



TRUTH ON TOUGH TEXTS

EXPOSITIONS OF CHALLENGING SCRIPTURE PASSAGES

WWW.THESCRPTUREALONE.COM

FROM SOLA SCRIPTURA PUBLICATIONS

ISSUE 128 (Jan./Feb. 2021)

A BIBLICAL VIEW OF CHURCH HISTORY

SELECTED TEXTS

LET US WEIGH CHURCH HISTORY SOLELY ON THE scales of Scripture.” So reads the epigraph on a book I have been scribbling for almost three years: *Church History in the Light of Scripture: Exercising Discernment Then and Now*. I have been a serious student of Church History for many years, and have written on a few subjects, some of which have appeared in this humble publication. The more I have read, researched, and reflected, however, the more deeply burdened I have become. Why? Well, quite frankly, because Scripture is conspicuously absent from the vast majority of Church History books. Scripture commands us to discern everything, so should this not include the history of the Church? Should we not want to learn from the grave errors of those who came before us? Should we not heed the warning of George Santayana (1863–1952), “Those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it”?¹

The immediate reaction to that idea, however, is to call it “subjective.” “Historians are supposed to be objective and just report the facts,” it is argued. Any person who has read a fair amount of history, however, knows that this is impossible. For example, since no historian can report every event, even choosing which ones to address is subjective. Further, every historian does a certain amount of “interpretation” depending upon his or her own perspective. A single example is Ralph D. Winter’s “Forward” to *A History of Christianity* by renowned historian Kenneth Scott Latourette (1884–1968):

If as a committed Christian he does not hesitate to expose weaknesses and shortcomings when he finds them, then as a loyal Baptist, he does not hesitate to give credit to church movements far removed from his own tradition. In fact, there is one bias that runs throughout all his books and helps explain his larger perspective. Unobtrusively, but consistently, he favors the minority, the man on the bottom, the movement without pedigree or official backing.²

Scotsman Andrew Miller (1810–83) is another example. In his sadly little-read book, *Miller’s Church History* (a.k.a., *Short Papers on Church History*), that godly, discerning pastor was not content to look at history merely through the lens of academic scholarship, as do many others. Rather, he examined events and persons in the context of God’s dealings with men and with Christ as the only Head of His Church, and his work

should be required reading. As he wrote in the “Preface”: “I have aimed at more than mere history. It has been my desire to connect with it Christ and His Word, so that the reader may receive the truth and blessing, through grace, to his soul.”³

So, if I may for emphasis overuse the word, while we certainly want to be accurate in reporting the *facts*, the *fact* is that we should examine the *facts* in light of the *facts* of Scripture. In *fact*, I submit that such an approach actually is as *objective* as possible simply because we examine everything according to the *objective* Truth of Scripture.

To put it another way, the fundamental nature of doctrine cannot be overemphasized. After all, the word “doctrine” appears no less than 45 times in the NT, 11 of which refer to Jesus’ emphasis, four to what the apostles declared in Acts, two specifically to the Apostle John, and most of the rest to Paul’s ministry. Why? Because it is the *only* thing that grounds us in the Truth (2 Tim. 3:16–17; 4:2–4; etc.) and equips us for discernment (Acts 17:11; 1 Jn. 4:1; Heb. 4:12; etc.). So, if doctrine was crucial in those early days of the Church, was it meant to be any less critical in the centuries to follow?

I would, therefore, like to submit two overlapping contrasts that I am convinced are at the core of this issue and ask you to prayerfully consider them.

Christendom vs. Christianity

Is it not interesting that the title of many Church History books include the word “Christian,” such as: *History of the Christian Church*; *Christianity Through the Centuries*; *Christian History Made Easy*; and so forth? Why is that odd? Because these books then go on to recount men, movements, and methodologies that were anything but Christian *but still include them as part of Christianity*. Was Arianism Christian? Of course not. Were Docetism, Gnosticism, Pelagianism, Asceticism, Monasticism, the Crusades, the Jesus Seminar, and many other examples biblical Christianity? Hardly!

For example, in a previous TOTT, we analyzed the repeated description of Roman Emperor Constantine as one who was converted to Christianity, even though his life demonstrated anything but true conversion.⁴ An equally dramatic example was Clovis I (466–511), the first king of the Franks (Germanic peoples), who most historians again say converted to Christianity. One goes so far as to write that he “embraced

the faith” and his “people followed [him] into the spiritual City.” But what are the facts?

While his wife Clotilde (a Catholic Burgundian princess who would later be venerated as a saint for this influence) urged him to convert, it was a battle in 496 that was the final push. On the verge of a total rout by the Alamanni tribe, he vowed to be baptized if his wife’s God gave him the victory. After the victory, he was, indeed, “baptized,” along with 3,000 of his army who followed him. As one historian clarifies, however, “The soldiers marched along side a river where priests stood with branches from trees. As the soldiers went by, the priests dipped the branches into the river and flung baptismal water on them, repeating the proper formula. As soon as the water touched the soldiers, they were supposedly made Christians.”⁵ Was that true Christianity? In fact, Clovis’ life afterwards, like Constantine’s, demonstrated false conversion. Sadder still, this kind of “mass conversion” was actually typical in Europe. Like Clovis, when kings converted they brought their people with them, who also brought pagan superstitions and behavior with them into the Church.

And now for the real controversy: is Roman Catholicism Christianity, even though it is the *major* emphasis in many Church History books, even some written by Protestants and evangelicals? Well, consider this: by the close of the fifth century, the following were deeply and permanently rooted in “the Church”: prayers for the dead; making the sign of the cross; veneration of angels and dead saints; the use of pictures, images, and relics; viewing the Lord’s Supper as a sacrifice; daily celebration of The Mass; exaltation of Mary, the “Mother of God”; creation of Lent and Easter; adoption of Christmas; the priest as the representative of Christ; the sharp division between the “clergy” (church officers) and the “laity” (ordinary church members); beautiful vestments to separate clergy and laity; the burning of tapers and candles; altars; elaborate and complex liturgy and ritual; pilgrimages to holy places; monasticism; persecution of heathen and heretics; and little true preaching and teaching. And all this grew exponentially worse in the centuries to come.

Now, how can anyone conclude that that is true Christianity? I need to interject here, as the title of this article reflects, I am *not* talking about a *Protestant* view of Church History vs. a *Catholic* view—I am talking about a *biblical* view. I emphasize this for a very specific reason. While some readers might say, for example, “You’re just bashing Catholics because you’re a Protestant,” that could not be further from the truth. As history repeatedly demonstrates, there were colossal deviations from Scripture in Catholicism and Protestantism alike. Frankly, much of so-called Protestantism is no closer to biblical Christianity than is Catholicism.

It is for that very reason that it is absolutely essential to recognize the glaringly obvious fact that there is a vast difference between *Christendom* and *Christianity*, a contrast that continues to this day. What does *Christendom* mean? The famous American lexicographer and textbook pioneer Noah Webster (1758–1843), who was also a born-again believer, defined *Christendom* this way in 1828: “The territories, countries or regions inhabited by Christians, or those who profess to believe in the Christian religion.” A modern Webster’s says much the same. In other words, *Christendom* is a global term that describes countries or communities that, to one extent or

another, adhere to principles and practices gleaned from the Bible. In other words, it’s critical to understand that *Christendom* is only *professed* Christianity. For example, just because a judicial system might use the Ten Commandments as its foundation (something American courts, in fact, are trying to remove from the courtroom) does not mean the system is truly Christian in the biblical sense of judges who have been regenerated in salvation.

So, as history unmistakably bears out, *Christendom* is the unholy mixture of ingredients from Judaism, Christianity, philosophy, tradition, and even paganism and does not revere Scripture as the final and sufficient authority for anything. In dramatic contrast, then, *Christianity* is not about *religion*, but rather *relationship*, a personal relationship with its founder Jesus Christ. It’s not about a creed, code, or even conviction. It is about being right with God because of His grace alone, through faith alone, in Christ alone and about recognizing His Word alone (not tradition or human reason) as authoritative and sufficient. So, not all those who live under the banner of **CHRISTENDOM** are true, born-again Christians. While the nations of Europe, for example, were once mostly *Christian*, they are today simply part of the 2.2 billion members of *Christendom*⁶ because they replaced Biblical Christianity with Secular Humanism.

The Remnant Among the Religious

To put the foregoing another way, there is a dramatic difference between the *religious* and the *remnant*. A remnant, of course, refers to a small remaining quantity of something. The seamstress, for example, is very familiar with the cloth remnants left over after making a garment. Are those remnants worthless scraps? Hardly. Using fabric remnants is practically an art form (see Ex. 26:12 for just such a picture). Likewise, the remnant concept is a recurring theme throughout both the OT and NT, and its significance is far more important (e.g., Isaiah 7:3; 11:11–12; 10:10, 17–20; 46:3; Jer. 23:3; 31:7; Joel 2:32; Amos 5:15; Micah 2:12–13; 4:5–7; 7:18; Zeph. 3:13; Matt. 7:13–14; 13:1–50).

All this irrefutably demonstrates that *Christianity* is comprised of a *remnant*, which God has always *preserved*. It is not comprised of the *majority* of people, but rather the *minority*, including a minority of the 2.2 billion people in *Christendom*. Those 2.2 billion “Christians” include the categories: Roman Catholic, Protestant, Orthodox, Anglican, and Independent. Do we see this remnant in Church History? We certainly do, although few Christians have heard of them and some historians ignore them. It is also critical to acknowledge that Rome repeatedly crushed any deviation from its “orthodoxy.” Space permits only brief mention and discussion of a few.

Maewyn Succat (a.k.a. Patrick)

While people wear green, dye the Chicago River green, and drink green beer as they revel in the festivities of Saint Patrick’s day, the so-called “patron saint of Ireland” wasn’t even Irish (*or Catholic!*). Space prohibits Succat’s (c. 389–461) background, so briefly, Irish pirates kidnapped the 16-year-old Scottish lad and sold him to a chieftain in Northern Ireland, who sent him into the fields as a herdsman. In his solitude, he reflected on the Divine truths his parents had taught him and wept over his sin. As the renowned historian Jean

Henri Merle d'Aubigné (1794–1872), recounts: “Evangelical faith even then existed in the British islands in the person of this slave, and of some few Christians born again, like him, from on high.”⁷ After six years, Succat escaped and made his way home, but since he had come to Christ on Irish *soil*, he felt compelled to preach the Gospel to Irish *souls*. He returned there to preach to war-loving Druid pagans. Some historians maintain that he was consecrated bishop of the Irish, then being known as Patrick.

What is critical is that despite the claims of Roman Catholicism, the idea of Patrick being Roman Catholic, as depicted in statues and pictures, is a total myth. He is invariably pictured as traveling throughout Ireland wearing a bishop's robe and mitre, but this attire did not even exist then, appearing later in the Middle Ages. Even more basic, his message and method were more in line with Protestantism than Catholicism. The Celtic Church did not come under the dominance of Rome until 664, at which time it rapidly declined. Additionally, many souls were converted, not by external sacraments or by the worship of images, but by the preaching of the Word of God. Further, he was “independent of the Pope . . . he never mentions Rome or the Pope, never appeals to tradition, and seems to recognize the Scriptures [sadly, however, also the Apocrypha] as the only authority in matters of faith.”⁸ Further still, he never uses the term “priest” and never mentions practices such as auricular confession, extreme unction, or the adoration of Mary. Finally, there is even support indicating that Patrick was married (Sheelah was her name), thereby denying the unbiblical folly of celibacy.

Yes, there is much *fable* that has swirled around Patrick (e.g., using the shamrock to teach the Irish about the doctrine of the Trinity, banishing all the snakes in Ireland by chasing them into the sea after they attacked him during a 40-day fast, and his walking stick growing into a living tree), but the *facts* indicate a truly born-again, godly proclaimer of Christ alone. While he was not entirely free from the errors of the time (e.g., “pious miracles” and monasticism), generally speaking we see the Gospel in the earlier days of the British Church.

The Jovinians

An early resister to the abuses of the Church of his day was Jovinian (died c. 405), “one of the earliest reformers before the Reformation.”⁹ A well-educated Roman monk, he began challenging the well-established teaching that asceticism, monasticism, and celibacy were inherently superior as the purer and therefore holier way of life. He did, in fact, teach the biblical view that the ordinary Christian life is holy and that other distinctions should not be made. He further proclaimed other biblical views, such as rejecting the teachings of Mary's perpetual virginity and that good works merit salvation. He, and the many who recognized the Truth and followed him, were condemned and excommunicated for heresy and blasphemy. Jovinian himself was exiled to the island of Boa till his death but his teaching continued to spread in many parts of the Roman Empire resulting in many nuns leaving their convents and getting married.

Vigilantius

The controversy stirred up by Vigilantius (c. 400), a presbyter in southwest Gaul (France), started out as a personal

one. In 395, he was encouraged to visit Jerome in his monastery in Bethlehem but was soon rightly convinced that Jerome was enamored with Origen and his bizarre and dangerous allegorical approach to biblical interpretation. After writing an epistle condemning Jerome's Origenism, the ever arrogant, hot-tempered Jerome responded by comparing Vigilantius to Judas and calling him “an ass.”¹⁰ In fact, his response “contains more of personal abuse and low witticism, than of solid argument.”¹¹ As the years passed, Vigilantius' teaching spread, and he was supported by many in the laity and clergy alike as well as protected by some bishops against Rome's intolerance and Jerome's renewed attacks.

Vigilantius' teachings, in fact, are a wonderful reflection of biblical Truth in contrast to the error that surrounded him: he attacked the veneration of martyrs and relics; called those who worshipped the “wretched bones” of dead men as-gatherers and idolaters; considered praying to martyrs as a deifying of them and a step back into paganism; rejected the burning of daylight candles in the basilicas simply because the martyrs were rejoicing in the light of the Lamb on the throne and had no need of such illuminations; and condemned the celibacy of the priesthood and monasticism. Like Jovinian, he held that there is no distinction of morality into higher and lower classes, but that the demands of virtue are equally binding upon all men. Vigilantius again dramatically demonstrates that there were true believers in that day despite the unbiblical teachings of “the Church.”

The Paulicians

Of several dissenting movements that arose against the Roman Church, the Paulicians (Pau-lee-shuns) are among the most enigmatic. This is because most of what we know about them comes from sources written by their enemies, which can hardly be considered objective, or even honest. In fact, as the British poet/novelist/playwright/theologian Charles Williams (1886–1945) so well put it, “Not one mind in a thousand can be trusted to state accurately what its opponent says, much less what he thinks.”¹²

For example, while Philip Schaff was a renowned historian, he viewed Roman Catholicism as true Christianity. He, therefore, recounted what Catholic sources of that day stated about this group and included them in the “Heretical Sects” section in chapter 12 of volume IV of his *History of the Christian Church* and details their “heretical beliefs.” In other words, and this is a critical point, Schaff (and other historians) judge who is heretical and who is not based solely on where they stand in light of Catholic orthodoxy, even when that orthodoxy is often totally unbiblical.

Originating around 650 in Armenia, the Paulicians (a name given to them by their enemies, while they called themselves Christians or “the holy, universal, and apostolic Church”) were founded by Constantine of Mananalis, who had (in return for his hospitality toward a deacon from Armenia returning from captivity among the Muslims) received a gift of a manuscript of the four Gospels and Paul's Epistles. This was a rare gift, indeed, as the Scriptures were concealed from the laity by Rome. As the reading of Scripture alone usually does, Constantine's thinking and life were transformed, a desire to return to apostolic Christianity was born, and he took the name Silvanus (after Paul's companion).

The most damning accusation against the Paulicians by Rome, one many historians again parrot, is that they adhered to Manichaeism, a radical Gnostic sect that thrived from the third to seventh centuries and was one of the most formidable foes of biblical Christianity. That charge, however, is demonstrably false. After reading the Scriptures he had received, Silvanus immersed himself in them, threw away his Manichean books, renounced that apostasy, and commanded his followers to read nothing else but those Scriptures.

Silvanus preached faithfully for 30 years, seeing many come to Christ not only from the Zoroastrian religion prevalent in the East, but also from Romanism itself. Once again, the Catholic Church began its persecution of those who dared to dissent. Why? Here are a few points that fly in the face of Romanism and totally explain why it mercilessly persecuted this group:

- Marriage, ordination, confirmation, and extreme unction, are not necessary to salvation.
- True baptism must be preceded by repentance and faith, rendering infant baptism invalid.
- The Virgin Mary was not a perpetual virgin, nor can she intercede for us, for Christ is our only intercessor.
- The idea of Purgatory is false and vain.
- Images, pictures, holy crosses, incense, and candles are all to be condemned as idolatrous, unnecessary, and alien to the teaching of Christ.
- The Scriptures and a knowledge of divine truth are not to remain the exclusive possession of the priests.

While the Paulicians were not without some errors, we still see in them far more biblical orientation than we do in the so-called “orthodox Church” of the day. Here is another example of the *remnant* among the *religious*.

The Petrobrusians and The Henricans

I must be brief here, so I will go immediately to what the Petrobrusians (Pe-troh-broo-shuns) and the Henricans (Hen-ree-shuns) believed, as they eventually merged in the twelfth century. Does the following list reflect Scripture or tradition? Does it demonstrate heresy, which these groups were charged with, or Truth? They:

- Adhered to the Scriptures alone and rejected the authority of the Fathers and tradition.
- Denied the dogma that children could be saved by the baptism of Christ before they had come to an intelligible age, and denied the charge that they “rebaptized” since the so-called “christening” of infants was not valid in the first place.
- Maintained that temples and ornate churches ought not to be built, that existing ones should be torn down, that sacred places were not necessary for worship, and that God hears prayers as well in a tavern as in a church, in a market-place as in a temple, before a stable as before an altar.
- Maintained that crosses ought to be broken to pieces and burned and passionately denied that the instruments by which Christ was cruelly slain should be adored or venerated.
- Denied that the body and blood of Christ could be wrought and offered by the priest, regarding the idea of

transubstantiation absurd and sacrilegious (although it seems they went too far, however, in rejecting the Lord’s Supper entirely because of the superstitious abuses that had become so deeply rooted).

- Condemned sacrifices, prayers, alms, and other works for the dead as useless.

The Waldenses

It is truly troubling that some evangelical Church historians use the word “heretical” in reference to the Waldenses (Wall-den-sees), for that is patently false. Yes, they were heretical as far as apostate *Rome* was concerned (and thereby not “orthodox”) but not according to *biblical* truth. On the contrary, “they held substantially what the apostles before their day, and the Reformers after it, taught.”¹³ The Waldenses are, in fact, a crucial milestone in the history of the true Church.

Again, space prohibits looking at their origins, but those origins demonstrate once again a consistent remnant of true believers through the ages. What matters most is what they believed in contrast to the appalling apostasy of Rome. They did, in fact, hold to biblical theology and proclaimed those truths long before the Reformers of the sixteenth century.

Speaking of the Reformation, a word of clarity and caution is needed. I recently heard a greatly respected Reformed evangelical (whom I, too, highly value) say: “Until the Reformation, the Gospel was hidden.” I have also read similar comments from others. One states even more strongly: “Not only was [the Dark Ages] an age that is remembered to be full of war and disease, but it was also a time in which the Gospel was hidden from man.” That is very troubling. Are we to conclude that no one was saved for hundreds of years until Martin Luther “discovered” that “the just shall live by faith” or that he “rediscovered God,” as another historian puts it? Are we to think that men had so perverted the Gospel that God was powerless to save anyone? Was God rendered “unsovereign” for a millennium? On the contrary, there were many individuals and groups that recognized the true Gospel and had no part of Rome. What the Reformation accomplished was bringing the Church out of 1,000 years of darkness and was the first *major* attempt to return to biblical Christianity (in addition to the smaller attempts we are noting here). So, while the Gospel was certainly greatly *obscured*, it was *not hidden*. God has always preserved His *remnant* among the *religious*. How, then, did the Waldenses contribute? They:

- Held the Holy Scripture to be the source of faith and religion, without regard to the authority of the fathers or tradition. While they principally used the NT, they also regarded the OT as canonical Scripture.
- Rejected all the external rites of the Roman Church except Baptism and the Lord’s Supper. They considered temples, vestments, images, crosses, pilgrimages, relics, and the rest of the Roman sacraments to be inventions of Satan, fleshly, and full of superstition.
- Further held Baptism and the Lord’s Supper as being symbols only, denying the real presence of Christ taught by Rome (i.e. transubstantiation).
- Rejected the papal doctrines of purgatory, masses, and prayers for the dead, acknowledging only two destinations after death: heaven or hell.

- Rejected indulgences and confessions of sin to a priest, with the exception of mutual confessions of the faithful for instruction and consolation.
- Viewed monasticism a putrid carcass, vows to be the invention of men, and that the marriage of the clergy is not only lawful but also necessary.
- Denounced Rome as “the whore of Babylon,” denied obedience to the papal domination, and vehemently repudiated the notions that the pope has any authority over other churches and that he has the power either of the civil or ecclesiastical sword.¹⁴
- Studied Scripture in translations made into their native languages, set up schools to train preachers, and rejected oaths.¹⁵

Now, while I strongly disagree with their insistence on “apostolic poverty,” penance, a continued veneration of Mary, and their advocating of women preachers, the Waldenses still “were *the strictly* biblical sect of the Middle Ages.”¹⁶ They were, hands down, the *custodians* of the Truth in the midst of lies, the *censors* of the apostasy that dominated Christendom, and the *carriers* of the Scripture torch in that dark abyss.

What was the response from “the Church”? The bigoted and arrogant Pope Innocent III (reigned 1198–1216) was so against the widespread “heresy” of the Waldenses that he was determined to “exterminate the whole pestilential race,”¹⁷ which he proceeded to attempt. He “was no sooner on the throne than he began to wage war against heretical infection.”¹⁸ “The Inquisition was a thoroughly papal institution, wrought out in all its details by the popes of the thirteenth century, beginning with Innocent III,”¹⁹ and the tip of his spear was cast in the form of the Dominicans. Pope Innocent VIII (reigned 1432–92) imitated the vigor of his predecessor and set out to exterminate the Waldenses, even launching a Crusade in 1487 that lasted three decades, and the martyrs were many. People were flayed alive, buried alive, disemboweled, cut open and lime poured into the wounds, impaled on a spit and roasted over a fire, had fingernails torn out and fingers chopped off, and much more. In the infamous massacre of 1655 alone, 1,700 Waldensians were killed by Catholic forces commanded by the Duke of Savoy. We ask again, do such thoughts and actions proceed from hearts that have been truly regenerated? Would a true “Vicar of Christ” sanction such barbarity and murder? But still there are those who inexplicably insist to this very day that Roman Catholicism is “the Church,” or at least “another branch of Christianity.” The real truth, however, is that it was the Waldenses, and others like them, who were the *remnant* among the *religious*.

There is much more we could examine, but, alas, we cannot do so here. We must at least make quick mention of others of the remnant, however. An often overlooked fellow who helped pave the road on which the theologians of the Reformation would tread was Thomas Bradwardine (*Bradwer-*

deen, 1290–1349). Considered by many to be a genius, he was a theologian, philosopher, mathematician, and astronomer. So great was his reputation, in fact, that he was known as *Doctor Profundus* (the Profound Doctor). His massive 900-page polemic, *The Cause of God Against the Pelagians*, which earned him his nickname, strongly presents the Doctrines of Sovereign Grace, as championed by Augustine before him and those who would soon follow him, all of whom predated the Reformers: John Wycliffe (c. 1328–84), John Huss (1369–1415), Girolamo Savonarola (1452–1498), Johann von Wesel (c. 1400–81), and Wessel Gansfort (1419–89).

Those *preserved remnants* (and others like them) among the *profane religious* continue to confront us today. They challenge us not only to stand for the Truth, but also, I would encourage and entreat, to start looking at history *biblically* instead of *traditionally*, not just regurgitate facts but discern Truth, not just perform an academic exercise but learn how not to repeat the same errors.

Dr. J. D. Watson, Pastor-Teacher, Grace Bible Church
Director, Sola Scriptura Publications, a ministry of GBC

NOTES

- ¹ Santayana, *The Life of Reason*, Vol. 1., 1905.
- ² Kenneth Scott Latourette, *A History of Christianity, Revised Edition* (HarperCollins, 1975), Vol. I, x.
- ³ Andrew Miller, *Miller’s Church History* (Bible Truth Publishers, 1999; originally, Pickering & Inglis, London, 1928), iii.
- ⁴ See TOTT #110 (Jan./Feb. 2018), “Reader Questions (9).”
- ⁵ Robert A. Baker, *A Summary of Christian History*, Third Edition (B&H Publishing Group, 2005), 69–70.
- ⁶ As of 2020, the Operation World Database (OWD, <http://operationworld.org>) states that there are 2,229,951,315 Christians in the world (annual growth 1.2%) with 545,886,818 of those being evangelicals (annual growth 2.6%).
- ⁷ Merle D’Aubigne, *History of the Reformation of the Sixteenth Century*, Vol. 5, Book 17, Chapter 1.
- ⁸ Philip Schaff, *History of the Christian Church*, Vol. IV, 47.
- ⁹ McClintock and Strong, *Cyclopedia*, “Jovinian (2)” entry.
- ¹⁰ Ibid, “Vigilantius” entry.
- ¹¹ Schaff, Vol. III, 232.
- ¹² Charles Williams, *The Descent of the Dove: A Short History of the Holy Spirit in the Church* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974), 112.
- ¹³ J. A. Wylie, *History of the Waldenses*, 11.
- ¹⁴ The preceding points adapted from McClintock and Strong, *Cyclopedia*, “Waldenses” entry.
- ¹⁵ Nick Needham, *2000 Years of Christ’s Power*, Vol. 2, 334.
- ¹⁶ Schaff, Vol. V, 494 (emphasis added).
- ¹⁷ McClintock and Strong, *Cyclopedia*, “Waldenses” entry.
- ¹⁸ Schaff, Vol. V, 519–20.
- ¹⁹ Ibid, 517.

RECENTLY RELEASED: Pastor Watson’s two-volume work, *The Christian’s Wealth and Walk: An Expository Commentary on Ephesians*. If you purchase both volumes directly from SSP, the set is only \$32.00 (a shipping donation is entirely optional). Just write to us at: Sola Scriptura Publications; P.O. Box 235; Meeker, CO; 81641.

COMING IN APRIL: *Solemn Sentences: The Seven Statements of Christ on the Cross*

TRUTH ON TOUGH TEXTS

A Ministry of
Grace Bible Church
P.O. Box 235
Meeker, CO 81641
www.TheScriptureAlone.com
dwatson@thescripturealone.com
A F.I.R.E. Church
www.FireFellowship.org

This monthly publication is intended to address Scriptures that have historically been debated, are particularly difficult to understand, or have generated questions among Believers. We hope it will be an encouragement and challenge to God's people to carefully examine and discern Truth. While the positions presented here are based on years of careful biblical research, we recognize that other respected men of God differ.

If you have a question that perplexes you, please send it along so we might address it either in a full length article or in a "Reader Questions" issue. Other comments are also warmly welcomed, and letters to the editor will be published.

This publication is sent free of charge to anyone who requests it. To aid in the ministry, donations will be greatly appreciated, but never demanded. If you know someone you think would enjoy TOTT, please send along their address.