite sure whether he did or not, and that his followers therefore used the term that way which then would mean that they were giving up the word catholic and allowing their opponents to use it. After all there is no sense in fighting over a word the important thing is the meaning, and that part of the Apostles Creed is very important, and we must if we say I believe in the Holy Catholic Church, we must think of the true meaning, and of course no Protestant would think of it as I believe in the church from which I am not a member and which would exclude me unless I make great changes. Student:..... AAM: That's right. Of course, if the Roman Catholic church of today has the truth and the other groups are heretics then in the proper etomological sense the term catholic should belong to them, and not to us, but if the Roman Catholic Church is χ one group which has the truth and another group would have the truth would differ ϕ in views from them then the word catholic can apply to them as to the others. If the others have the truth and they don't have the truth ϕ then it certainly shouldn't apply to them at all, so that ^{to} ~~they~~ simply use the word catholic alone and apply it to the particular group ϕ is very much against the etomology, but etomology doesn't make a great deal of difference. Words change in their meanings. If we're going to use it in a different sense than it is/ was ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ originally used today then it's all right and if so we have to be very sure we understand what it use to mean in ancient times when we are discussing it. Yes? Student-.. AAM: During the time of Irmeaus the Church of Rome was a very strong church. That it had any powerful influence outside of Rome would be different. Well, it had the example outside of Rome. There's no evidence it had any authority outside of Rome in the time of Irameaus, but would have great influence, and the question would be why did the church at Rome have influence? And Rome being by far the largest city of the Empire, Antioch the second one, Rome being the center of the Empire A city to which people came from all over the Empire for matters of business, for matters of any kind, it was the center. Rome would naturally ϕ

by the place to which it would go out and to which it would come. If a man became a leader of a new heresy way over in Asia Minor or up in Spain somewhere inevitably within a few years if he prospered and got followers he would be in Rome with a group in Rome following him.

End of Record 53 and the Beginning of Record 54..... it would have tremendous influence, and of course Iramaus says you want to know what the truth is about these heresies. Well, look at the church in Rome and look at the church in Antioch. Look at churches which have had a long history, which are strong churches where the truth has been preached continuously since the time of the apostles and see what they believe, and you will find that these churches he says don't accept these Gnostic heresies., which is one of his big arguments. In the way that he used the argument they think that whatever Rome says is right Well, that's not the way he words it. Of course, the Roman Church today according to its theory the fact that Rome was the capital of the Empire has nothing whatever to do with the power of the Bishop of Rome according to their theory. It is entirely a matter of Petter who was given the keys by the Lord having passed on to his successors, and if Peter hadn't come to Rome ~~to~~ according to their theory the Roman Bishop would have no authority whatever. It would be the bishop of whatever place Peter stayed at. That is their theory, but historically, it is the opinion ~~on~~ Protestant people that the influence of the Church of Rome was due entirely to the place of Rome as the of the Empire, rather than to the question of who found the church. Well, indeed we have a little more to say about the Church of Rome before we are through with the second century. I haven't any statistics on the second century but I'd like to say this at this point, perhaps, it will give an idea from this that it is estimated by scholars that about the middle of the third century about 250 A.D. that the Church of Rome had about 50,000 members which you see is a very large church. It was only about a twentieth of the people of Rome, but it ~~was~~ was a very large church. Student:..... AAM: No, the word catholic was used as early as the coming of Ignacian. Nearly a hundred years before this, but it came to be more and more when there would be a question about a certain group. Now here is a group that differs from us on some point. Well, are they catholics

or aren't they? Well, if it is a minor point, they are just as Catholic as we are. It doesn't make any difference. If it is a real heresy they are not Catholics. The term has that meaning, and when eventually about 1000 A.D. or a little earlier, the church was divided into two separate main sections, the Eastern and the Western. The Western was called the Roman Catholic Church, and the Eastern was called the Greek Orthodox Church, and the difference was that the Easterners prided themselves on their orthodoxy and tried to get every little point exactly right, while the Westerners tried to consult on their4.. that is on having the doors of the church as wide as the doors of the Kingdom of Heaven including everyone who has the great essential doctrines regardless of the variation on minor points, and that the word Catholics means not making4½... ... Now of course today it's different because it's 1540 in those years along there in the Council of Trent a definite viewpoint was adopted which had been held by only a portion of the medieval church and was made the definite position of the Roman Catholic Church at that time. That would have included many of the popes at that time and certainly believers were concerned, but since the Council of Trent in the middle of the 16th century the Roman Catholic Church is a sect with very exact views on a number of points and with great liberty of opinion before that time. So it is a question as to whether they are entitled to use the word Catholic since that time, but they have used it a great deal and the Protestants Yes? Student:;;;;; AAM: Well, their theory was that wherever Peter was, he was the head of the church, and of course this theory is based on two or three verses of scripture and it's a matter of ... of those verses, but there is no scriptural reference whatever if Peter had such authority that he had a right to pass it on to somebody else, but they claimed with no evidence whatever except their statement that he passed the authority on to the next Bishop of Rome. Well, now, it is extremely unlikely that any documents from that time will ever be discovered which will prove this particular thing, but if something would be discovered which would disprove it, they have some very clever and able scholars who would find a very excellent way of explaining it in such a way that it wouldn't affect the authority. But at the present, there is no need of such explanations, because this is the claim that

is made. But what I am wanting for our Church History here is to have definitely in mind the difference. The power of the Church of Rome and its importance is one question, but the question of whether this church had a right to control other churches had a right to do so not by virtue simply of being at the capital of the Empire, but for some other reasons would be the question on which we are interested in from any evidence of that period. We find people looking to this as a great church, a church of influence, but we do not find any evidence at that time that they considered it as having an authority in itself to dictate to them in any way. Well, the Montanism them--Irenaeus urged the ~~BISHOP~~ Bishop of Rome not to excommunicate the Montanists, but they were excommunicated whether immediately or a little later, it doesn't seem to be very clear. Not long after we find them considered as heretics by the Church of Rome and by most of the Catholic church. Student:..... AAM: Yes, any bishop anyway had the power to say that a man could not take the communion in his church. That was to excommunicate. Excommunication would refer only to his church and would have no relationship to anything else, and there is no evidence that he8..... At this time many of the bishops of Asia in different cities in Asia had already excommunicate the Montanists. They had said the Montanists are not to partake of the communion in my church. They are not truly Christians. The Bishop of Rome said the same thing. He cut himself off from relations with Montanists. It does not mean that he had authority to say he may not partake of communion, but only he may not partake of it in my church. To excommunicate is to cut off from communion with you, not necessarily to cut off from communion with the Lord. Now the other dispute at this time was the one on which there was a great deal of heat, and a great deal of hard feeling and this was over the question of the date of Easter. It is a strange thing that people may on points of doctrine very important points of doctrine you may get people together in the same church You know how a church in which people are both loyal members of the church and one believes in the deity of Christ and in his atonement and another has no faith whatever in any of these doctrines and yet they were both loyal to the church and they would both feel very proud of their particular church. But if you get a church in which there is a particular right or ceremony and they differ on the

ceremony it becomes a tangible thing and sometimes it will make a great deal of difference and a division between than a doctrine point which may be far, far more important. Well the matter of Easter is a matter of a right of a ceremony. But the question is when are we going to have Easter. Well, now, if I were to ask ~~if~~ any one of you here when will we observe Chr~~s~~tmas in 1957? I am sure that everyone of you here would unanimously say December 25, but if I were to say when will we observe Easter in 195~~6~~, I am not sure if there would be anyone here who could give me the date on which we will observe Easter in 195~~6~~. Dec. 25 is Christmas. What day is Easter? Who is there here who could tell me in 1957 when Easter will be observed. I wouldn't be surprised if there were a very few of you who could tell me in 195⁴ when we will observe Easter. I wouldn't be surprised if you wouldn't even know what it was in 1953. And yet you all know when Christmas was each year. Isn't that strange? Are you so much more interested in Christmas than you are in Easter? Actually Christmas, the birth of Christ is important, but Easter, the Resurrection, is far more important in our religion. Yes, you all know the date of Christmas and you don't know the date of Easter. On the other hand, if I were to say to you what day of the week will we observe Easter in 1973. You would all say Sunday, but if I were to say to you what day of the week will we observe Christmas in 1973 probably nobody here would know. There might be very few of you who would even know 10 years ago what day of the week observed Christmas. But you would know what day of the week we observed Easter. Well, you see, it's a matter of ceremony. When is it going to be? When I was in Jerusalem in 1929 I went to the alleged church of the resurrection, the Church of the Holy Sepulcher. I went there on the date which the Roman Catholics and we celebrated Easter and then I went there again about a month later and find a tremendous crowd of people gathered together there to celebrate the Greek Orthodox celebration of Easter. They had their Easter three or four weeks later. Well, now if you had in the same town one church that observed Easter on a certain day and another a little later, there would be a confusion, and particularly if you had one church which today was celebrating Easter, the Resurrection of Christ, and the church across the street was observing the Crucifixion on that day and Easter two days later, that would be

very confusing. You come out of one church happy and celebrating the Resurrection and the people across the church would come out with mournful faces as they remembered the crucifixion of Christ. Well, that was the situation which sprang up in the early church, and it was ~~not~~ not a simple problem to know what to do about it. It is not a fault of humanity that our calendar is confused. It is nobody's fault, but it is a fact that God created the universe in such a way that there is not clear definite ~~the~~ calendar. What made the calendar. The thing that finally makes our ~~the~~ calendar is how long it takes the ~~the~~ earth to turn from the time when the time is heading for this part of the earth to the time that it is hitting this part of the earth and the relation to whether the earth is on this part of the sun or on that side of the sun or on this side of the sun. How long does it take the earth to go around that area. It's pretty ~~hard~~ hard to determine. The scholars now know that it takes 365 days and five hours and 29 minutes and a certain number of seconds. If you can figure it down to the seconds and and it still won't come exact. It doesn't divide into a year. There are not an exact number of days in a year, and the same thing relates to a month. A month originally is the length of time it ~~takes~~ takes the moon to go around..... End of Record 54 and Beginning of Record 55

If you divide the days into the months it's a fraction1..... Some have three different things unrelated to each other. The time that the ~~the~~ earth turns around a day, the time that the moon goes around the earth, and the time that the earth goes around the sun. They are unrelated to each other, and if you want to remember particular dates for a particular situation, it is a question which we are going to use for our pattern. Now the Jews from early time use the Babylonian calendar which has the moon, and the Jews today have a ~~the~~ calendar in which the month is painted as the term--the ~~the~~ length of time it takes the moon around. $\frac{1}{2}$ Very few of you could tell me when the full moon will be four months from now, and you can't tell because it doesn't fit exactly. If we had a real natural calendar the full moon would always be right exactly in the same spot. Back in Ancient Babylonian, they would have a man up on the hillside watching, and he would give his word. He'd say, "This night I saw the beginning of the full man, just a little sliver."

It was only visible maybe for a half a minute. ~~XX~~ If that didn't appear so it was very important to watch carefully. It exactly related the ~~XXX~~ calendar to the moon. Well, the Jews had this ~~XXXXXX~~ calendar which related to the moon and today the Jews have twelve months in their calendar but every few years they have a thirteenth month so that it makes it up, so that over a period of years there moon calendar but there is an extra month put in every little while so as to keep it even and they have to keep it exactly so over a period of 50 years it is exactly the same as ours, so each particular year differs. The Mohammedans haven't done that. They have a moon calendar, and the moon calendar pays no attention to the sun calendar. The whole month they fast in they don't even $3\frac{1}{2}$ Sometimes it comes in summer, sometimes in winter, sometimes, it comes in spring to the length of the year. Well, now in the early church they said the half circle was the time when Christ was crucified, and therefore that is the time when we should remember his crucifixion. As the Jews were celebrating their Passover, the Christians were celebrating the remembrance of the death of Christ. And so on a certain day of the Babylonian calendar, the fourteenth day of the ~~XXXXXXX~~ month of Nison. On that particular day the Christians observed the Crucifixion. They had a day of fasting on that day. And then when according to the Jewish calendar the day came to an end which is just at sunset and which is still this year at sunset. If the Orthodox Jews had a theatrical performance in New York or if there is one at which the Jews want to attract Orthodox Jews to now on a Saturday night, they would begin it late in the evening, so that a Jew over in Brooklyn can see the first the Sabbath is over and that it is all right now to travel on the subway and that he can go on the subway after that and go to the theater in New York that evening, but he cannot go early because he can't travel until the day is over, and the day is over when it gets dark enough When the fourteenth of Nison was over then the Christians would celebrate -- they would then have a communion service in which they would remember the results of the death of Christ and his resurrection. And so their time of joy was on the evening following the fourteen of Nison, which we would call the evening of. And that was done through most of the churches of Asia.

And I suppose it was done at Rome at first, but after a time in Rome where the people came more and more to be non-Jewish in background and they did not have --were not accustomed to the Jewish calendar particularly and the principle thing they learned was to celebrate the resurrection on the seventh day of the first day of the week and that came to be their big day of celebration every Sunday was a day of remembering the Lord's resurrection. They were interested in the one great remembrance of the Lord's resurrection. The Easter Day, when we would remember him particularly, and then they said he was ~~XXXX~~ crucified on Friday before the day the Sunday on which we remember His resurrection ~~XX~~ is the day we look back and remember His crucifixion. And so they would have that in the spring and they wouldn't pay any attention to what the fourteenth of Nisan was. They would do it on a Sunday, and so one group would have it any day of the week that happened to be the fourteenth of Nisan and the other would have it on a Sunday, and before long the Passover and the ~~X~~ Christian day were not always coming together and when they would come together there might be clashes between some of the very fanatical Jews and some of the Christians who would ~~XXX~~ perhaps have more enthusiasm than spirituality and they wanted to avoid these clashes so they tried to have it on the Sunday that wouldn't be right by the Jewish Passover. And the result was that eventually in the West they developed pattern. They would watch in the spring time for the the day when the sun is right over the equator. In other words the day when day and night are exactly the same light. That is the 21st of March, and when the 21st of March came they would say when is the next full moon and watch for it. And then when the full moon came, they would say the next Sunday after that is Easter. So you see if the 21st of March is a full moon then you can have Easter until a month later after the next full moon, but if the 22nd of March is a full moon then you can have Easter on the following Sunday and that is the system we use today to determine when Easter is. If you want to know when the next Easter is going to be, see on the 21st of March what the moon is like. And if the moon is not full that day--if the moon is full wait a whole month--if it isn't full the next full moon the next Sunday after that will be Easter. If the full moon is on Sunday that won't be ^{the} Easter. It will be the next one after.

So you see that Easter can be early in March or late in April. There is a range of about 6 weeks in which Easter can come and we determine it according to the and the full moon. It's a very complicated system, but in the West among the pagans who had become Christians this habit developed of celebrating Easter that way. Now by the middle of the second century, you had many churches in Asia which held to the fourteenth of Nisan as the day of the Crucifixion, and they remembered the ~~XXXXXX~~ resurrection particularly right afterward. And you have the churches of the west mostly remembering according to the very complex system I just described to you, and it came to be a confusion and the Bishop of Rome and the leaders in the West insisted on their system. This is the right system and when Polycarp was very much concerned about it in 150 A.D. he made a visit to Rome and talked with the Bishop of Rome and they differed on the question. Neither could convince the other, but they said we are both good Catholics and they ~~XX~~ celebrated the communion together and the bishop asked Polycarp to celebrate the communion in ~~XXXXX~~ Rome giving honor to Polycarp even though they differed on the question of Easter. Well, that was the attitude of that bishop of Rome, but when you come to Victor the bishop of Rome, he is the first bishop of whom we have any evidence that tried to think of himself as an authority over the world. It was Bishop Victor toward the end of the century. We have no evidence that any other pope within a number of years before or after took that attitude but ~~XXXX~~ how much authority he thought he had over others, I don't know as we have much evidence, but at least he had this attitude. He wouldn't work with anybody who just didn't exactly agree with him. So he is the one who was going to throw out the Montanists and I... persuaded him to at least wait awhile and then he decided that he was going to excommunicate all the people who didn't observe Easter on the particular date on which the Western church has always observed. And he was going to excommunicate the church of Asia. Your people can't come to communion in our church and if they are here and we forbid our people to go to our church because you have Easter on the wrong day, and Irameous plead with him not to do it, and he didn't do it. He did the Montanists, but he didn't the

The people who observed the fourteenth day. Student:..... AAM: The Jewish

Passover is at that season of the year. They have their passover along in the spring, and the Christians day was at first the same day. Then they made it the Sunday following, and then sometimes that would mean that they observed the Crucifixion the same time as the Passover was being observed, and sometimes it wouldn't. And then they began to have some disagreeable instances and they said let's be sure it's a different date although in the same general season, and somebody I think it's only about once in 80 years. or something like that it comes the day as the Passover. It is quite rare. Who hit on the system we don't know but this was the system we all should keep today and we do. Student:..... AAM: The fourteenth day of Nisan is the day they remember the Crucifixion, and then they might have an Easter Day the Following Sunday or whatever it was. Sometimes it would be the next day and sometimes it would be five or six days later, or they might simply have a celebration that evening. The dispute really wasn't so much over Easter as it was over the day of the Crucifixion, but the Eastern church was putting its emphasis on the day of the Crucifixion and the West was on Easter. And it was the Easter that won out. Student:..... AAM: Irameous had been a student of Polycarp. He had learned with Polycarp. He had a great foundation, and yet he had come to the West and the West this is what they did and he had fallen in line with it and he used it .. Irameous would not be excommunicated under this. He held to the day of Easter as we do today, but he said these other people are just as good Christians as we are. What if they do observe it on a different day? That's no basis for division. He said don't cut yourselves off. Don't cut off the church of Rome from fellowship with large groups of fine Christians in Asia simply over a matter of observances. That was his plea and it is a ~~XXXXX~~ beautiful letter. His plea urging Christian forbearance on points which aren't essential. It's a beautiful letter which is preserved in Eusebius. Student:.... AAM: Well, no, because the question would be this. Are you going to celebrate on a particular date on which the Jews who have a month calendar celebrate passover which may be three weeks earlier or three weeks later or are you going to celebrate it on the date of the year which14 $\frac{1}{2}$ The month didn't agree with the year, and the thing was that to the west they

didn't know anything about this Jewish calendar. And they said we are not Jews. We are Christians. We believe in Christ..... ENd of Record 55.

Beginning of Record 56 Why should we try to go by the Jewish Catholics?

We're not interested in the Passover. We're interested in the Crucifixion of Christ. So we will follow according to our calendar, but then they say now Easter we celebrate on Sunday so instead of trying to get the exact date and having but this is our Christian Easter and we ~~don't~~ want to make it the same day as the Jewish Passover. Yes? Student:..... AAM. The particular term-it's my impression that it comes from a The English word----- The term is a derivative of the word Passover. From the word Passover comes the word Easter in many of our languages, but the actual English word Easter seems to come from the sunrise, from the coming of the new year, and may refer originally to a spring festival. Student: AAM: It ~~is~~ only the English speaking people that use the word Easter. Most of the Western countries, I believe use the word..... which is deriv~~ed~~ from Passover. But as far as I'm concerned we call our day observed for the resurrection of Christ we call Sunday, the day of worship. And we have week days and you take our month names. We ~~XXX~~ call January after the old Roman God Janus.... and many of our month names are named that way. But they aren't just terms to indicate things. The etymology is forgotten. It has no~~z~~ meaning. After all, etymology doesn't matter. It'~~w~~ what does the word mean today. Well, this agreement then over the date of Easter was a non-heretical divergence, and eventually all those who held the Easter Date were excommunicated, but that was a couple of centuries after this. Thanks to Irameous the church didn't split over this at that time, and by the time when they did a couple of centuries later ...4..... By that date the great bulk of the Christians had come over the system of having Easter as we have it today, so that there ~~WXX~~ were no great number of people who were cut out from the ranks of the general fellowship of the church when it happened a couple hundred years later. Well now H. The Roman Church in the Second Century. If it were not ~~for~~ the claim~~s~~ of the Roman Catholic Church today, I would not We have already said about the Roman Church in the second century. And what we

have said is important to say and worthwhile but it is far far short of the claims of the Roman Catholic Church today. But I would like to mention about the Roman Church in the Second ~~XXXXXX~~ Century that now it was a large group of people, a great many of them foreigners and not Romans, ~~XXXXXX~~ and the language of the church was not Latin but Greek. It was a foreign speaking turn, church of Rome at this time. Most of its bishops were people who had come from the East, from Greece, or else migrated to Rome, But it was an important church, the church of the capital of the Empire, but it was nothing like the claims made today, and I would like to read X to you an interesting word from this book which I have here "A Roman Catholic Church History" It is called An Outline History of the Church by a man named Joseph and it a very strong piece of work. It is careful in its statements. It may not say certain things that we think ought to be said, but when it says something its facts are usually quite dependable. It is not a book for popular consumption but a book for use in school, and it is a careful accurately written book. I read to you what it said about the first century about whether the second and third pope were the same man or two different men. And that seems strange to say that the bishop of the church ordained by God for that purpose. We wouldn't even know whether there were two of them or one of them. Now, regarding this. In this book they take up each century and under the century they begin with the political history and then a section on the church and under the church the first section is always is the papacy, and when you get down in the book very X far you'll find that they have several pages on the papacy taking up each pope in order and telling a good bit about him. Well, now let me read you what he says about the 100th he calls it. The second century to the third. No. 1 the papacy. All he says is two paragraphs. Let me read you the first one. "Several of the eleven popes who ruled the church in the second century were martyred." That's one thing about the church of Rome. It was a dangerous place to be bishop, because if persecution broke out that was where it was apt to start. And severl he says of the eleven popes If he knew how many he would say how many. Several of the eleven popes who ruled the church in the second century were martyred, for accepting St.....

St..... and St. Victor.... . That's three he names of the eleven. Except for these three they remained rather shadowing figures with of uncertain dates. There is what he says. In the second century a hundred years after the death of Christ, in that century, the Roman Catholic Church lists eleven popes who ruled the church, but of those eleven all is remembered is shadowing figures with uncertain dates. Well, now they weren't considered particularly important if that 's all they remember about them. YOU can see their pictures today, but they may be largely imaginary pictures. We don't know when they ruled, and we dont know much about them. And we know some of them were martyrs but we don't know how many. That doesn't fit with people of that kind having trouble that they were ordained of God to be the rulers of his church. It doesn't fit. There were many things which people were tremendously interested in and during the second century, but they didn't think it was particularly important to remember the names and important facts about the various bishops of Rome except for these three men who are known not because of anything in Rome, but because of their relations to some great man from some other place, like A..... What do we know about him until Polycarp came to see him. It was on account of Polycarp that we know about A..... We have great men in the second century. We 've noticed a number of them, but not one of them was a bishop of Rome. The great writers, the great leaders, the great apponents of heresy of the ~~XX~~ second century were not bishop of Rome. There were great men here and there. The bishops of Rome were proba^By organizers. They were probably mostly good Christians. Some of them probably suffered martyred with great loyalty to Christ. But they were not outstand figures in the church, and that isn't what you would expect if they were ordained of God to be the leaders of his church to have ~~XX~~ rule over the church history. Student:///// AAZM: The persecution was not nearly so severe in the second century as it was in the third century, and we know a great deal about Irameous, about Justin Martyr, about quite a number of men. Although it is true there are a great deal we don't know about, ~~tht~~ we don't have full records preserved. They were looking for the return of Christ very soon. They were very busy witnessing to the utmost and so they would be

ready for his coming, and they were not as a whole greatly concerned in preserving records. And so it is a fact that we have less records by far of the second century than we have of the later centuries, but in these records the men that are outstanding are not the bishops of Rome and they had felt that they were ordained of Christ to be the heads of his whole church. It would be very strange that if in the amount of information we have a great part of it didn't relate to them. Now these three we know about and what we know about them we learn because of their relationship with great people who lived elsewhere, like we know about and about Victor about Irameous letter's.

Student:..... AAM: I don't think they faced that particular question, but I think if you take the views which they hold and insist upon them that just as conscious of it at that time as anybody ever was and of course they do make much of the fact that the bishop of Rome wrote a letter to the church of Corinth telling the church of Corinth that they ought to be a better church. they said now this is Rome giving orders to the churches. But the interesting thing in this is that Clement never says anything about himself or claims any authority for himself. He is from the church of the great capital. Some ~~XXXX~~ ~~XXXX~~ people said it is impossible to think of the church of Corinth talking to the church of Rome so whether it is or not I don't know, but at least there is no evidence in the letter of ~~XXXXXXXX~~ Clement speaking of himself as the authority. He doesn't even mention himself. He writes on behalf of the church But ~~W~~ it will be very strange if Christ actually told Peter You are the head of the church, and Peter told the man who succeeded him , you're the head of the church. You ~~have~~ the authority. and it went on that way. It would be very strange if they and the members of the church weren't conscious of it. I doubt if any Roman Catholic would think that would be the case, that they weren't conscious of the second century..... Well, I'll go to the assignment for next time End of Record 56 and Beginning of Record 57.....

The Roman Church in the second century, and we know that they were not outstanding. The church seems to have been an important church, but there is not so much that happened there that is important that is preserved to us as the other churches and its leaders most of them practically nothing is known about.

..... and Victor is very similar to popes of many later ages. He seems to have been very determined and anxious to exert his authority, far more than the other Bishops of Rome in the years before or during the next century. In general though he was not at this time by individuals who occupied the position of bishop of Rome. No. 3 the Third Century. Now we come to the third century and we find that by this time the Christian Church is much larger than it was the century before, as it was quite a small organization in 100 A.D. by 200 it was many times as large, and the result is that we have much more information about it, yet we still are in a period when there are very important things about which we know nothing. We have a great many different movements during this century. We have various churches which were quite strong, but the middle of this century the Christian Church at Rome ~~was~~ which had 50,000 people in it which was 1/20 of the people of Rome. It was a pretty good sized Church. There were 40 different churches. One bishop over the different churches. So that the number of people who were Christians during this century is far larger than earlier. During the earlier ~~period~~ period we find that ~~all~~ all kinds of lying stories were spread about the Christians as they were committed to all kinds of wickedness and their secret meetings were talked about with all this sort of thing among the heathen. Now this is largely ended by the third century. There are enough of them the people know there is nothing to that sort of thing. Student:..... AAML Yes, you mean I didn't give information about H? Well, I didn't give any particular subject matter, but the thing I stressed under H was that the church was not outstanding at this time. I read you from that book of church history that the most of the popes at this time we know practically nothing about. Just the names, we don't know their dates, we don't know anything about them. The idea that if the bishop of Rome was ~~supposed~~ supposed to be the head of the church, he did a pretty poor job of it during that century, because hardly the names are known. It would not be worth heading if it were not for the fact that tremendous claims are made today of the Roman Church, therefore, ~~it~~ it is important that we know them, how comparatively unimportant its bishops were during the greater part of the second century A.D. Now in this ~~third~~ third century the church was ~~such~~ ^{not} such as had been early in the

second century such a small organization that any kind of lying stories could be spread abroad. There were wicked people among Christians as there always has been, but there were not many of them, and there were a large enough number of good people that you could not persuade the rank and file of the people of the empire that they were people who were addicted to wickedness. In fact, it came to be a common statement when they could see how the Christians loved one another. They saw an attitude among one another that was very different from anything found among pagans, and yet in spite of that during this century, the power of the empire do have a hatred of Christianity. ~~IX~~ They realize their wickedness and the entire moral standards of the Christians naturally displeases them and then of course there are those who were considerably devoted to the worship of the old gods and we find their fanaticism dislike this new movement that is becoming so strong within the empire. But this century instead of taking as I have the first two and taking various subjects through the century, I think it would be more profitable to take this century in sections and tell about the different developments withing the ~~XXXXXX~~ sections. And so I'm going to make A. Christian century from 200 to 237. And you see it is a little over a third of the century. Supposing a man was born in 180. He was 20 years of age at the beginning of the century. By 237 he will be 57. You see it is the greater part of a man's life, but we call it a full generation. This turn from 200 to 237. And I'm going to take that as a unit first. There is not much points in knowing about something important in the third century which happened about 220 and then mention something important that happened about 280 the people would never see each other and would have no contacts with each other. There is so much space in between. It is much better to have the material to do it as we have in this century to go a little more slowly and get an idea what happened at particular sections of the century. And so we are going to take this generation from 200 to 237, and we're going to get an idea of the events during this generation. Under this I am going to make no. 1 then - Relation to the Roman Government. We notice that the ~~XXXXX~~ relation to the Roman Government during the second century was one in which Christianity was ..against the law, but most of the emperors paid little attention to it. There was ~~XXXXXX~~ persecution which broke

out here and there, but until the latter part of the century the attitude of the emperors was do not let anybody be injured as a Christian simply for the personal dislike of someone else or the desire for other persons to receive the rewards as ...8..... If someone is declared to be a Christian bring him before the governor and if he denies the charges and sacrifices to the gods, let him go and punish the man who falsely accused him. That was the attitude of the emperors up until Marcus. ~~N~~ Marcus..... being more logical said if Christianity is illegal it should be punished, and there was more widespread persecution under him than there had been before, but we notice that at the end of the century the wicked ~~XXX~~ emperor..... for some reason stopped the persecution. And we did not have under reign any persecution that is after the reign is well underway and then and after him who is unrelated to who became emperor in 193 continued the policy, and so Christianity for the last 15 or 20 years of the century was hardly persecuted at all. When the third century began with Sept.....having reigned and after this century had gone on two years he introduced a change. He made an edict making it illegal for anyone to become a Jew or a Christian, and this of course in the case of the Jews they had special rights given them. Those who were Jews could continue but in the case of the Christians it was illegal to be a Christian. It was illegal to now become a Christian or ever to have become one. And so we have an outbreak of persecution under an outbreak which was one of the most severe that the Roman World had ever seen. It was particularly severe in North Africa and in Egypt. Egypt of course is also Northern Africa, but it is further south than the region around Tarsus which we call North Africa, and we distinguish the two because there is a long distance between them and naturally each of them would be more closely connected with the neighboring part of Europe than they were to each other. So when we speak of Africa from now on, we won't mean North Africa rather than Egypt. We'll call Egypt by its own name. Now in these two sections the persecution was particularly severe but it was felt all through the Roman Empire. The outbreak of persecution naturally had differed in its reaction to different people. There were those among the Christians who were terrified at the coming of the persecution. There

were individuals whose faith was not very deep perhaps. Perhaps ~~XXXXX~~ they would have seemed to be in times of peace when everything was easy, but now who gave up their faith and went and sacrificed. The Christians then called them apostates--people who had given up their faith. There were some, however, who sacrificed of fear, and who did not really wish to give up their faith who tried to continue being Christians and after the persecution was over wanted to reenter the church. They called these sacrificers rather than apostates. The apostate was the one who had completely and firmly given up his faith. The sacrificer was the one who out of fear had given in and had sacrificed. There were others who had a good friend who was in the Roman government and this friend was a pagan and he liked the Christians and he didn't want to see them persecuted so he would make a certificate that they had sacrificed even though they hadn't/ And some tried to their consciences in this way. When the investigator would come, they would say, are you a Christian? Do you deny to serve the gods. You say, here is my certificate. They'd look at the certificate certified he had sacrificed, and the man hadn't sacrificed, but he had a certificate that said he had and he tried this way to escape the persecution. Now these individuals after the persecution was over were -- there was great controversy in the church as to what should be the attitude toward these. ~~XXXXX~~ They were considered by the church just as bad as the sacrificers. And particularly was it the case when the individuals who had paid for these certificates. Some13..... They thought they would escape God's favor by not sacrificing but they would escape the governors disfavor by buying the certificate that they had sacrificed. It seems like a very unsatisfactory method all the way around. ~~XXXXX~~ One of the types of giving in which was particularly disliked by the Christians was what they would call a This latin word means one who had handed something over.13 $\frac{1}{4}$ particularly interested to get the Bible to get a hold of the Christian books and destroy them, and so the Christians would do anything to prevent having to turn over the books but once the persecution was over they wouldn't have the Bible and it was quite difficult to get another copy. And so a Christian who under the fear of the persecutors would surrender their faith was particularly afterwards to the body of the Christians. Now just

large a number there were among the Christians who gave in to the persecution in these various ways is hard to say. During the previous 14 years of no persecution there had been many coming into the church without fully realizing what it meant and some of these however proved to stand very ~~XX~~ valiantly against the persecution but others surrendered. Student:..... AAM: It is rather difficult to say. I don't know how widespread it would be. And at this time I doubt if there were any copies at this time of the Bible as a whole. The use of the book form had only begun to be coming into use. But the scrolls were what most writings were on. And the scroll could not have the whole Bible on it. So it would take quite a number of scrolls to make the Bible. My guess would be that the great mass of the people read a copy of some part of the scriptures End of Record 57 and Beginning of Record 58..... Most of the families in the church would have a portion. There would not be probably any single~~d~~ copy of the Bible available. Now while this was the attitude of some, and doubtless a good many, the attitude which was much more characteristic of the church at this time was one of welcoming the opportunity to show their loyalty to their faith. When a person would be brought before the judge and would stand before the danger of death and asked if he was a Christian, he would boldly say, Yes, I am and declare his faith in Christ and his refusal to worship the idols nor the sacrifices to the emperor. He would be called a confessor. 3..... This was not the attitude of the mass of the church by any means, but there were individuals who were carried away with the enthusiasm to stand for the Lord and felt that they should follow martyrdom. Now, Tertullian wrote an essay on in Persecution in which he contended that it was wrong to go forward and seek martyrdom that way, but that it also was~~y~~ wrong to under any condition. On the other hand Clement of Alexandria said the Lord himself has commanded us to flee to another city when we are persecuted. Not as if the evil matter that we fear death, but that we may not lead nor any to evil doings. The church We do ~~KKKK~~ not commend those who expose themselves for the teaches not so. So you see there were different attitudes naturally taken in the face of these crises. In ~~each/there~~ Egypt there was a wealthy man named Leonibus who had been a prominent Christian and he is not an

individual character of importance in history but his son is. I don't know as you need to remember his name, but Leonibus was seized and was taken and tortured and killed, and his son who was 18 years of age was determined to go and share in his father's martyrdom and order that mother took all his clothes away and hid them so he couldn't get out of the house in order to prevent him from doing it; and is said to have saved his life from persecution in this way. Now Origen went on to become a great teacher, the greatest scholar of the early Christian church, one who wrote thousands of books. It is impossible to believe a man did as much writing as Origen did. But he had many wealthy supporters who would hire great numbers of writers to sit down and take his notes and shortened them in all his lectures and then to copy them down in longhand and make manuscripts of them, and his writings were distributed all over the Roman world. Eventually when he was 70 years of age and another great persecution came, he was taken and was very cruelly tortured and two years later died as a result of the tortures which he had undergone. But in his case, his mother prevented him from seeking martyrdom when he was 18, and the Christian world received its greatest scholar as a result of it. He had a life which contributed tremendously to the growth of Christianity and then he had to be martyred at the end of his life. Some of the tortures which were thought of by the Roman persecutors at this time as in previous times were extremely ingenious and very very cruel. We have long descriptions of the utter wickedness of the tortures which were used to try to scare people into leaving the Christian faith and yet the strange thing is that then there were these terrific tortures, and these terrifically cruel treatments of those who were persecuted and yet there was nothing like the attitude of the Communists today of trying to force uniformity of among the people as a whole. It was rather to take individuals and to torture them and to scare others away in this way, and so we find that at this time in North Africa when there were five Christians seized and put in prison and threatened with martyrdom and these five had not yet been ~~XXXX~~ baptized. They were who were receiving instruction. We find that the members of the clergy were able to gain entrance to the prison and to baptize them in the prison before they were executed. Now that shows a

degree of freedom for the rest of them which is altogether different from the Communist persecution today. The persecution seems to have been not at this time of seeking out every individual. There were thousands of Christians in the empire who might be seized, and thus cruelly treated, and who might never even be touched upon even though they would go to the prison and bring food, and bring things to them. Sometimes they would almost be worshipping. Not worshipping actually, but almost worshipping the confessors in the prison, and sometimes when the people were taken to their deaths, great crowds of Christians followed them with great reverence as they were executed. This strange combination in the persecution at this time in the attitude toward many whom they treated so cruelly and hundreds whom they seemed to have ignored who were just as definite in their Christian testimony. There were two individuals who joined this persecution under who were killed who have been particularly remembered. The name of the two young women were Perpetua and Felicitas. Now they were in North Africa. We have an account of their martyrdom in very interesting details of the account of it which some think was written by Tertullian, but we do not know. We don't have proof as to who wrote it. But it gives us a great many details of it. These were two of the five people whom I just mentioned who were baptized in the prison. Now it is interesting that these two Perpetua was the daughter of a wealthy man. She was from a prominent family, people very well-to-do, and Felicitas was a slave, and these two in the eyes of the Christians were on an absolute equal position. One with a very fine background and the other a slave girl, but both of them standing nobly for the Christian faith. Both of them venerated as martyrs, both of them receiving every honor at the time from the Christians. Now these two were. There were some men also who were martyred at the same time, but these two are the ones particularly mentioned in the account. Perpetua was married. She was 23 years of age. She had a young child born only two or three months before. And her father came beseeching her to have pity on them and her young child and give up her Christian faith. The government came to her and said, "We don't want to hurt you. Just offer a little pinch of sacrifice to the emperor. That is all we ask, but she remained firm in her Christian faith and was put with the others

to be thrown to the beasts. The slave girl, Felicitas, two days before she was to be thrown into the wild beasts gave birth to a child in the prison, and there she was crying out in agony in the agony of this childbirth, and the jailer said to her, "If you can't stand this pain, how do you think you will be able to stand the pain of suffering and being chewed up by the wild animals." He said, "Why don't you give up your Christian faith and get out and go to the hospital where you can be taken care of and treated better. Just offer a little sacrifice to the emperor's statue. That is all that is necessary." And she turned to him and she said, "What I now suffer, I suffer myself, but then there will be another who will suffer with me, because I also shall suffer for Him." She stood by her Christian faith and the two girls together were thrown to the lions. Persecution under continued through his time. He reigned until his death in 211. That was nine years of rather continuous persecution, though with ups and downs. It was not a searching out, like the Communist persecution today, of anyone who makes the slightest hint of deviating from that which the officials want everyone to believe. It was not that. It was a rather arbitrary thing selecting certain ones for very cruel punishment and not making it extremely difficult for great number of Christians who continued with their services and their Christian propaganda. The persecution was continued after death through the reign of his son C..... Now oldest son was murdered by his youngest son, and if you go to Rome today, you will see three great arches there in the Roman forum. The arch of Titus, the arch of Constantine and the arch of S..... And of the arch of S..... you can see the line where he mentioned his sons, and when the youngest son murdered the oldest son, he had the line crossed out on the arch, and you can still see it today where it is crossed off on that arch there in Rome. We don't need to mention him among our emperors, because it was a very brief time after his father's death before he was murdered. C.... a cruel and brutal man reigned for the next 11 years. 211 to 217. Caracalla. It was a name which you occasionally hear today because he built great on the outskirts of Rome which are known today as the .. of Caracalla. But it's a great large building in which one part of it has been out into a stage and they have great concerts and

End of Record 58 and beginning of Record 59..... unless there was clear
 proof that there would not sacrifice and don't search them out, but the
 Marcus went the other way. In general now, it is the emperors who
 wanted to have a continuous government ~~with~~ with justice for the people as a
 whole and that the Christians were a menace to the land. Now, In general, it
 is the less worthy emperors who stopped the persecution during the century
 it worked this way very much. Student:.... AAM: He was a man of very very
 fine character, and every~~thing~~ one must praise him for that, and Tertullian
 couldn't quite believe that he was responsible for that ~~persecution~~ persecution
 but he had not evidence he wasn't, and he was the suprem~~e~~ ruler of the land,
 and the greatest persecution they had yet seen broke out in his reign, and was
 carried on in many different sections. Now if a person is convinced that Marcus
 couldn't have anything to do with it, you can't persuade him at the time, but
~~EX~~ it certainly would have been easy for him to stop it.....3..... Well,
 and Caracalla had simply carried on the persecution. He was succeeded
 in 217 by a queer sort of fellow named Heliogabalus. ~~Now~~ Now Heliogabalus was
 put in the position by the army, and he was one of the worst type of men who
 ever occupied the throne of the Roman Empire. He had been a priest in Syria.
 And he had participated in all sorts of wickedness, but he tried to get the
 people to worship Baal. Now you have a situation where Jezebel brought the
 Baal worship into Palestine only that instead of the enemy of Baal to
 his mind is the old god to Rome, and so he brings in Baal and these other
 Syrian Gods and he doesn't do away with the Roman gods, but he makes the Roman
 gods..... He will take one of the leading Roman goddesses and he will celebrate
 a marriage between her and one of the lesser Syrian gods, and then after a year
 or two he will have a divorce and this Syrian god would throw out this Roman
 goddess, and he carried on that sort of thing for about six years until he was
 finally assassinated, but he thought of Christianity of another religion which
 came from Palestine into the area and rather than an enemy, and so
 persecution was very little during his reign, and his coming in brought an end
 to persecution to Christianity. At the same time in the end, it would have
 touched the of Christianity because the Romans with their belief in their

great gods seeing the Roman Emperor treating the Roman gods in this way would tend to lose faith in the reality of the power of the Roman gods. Well, now he reigned for six years, and then he was assassinated, and he was succeeded by his cousin who was a very wicked sort of man. His cousin was ~~X~~ Alexander Severus. Alexander reigned from 222 to 235. He had a reign of 13 years, and he was as different from ~~..H..~~ as any man could be. He was mild and amiable interested~~d~~ in philosophy. He was an oriental like his cousin. He ~~was~~ did not have the fanatical hatred toward the Christians like the Romans had and who restore the beliefs and deities of Ancient Rome. And Alexander was a at least he was a man who believed all religion was right, and he put up a private chapel, he put up busts of the Roman Gods, and of Abraham, Moses, and Christ. He put them all up there together, because he felt that all religions were good, and so we have a period of 13 years here, while there might be occasionally a little bit of persecution in one particular area, in general the Christians had peace, and they had this period of 20 years without interference from the Roman government at all. The church was growing in Rome and in all the other sections of the Empire. Alexander S..... regarded Christianity so leniently that his mother sent for Origen when she was visiting in Egypt and got him to explain to her this belief, and there are some who say that the first Christian churches would be ^{erected} ~~wrecked~~ at this time. Before this the worship was held either in the open or in the homes of ~~XXXX~~ members. But ~~by~~ the end of the century, we have a great many church buildings, and it may be that during his reign was ~~during~~ when they began. Now he takes it to 235, and I made this--- first I thought this morning I would run into 235, but then I changed it to be 237, and the reason I did that was because I thought it was good to bring in the next emperor. The next emperor, when Alexander was murdered, and in this period we have 25 emperors of whom all but four were assassinated. When he was murdered a Tragen barbarian who was a soldier in the army and had gotten a great many friends in the army seizing the empire and for two years he was able to hold the position as emperor. His name was Maximin. And Maximin wasn't particularly against Christianity, but he was against the man he just killed, and since Alexander had not injured the

the Christians, he introduced persecution against The Christians. And during these two years there were arbitrary seizures of Christians in various places, many being sent to work at cruel labor in the mines for many would die under the cruel treatment, but he only reigned for two years, and he spoiled some of the temples, and he was just a brutal character all around. So you see we have a period of 37 years which the first two years had no persecution Then we have 15 years of very severe persecution at first and then coninuing with to some extent through the 15 years till 217, and then we have 18 years with practically no persecution. And then we have these two years of cruel treatment of religious people in general and the Christians perhaps suffered a little more than others did during this two years in which he reigned. So you see, how different it was from the picture that many of us have of the Roman Empire trying to destroy Christianity, trying to route it out and utterly put an end to it. We have a greater persecution later, the greatest that ever occurred in which it was the idea to do that very thing, but up to this time that thing had not really been attempted. They would seize individuals and punish them very cruelly, but they made no attempt to seize all the Christians, no attempt to search them out and get every one of them they possibly could, and there were long periods 20 years sometimes even as long as 40 years in which there was practically no persecution and Christianity had a chance to spread without any opposition ~~XXX~~ at all on the part of the government. The Lord directed it and planned it in such a way that the only church would get rid of those whose faith was not very deep and would strengthen the faith of those who had ~~the~~ to face the cruel ordeal and determine whether they would and at the same time they had the long periods in between when people remembered the persecution and remembered the constantcy with which the Christians had stood for their faith and been attracted to ~~XXX~~ come and learn what it was that these Christians believed and gave them an ability to stand before such as others were not able to do. Student:..... AAM: There is no evidence of any opposition to Christianity, buthe was a rather cruel sort of a fellow in general and the thing was under way12.... He would have stopped it if he had wanted to, but he did n't stop it, it did continue

during most of his reign. So much then for No. 1 The Relation to the Roman Government. I called persecution at first. I decided to change it to the Relation to the Roman Government because we are interested not only in persecution, but in the attitude of these governors who did not persecute and the reason for it. Now, I'm going to mention No. 2 under this head and ~~the~~ Anti-Trinitarian movement. That reason I'm putting that as No. 2 instead of a little further on is because some of the great writers whom I want to discuss in this material are particularly important in connection with their attitudes toward these anti-Trinitarian movements. And it is good for us perhaps to have a brief ~~of~~ idea of these movements at this time. The Anti-Trinitarian movements at this period were called as a whole by the name of monarchianism, and gave that term to it a monarch is a single ruler. One who controls, and it probably was an idea stressed by those who began these Anti-Trinitarian movements. They said, we don't believe in three gods or two gods. We believe in one god, and so they came to be called the monarchianists. Now, of course, all Christians believe in one god, but the question is what kind of a god do you believe in? Is it one god and that's all there is to it? Or are there three persons in the one God? Now, the exact terminology had not yet been worked out at this time. ~~by~~ the Christians, but the belief of the Christians right from the time of Christ was that there were three persons but one God, and the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit. Three distinct persons, but actually just one God. Now, we can't understand how that can be, but that has been the belief of Christianity all through the ages. That has been the belief of the teaching of the Bible, and the belief of the Christian church. Well, now, these people make people think you are talking about three gods or two gods. We don't believe that. We believe in one God. And consequently it is easy to have a reaction from that which is stressed on the unity of God but that can lead into very ~~small~~ small beliefs. End of Record 59 and beginning of Record 60 and come down later in the next period, so I don't think I'll say much about it in this period but in the next generation. Now, these three $1\frac{1}{2}$ is that which simply said, there is one God and Christ is a man so Christ is not God, Well, of course, that is denying the very center of

Christianity when one takes that position . And this attitude, they call that dynamic monarchism. They said there was a power which cam upon Christ, which overshadowed him, which used him, which adopted Him, but he was originally just a man. Now this attitude is anti-Christian and did not have much weight in the church although there were places and times where it was more subtely put and which it did have considerable strength. There was one of the groups for instance, which said that Melchzdek was the head of the angelic hosts, and he was the mediator between God and the angels and so if He was greater than Christ, who was merely the mediator between God and man. And this shows you the vague areas into which these groups of men went. The Victor the bishop of Rome declared that these beliefs were not Christian were not to be recognized in the church at all. They were not to take part in the communion service in the Roman church, and so Bishop Victor excommunicated them in Rome. There were two or three groups, I don't take time to discuss them in detail of this dynamic type, but the second class of them said no, that is not true. Jesus is not a man who became god. Jesus actually is God and there is only one God, and the bishops of Rome at this time liked that much better than the other which they could easily see was untrue, but they liked it so well that they were accused by some of their opponents of adopting this second type. That is denied by the Roman Catholic Church today that any bishop of Rome ever adopted this, but some of their contemporaries were quite certain that they had done so. Now this second type which said there is one God. There is one God and that God is Christ, and He suffered on the cross Jesus said, "I an my father are one. He that hath seen me hath seen the Father." There is just one God. Well, Tertullian said they make the father to be the one who was crucified. And so Tertullian gave them the name Papritassian. That the Father suffered on the cross. And the first of the outstanding first leaders of this group came to Asia Minor to Rome. He had been a confessor in Asia Minor. He had stood up valiantly and refused to Sacrifieed, and so he had great... . He was considered as a man who had stood despite the danger of death, and the Bishop Victor looked with great friendliness upon him, and when the bishop

ordered that the Montanists were not allowed to take part in the Roman service to this man who had the view that it was one God

Tertullian said about him. He says, He with his vision of Rome - that they rolled away the Holy Spirit and crucified the cross. As you see that XX is the statement that a lawyer would make who was very clever ~~to~~ to give an impression a little bit from the actual facts. The fact was of course not that they crucified the father but6..... and the Montanists put their stress on the Holy Spirit. The Roman bishops at this time called the teaching of and his followers very attractive to them, and it was not for some time that they were persuaded that this was a more subtle thing and a more dangerous thing than the dynamic.... and we do find that by the end of this period the Roman bishops had definitely turned against this. But there was a time when they were wavering and their enemies say that they actually embraced this heretical view. Now, the R. C. today but our next point is going to be about the greatest scholar of the Roman church in the first few centuries, and his name is ~~is~~ Hippolytus. I am not mentioning here the third type of anti-Trinitarian movement because it doesn't really begin until the next generation. But Hippolytus was the greatest scholar of the Roman Church in several centuries and an interesting thing is as Philip Shaw says Hippolytus lived three lives. First it was an actual life here at home in the beginning of the second century. And he was a man of great renown, highly thought of who wrote many important books, and who died under Maximin, and there are all kinds of traditions as to how he died. Some say he was tied to two or three wild horses his arms to each one and they were driven out and he was torn into pieces. Others say he had cruel punishment in the mines there and died there. What the actual situation ~~XXXXXX~~ we don't know except we believe he was a martyr. ~~EX~~ Some call him a bishop and some call him a president. There is much dispute as to the actual situation. But his second life was during the middle ages when he was one of the greatest of the saints of the Roman Catholic church. He was revered in the Roman Catholic Church in the middle Ages. And the ~~XXXXX~~ third life he lived is in modern times, because there was discovered 100 years ago a work which was by him which has been proven to be by him. In it he tears into the character of these

bishops of Rome and calls them heretics and wicked men and them most bitterly. And the Roman Catholic Church has venerated him as a saint and now we find that tore into the bishops of Rome and accuses them of being very bad characters and heretical in their viewpoints, and so Philip Shaw says that he lived three lives. Now what was his real position? Well, an Austrian scholar in the last century named Vollinger. And he worked out a very clever solution to keep Hippolytus as a great saint and yet believe that he sincerely believed that these popes were wicked men and yet hold that actually there is no hard in this belief. And that is ~~WKK~~ what is taught about him in all Roman Catholic Churches today. We have to leave that till tomorrow morning. Last time we took up Nol 3 Hippolytus. We are dealing right now with this first third of third century and within this third we are looking at those men and those women who were particularly important at that time. It's a little hard to be sure just what order to take them in because they were contemporaneous. One might be prominent say in the first part, another in the middle, and one in the first part again ~~KK~~ in the last part. And it's a question--I don't think that exact order matters a great deal. There is one other who perhaps chronologically might better have been put ahead of Hippolytus in our outline, but I'm putting him after Hippolytus simply because Hippolytus ~~was/the~~ connects rather logically with the subject we were just looking at--the Anti-Trinitarian movement. I mentioned that there were three phases of these Anti-Trinitarian movements which were called in those days Monarchianism. The first of these phases was the dynamic Monarchianism which seems simply the power of God--That God came on Christ and Christ was really only a man. ~~XXXXXX~~ This would clearly seem to be non-Christian. Good Christian people slipped into it without realizing what they were getting into, without realizing how their ideas were moving, but then others saw how their ideas had moved and soon reacted rather strongly about it and the reaction against it led to the second thing of the Anti-Trinitarian movement - the phase which stressed the unity of the Godhead so much that it presumed Christ to be a part of God actually, and this group of movements came to be called which is a latin word meaning the father was suffering. The opponents of it said, well, then according to your view God the father died on the cross. God the father suffered on the cross and they

oh, no, it was Christ the Son who suffered on the cross. He said there is not distinction between Christ the Son ~~KK~~ and God the father. One God- there is no division of persons at all. Well, then they would say, you believe the Father suffered on the cross. Well, it may be so, but we don't really mean that. It is pretty hard to define their ideas exactly in these areas, and some of them even went so far as to say that is what they meant that the father suffered on the cross. But it is much easier to see how the first type of Anti Trinitarian movement is definitely unChristian than the second type. It is much easier to see, and some of the Bishops of Rome gave--while excommunicating the first type are referred to Protestant histories as men who accepted the second view. Now that the R. C.'s of course would deny. They would not admit that any bishop of Rome would have accept that. But they would say that some of them were too mild toward it perhaps. The present R. C. view is that all the Bishops of Rome are infallible and that they could not possibly have followed into these views, and we can cross examine them. We have not a great deal of evidence from the period and so it is rather hard to prove. But there were those at the time who thought that some of the bishops of Rome were actually members of this group. The third group really begins in the next period, and we won't take it up now. It is spoken of as S..... and he was a man from the East who was living in Rome during this first period. End of Record 60

Tape Side One

in their

I would like to start punctually on time, and to have everybody ~~on~~ seat on time. When a class is as large this one, and if you are late by one minute, and there are seventy in class, then that means we are 70 minutes late. So, especially in a large class like this it is very important that we be present and ready to start right on time. Now, this is my first chance to greet some of the old students whom I have not seen since last spring, and I ~~may~~ not have chance to ~~see you~~ with and speak ~~to you~~ in the next two or three days, but I hope I will. ~~Any way~~ way I want to tell you that I am very happy indeed to have you back with us, and we look forward to a year's blessing in the Lord. For the new students ~~wh-~~ there ~~are-~~ will be a few things to say about our general conduct of the class which will be perhaps rather important. First, let me say this, that I have a great deal to do, and matters that are not important I ~~would~~ would like you to handle with Mr. Faucette or with others of course instead of with me, but ~~y~~ if you think something is ~~very-~~ important, please do not hesitate to come and see me. I do not care if it is important to me, but if you think something is important, please do not hesitate to come and see me. I do not care if it is not important to me, but if it is important to you, ~~o~~ I am anxious to be of any help to you if I can. I was speaking with a fellow just yesterday who had a rather serious . . . to his course by a decision which the faculty ~~member~~ has made last ~~March~~ at this point. I do not know/whether that decision was right or wrong. It cannot be changed now, and so there is nothing ~~e~~ that can be done/about it. ~~There~~ is no point in seeing him. I have ~~a~~ great confidence in the particular faculty member, but we all make mistakes. I have had many more years of experience in Seminary management than ~~any~~ body else ~~xxxx~~ connected with our group and consequently anytime you think that something is in ~~someway~~

P-R. Ch / H. S. 1

a

INJURING to you and/wrong decision has been made, and there is something that is important in the conduct of your course or in your life, please do not hesitate to come and see me, because I am anxious in such a case to look into it and see exactly what the situation is and to do what is best for you and what is best for the school. ~~We~~ Naturally we are not in a situation where if we had two or three, four students and could tell every-~~sk~~ individual ~~student~~ student. Whenever there is any particular favor given to one person and you have to think immediately. Does this mean that there are twenty-five others who have equal rights to ask for it. I always think further than that. I think I would rather add the additional twenty who would be entitled to it, if they knew there it could be done. I do not think that it is fair to give any one student a special privilege unless/everyone I let w ho would have equal right to the privilege and he knew about it, understand that he would have an opportunity/ to ask for it, and so, in a / institution with any size of a number of students, the probem is keeping things on an even scale, and being just as helpful as possible to every individual, but in whatever arrangement that is made for-one individual thinks of what it does in relation to all other individuals. And I have had good many years of experience in dealing with problems of this type, and sometimes I can know the answer ~~now~~ in a ~~minute~~ minute or two. Twenty years ago i might have taken me three or four hours to work out. So, please do not hesitate if you want to come and see me anytime there is any way in which I can be of help to you. You know the new students I have already mentioned twice that I am very slow in learning your names. So, even if you talk with me an hour, please do not expect that I should recognize you ~~at-once-~~ the next day. when I guarantee that /years are over, I will recognize everyone of you. But I am rather slow in learning to recognize the faces.without-- But I probably remember most of what you said, ~~at~~ and once you remind ~~me~~ me of your name, I will be ~~ok~~

Pre-Reformation Side 1

quite aware of the situation. I often think that ~~/~~ if a person fails to get something that he needs, some training, some important training he needs in grammar school, ~~or~~ at higher school he could make it up~~/~~. But if he fails in higher school, then he can make it up~~/~~. If he fails to make it up, he will make it up in Seminary.

But ~~/~~ if he fails here, his ministry will be ruined, and his life will be ~~tr- ~~taught~~~~ trained ~~/~~ by some very little thing that could have easily been remedied if he were only aware of the problem. And therefore I feel that the Seminary training has to be ~~spoke~~ to quite an extent a .. / ^{custom made in in} operation ~~/~~ which the need and the situation of the individual are taking ... to a very great extent. So, I am very anxious to know whenever there is any particular situation in which I ~~can~~ ^{be of} give help to you, Now, this course in Church History I am arranging the material, I will arrange the material under certain definite heads, and I think that it will ~~ma~~ ke it easier for ~~y~~ you to grasp it, and I will call the Roman ~~Number~~ Numeral One, Introductory.

There will be some more important material under this head. And under that A. The Method of the course. Incidentally, about any problem you might see me about, during these three days, Today, tomorrow and Friday, I am very anxious to see you if I can be of help to you. It is entirely possible that I may not ~~be~~ have any time next week ~~/~~ in which I could deal with any particular problem. After the next week, I should have plenty time then. So, if you have something that you might think you might see me about ~~/~~ next week about, please do so this week.

Now, A. the Method of the Course. I have attended an institution where you would sign up for a course for one or ~~two~~ or three credit hours, you would go to class and you would sit there with that length of time taking notes and ~~/~~ in the end of the year you glance over the notes, and then you take a brief ~~ex~~ examination, and receive one or two or three credits ~~hour~~ for the course, depending on the number of hours you sat through the week in the class. And in the very same

Pre-Reformation Church History , Side 1

institution, from the same professor, I had another course which would be two-hour credit course in which he has assigned fifteen or twenty hours of work to do every week. Since I had three or four courses before, it did not average fifteen minutes a week, I did not feel justified in complaining . . . it certainly seemed a sloppy way to handle things. I have been very anxious to avoid that sort thing here. And so we think of credit hours as not an hour in fact, but we think of credit hours as an hour in class and two hours outside class, or two hours in class and an hour work outside the class. In other words it means three hours a week in a ~~one~~ credit hour. And so, in all of our courses ~~we~~ you have an hour in class, prof. should assign you approximately two hour work on the average and sometimes it is difficult to keep the average, because sometimes there are particular things that take more time and ~~and~~ there are other times ~~when~~ when it is hard to find . . . We try to average three hours a week through the term/ for each credit hour class. There is one exception in Hebrew. The beginning Hebrew has physical problem. The problem of getting your eyes used to new letters. ~~Even~~ Hebrew ~~is actually it~~ would not be a particularly difficult subject if we use the letters ~~in~~ we are accustomed to. But since the big job is getting your eyes used to these new letters, that takes time. We always felt that for Hebrew it is quite proper to expect very ~~a considerable amount more time~~ of drilling on it ~~in learning than~~ than in other courses. Then that is the only course in the Seminary in which ~~we~~ we expect to spend normally/average ~~three~~ ^{an} of more than three hours ~~or~~ total including an hour in class and two hours outside ordinarily. Now, in Church History, two years ago when I dealt with the Post-Reformation Church History, I gave three lectures a week for two credit course, and the assignments corresponded to that. This semester I do not expect to do that. I expect to average two hours in class a week and ~~two~~ to assign, not

PreReformation Ch. H. Side 1

over four hours on average of outside work. You notice on the schedule that the Church History meets on Tuesday morning at 9:20 and Wednesday morning at 9:20 and it says on Thursday morning 9:20, special. We will have that meeting tomorrow, at 9:20. Next week there is a good possibility that I will not be meeting/any class at all. I am expecting to average two hours a week throughout the term. = but occasionally I have to be away and this extra special hour will make it possible to adjust that a little, and I want to average two hours a week. I do not want to average three hours as I ~~did~~ did two years ago. That means / that you might have a little more outside work than they did two years ago. But the outside work, the assigned reading and the reports which I will assign, I expect them to be turned in on time, and I will deduct if they are not, except in the case of a person who is starting the seminary for the first time. If you are taking beginning Greek and beginning Hebrew, I will give you a little ~~more~~ extra leeway, / because those courses ~~do not~~ build, and Church History, you might say, is a series of... while they are interrelated to the series of .. if you miss two weeks of Hebrew, you might as well quit and start all over next year. But if you miss two weeks of Church History, you can go on from the point where ~~you~~ you are, and you will, with certain amount of handicap, not be greatly handicapped, and you can ~~make~~ make it up yourself, in vacation. So that if you are taking two beginning languages, simply mention that on your late paper, and I will understand that. Papers can be a week or two later in that case, because I want you to keep up with your work in the languages. I am not going to assign any / outside reading and reports enough to bring the total of six hours of week. I am not going to assign that much on the outside readings, because I feel that it is very important that when you ~~have~~ start the lecture that you have the previous

PreReformation Ch. H. Side 1

over four hours on average of outside work. You notice on the schedule that the Church History meets on Tuesday morning at 9:20 and Wednesday morning at 9:20 and it says on Thursday morning 9:20, special. We will have that meeting tomorrow, at 9:20. Next week there is a good possibility that I will not be meeting^{with}/any class at all. I am expecting to average two hours a week throughout the term. = but occasionally I have to be away and this extra special hour will make it possible to adjust that a little, and I want to average two hours a week. I do not want to average three hours as I ~~did~~ did two years ago. That means $\frac{1}{2}$ that you might have a little more outside work than they did two years ago. But the outside work, the assigned reading and the reports which I will assign, I expect them to be turned in on time, and I will deduct if they are not, except in the case of a person who is starting the seminary for the first time. If you are taking beginning Greek and beginning Hebrew, I will give you a little ~~more~~ extra leeway, $\frac{1}{2}$ because those courses ~~do not~~ build, and Church History, you might say, is a series of... while they are interrelated to the series of .. if you miss two weeks of Hebrew, you might as well quit and start all over next year. But if you miss two weeks of Church History, you can go on from the point where ~~you are~~ you are, and you will, with certain amount of handicap, not be greatly handicapped, and you can make it up yourself, in vacation. So that if you are taking two beginning languages, simply mention that on your late paper, and I will understand that. Papers can be $\frac{1}{2}$ week or two later in that case, because I want you to keep up with your work in the languages. I am not going to assign any $\frac{1}{2}$ outside reading and reports enough to bring the total of six hours of week. I am not going to assign that much on the outside readings, because I feel that it is very important that when you ~~ha-~~ start the lecture that you have the previous

Pre-Reformation Ch. H. Side 1

lectures in mind and therefore I am counting on you to review each lecture prior to the next lecture. Now, it is very ~~discouraging~~ disconcerted when I found last ~~of~~ I intended to much more than in Church History, because that ~~of~~ field was built so much more on the previous hours, but it is very disconcerted when you deal with a very important problem, and after having dealt with it about an hour, somebody asks a question which shows that he has no slightest conception of what it is because he has not looked at his note in between. I would like to ask everybody to take fifteen minutes ^{to} or half an hour at least reviewing the lecture each time.

I would like to ask you to do that. Human nature being what it is, asking would not provide. Some would/do it all night before the examinations, and so I find it necessary to do something that students ^{detest} ~~detest~~ very much, but I am sure that they will be very grateful later on, and that is to give spot quizzes at the beginning of the hour ^{the} or previous lecture or on something earlier in the course. And as I say, the big part ^{of the work} of this course is to get ~~int-~~ mind what we have dealt ~~in~~ class.

Because my greatest interest in church history is not having you learn a lot of dates and facts, if you ^{can simply} take a book and memorize them... I do not see any great value in that, ^{if that is} ~~because~~ all you get. My interest ^{is} in having you have ^{an} understanding of these, what they mean, and ~~wh-~~ what their interrelation is, what importance they should have for our lives, and if I have to spend the first ten minutes for each hour trying to remind you of what I gave the hour before, I would waste a lot of time, and I ^{to} ~~should~~ do that, ^I ~~we~~ would have to have three hours a week, and I ~~am~~ not going to do that, this ~~ex~~ semester, and so I am going to give you ~~of~~ quizzes very frequently, and if you do not like it please go out ~~and~~ ~~back~~ back where nobody can see you and yell about it about five minutes and get it out of your system, and then come in here and write a good ~~corrct~~ answer to the questions that I will ask

Pre-Reformation Ch. H. Side 1

you in the quiz, but I am not just interested in your talking something up in two
final
days before the exams putting on the paper and then forgetting it, but I am interested
in your getting it and so you have to keep on reviewing. So, there will not
such
be a great amount of outside reading for this course, but there will be very considerable
amount of review of the lectures and expected, and you should certainly have
at least have an outline of the previous lectures in mind and the main things, and
main facts with which it deals, and the main things of understanding of the
main features. Now, in this class, the most important thing in this class is the
attempt I make to give you the understanding of the meaning of church history.
not
And what I understand to be as the meaning of it you can find in books, but you
have to read many books to get the full of the view which I would present,
and therefore, if you are going to class, you should always be present in class.
the it that
We do not have cuts in Seminary. We consider cuts a rather infantile matter, to give
cuts. The Seminary should have passed that stage. We expect everyone always
to be any course
students in class. If you feel that it is a waste of time to be in class,
you may just as well please come and talk to me about it. Because it is
altogether possible that some members of the faculty including myself may have
gotten off tangent and that he is wasting time. It is possible, and in such
a case we should remedy it immediately. It is equally possible that you have mis-
understood any particular matter, and in that case, we will try to make it clear to
you. Please do come and talk to me about it. We mean that everyone of
our stu- our ... is important, and we expect everyone to be present on time.
The Method of this course, then, is primarily a lecture with assigned readings.
It is not a research course. It is a lecture course to get the understanding of the
main--

Pre-Reformation, Side 1

MEANING of church history as it may be vital in our lives and in^y our service for our Lord. That naturally leads to B. The Value of the Studying Church History.

Number 1. It can be a source of great encouragement to us. When I was a student in a modernist college, holding my faith in the Scripture, believing the Bible to be true, and believing in the great doctrines of the Christianity, but in a college which was five years before had been a thoroughly evangelical school, and which was in ~~the process of transition within the two or three~~ process of transition within the two or three years afterwards became a completely modernistic college. When I was there, in class, there was a way pressing on you an attitude that the teachings of Christianity were a lot of old myths and fables, that way even without much presentation, pressed on us, I could not avoid it. And I cannot tell you what an encouragement it was in connection with a course, I made the study of the first church councils/ the ~~ni-~~ Nicene Church Council of 325, and in reading about the council, how tremendously ~~they--~~ ~~were-excited~~ ~~about~~ those people were at that time, 325 years after Christ, 1600 years ago about the doctrine whether Jesus Christ was fully God ~~and~~ or whether He was in some way partly God. God rested on Him, something like that, and when I saw how ~~those men~~ those men from all over the Roman Empire felt so long ago that this was such a tremendously vital matter and I was thinking that there are other matters that are still more important than this matter. It was ~~a~~ such a great relief that such weight was pressing ~~upon~~ upon them, to get the feeling of these ~~the~~ things in church history where these ~~men-~~ many important people had felt that these matters were so important. To see how the Christianity began and how the little group of the disciples, a little group of scattered disciples who had fled for their lives that their master had been crucified, and they were afraid to admit to anybody that they were connected with him, and some of these conditions of

Pre-Reformation Ch. History, Side 1

terror and confusion among these mostly comparatively uneducated people.

There began a movement which spread through the whole Roman Empire ~~through~~—and until that power, one of the greatest powers the world has ever seen, finally being unable to crush it and had to succumb to it. And the whole Roman Empire was filled with this teaching two or three hundred years, but to see how it occurred, what a source of encouragement to us! When we face the encroaching modernism and the encroaching unbelief and denial of Christianity, sometimes it looks almost hopeless, but we see what God ~~thru~~ did ~~then~~ then. What an encouragement to us ~~too~~ when we read about Martin Luther and see how the greater parts of the world ~~was~~ was filled with formalism and with an attitude which accepted a great many Christian doctrines which ^{they} did not apply to their hearts, did not get their real value to the life, to the soul, and how this man risked his life to begin to present these matters, and ~~it~~ was ^{who} a situation after situation where others ^{are} doing exactly the same thing, ~~—they have been~~ ^{for} have been killed ~~with~~ their faith and their doctrines ~~have~~ been completely eradicated from the area where they spoke, but how in the providence of God Martin Luther was able to continue fiercely, and from that little start, there spread over half of Europe and over the whole northern section of ~~the northern~~ Europe a new understanding of the gospel had made tremendous impact. How utterly hopeless it was when Luther began the new work of Reformation. What an encouragement to us! What an encouragement it can be when we study that little band of the Pilgrims in 1609, that little group of comparatively uneducated people, dissatisfied with formalism which was in the church of their day, though these churches were presenting the true Christian doctrines, but in such a formal way and without real ^{an} opportunity to study the Bible for himself, and see

Pre-Reformation, Side 1

(655) what it taught, and make it real in your life, and how these little groups of people with no resources stepped to serve the Lord, and other groups which stepped out in the previous years had been annihilated by war, by torture, by shipwreck and by other means, but how God took this little group ~~na-~~ and moved to . . . moved to the United States and enabled them to survive ~~and--~~ the tremendous difficulties, and set a pattern which for two or three hundred years had an effect upon ~~this~~ this country which made the nation different from almost any nation in the world that we have ever seen before. You see how the hand of God works against the seemingly impossible obstacles. What a tremendous source of encouragement! Well, then, I think one of the greatest purposes of studying church history is this encouraging which we can get out of it. But I want to go on to 2. which I will call, the purpose of studying the church ~~history~~ history/ negatively. I think that this is tremendously important. The purpose, negatively, a. not to learn what is true in theology. We do not study ~~the~~ church history to learn what is true about God, to learn how one can be saved, to learn the great facts of the origins of the world or its . . . we do not study church history for this purpose. Church history is not reliable source for these things. I believe that the so called Jehovah's Witnesses is a cult which is presenting the false doctrine. I admire the zeal these men ~~who~~ show, but I detest the harmful results on people's ~~life--~~ lives of the false doctrines that they present. But one of them has a wonderful title which is taken from the Scripture. Let God be true, and let every man a liar, and it is a fact when it comes to knowing what the truth is about God, what the truth is about the great things of the universe. ~~That~~ There is one way to find it out. And that is from the study of the Scripture.

Pre-Reformation Ch. Hist. Side 1

Now, church history can be a tremendously important to us in showing us what an effect the Bible has had, and where people ~~have~~ have studied the Bible and have attempted to follow it, God has tremendously used them, and where people used other means of getting truths, the church has been a failure. The ~~whole~~ Bible is the source of knowledge. The Bible is the source of this knowledge. I gave/a course in Church History, and under these present circumstances, once in three years we started in . . . I think we have gone through the whole . . . through and we go right straight through, and all our students who take courses in three years get this course from me continuously, but if you take it in four ~~years~~ years, as good many do, they may get it in their first year and then in their last year, but I do not give it every year, and I do not feel that we should have a full-time man in church history. If we have a full-time man in church history, he will naturally be entitled to give electives in the courses and develop/a department. I see a real value in developing a department in church history, ~~and~~ after a person has had five or six years of exegesis. But I believe that the vital thing is to know what the Bible says, and that is the vital thing, and therefore, we ~~must-examine-~~ clam it into two years, and we try to get the basic, vital things during that time, and we do not give any other electives in church history, ~~and~~ interesting as they may be, and valuable as they might be, because we think that in the course of three or four years of course . . . much further as Master's degree would lead you, we feel that the main thing ~~in church history~~ should be exegesis. It is a question, What does ~~the~~ God say? The whole world may turn against ~~it-~~ the truth, but that does not make any less true. You

cannot settle ~~truths~~ truths by whom? You cannot settle truths by counting the truths. You see who knows the facts, and when ~~it~~ it comes to the great facts of great eternity, I often think that many of our ~~philosophers~~ philosophers are a ~~rig-~~ like a group of very highly intelligent people who had never ~~been~~ crossed the Pacific ocean, had never been to the Pacific oceans, and had never talked ~~of any~~ with anybody about the Pacific ocean, and had never read any book about the Ocean. In these days of widespread information it is hard to ~~imagine~~ imagine ~~that~~ such a situation. ~~If you will imagine~~ for ~~imagine-~~ But if you will imagine/a moment, think of a man of tremendous intellect, a wonderful thing, who has never crossed the Pacific Ocean, never talked with anybody who had ever seen the Ocean, and who had never seen anybody who had seen the Ocean, these men go up on Mt. _____ near San Francisco, and there above the clouds they are able to look away the Pacific Ocean, and one of them says, I wonder if there is any country over there, and then the other says, Well, now, I think I can give you some ^{good} philosophic arguments to ~~we~~ prove that there is not any such ~~thing~~ thing. This man says I can give you a better philosophic argument that there is a country, and then they argue back and forth, and they may have some very acute ~~and~~ reasonings as to ~~the~~ whether whether there is a country beyond the Pacific Ocean or not, or that is ~~so~~ simply the end, or whether if you keep on going ~~round~~ around, you will come back to America. They may have some very acute reasonings, but the only way to find it out ^{for somebody} is to go there, or to read a book written by somebody who has been there. They might discuss, Is there anything over there or if there is any what sort of country is it? What ~~kind~~ kind of language do they use? Do they really run from north to south like the Mississippi? Or do they run from north to south? like the Nile? Or ~~do~~ do they run from west to the east like the Yangtzse? Or do they run from ^{east} ~~west~~ to the ^{west like the}

Pre-Reformation Church History, Side 1

They could
 Columbia? Think of these things and give illustrations and ~~comparisons~~
~~comparisons~~ comparisons and they could show wonderful acumen, and they
 could think of all the possibility, but they would never know with certainty
 whether there would be a country, ~~and~~ and if there is, what kind of country
 that would be, and in what situation it would be at all, they would not know
 unless either one of them went or talked with somebody who had been, ~~and~~ or
 read a book written by one who had been there. And no human being has ever
 gone beyond the grave and come back to tell us about it aside from Jesus Christ
 our Lord. We do not know what is beyond the grave. No amount of philosophic
 thinking can possibly tell us. We do not know anything about God. We can see
 that there must be ~~some~~ a god. As Paul said, if you look the nature, you
 see the works of God, you see His power, you see His majesty which is
 implicit in nature except that Satan has ~~of~~ blinded our eyes so that we cannot
 see. But we see the power. We see the greatness. ~~We see~~ We do not know
 His character. We do not know whether He is a good God or He ~~is~~ sends
 rain to make things grow and He sends the sun to keep us warm and all this.
 Whether He is a cruel, ~~of~~ ruthless god who sends hurricanes and ~~of~~ floods and
 tempests and ~~and~~ tornados. We do not ~~we~~ know whether He is ^{whether} good or ~~He~~ is
 bad. We do not know whether He has made us for a joke and He is going to
 crush us with the turn of His hand. Or whether He loves us and made us for
 fellowship with Himself. These and thousand other questions can only be
 answered by reading the book that was written by the One who knows that
 God Himself overshadowed the human writers and led them in their writing so
 that it would give facts about these things. And therefore, if we are going to

know what~~/is~~ true in theology, church history will tell us what people have thought, and it is good to know what people have thought because it suggests matters for investigation, but it does not give you the answer. Human thinking, human reasoning are wonderful to suggest matters~~/~~ for invest~~ing~~igation, but it is useless when it comes to give you answers about things we cannot reach. And the other side of the ~~M~~oon except for the satellites that go around and take a picture of it and nobody on earth could tell what it is like until that happens. Nobody has ever seen the other side of the moon. It might be utterly different from this side. I rem~~ember~~ber when I was a student in seminary, I used to go bike-~~w~~ riding for a little exercise. One day I was going along and I saw a head of a most attractive young woman I had ever seen for years. Oh, my, as I saw her, I just wondered what her face would look like, and I drove along and ... I said to myself, I do not want to embarrass her, I do not want to scare her, and so as I got back, I turned around and saw, she was at least forty ~~y~~ years older than she was from the back view. It was absblutely different. And nobody could have told that without seeing her. You could not reason it out and the same is true about the other side of the moon. You have to see to know what it is like. The great facts of eternity there is one way to find out, that is, to see what someone has said who knows, someone has told who has seen them. God Himself is the ~~second~~ only one who has. ^{our} And therefore, ~~the~~ only source of knowledge of theology is the Bible~~/~~. Exegesis is ~~far~~ more important than church history. While I feel that one courses~~/~~ in ~~those courses~~ two years, two credit hours... is tremendously helpful, I do not feel that~~/~~ three years~~/~~ course more time~~/~~ should be given. ^{to it ---} vital to the exegesis

and see what it really means, and get into it, and get the facts that God has given us... our purpose in church history is not to learn what is true in theology. Now, this is not to learn how God desires us to worship Him. Someone showed me a letter to me two years ago that had been received from a friend who had just been , during the war, they had been to the U.N. forces in Africa, and they said, if you had seen as I did the remains of the churches of 20th century A.D., and the ruined churches of 20th century A.D., excuse me, not 20th century, but second century A.D. If you had seen those little churches of 2nd century A.D., all the all these ~~xxxx~~ different things that they thought were important ~~and~~ in worshipping God, you would realize ~~xx~~ how silly it is to just go to a church and sit there and listen to a minister to preach. How important it is to have the right forms~~and~~ ceremonies and all that. Well, the question of how much form and ceremony are desired to use in worshipping God is one which can be decided on the basis of the Bible and that of Rome, not ont which can be decided by church history. When you think about this church that found the rooms, they said it was from the second century A.D. My guess is that it was the last part of the second century. A.D. We do not have a great deal from ~~the~~ the first part of the second century. Then suppose it was ~~16x~~ th 175. Suppose it was 145/year after Christ died. 145 years from now ~~would~~ was 1820. If you are ever up to Boston area, driving up there, and ~~to-~~ stop there what they call straw-bridge... They ~~try~~ to keep the town just as people lived in 1800 A.D. and as you look around the condition of life and the way people lived ~~is~~ in 1800 A.D. you cannot just imagine the changes that have taken place. Most of you could not imagine the changes that have taken place since I was a boy. You just could not imagine. Most of them take place so gradually that there is not much said about it in our book.

Church History, Side 1

But life is constantly changing, and the way people worship God in a certain church 150 years after Christ died does not prove much as to how Christ wanted us to worship God. If you can get all the churches ~~of that day~~ of 150 years after Christ died you would learn perhaps quite a bit. We cannot get one per cent of it. But you could get all of them/, You would use a lot of them, ~~would not~~ what as to and then you/~~could learn~~/ God's will is/~~how~~ to worship Him. One way to learn that is to see what the Bible teaches. I believe that it was God's intention ~~that~~ ~~to~~ help in order to/~~keep~~ us from this danger into which so many, many people fall that He purposely thought that after the ~~new~~ New Testament was/~~w~~ written there should be very, very little Christian literature that was preserved for more than a hundred years. For the next hundred years the amount of Christian literature that has been preserved would not, I believe, make up ~~that~~ a third of what is in the New Testament, and much of it is highly questionable as to when it was written or who wrote it. You get along two or three centuries later you have a tremendous amount of Christian literature, but there is a big gap in what has been preserved. I believe that gap ~~is~~ should warn us ~~against~~ ~~you~~ this idea that many of ~~us~~ have. All that ever the early church did. That is No, right. ~~What~~ the Bible teaches is right. From the study of Church History you can get tremendous encouragement to go to the Bible and see what it teaches and follow it and meet that encouragement, but the purpose of studying church history is not to get an authoritative source of deciding how God wants us to worship Him, and then small c. Is not to learn God's plan for our lives. Church history, from this you can get tremendous encouragement. Like ~~when~~ how God used people in the past. You can get tremendous encouragement by

Church History, Side 1

and
seeing how man has .. and God blessed them, / God used them. X

You can get great help in your life in church history. But if you want to know God's plan for your life, the place to go is the Bible. That is the only source of real truth. History is interesting, and it has value, but for ~~the~~ Christians in the source of knowledge and ~~is~~ the source of getting touch with God, and learning His will for us should not be church history, it should be the study of God's Word. This may seem like a repetition so many times, but it is amazing how many people you find that the ~~biography~~ biography of some individuals, what some particular men have gotten, what some particular church groups have gotten, back to them they seem to settle most of their problems. How God we are. He has given us such marvellous ~~treasures~~ treasures of the Bible. And that has been our central feature of our Faith Seminary from its very inception, has been insistent that philosophy has its place, that history has its place, that all has its place, but the one dependable determining source of knowledge in the Divine things ~~is the~~ is the Bible, and the most important thing a Christian can do, no matter what line of service for the Lord he is going to be in, is to learn to understand ~~the~~ that life. It does not do much good just to hold it in our hands. What is in God's Word is all true, and not know much about it. You know a few wonderful verses and that is grand. I had some people say to me, Well, we have got John 3:16, what else do we need? Well, ~~you~~ if you say John 3:16 ~~is~~ and all the truths in the Bible that fit with John 3:16, that corresponds or develop it, put them on one side, and put the rest of ~~them~~ the Bible on the other, I would say that by all means... that is the ~~heart~~ heart of the Bible. God just did not give us John 3:16. God gave us a book with sixty-six books and He intended that everyone of them would be vital in your life, in your work, and in the activity of the Christians.

Church History, Side=1

So, He wants us to know what the book of Nahum teaches us and what the
and what is and
second John has to say. The meaning of James for our lives, is what is the
importance of the second Samuel, and there is tremendous importance in
every one of ~~these~~ these, and to know ~~what~~ what the Bible says, what it
teaches and to get into it and see what is really meant at those points where
those people can easily twist and get any subtle meanings out of it. That is
the most important thing. But church history certainly has its place. So,
we go on number 3. The purpose of studying ~~the~~ church history positively.
We looked at it negatively, and now we look at it positively. Under this,
small a. To see how God has worked in the past. I do not need to say much
about that now, because much of what I have already said ~~on~~ falls into that
category. What an encouragement it is to see how God caused that the
Christianity ~~would~~ would spread through the whole Roman Empire, to see how
God caused that Christianity would spread the whole Roman ~~Empire~~ Empire,
and with overturn the attitudes of the pagans and philosophers and of the
opponents of the Christianity were completely ... this way ~~three years~~ in three
hundred years. What an encouragement it is to see how the Reformation
took place. What an encouragement it is to see how ~~the~~ He took the little
band of the pilgrims and set a standard that affected ~~the~~ an entire nation
from this little group of comparatively uneducated people, ~~some of whom~~ ...
were able to acc~~omplish~~omplish with His help. What an encouragement to many
things in church history can be, if God has a purpose, and if you are
completely cons~~ecrated~~ecrated to Him, and if you really think of His will, and not
your own pleasure, or for your own glory, for your own fame or ~~some of~~
something about yourself, but ... you are really seeking... who knows what

Church History, Side 1

He may accomplish through you. Church History does not tell you what to do, but it encourages you tremendously in doing it, and it is ~~factly~~ a fair illustration of how God has worked in the past. We see many of them, and I do not ~~mean~~ mean to elaborate on this further, but now ~~mean~~ to speak of it under the second point which is much less familiar, but is I believe quite important. Small b. To see how Satan has ~~worked~~ worked in the past. Anybody who has the idea that this world is a world which ~~the~~ God has just gradually . . . out and pretty soon all is going to be a completely Christian world. Simply does not know much about those facts; yet, there are people who are moving ahead on that assumption, and unfortunately in order to move on that assumption, they have to change the definition of Christianity until it becomes an assumption entirely different from what the Bible teaches. But God has permitted Satan to be the prince of this world, and God has permitted Satan to have such a power in this world that we read in the book of Jude that even the archangel ~~of~~ Michael, striving with Satan about the body of Moses, durst not give him a railing accusation, but said, The Lord rebuke thee. Satan is a tremendous power in this world. God permits him. And it is easy for us to forget. People say, I remember back in 1915, people said, Oh, there cannot be a God who would permit this ~~war~~ war. Well, they do not know anything about sin. They do not know anything of the reality ~~of~~ and nature of Satan that God permits for His own purposes to continue through this age, and we cannot resist it in our own power. Sometimes people say, Resist the Devil and he will flee from you. That is a misquotation of the Scripture. The Bible says, Submit yourself unto God, and God will resist the Devil. He will flee from you. In the power of God Satan can do nothing to injure us,

Chr-- Church History. Side 1

And church ~~his~~ history shows how ~~after~~ case after case people would step up ~~be~~ boldly to do great things for God in their own strength, and utterly failed. We need to know the tremendous power of Satan, and his reality, and the fact that he is here, and he will be here until the end of this age. We need to be aware of this tremendous power and we need to be aware of his wiles. He will do his best to destroy our witness, to destroy our activities as he can. If he finds that he cannot do ~~it~~ that, then he tries to push us into ... where we are putting our whole efforts in some side issues, ~~and~~ This may be good, it is not accomplishing much in the ~~w~~ Lord's work. Sometimes I feel as if struggle with Satan is like a ... of war, here we are pulling and pulling and pulling. And on the other ~~side~~ side, the Satan is pulling and pulling that way, and when you find that you cannot pull this over ~~the other~~ this way, and then we-- let ~~just let it go--~~ us let it go...and we fail to accomplish what is our ... likewise it is way over there and we fail to accomplish what is right, and the right place is not way over there and way over here. It is wherever God's Word teaches us / that it should be. Satan will fail us ~~times~~ from dozen different angles. We learn from history how Christianity was a dominant force ~~of~~ all through the Nearest, and how in Arabia there were Christian churches ~~every~~ ~~w~~ everywhere in Arabia. How in Egypt, almost everyone was a professing Christian and there were thousands and thousands of earnest Christians in Egypt. And then we see in these areas people got into fighting and scraping over minor points that were made clear in God's Word, and instead of giving their efforts there trying to win ~~the~~ to the Saviour those who ~~did~~ did not have personal knowledge of him, there they were giving efforts, fighting over things that are made ... in God's Word, and they fought over these things, ~~and~~ to such an extent that the ~~w~~ outside world decided that

these little comparatively ~~no~~ minor things were what the Christians were interested in, and they had ~~no~~ knowledge of the real meaning of salvation and when the Mohammed king came forward in Arabia with that great teaching that ~~the~~ there is no God but one. And with that terribly distorted teaching he added to it and ~~both~~ combined with it and he ~~fled to~~ Arabia and eventually his force swept Egypt, and Christianity ~~became~~ almost powerful-less through that whole area, ever since, and God permitted Satan to take one of the greatest Christians' areas of the world to be turned into desert as far as Christianity is concerned. Today it is the hardest thing to do in the world to do the Christian work, ~~Forever~~ Islam has gone, ~~because~~ I was in seminary we had a missionary from Egypt who told ~~me~~ how a friend of his who was a missionary was in a little town in England, ~~and~~ In a little town in England, he was speaking in a little church, and there he told them about this missionary great/work in Egypt, and all he said was that you have to be so careful because of the law ~~of~~ prophecy of the Islams. Clear over here in England ~~and~~ nobody there would know what I hear, and so I will tell you about the Mohammed _____, ~~A~~ young man/came to me at night, like Nicodemus who talked with Jesus, who learned about Christ, and who was secretly baptized so nobody would know about it, and two days after he told/ this fellow was pushed under a streetcar and was killed. And the man who ~~pushed him~~ told about it believed that that was evidence of the pervasive power ~~through~~ this day of that teaching of the apostasy in Islam. And the result is that no missionaries who work there for forty years of earnest labor cannot have more than five converts. Now, there may be hundreds of them who became secret converts. All, ~~the human thinking~~ humanly speaking, could have been converted, if the Christians in Egypt and Arabia kept their eyes on the main things of the

gospel, and people had seen Christianity as really should be instead of ...
~~which~~- in comparison with which Mohammed seems to ... truth, and his
... ~~was~~ swept across the land, and introduced it, and there are many other
illustrations in history. Back in 1550 one third of the people of Poland
were Christians, were protestants, and most of the nobles of Poland were
protestants. No one could become the king of Poland without taking an
oath that he would do nothing in any way to injure protestantism in 1550.
And then there came a dispute on certain points of doctrines/which have their
importance but not to be compared with ~~it~~ the great fact of salvation through
Christ on which all the protestants would agree, and ... but this dispute came
there and a bulk of them disagreed with the teaching which came to be accepted
in the great part of northern Germany. The people there took no interest in trying
to help them, and the Jesuits sent there highly trained, learned, skilful...
technicians to hold a public debate and to win people ~~to their side~~ through to
stand there and ~~if~~ they got enough people to stand with them, and then they
began inciting the mobs and attacking the protestant churches and ~~would insist~~ in
fifty years all the protestantism was wiped out of Poland, and today, if you
take all the criminals and prisoners of the United States, ~~if~~ I heard it said
that ~~if~~ there would be two or three nationalities, of which there is ~~any~~ more
prominent than other there, Poland would be among them. ^{And one} ~~The~~ reason is that
three years they had ~~been~~ denied the opportunity of denying the gospel
in Poland except for a very slight exception. And Satan was able to destroy
this tremendous.... that true Christianity has made in Poland. We learn
from this how Satan worked in the past, not to simply think, Oh, I am going
to step ~~out~~ and I am ~~going~~ going to win the world ⁱⁿ of my own strength for
Christ. We must submit ourselves to our God, and follow him, and then

we can resist the Devil and we can accomplish great things for Him. We will meet at 9:20 tomorrow morning.

Side 2.

A word on seats

Briefly answer these questions. Discuss the value of history as^a means of learning what is true in theology, if your number is Odd. If your number is even, briefly discuss the value of church history as a means of learning how God desires us to worship Him. If your number is even. Not over two minutes.

Now we were yesterday speaking about the purpose of studying church history, positively. ^{To see} WE noticed under that small c. / How God worked in the past . To encourage^g feature of it which is very thrilling and which is the main reason^{and-} and most minutes every say . . . To see how God works . . . it is thrilling to see how much worthwhile it is. But they miss a great part of the value of it if they did not also see the other purpose of it. And the second purpose that we noticed is to see how the Satan has worked in the past. Everyone is familiar with the name of John Calvin, one of the greatest theologians who ever lived, but I regret to say that great many ep- people do not know another phrase of Calvin's activity which was just as important as a theological writer. Calvin was a man who was tremendously interested in the spread of the gospel. There is a wide belief that he wrote a^g speech which the Director of the University of Paris gave which presented the gospel very clearly at the opening of the University year, and as a the result of which the director and Calvin ~~had~~ both had to flee for their lives. Well, many people were burned at ^{the} stake ~~and~~ in France for believing

the gospel and trying to present it to others, but Calvin took refuge in Geneva, and there in Geneva in the midst of great difficulties and obstacles he proceeded to becoming established, but his primary interest there was making the centre for the evangelization of France. So, over the years, he received and protected ~~hundreds~~ hundreds of refugees, but he was not content with that, but he trained them in the gospel and in the presentation of the gospel and they went back to France, and these men went about from door to door widely presenting the gospel until one day in a park at Paris, somebody sang, a little boy started to sing one of Calvin's hymns and somebody else joined and somebody else joined ~~and~~ and pretty soon there were five thousand people ~~came~~ were singing this hymn, and it was apparent how widely the gospel was reaching through France as a result of the work of these men whom ~~of~~ Calvin was training, and many of them were captured and many of them were killed, ~~and~~ but others avoided being captured, and kept on pushing and working until over a third of the people ~~had~~ of France were ... Then the Romanist leaders set to work to try to destroy this and attacked them ~~and~~ ^{on/e} in two wars and ~~ant~~remendous massacre thousands were killed, but a year later there seemed to be more than there ~~were~~ before. In southern France, there would be a ~~great~~ town in which there would be a great Romanist cathedral, ~~and there would be~~ ^{where} they would have a great mass/celebrating it and fifteen people present, and then ~~two~~ blocks down five thousand people out to hear the preaching of the gospel, and the Jesuit order ~~which~~ was determined which was started after Calvin started his work, but which has been the most able instrument in wiping out the gospel the world has ever seen, and perhaps with exception of Islam. The Jesuit order set to work to try to win France back to ~~Romanism~~ Romanism, and in the city of Paris, they **managed to fill the people with fanaticism**, and so outside the Paris, their activity was not so successful. And the king of France died, and the next

K Ch. H. Side 2.

man in line was a protestant, a ~~Huguenot~~ Huguenot, what they call. And in several ... battles his forces met the Romanist forces and defeated them, and the _____ of France was in their / hands. And then they could not take Paris, because the Jesuits so filled the people of Paris with fanatical zeal, and with fanatical zeal and fanatical ~~principle~~ ^{hatred} of protestantism they were living on grass and herb, but they still resisted it, and then the / Henry of _____ ~~was a able~~ who was an able general and leader of the Protestant party ^{being} ~~siad~~, what is the use of / the king of France? The last king died and he was next in line. All ~~the~~ France but Paris recognized as king. He said, what is the use of being king without Paris? He said, What France without Paris? Paris is worth a mass, and so he ~~q~~ announced his desire to join the Roman Church. One of the priests in Paris preached a sermon in which he said, this morning my God went to mass to make him king. And they ridiculed him and in fact ~~he said~~ they said, he was dishonest in pretending he wanted to be a protestant, ~~apparently~~ when he was just doing to advance himself. But the Jesuits said, No, we must take his word, we must accept his sincerity, and so he became a Romanist. He said, I can help my protestant brothers be= more by being Romanist myself, When I become the king of France, and control the country, then I can / without being able to get Paris, having only nominal power in France. So, he became ruler of France, and did a tremendous amount to help of the people of France, and he made a treaty whereby he made -- ~~it-~~ the Edict of Nantes by which the Protestants were guaranteed religious freedom forever. They were guaranteed there would be ~~no~~ absolutely no discrimination / in government office on the basis of whether they were protestants or Romanists, and they were guaranteed equal opportunities ^{everywhere} ~~everywhere and~~

CH. H. Side 2

and in the cities and in the south of France they were ^{even} allowed to keep garrisons insure their safety. But ~~✓~~ a Jesuit persuaded the others to accept Henry's ^{genuine} statement as ~~general~~, and thus stopped France ~~and~~ from being torn asunder like a civil war, and made Henry ~~the~~ king, and they made parliament ~~agree to~~ agreement. They promised that they could bring up Henry's children, and so they brought up Henry's children, and they became chief officers and representatives. And the lazy invalid son Louis XIII became king and never bothered much about anything, but a cardinal ~~named Richelieu~~ Richelieu and France. And when the protestants would have a great meeting with thousands of ^{present} them/in their synod representing nearly a third of the people of France, Cardinal Richelieu was greeting them and thanked them for their loyalty to their country, and showed every friendship toward them. The only thing ^{was} ~~which~~ he said, Why should you have garrisons in your cities? That is a state within a state. You ~~should~~ respect the country to protect you to have either ~~command~~ commandship... we are perfectly safe. We are all Frenchmen and nobody will interfere with you. And he persuaded them to give up the garrisons, all except one city. So, that one he attacked. After a considerable seige, he proceeded in capturing ~~the~~ _____, and he took away its garrison, ~~✓~~ but he left it free. Then Henry IV's grandson Louise XIV became king, and the Protestants were a great force ~~in~~ in France, and many of them were ~~✓~~ in leading positions in the government as they have been for years. They ~~✓~~ir churches were preaching the gospel and their people were going forward to important positions and leaderships in every way. But at Henry's court, ~~the~~ in Louise's court the Jesuits had ~~control~~ control. And Louise sank into the depths of wickedness and licentiousness and in sin, and the ~~Jesuits~~ Jesuits/preachers

Ch. H. Side 2

preached the terrors of hell for his own who lived ungodly life, and Louise said, I feel as though I could hear fleeing scourging around me, and what hope is there for me? And the Jesuit confessors said, there is no reason for you to ~~reas~~ worry. He ~~sk~~ said, why not? From what you preached about the terrible fate that people will have who have lived like myself live. Well, he said, you can easily offset your wickedne life by some good deed. Well, he said, what good deeds could I ~~o~~ do enough to off~~set~~ the wickedness that I had in my life, and the Jesuit confessor said, well, that is simple. A large part of your country does; not recognize the pope as the supreme leader, and he said, they are preaching salvation by faith instead of attending the mass. He said, they are denying the doctrine^s/of the Roman Church. Get this out of your country, and God will bless you forever. Well, let me go ~~thax~~ just the way you are. And Louise imm~~edia~~tely set to work and gradually removed the Protestants from high positions in the government, and gradually made ~~o~~ it more and more difficult for them and then he began to put in troops in the ~~city~~ ^{cities} where they had a great number of Protestants and put there most licentious soldiers into the homes of ~~the~~ outstanding protestants, ^{and} giving them license to be as mean^{as}/they could and disagreeable to the people as they could felt like it, but if somebody turned to Romanist.all they stopped, he was immediately treated well, and great many who had not really ~~adde~~ had the heart of the gospel in their mind gave up and joined the Roman Church, and then it cut ^{to}down/the real ~~o~~ Christians. And then Henry, or Louise announced that the Edict of Nanyes was repealed. And this Edict which had been for two thir~~ds~~ of a century in effect he repeale~~d~~. He ~~sk~~ said, every Protestant minister must leave the ~~country~~ country within sixty days. No one

Ch. H. Side 2

else is permitted to leave the country, but all must join the Roman Church, and attend Romanist churches or they ought to be imprisoned for life or sentenced ~~to death or to galley slave~~ to galley slave. And thousands of men ~~just~~ managed to get out of the country. Thousands of them went to Berlin and kept up Protestant services two and half centuries after this time. Thousands of them went to South America, and thousands of them came to this country despite ... efforts ... to keep them in, and others could not get out of the country, and fled into mountains and there ~~they~~ they managed to survive there but they were hunted down by the soldiers and they were killed and thus the Protestantism was reduced to maybe 3% of the people of France. And it was two centuries after that before they had freedom of religion. Paris is worth a mass. Henry said. Devil certainly ~~is - is~~ used the Jesuits, and certainly used Henry's ~~own~~ compromise to destroy one of the greatest evangelistic works the world has never seen, one of the greatest outreaches of the gospel. Today France is one of the hardest countries in the world to reach people for Christ. It is one of the hardest places to make impact on the lives and hearts of the people. The country as a whole is nominally Romanist but the bulk of the people are actually atheist. I heard a French diplomat say once, In order to make any progress in France in politics you have to be known as one who is against the church. But if you become a representative outside France, then you have to be known as an ardent supporter of the church, because ~~France~~ France ... is known as the defender of the Romanist Church. This was a few years ago. I do not know under De Gaulle how things have changed. This country which could have been one of the greatest Protestant nations and one of the greatest centres to send missionaries throughout

~~the world~~ Ch. H. Side 2

the world became almost a non-entity as far as the preaching of the gospel is concerned. And it is one of the outstanding instances in history how Satan has worked in the ~~of~~ past. And God does not want us to underestimate Satan. He wants us to realize that he is ready and anxious to wreck our testimony for the Lord. We should submit ourselves to our God. Make sure that we are in line with His purposes and we are ^{putting} ~~in~~-Christ first in everything, not speaking our own money, our own comfort, anything except His purposes. And then we can ~~destroy~~ ^{probably} the works of the Devil, but only then when we have done half way Satan may and will ~~be-~~ defeat us. Now the third purpose ~~possibility~~-- of studying the church history is to see how much of our social and religious culture is historical rather than biblical and logical in ~~order~~ origin.

3. To see how much of our social, religious culture is historical rather logical or biblical in ~~historical~~ origin.

A little after the turn of the century there was a great dispute among the presbyteries of Philadelphia. Should a man stand ~~when~~ he prays in public or should he kneel? They almost had a split among some of the churches/ over the question, which is a right way to do. Forty years later, three fourths of the ~~the~~ churches which had been taken over by modernism and unbelief. When we begin ^{giving} ~~to give~~ attention to matters purely form and ceremony, it is easy for Satan to come in and to lead us away from the attention to the real thing of the gospel. We cannot learn the truth except from the Bible. Church history does not tell ~~of~~ us the truth, because everyman might be mistaken. It is only the Bible on which we can defend for truth. Church history does not tell us how we should worship, and in God's providence He caused that we should ~~that~~ have no evidences/ to speak of being a means or methods of worship of the church for 150 years after Christ. Time is enough to develop into any

Ch. H. Side 2

DIRECTION, so that we should look into the Scripture, and not to the church history to learn how to worship, but we can learn much from church history about how easy it is for people to ~~follow customs~~ fall into certain customs and then the custom continues a little while ~~xxx~~ you begin ~~to~~ to think that it is of Divine origin, and you begin to think that is the thing that is really important, and you get the ~~idea~~ eye off the Scripture which is the only source of knowing what is important? I heard a story about a new officer who was appointed according to the story which I heard, appointed to have ^{charge} ~~charge~~ of soldiers who guarded the palace of the czar... and according to the story ~~th~~at I had heard which I have no reason to think that it is not true, ~~xxx~~ and yet I have no absolute proof that it is true. According to this story, this officer found that the arrangement for the placing of the soldieries around the palace for protection involved the standing of the guards at certain places on the lawn and always night and day a guard stood at that particular place, and he would stand there until he ~~xxx~~ was relieved. Night and day there was always a soldier at this place. ^{figure} And the officer could not ~~tell~~-why there were not thirty others = if there is ~~a~~ danger of a riot or attack places that would be much more important to defend than this particular spot and in fact these other places were well protected and he thought that he could use this soldier elsewhere very well, but these were the orders, and he inquired why is it? Well, it has been always done that way. And being a studious young man, he began to investigate the records and he found that three;h^oundred years previously, over two hundred years a soldier stood right at that right place, and never left the place without a guard standing, and then he found that it began when the Empress Catherine, the ruler ~~of~~ of Russia who was interested in innovations and changes and new ideas. She received some rare shrub from a relative of hers in Southern Europe, and this would look very beautiful

Ch. H. Side 2

on the lawn, and she was afraid someone would trample over it and it would not have a chance to grow properly, so she planted it at a certain place and gave a very strict order that a soldier must stand right at that spot and he must there on guard so there is nobody ^{who would} /carelessly trample over the shrub. And those orders were given and established and within a few months / the shrub was ~~xxxx~~ it unsuited ^{for} to the climate ~~xxxx~~ of Russia, and the shrub withered away and disappeared, but over two hundred years a soldier was ~~xxxx~~ kept on guard at that spot and no body knew why he was there, and that is, it is a natural human tendency. . . . anarchy, unless we do things to which we are accustomed. We do not know why we keep on that way. And 90% pf the people just follow blindly whatever they have been accustomed to. I think 8% of them blindly attack whatever they have been accustomed to. There may be 2% of the people who try to think /through and try to see what the sensible thing is, but ~~xxxx~~ it is an important thing in our carrying on of our civilization its tendency to keep on the way we have had things done, unless we ~~xxxx~~ find a reason for change. But when it comes to the work of Christ, it is very good for us to get an understanding of that fact. / How much there is in life. / ^{That purely} it is /a matter of having been ~~xx~~ established through some accidents, through some custom, through some fitness to some situation which has now changed, and having become ~~xx~~ established, people simply are confused in it. I personally think that one of the greatest advances that could possibly be made in the study of the Old Testament would be ~~that~~ if there would be a system worked out and it would not be difficult to work it out in which one of our Latin letters / ^{would} be used for each Hebrew letter, and you will always have the same understanding for one same Hebrew letter, then

Ch. H. Side 2

and thus we could learn the Hebrew and study it and read it in our Latin
as much
Letters . In my opinion students will learn ~~Hebrew~~ ~~more~~ in one year as
they do in three when they have to go through the toil of getting their eyes
used to a new type of letters. It is the same sort of toil everyone of us had ^{done when ..} /.. a child
... in getting used to the Latin letter that we commonly use. But there would be
no particular use in teaching people that way, because our Hebrew Bibles are
all in Hebrew letters and ^{our} grammars and our dictionaries ~~and~~ use them, and
if you had a few thousand dollars it would not be difficult to put all these
into Latin letters, but nobody ~~felt~~ .. has felt... but anyone who has the
money to do it, seldom has interest ~~to~~ to do that. But I know a great professor,
a learned scholar, a man who was a great expert in ^{the} American language
and wrote ... which is a language preceding the Babylonian unless ... who
wrote a standard grammar ~~years~~ years ago, and somebody suggested to him
to write in Latin letters instead of in Hebrew letters. Then, Oh, he said, that
would be unscientific. That would be unscientific! He was shocked / at the
idea. Actually it of course does not ~~make~~ make any difference what kind
of letters you use provided that everybody uses them and understands them.
Purely a custom that has developed. We have ~~of~~ letters C, A, B, C. instead
of ~~Alpha~~ Alpha, Beta, ^{we have} gamma, /C instead of G there, because ... have
any G. And when they saw G, they said, ke, not being able to say Ge, and
so they got Ke there instead of Ge, and then the Latin / ^s who had ~~A~~ G / ...
that is for a Ke, they did not know that they _____ had Ke for for Ke, so they
took the C and put a little mark across the lower part to make a new letter Ge.
So we have got two Ke's in our language. Only in English sometimes we make
Ke , sometimes Ce, in order to add further ~~of~~ confusion for people. I heard

Ch. H. Side 2.

it said that in Mexico a child can learn to read as well in a year as a child can learn in the United States in three years. I do not know how you could prove that unless you are sure that the two particular children were of equal mentality. But I can easily imagine that it would be the case, because we have an antiquated ridiculous absurd spellings in English. There is absolutely no sense to it, and yet if you try to change it, and it is just about impossible. A Christian would be very foolish to spend his lifetime to get spelling system changed, to spend your life time in trying to get people know Christ, and to be saved through Him, and to follow Him, but when we realize how accidental some of these things are that seems so important in life, why, it just makes us easier to understand to do the Lord's work to get enough an understanding of a fact- this factor. I think from the church history if you watch you will find much that will be helpful for you that way, that will help you-ful to put your emphasis on what is biblical and what matters without necessarily coming into sharp conflict with people who have customs that there is nothing wrong with it. There is nothing particularly important about it, particularly biblical about it. Well, we go on to D. d. Small d. Small d is a rather difficult thing to do properly, but very helpful if you can. The purpose of studying church history. Small d. is to become acquainted with great men of the past, and to see the points of strength and weaknesses, to become acquainted with the men It is all too easy in the study of church history to have it simply be a series of the expense of a few names and tags upon which they hung and perhaps to think of a few men of vital importance as a sort of superman, but if there is time in certain areas of history to look in enough details to get to know these men to see their struggles and their uncertainty, to see how they came to make the decision they make,

Ch. H. Side 2.

you might say, humanly speaking, they are hung in balance whether they make this decision or that, or they make one decision and then ~~go on~~ went on to be greatly used of God while in case of other people there they may be opposite decision and they may be disappear from history or what they did was very harmful rather than helpful. To see it not simply as a series of events that is presented before you, but as human being facing problems and situations and trying to solve them, can give us an understanding in situations which we face ourselves. The principle of understanding ought to give us the importance of going to the Scripture for our ~~every~~ answer, because that of course is where the principles come from that are vital. Somebody has said that people no longer learn anything from history except that people do not learn anything from history. I think that that is a rather extreme case. But it is true that people repeat the same mistakes over and over. They do not seem to learn from history. I remember about 1930 I read of a story of somebody told, some Englishman who was rather looking down on the Chinese, and he told, he said, back 150 years, I just do not know when it was. He said that one of the opium wars, the English had to attack Hong Kong, and he said that the Chinese had fortified Hong Kong from the side toward the water, and strongly fortified from that side. The English ship went around, in fact, from the north where it was not fortified, and they came in, and he said, the approach that one of the Chinese ~~ships~~ came to the shore and howled, a wrong way, a wrong way to be over there. But they did not pay any attention to their telling that was the wrong way. They came in/they took Hong Kong fairly easily, because they came from the side and it was not defended, although a great effort has been made to defend it from ^{the} ~~inside~~- seaside. Well, this statement I read by an Englishman

CH. H. Side 2.

~~XX~~ 1930 telling about how foolish the Chinese were in that particular situation, and it was rather amusing what I would be five times ^{as} /amused as I would be ten years later. When I read an ~~article~~ in the Saturday Evenin Post telling how how these British ~~spend~~ spend a hundred million dollars in fortifying Singapore so it could not be attacked from the sea. A hundred million dollars then would be worth five times as much today. So, evidently, they evidently made tremendous effort to make Singapore absolutely ~~impregnable~~ impregnable from the sea, and the Japanese simply came down from the Mainland peninsula and attacked from the north where it was not much defended and they took it without much effort. And so, the Englishman who was laughing at the Chinese for their mistakes one hundred ~~hu-~~ years ~~ago~~ made exactly the same mistake. And it shows how history repeates itself, and I find it in running a Seminary the very sad thing is that I face the problem. What are ~~you~~ you going to do about this problem. I think through ~~very~~ very carefully, and I think the whole thing is settled and I get it so we do not hear ~~about~~ about it for ten years. And you forget about it. You find the same problem coming up again, probably new to the group. But you forget the measure that he had introduced that had made it ... Now they say we do not learn it from history, but I do not think there is any reason that we should not learn from history. We can learn from people's mistakes to try to ~~lea-~~ avoid those mistakes. It is wonderful to read about some of these great Martin Luther, John Calvin, John Wesley and ~~se-many-great~~ men who had followed the Lord and how marvellously the Lord had used them. But we ought to take enough time.

Ch. Hist. Side 2.

TO READ at the same time some of their associates, and some of their ~~for~~ friends who went ahead ~~and~~ to serve the Lord and so effectively up to a certain point, and then their courage failed them. Everybody heard of Martin Luther, but how many people have heard of Staupitz? Staupitz was the head of the Augustinian order in Germany. Staupitz told the gospel to Luther. I do not know whether Luther got it from him or not, but he heard from two or three different sources. Luther did not invent the ~~Good~~ Gospel. The gospel was in the Scripture, and the people all through the ages had been ~~so~~ saved by ~~g~~ the gospel. But when poor Luther as a monk there was trying to get the ~~Right~~ Divine forgiveness for his sin, and he could not get any feeling of forgiveness. He went through all kinds of ceremonies and forms and said, My/ sin, my sin, what can I do about it? Staupitz said, he believed in Christ, ... Christ bore your sins on the cross. Can't you simply trust in Him? Staupitz showed Luther ~~that~~ the center of the gospel and encouraged him ~~and~~ to study the Word and ~~god~~ got him the position of professor at Wittenberg University, as the expounder of the Book of ~~the~~ Romans and other books of the Bible which so greatly increased Luther's understanding, but then it came to a point where it was necessary to stand for the truth, Staupitz who helped Luther to ~~l~~ back him out and encouraged him all along, and so he sent his own ~~son~~ sister, his younger sister to learn what she could from Luther and to be a member of the group of women who were studying there in Wittenberg. Staupitz, when he faced the final crisis, could not stay, and he asked for a special permission to leave the Augustinian order and to go into another order for he was not known, and he went into this order, and Luther wrote two lovely letters ~~and~~ in which he told him/ Beloved father in Christ, Luther was terribly

disappointed, when the man who had led him so much when he came to the vital issue, ... today Luther is one of the great heroes of faith, and very few people ever heard of Staupitz. Staupitz was a great and good man. I have no doubt that he was saved. But I am sure that he regrets bitterly the fact that when he came to the ultimate crisis he failed. And to learn about people who have failed, ~~and many~~ compared with the few who have pressed forward and followed the Lord and whom God has used throughout the ages, can be not only be encouraging to us as know of those who have succeeded. In order really to know these men you have to take a considerable time in getting the whole situation in mind to know the flesh and bone of man rather than simply naming them. There we simply cannot do that with the time available with a great many, but I do try to do it when I can, because I feel that it is very helpful. Then E, I said, most ministers use Church History mostly for the first ~~main~~ point of encouragement, I should have ~~not~~ not been ... that statement, because it is ...

E. E. To get illustrations for Divine truths. And church history has wonderful illustrations of the truth. And you can find stories that ~~are thrilling to people~~ will thrill ~~many~~ people - them, encourage them, and stir them to follow the Lord with more truth. But we must remember that history does not prove what the truth is. It wonderfully illustrates, but ~~to~~ we learn from the ~~fact~~ what the truth is, and see ~~from~~ in history how it has ~~to~~ worked out. I like a story about Martin Luther when he was on his way to the Diet of Worms where he was to stand before the Emperor for his faith, and probably .. would be treated ~~like~~ as John Huss had a little over one hundred years before when he was burned at stake. .. went back ~~with~~ ~~under~~ ~~safe~~ ~~conduct~~ although safe conduct was given him. Though there was ~~t=~~ on the way and the imperial herald ~~had~~ let

him preach on different towns on the way, but every place they stopped, there saw signs up that the emperor ordered ^{that} all Luther's books to ~~be~~ must be gathered together and burned, ~~and~~ and people said, that is what they will do to you. Now that is what they will do to you when you get there. Many people thought that Luther must be a some sort of terrible man that he would be in such a situation. Others thought he was a wonderful man. But all of them and hear him. were curious to see him. So, he went into the church and people ~~passed~~ ^{him} crowded ~~in~~ the church and one place such a crowd came in ~~in~~ that the whole side of the church came off. When one side of the church fell over the people, they ~~the~~ jumped up and ran. This man must be a preacher of ^{the} Devil that the very church would break as soon as started to preach. And Luther howled with his great voice, Come back here, come back here. The Devil is trying to keep you from hearing the gospel. When you ~~look~~ look at the events in your life, God may be leading or Devil may be leading. Which it is you learn from the Word of God. Don't let circumstances determine your life, or what you do. You determine the circumstances ~~in~~ in the light of the Word of God. But you can find wonderful illustrations of the truth in history. It is wonderfully illustrated, but it does not prove. ~~xxx~~ divisions of church history. Division s of church history. Number 1 ~~on~~ under that. History is a continuum - breaks are not usually complete at any one point. ~~History~~ ~~xxx~~

It is easy for us to think, we find in history such an empire as _____ and then there was a ~~period~~ period of such and such. And then there is a period of such and such. Well, these changes, these differences are very great. But the breaks between them are not sharp. They are not absolutely gradual. The changes take place often within a comparative short time. But not instantaneously. Usually there is a little time involved. When did the Christian era begin?

Church History, Side 2

Well, it began in our figuring when our Lord ~~Jesus~~ Jesus reached the age of four or five. It is an arbitrary point. I do not know why the issue of age four or five is particularly an important point. They ... see the difference between A.D. and B.C. Of course, there was a monk about 500 A.D. who ~~tried~~ tried to figure out from his birth and made a mistake and they got fairly near to it, ~~but they could not~~ and it is good to have a good humerical system, a lot handier than it was back in 200 A.D. when they said, this was the third year of the Empeor so and so or this~~s~~ is the fourth year after the earthquake. This numbering system that we have are very handy. But did the change take place?/ between the pagan and pre-Christian era? And the Christian era. Well, very few people knew when Jesus was born. Then 30 years later he began to preach, and the multitudes came to hear him, but compared with he whole population of the ~~Riast~~ Palestine there were hardly any. ~~Today~~ The day when he was crucified, in God's sight it certainly was ~~the~~ the most important day that ever occurred in the history ~~since~~ since the fall of man. But how much of ~~the~~ the world knew about it? How many people outside the Palestine knew about it? That obscure ~~Gal~~ Galilae^mean who/some thousands of people followed had followed him until the very time when He was crucified there. As far as th most of the world is concerned, they did not know Christianity existed until ~~the~~ a century or two later. Time came when everybody in Roman Empire ~~was~~ faced it as a ~~real~~ real force. The time came when paganism completely disappeared/ ^{before} But nearly 400 years went by before that time. Maybe/ 200 and 250 years before ~~have to be~~ half the people of the Roman ~~Empire~~ ^{from the} world knew even there existed such... there ^{is} was a change ^{an} from ~~the~~ a year or two years of since. ~~The~~ But the changes ~~are~~ not/ instantaneous thing.

Ch. History Side 2.

That is true of most changes. History is a continuum. Breaks are vital.

There are important sources come and usually changes occur over a period of
Centuries
time. Number two, Sanctuaries are convenient means of general division.

Good many times it seems as if important developments last just about ~~one~~ a
hundred years. It is of course just because we have ten fingers ... that
we figure time by centuries, but it is a very convenient system and we are
going to use this system in this class. I wish that you would make it sure that
you ~~know~~ are familiar with common designations of ~~these~~ centuries. It is
a little bit confusing. The first century is the years that do not have any
one in the hundred line that begins. The year begins before one hundred.

The second century has one at the beginning of it, and we are now in the
ith ~~the~~ though
twenty century. We start at the figure 19. Everybody should be ~~what~~ why
that should be. But it is a little bit confusing if they do not keep in clearly
in mind. But I think that it is rather important to get an idea of ~~history~~ fifty. To get
an idea of ... see the differences between the two things that ~~are~~ were twenty
years apart and to see the two things that were one hundred years apart. So,
we are going to refer to centuries and I am going to use them in our outline
a good deal. Please get back clearly in mind so that if I ask you to describe
events in the 14th century, you won't describe ~~things~~ what happened between 1400 and
1500. This is ~~what~~ what happened between 1300 and 1400. And remember
that the 1st century is before 100 A.D. and not after. Now, some ~~the~~ people
think that ~~the~~ history is simply a matter of memorizing a lot of dates. Remember
the boy who learned the poem in 1492 when Columbus sailed the Ocean Blue, and
then he said, Now, I know when America was discovered. So, ~~it is perfect~~ he
knew it perfectly well, So, the next day when someone said, he said, 1583.

Ch. History Side 2.

Where did he get that? ~~1589x~~ In 1583 Columbus sailed over the _____ Sea.

When you learn dates like that, they mean absolutely nothing. And so, people go to the opposite extreme and take the attitude, Why bother with dates? Dates are like skeletons. They are tremendously useful if you think of them as a means of getting the general relationship of events. When you look at the Middle Ages, I want you to know within a hundred years when something happened, know what century it occurred, I do not care ~~whether you know~~ about your knowing 1372, 1327, but I do not want you to think that it was 1627. When we are looking at the time of Reformation, we are looking either by- the year a few things that I want you to know rather exactly. In the ancient church history period, I think it is good ^{if you can} to know ~~what~~ about what a third of the century something happened, and there is no greater importance from our viewpoint in knowing whether the Emperor Nero died in 64, 65, 66, 65 67 or 68. It does not make any big difference ~~from our viewpoint~~. But it makes big difference whether it is- was 68 or 38. Whether Christianity has had nearly 40 years to get under way after the death of Christ, or it was only 6 years. So, a third of a century is about the time of the mature active life of the average person or at least he used to be ~~without~~ our increases in health and sanitation. ~~to some extent~~ ^{recent} that we enjoy, probably a bit longer now. But through most of history, a third of a century of ~~a~~ time when a man begins to be an important factor in life until he becomes an old man, and a new generation has practically taken over. At least it used to be. I think you can ~~it~~ extend it to some extent now. But that is only a few years. So, in our ancient church history try a thing to remember within a third of a century when ~~anything~~ happened. And it is very

important to know whether it happened in 37 A.D. or 137 or 237. Somebody
you
ask ~~about the other wh- day- then~~ when the air plane was invented., if you say
1812, everybody today will laugh. It is ~~xxx~~ ridiculous to think of all that
happened during the last century ~~woud~~ about air planes, but if you know
whether it was 1904 or 1906 or 1908, it does not make a great big difference,
this
~~We~~ if you know that it was earlier in ~~the 20th~~ century . So, I would like you
to remember dates to that extent, of a third of a century within this course.
And that, you won't find it difficult ~~to~~ if you get the relationship of them
~~thoroughly in mind.~~ fairly in mind. Now, number 3. Church history is
usually divided into three mai sections; partly on secular 'history...

We see ~~an~~ the ancient church history, the medieval church history and modern
churc h history. I say, partly based on the secular history. Because in
church history the modern period ~~p~~ begins with Reformation. In secular history it
begins with Renaissance, maybe fifty years earlier, but it is the same general
period. But it was the change between a world in which the Roman civilization
was in control,/ and a world which has been overrun by an unassimilated people
who destroyed most of the civilization, and sank back into the dark ages, and
then a world ~~win~~ in which again civilization began to come vigorously to the fore,
that is a movement in the secular~~r~~ history. That makes a tremendous difference
in church history. And the modern period, I ~~think~~ think , is most important
for our understanding, but the ancient is more important than the medieval far
less. The Medieval is as long as the other two put together, and it is ~~xxxxx~~
view
very interesting, but from our ~~view~~ viewpoint we will have to spend a little time
on the Medieval. I want you to understand the ancient. Because it is very
important from our viewpoint. And the ancient church history began after
the end of the New Testament. ~~When~~ We are not dealing with the New

history
Testament/in this course. We are dealing with what happened after the New
Testament. Then the church history began after the death of Christ, and
Apostles
practically it began practically after the ~~Apocalypse~~. We are not dealing with
Paul, for instance, in this course. That is dealt with in the Apostolic history.
But our church history, then, begins and runs on until the Roman Empire
disappeared and the area was divided into petty little groups ~~and~~ always fighting
against each other. And instead of a situation in which nine out of ten
people could read and write, you get into a ~~stark~~ situation which may be
one in a hundred. It was the coming of barbarism and it last nearly a thousand
years. Well, we will continue there a week from the next Tuesday. It is
my
not/present expectation to meet in the next at all. There would be an assignment
that I will post. It is not my present expectation that there will be any
meeting next week, but we will post an assignment on the bulletin board
which I would like you to have ready a week from next Monday.

IX. Leaders in Monasticism.

- A. Paul of Thebes - A.D. 250, he lived as a hermit in a cave. Influenced others.
- B. St. Anthony - Christian hermit who defended Athanasius.
- C. Athanasius - He wrote a life of St. Anthony.
- D. Basil the Great - Cappadocian father who tried to live an ascetic life.
- E. Pachomius - Contemporary of Anthony who started group monasticism.

X. Church Leaders.

- A. Jerome - Advanced monastic idea; wrote Vulgate; Origin controversy.
 - 1. Damasus I - Bishop of Rome. Encouraged Jerome to write the Vulgate.
 - 2. Ursinus - A deacon who tried to become bishop instead of Damasus I.
 - 3. Paula - Widow who was greatly influenced by Jerome's monastic ideas.
 - 4. Jovinian - He attacked monastic life. He abstained from marriage.
 - 5. Helvidius - He also opposed Monasticism.
 - 6. Vigilantius - He wrote against monasticism in stronger language than Jovinian.
- B. John Chrysostom - The great preacher. He was bishop at Constantinople.
 - 1. Libanius - Greek sophist, who taught Chrysostom and Basil the Great.
- C. Augustine - He wrote 'Confessions', 'city of God' and 'Retractions'.
 - 1. Monica - Mother of Augustine.
 - 2. Valerius - Bishop who preceded Augustine at Hippo.
 - 3. Donatist Controversy
 - a. Mansurius - Bishop of North Africa who was succeeded by Caecilius.
 - b. Felix - Bishop (tradetor?) who ordained Caecilius.
 - c. Marcellinius - Roman governor who said the Donatists were wrong.
 - 4. Manichaeian controversy
 - 5. Pelagian controversy
 - a. Pelagius - Human nature not inherently corrupt. Man basically good.
 - b. Coelestius - Lawyer and devoted follower of Pelagius.
 - c. Jerome - Wrote three books against Pelagianism.
 - d. Bishop John of Jerusalem - He took the side of Pelagius at a synod.
 - e. Orosius - He brought criticism against Pelagius at Council of Jerusalem.
 - f. Honorius - The emperor who persuaded Zosimus to turn against Pelagianism.
 - g. Julian of Eclanum - He presented the Pelagian views effectively & clearly.
 - 6. Semi-Pelagianism - They said man was not entirely corrupt.
 - 7. Semi-Augustinianism - General view of the Western Church.

The Fifth Century. 401-500 AD.

I. Pagans and Political Leaders.

- A. Arcadius - emperor of the Eastern Empire.
- B. Honorius - emperor of the Western Empire.
- C. Stilicho - Vandal leader who helped Honorius, but enemies had Stilicho killed.
- D. Alaric - 410 AD. Plundered Rome, but did not injure churches. Visigoth.
- E. Count Boniface - Roman general in Africa who invited Genseric to help him.
 - 1. Aetius - Lied to Boniface and his wife so that he eventually could be leader.
 - 2. Genseric - Vandal leader who conquered North Africa.
- F. Attila - Hun who invaded Italy but Leo I probably persuaded him to leave.
- G. Clovis - Leader of Franks who had a Christian wife and later became one, too.

II. Mission Work in the Fifth Century.

- A. Palladius - First missionary to Ireland, but failed in his mission.
- B. Patrick - Self appointed missionary to Ireland, who succeeded in his purpose. (Germanus - Some say he was sent by Clestine I as a missionary to Britain.)

III. Bishops of Rome in the Fifth Century.

- A. Innocent I - He asserted his 'supreme official authority' on Pelagius controversy.
- B. Zosimus - He took side of Pelagius at first; but then turned against him.
- C. Celestine I - He wanted to win Ireland for the church so sent Palladius.
- D. Leo I - Claimed supremacy of Rome. Wrote a tome, included in Chalcedon act.
 - 1. Hilary - French leader who did not recognize authority of Leo the Great.
 - 2. Valentinian III - Emperor who gave decree to recognize primacy of Roman bishop.
 - 3. Priscillianists - Leo wanted to have this sect investigated.
 - 4. Pelagians - He said anyone who held to these views should be deposed.
- E. Gelasius I - Wrote to emperor Anastasius, & said priestly power above his power.

IV. Christological Controversy.

- A. Apollinarianism - Jesus had a human body and human soul but a Divine spirit.
 1. Condemned by the 1st Council of Constantinople.
 - B. Nestorianism - Divine and human nature made so distinct so as to become 2 persons.
 1. Cyril - Archbishop of Alexandria who criticized Nestorius.
 2. Celestine I - Bishop of Rome who told Nestorius to give up his ideas.
 3. Council of Ephesus - Deposed Nestorius.
 - C. Monophysitism - Jesus had only one nature. (See below).
 1. Dioscorus - Succeeded Cyril. Stressed idea of one nature in Christ.
 2. Eutyches - The view received the name Eutychianism from him.
 3. Flavian - Bishop of Alexandria who wrote to Leo I for advice on this view.
 4. Leo I - He wrote the Tome in answer to Flavian's letter.
 5. Council of Robbers, 449 A.D. - This defended the Monophysite view.
- V. Simeon Stylites - Syrian monk who lived on a pillar for 40 years.

The Sixth Century. 501-600 A.D.

I. Secular History.

- A. Romulus Augustus - In 476 A.D. he was removed from office, thus ending Roman empire.
- B. Theodorick - Arian king who was defeated by Justinian.
- C. Justinian - Reconquered N. Africa from the Vandals and Italy from the East Goths.

II. Religious History.

- A. St. Benedict - Founded Monte Cassino and the Benedictine Order.
- B. "The Three Chapters" - Nestorian writings that Justinian condemned.
- C. Eutychias - Bishop of Constantinople who presided over the 5th ecumenical council.
- D. Vigilius - Roman bishop who refused to attend the 5th ecumenical council.
- E. Gregory the Great - Originator of the doctrine of purgatory.
- F. Augustine - Benedictine monk sent as a missionary by Gregory to England.

The Seventh and the Eighth Centuries. 601-800 A.D.

I. Secular History.

- A. Mayor of the Palace - The man in France who ran the government.
- B. Charles Martel - Mayor of the Palace in 732 AD who stopped the Mohammedans.
- C. Pepin the Short - Son of Martel who got backing of the Pope to be king.
- D. Charlemagne - The Holy Roman Empire began in 800 AD when he was crowned by a Pope.
 1. Leo III - The pope who crowned Charles the Great as emperor.
 2. Alcuin - The educator that Charlemagne brought from England.

II. Religious History.

- A. Monothelism - Christ had two natures, but one will.
 1. Sergius - Patriarch of Constantinople who suggested the view.
 2. Honorius - Bishop of Rome who backed the view. Later popes condemned him.
 3. Diothelite view - View adopted by 6th ecumenical council opposing this view.
 4. Agatho - Bishop of Rome who opposed Monothelism.
- B. Mohammedanism - There is one God, Allah, and Mohammed is his prophet.
 1. Islam - Proper name of the religion, which means submission.
 2. Feast of Ramadan - Hard ceremony, in which you can't eat or drink for a month.
 3. Hadija - First wife of Mohammed.
 4. Jejira - Mohammed's flight from Mecca to Medina.
 5. Abu Bekr - Caliph who succeeded Mohammed.
 6. Omar - Caliph who conquered Jerusalem, took Egypt, burned library of Alexandria.
 7. Ali - His two sons were killed. Thus two opposing groups were formed in Mohammedanism - the Shiites and the Sunnites.

C. Boniface - English missionary who was killed by the Frisians in Holland.The Fifth Century continued. (Monophysitism).

1. Theodosius I - Emperor of the east who defended orthodoxy.
2. Pulcheria - Sister of Theodosius who married the general, Marcian.
3. Marcian - Emperor of the East who called the Council of Chalcedon.
4. Council of Chalcedon - Condemned Monophysitism as a heresy.

- D. Iconoclastic Controversy - Should images be destroyed? Be worshipped?
 1. Constantinople Council of 754 - Called image worship heresy and idolatry.
 2. 7th Ecumenical Council (787) - Called by Irene. Gave images lesser reverence.
 3. Caroline Books - Books Alcuin helped write; no religious value in images.
- E. Adoptionist Controversy - Double sonship idea.

The 9th and 10th Centuries. 801 - 1000 A.D.

- I. Papacy in the 9th Century.
 - A. Nicholas I - Opponent of Photius. (858-867).
 - B. Formosus - His successor didn't like many things that he did. (891-896).
 - C. Boniface VI - He as pope for just a few days. (896).
 - D. Stephen VI - (896-897). He had body of Formosus dug up and put on trial.
 - E. Theodore II - He annulled all the decisions of Stephen VI.
- II. Papacy in the 10th Century.
 - A. John X - Warrior who was put in as Pope by Theodora.
 - B. John XII - Probably the 2nd worse pope. He made Otto of Germany emperor.
 - C. Leo - Antipope, succeeded John XII who returned, so Leo was deposed.
 - D. Sylvester II - Called John XII a monster, antichrist, wicked pope.
- III. Religious Personnel and Events.
 - A. Theodora - 842. Held synod to have images brought back into the church.
 - B. Photius - Patriarch of Constantinople who said Western church was in the wrong.
 - C. Agobardus - Lyons, France. Opposed worship of Saints.
 - D. Claudius - Spain. Opposed worship of pictures; wouldn't use sign of the cross.
 - E. Radbertus - France. Advocated theory of transubstantiation.
 - F. Raðrannus - Opposed transubstantiation. We are nourished by the words of Christ.
 - G. St. Dunstan - England. He wanted to reform the church.
 - H. Cluny reform - Abbey in France that was a center in reform.

The 11th Century 1001 - 1100 A.D.

- I. Papacy in the 11th Century.
 - A. Benedict IX - A very wicked pope. He was driven from Rome. Later reestablished.
 - B. Sylvester II - He was forced out of the papacy, and Benedict IX reestablished.
 - C. Gregory VI (John Gratian) - Bought this office from Benedict IX. (Henry II - emperor that deposed Gregory VI).
 - D. Clement II - Made pope by Henry II, the emperor.
 - E. Leo IX - Appointed by Henry II. Came to Rome as humble pilgrim w/Hildebrand.
 - F. Alexander II - He bestowed England on William the Conqueror.
 - G. Gregory VII (Hildebrand) - Strengthened the Papacy. (Henry IV - Emperor excommunicated by Hildebrand. Repented at Castle of Canossa.)
- II. Religious Personnel and Events.
 - A. Azymites - Title given Latin Church by the Greek Church for using unleavened bread.
 - B. Berengar - Attacked transubstantiation. Tried by Lateran Council.

The 12th Century 1101 - 1200 A.D.

- I. Papacy in the 12th Century.
 - A. Adrian IX - Influenced Henry II of England to conquer Ireland.
 - B. Alexander III - He canonized Thomas aBecket as a saint.
- II. Religious Personnel and Events.
 - A. St. Bernard of Clairvaux - Hymn writer. Emphasized true gospel. Monastic Preacher.
 - B. Crusades - An effort to regain Palestine from the Turks.
 - C. Thomas aBecket - Good archbishop of Canterbury who opposed Henry II.
- III. Scholasticism -
 - A. Anselm - England. He developed ontological argument.
 - B. Abelard - Moral influence theory of atonement. Jesus was an example to us.
 - C. Peter Lombard - R.C. Father of Systematic Theology. Wrote 4 Books of Sentences.

- D. Iconoclastic Controversy - Should images be destroyed? Be worshipped?
 1. Constantinople Council of 754 - Called image worship heresy and idolatry.
 2. 7th Ecumenical Council (787) - Called by Irene. Gave images lesser reverence.
 3. Caroline Books - Books Alcuin helped write; no religious value in images.
- E. Adoptionist Controversy - Double sonship idea.

The 9th and 10th Centuries. 801 - 1000 A.D.

- I. Papacy in the 9th Century.
 - A. Nicholas I - Opponent of Photius. (858-867).
 - B. Formosus - His successor didn't like many things that he did. (891-896).
 - C. Boniface VI - He as pope for just a few days. (896).
 - D. Stephen VI - (896-897). He had body of Formosus dug up and put on trial.
 - E. Theodore II - He annuled all the decisions of Stephen VI.
- II. Papacy in the 10th Century.
 - A. John X - Warrior who was put in as Pope by Theodora.
 - B. John XII - Probably the 2nd worse pope. He made Otto of Germany emperor.
 - C. Leo - Antipope, succeeded John XII who returned, so Leo was deposed.
 - D. Sylvester II - Called John XII a monster, antichrist, wicked pope.
- III. Religious Personnel and Events.
 - A. Theodora - 842. Held synod to have images brought back into the church.
 - B. Photius - Patriarch of Constantinople who said Western church was in the wrong.
 - C. Agobardus - Lyons, France. Opposed worship of Saints.
 - D. Claudius - Spain. Opposed worship of pictures; wouldn't use sign of the cross.
 - E. Radbertus - France. Advocated theory of transubstantiation.
 - F. Raðrannus - Opposed transubstantiation. We are nourished by the words of Christ.
 - G. St. Dunstan - England. He wanted to reform the church.
 - H. Cluny reform - Abbey in France that was a center in reform.

The 11th Century 1001 - 1100 A.D.

- I. Papacy in the 11th Century.
 - A. Benedict IX - A very wicked pope. He was driven from Rome. Later reestablished.
 - B. Sylvester II - He was forced out of the papacy, and Benedict IX reestablished.
 - C. Gregory VI (John Gratian) - Bought this office from Benedict IX. (Henry II - emperor that deposed Gregory VI).
 - D. Clement II - Made pope by Henry II, the emperor.
 - E. Leo IX - Appointed by Henry II. Came to Rome as humble pilgrim w/Hildebrand.
 - F. Alexander II - He bestowed England on William the Conqueror.
 - G. Gregory VII (Hildebrand) - Strengthened the Papacy. (Henry IV - Emperor excommunicated by Hildebrand. Repented at Castle of Canossa.)
- II. Religious Personnel and Events.
 - A. Azymites - Title given Latin Church by the Greek Church for using unleavened bread.
 - B. Berengar - Attacked transubstantiation. Tried by Lateran Council.

The 12th Century 1101 - 1200 A.D.

- I. Papacy in the 12th Century.
 - A. Adrian IX - Influenced Henry II of England to conquer Ireland.
 - B. Alexander III - He canonized Thomas aBecket as a saint.
- II. Religious Personnel and Events.
 - A. St. Bernard of Clairvaux - Hymn writer. Emphasized true gospel. Monastic Preacher.
 - B. Crusades - An effort to regain Palestine from the Turks.
 - C. Thomas aBecket - Good archbishop of Canterbury who opposed Henry II.
- III. Scholasticism -
 - A. Anselm - England. He developed ontological argument.
 - B. Abelard - Moral influence theory of atonement. Jesus was an example to us.
 - C. Peter Lombard - R.C. Father of Systematic Theology. Wrote 4 Books of Sentences.

The 13th Century. 1201-1300 A.D.

- I. Papacy in the 13th Century.
 - A. Innocent III - Most powerful pope in R.C. Church. Had worldwide interest.
 - B. Nicholas IV. - Died in 1292. For 2 years after him cardinals try to elect new pope.
 - C. Celestine V. 1294. Used as a tool by greedy men. Influenced to resign.
 - D. Boniface VIII. Influenced Celestine V to resign. Annuled his acts.
- II. Mendicant Orders.
 - A. St. Francis of Assisi - Italian. Began Franciscan order. "Lesser brothers".
(Clara of Stephe - Began cloisture of nuns. Influenced by St. Francis.)
 - B. St. Dominic - Spain. Began Dominican order. Emphasized education. Preached.
- III. Divergent Groups.
 - A. Waldensians - Followed Peter of Waldo of S. France. Innocent III opposed them.
(Poor Men of Lyons - Another name for the Waldensians.)
 - B. Albigenses (Cathari) - Albi, S. France. Held Manichaeian beliefs.
(The Inquisition - A movement to destroy Albigensians.)
- IV. Scholars of the 13th Century.
 - A. St. Thomas Aquinas - Leading theologian of R.C. Church. Studied sentences of Lombard.
 - B. Roger Bacon - Franciscan. Studied scientific experiments. Condemned by Church.
 - C. Bonaventure - Head of Franciscan order.
 - D. Dons Scotus - England. Enemy of Aquinas. Mary had immaculate conception.
 - E. Raymond Lull - Spain. Missionary to the Moslems.

The 14th Century. 1301-1400 A.D.

- I. Papacy in the 14th Century.

(Babylonian Captivity - Popes subject to king of France. Resided at Avignon.)

 - A. John XXII - Set up permanent court in Avignon.
(Emperor Lewis - Summoned council to try John XXII.)
 - B. Urban VI - He wanted to reform the church but used poor tactics.
(St. Catharine of Sienna - She tried to give good counsel to Urban VI.)
 - C. Clement VII - Pope who was elected while Urban II was still in office.
- II. Religious Personnel.
 - A. Marsilius of Padua - He said all power came from the people.
 - B. William of Occam - Franciscan. Power of the church should rest with representatives.
 - C. John Wyclif - Made English Bible. Denied transubstantiation.
(Edward III - England. Sent Wyclif as a representative to Avignon.)

The 15th Century. 1401-1500 A.D.

- I. Papacy in the 15th Century.

(The Great Schism - More than one pope reigning at the same time.)

 - A. Alexander V - Pope elected at Council of Pisa. Thus you have 3 popes.
 - B. Benedict XIII - Pope from 1397 - 1424.
 - C. Alexander V - Died after 1 year, 1409-1410.
 - D. John XXIII - 2nd Pisa Pope. Tried on 70 charges. Imprisoned for 10 years.
 - E. Martin V - 1419. New pope elected to end the Great Schism.
- II. Council of Constance.
 - A. John Hus - Bohemian preacher condemned by Council of Constance.
 - B. Mary - Sister of king of Bohemia who brought scholars from England.
 - C. Sigismund - Emperor who wanted the council to be called.
 - D. Jerome of Prague - Brave friend of John Hus who died a martyr.

* * * * * THE ECUMENICAL COUNCILS. * * * * *

- I. Council of Nicea (325 A.D.) Arianism.
- II. Council of Constantinople (381 A.D.) Macedonianism. Apollinarianism.
- III. Council of Ephesus (431 A.D.) Nestorianism.
- IV. Council of Chalcedon (451 A.D.) Monophysitism. (Eutychianism).
- V. Council of Constantinople II (553 A.D.) - Three Chapter Controversy.
- VI. Council of Constantinople III (680 A.D.) Monothelitism.
- VII. Council of Nicea II (787 A.D.) Iconoclastic Controversy.
- VIII. Council of Constantinople IV (869 A.D.) Condemned Photius. (Western).
- Council of Constantinople IV (879 A.D.) Praised Photius. (Eastern)

Note also the very important councils of Pisa and Constance.