

Reformation
& Revival



A Quarterly Journal for Church Leadership

Volume 6, Number 4 • Fall 1997

Reformation & Revival Journal

A Quarterly Journal for Church Leadership

Published by
Reformation & Revival Ministries, Inc.
P.O. Box 88216
Carol Stream, Illinois 60188-0216
(630) 653-4165

Editor: John H. Armstrong

Associate Editors: Donald E. Anderson
Thomas N. Smith

Design and Production: Jennifer McGuire

Subscriptions Manager: Stacy Armstrong

Reformation & Revival Journal (ISSN 1071-7277), (U.S.P.S. 011-791), is published quarterly, for \$24 per year, or \$40 for two years, by Reformation & Revival Ministries, Inc., 630 Paxton Place, Carol Stream, Illinois 60188-9244. Second-class postage has been paid at Carol Stream, Illinois, and additional mailing offices. POSTMASTER: Send address changes to *Reformation & Revival Journal*, P.O. Box 88216, Carol Stream, Illinois 60188-0216.

This Journal is indexed in *Christian Periodical Index*.

Reformation & Revival Journal is published four times each year by Reformation & Revival Ministries, Inc., a not-for-profit teaching ministry organized in the state of Illinois in 1991. The ministry is committed to the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as the infallible Word of God and is in essential agreement with the confessional statements of historic Reformation theology. The purpose of this ministry is centered in its name:

1. To encourage *reformation* in the local Christian churches worldwide,
2. To promote the cause of *revival* and spiritual awakening through prayer and the provision of resources to aid Christian leaders.

Information

Subscription rates are \$24 for one year, \$40 for two years. Special full-time student rate is \$16 for one year. Please remit in U.S. currency only. For overseas orders add \$4 for each year for postage. Canadian subscribers add \$2 per year for additional postage. Back issues and single issues are \$8 each. To order in other currencies contact the names below:

Australian subscriptions available through:

Reformation & Revival Ministries (Australia)
% Mr. Malcolm Bouchard
110 Marshall Road
Rocklea 4106 Phone: 7275-3239

United Kingdom subscriptions available through:

Reformation & Revival Ministries (UK)
% Rev. Graham Hind
13 New Road

Haverfordwest, Pembrokeshire SA61 1TU Phone: 01437-763588

Canadian subscriptions available through:

Reformation & Revival Ministries (Canada)
% Rev. Don B. Cook
2113 Victoria Avenue E
Thunder Bay, Ontario P7C 1E4

Correspondence concerning articles, editorial policy, books for review, suggested manuscripts, and subscriptions should be addressed to the editor. Comments are welcome.

The conviction of the staff and editors of the *Reformation & Revival Journal* is that awakening, of the kind seen in the First Great Awakening in America, wedded to the doctrinal concerns of the historic Protestant Reformation as expressed in the terms *sola scriptura*, *sola gratia*, and *sola fide*, is needed in our generation.

The views expressed in this publication should be considered as the personal opinions of the authors and are not to be taken as an official editorial perspective.

ISSN 1071-7277 *All Scripture quotations, unless otherwise marked, are taken from the NEW AMERICAN STANDARD BIBLE, © 1960, 1962, 1963, 1968, 1971, 1972, 1973, 1975, 1977, by The Lockman Foundation. Used by permission.*

Table of Contents

Reformation & Revival Journal

| | |
|---|------------|
| <i>Editor's Introduction</i> | 9 |
| John H. Armstrong | |
| <i>All Grace and Grace Alone</i> | 27 |
| William Arp | |
| <i>Justification and Evangelical Christianity: A Historical Concern</i> | 49 |
| Philip H. Eveson | |
| <i>Four Aspects of Divine Righteousness</i> | 67 |
| Fred G. Zaspel | |
| <i>Justification: The Status of the Christian</i> | 87 |
| Steven A. Hein | |
| <i>Charles G. Finney's Doctrine of Justification</i> | 109 |
| David H. Linden | |
| <i>The Paradoxical Love of the Cross</i> | 133 |
| Donald G. Bloesch | |
| <i>Justification: A Pastoral Perspective</i> | 149 |
| Douglas R. Shivers | |
| <i>The Original Promise Keeper: The Doctrine of the Final Perseverance of the Saints</i> | 157 |
| Mark DeVine | |
| <i>Annotated Bibliography</i> | 179 |
| <i>Book Reviews</i> | 185 |

Sola Fide: *Does It Really Matter?*

John H. Armstrong

The sixteenth-century rediscovery of Paul's objective message of justification by faith came upon the religious scene of that time with a force and passion that totally altered the course of human history. It ignited the greatest reformation and revival known since Pentecost.

This Protestant movement was firmly grounded in the material principle of *sola fide*, so-called by Philip Melancthon. The Pauline doctrine of justification by faith alone, powerfully revived in the life of the church, set off a movement of God which changed the religious landscape forever. It is time modern church leaders reconsidered the power of this truth. If it were unleashed again the consequences would undoubtedly amaze us.

Now, if the Fathers of the early church, so nearly removed in time from Paul, lost touch with the Pauline message, how much more is this true in succeeding generations? The powerful truth of righteousness by faith needs to be restated plainly, and understood clearly, by every new generation.

In our time we are awash in a "Sea of Subjectivism," as one magazine put it over twenty years ago. Let me explain. In 1972 a publication known as *Present Truth* published the results of a survey with a five-point questionnaire which dealt with the most basic issues between the medieval church and the Reformation. Polling showed 95 per cent of the "Jesus People" were decidedly medieval and anti-Reformation in their doctrinal thinking about the gospel. Among church-going Protestants they found ratings nearly as high.

Reading Scott Hahn's testimony in his book, *Rome Sweet Home* (Ignatius Press, 1993), I discovered the same misunderstanding. Here can be found a complete and total failure to perceive the truths of grace, faith and the righteousness of God. No wonder Hahn left his Presbyterian Church of

America ordination behind to become a Roman Catholic. He did not understand the gospel in the first place, as his own words demonstrate.

I do not believe that the importance of the doctrine of justification by faith can be overstated. We are once again in desperate need of recovery. Darkness has descended upon the evangelical world in North America and beyond, much as it had upon the established sixteenth-century church. Luther said [in effect] “Upon this article the church is standing or falling . . .” If this be so I believe this issue of *Reformation & Revival Journal* will show why much of the modern church is “falling.”

But what, after all, is meant by the slogan *sola fide*?

Righteousness by Faith: Imputed or Imparted?

The apostle Paul wrote:

For I am not ashamed of the gospel, for it is the power of God for salvation to everyone who believes, to the Jew first and also to the Greek. For in it the righteousness of God is revealed from faith to faith; as it is written, “But the righteous man shall live by faith” (Rom. 1:16–17).

But what is this righteousness of faith? And how does it come to sinners? How are they to lay hold of it? Or, put another way, how does God give it to them? What relationship does this *alien* righteousness have to the believing sinner?

We must note that this righteousness is called “the righteousness of God” (Rom. 1:17). The apostle calls it “the righteousness which comes from God on the basis of faith” (Phil. 3:9). Why does he use this language? Because he intends to show that this is a righteousness that *God provided*. This is why the NIV translates this as “a righteousness from God.”

Furthermore, in Romans 1:18—3:20 Paul shows that all men stand as guilty, empty-handed and with nothing at all to offer to a holy God. But, and this is what amazed the apostle, God intervened; cf. 3:21. Thus we have that great word, “But now . . .,” i.e., at the very point of man’s utter destitution.

Recent biblical scholars have noted that “the righteousness of God” in Paul refers back to the Old Testament concept of *the activity of God* (Isa. 51:5). These saving acts were a manifestation of God’s covenant loyalty and faithfulness—i.e., *His* righteousness.

The point of this observation is to observe that God’s great redemptive activity in Christ is “the righteousness of God.”

This is why Martin Luther was correct to say that this text refers to “the righteousness which God has provided.” His observation plainly fits the evidence. Thus, as Romans 3:21 indicates, God’s righteousness was apart from law, or anything that man could do.

All of this doctrinal teaching is grounded in the biblical idea of covenant. Man can never establish covenantal relationship with God. He has nothing to offer to God. He can only accept the graciousness of God or refuse it. This is why we insist that the act of God whereby He bridges the gap between man and Himself is both *sola gratia* and *solius Deo gloria*.

In addition to the above observations we should note that Romans 5:18-19 refers to “the righteousness of One” or “the obedience of One.” This captures the essence of the Pauline argument. But this is not merely a Pauline doctrine. The apostle Peter writes that this is “the righteousness of . . . Jesus Christ” (2 Peter 1:1).

Plainly, *righteousness* is the key word. The Old Testament bears remarkably clear testimony to the fact that Messiah will be righteous (Isa. 53:9,11; 42:1-4; 50:4-7; 52:13; 11:2-5;

Jer. 23:5-6; 33:16).

These references are fulfilled in the One who truly fulfills all righteousness—Jesus Christ (Matt. 3:15; Luke 23:41,47; 4:34; 22:42; John 5:30; 17:4; Heb. 1:9; 4:15; 5:7-9; Phil. 2:5-9; Rom. 5:18-19).

One of the most important texts, and one most often attacked by unorthodox teachers over the years (e.g., Charles Finney and a host of his heirs), Romans 5:12-21, speaks in the plainest language of Christ as the second Adam, or the new man. As the first Adam failed, so the Second, Christ, did not.

Isaiah speaks prophetically of the Messiah as the righteous servant who keeps covenant with God. He is to be “The Servant of Yahweh.” This Jesus clearly fulfilled in His saving person and work. John Calvin captured the idea when he wrote: “For if righteousness consists in the observance of the law, who will deny that Christ merited favor for us when, by taking that burden upon Himself, He reconciled us to God as if we had kept the law.”

Thus, “He [the Lord Jesus Christ] humbled Himself by becoming obedient to the point of death, even death on a cross” (Phil. 2:8). It is for this reason that the *Formula of Concord* is correct when it says Christ’s righteousness is “His entire course of obedience from the manger to the cross.”

If we grasp any of this great and liberating teaching we shall never think again of righteousness as being something worked out *inside* of us. It is, and must always be, a once-for-all act. It is absolutely unrepeatable and cannot be given to us in any way except by *imputation*.

Furthermore, this righteousness is both vicarious and infinite.

1) It is vicarious in that it was rendered to God in our nature (human). Christ assumed both our nature and our obligation so that in our stead He could do for us what we

could not do for ourselves. To say this is vicarious means that it was done for us, not in us.

2) It is also infinite in that it was the righteousness carried out by an infinite person, the second person of the Godhead. Thus, “all the fulness of Deity dwells in bodily form” in Christ (Col. 2:9). To say righteousness is infinite means it cannot be reduced to an intra-human experience. This is big—big enough for sinners to run to it and hide! It is eternally pleasing in God’s sight, fully satisfactory for all of God’s just claims against me.

Earlier we read in Romans 1:17 that the righteousness of God is “from faith to faith” That is, it is *by faith* from start to finish.

It is as if he were saying, “It is by faith and nothing but faith.” I cannot think of a more clear statement of *sola fide* in all the New Testament. In addition to this the apostle later says it is “a righteousness apart from the law” (3:21). Paul further adds, it is “apart from works of the law” (3:28) and “apart from works” (4:6). The attacks of Roman Catholic apologists notwithstanding we plainly do have *sola fide* revealed in the clearest way in the New Testament.

Read Romans 1:18-4:25 and note that *faith* and *believe* are used repeatedly. What is important here is that Paul connects them both with righteousness. He is not talking about the believer’s holiness of life in these contexts. It is not until Romans 5-8 that Paul turns his attention to the righteousness that faith brings to us in our *experience*. Here he talks about the believer’s life, a new life, a Spirit-filled life, a life lived *by the gospel* (e.g., Rom. 6:13,16-20 where Paul clearly is talking about the believer’s actual righteousness of life lived out).

Interestingly, in the first section of Romans no mention is made of the Holy Spirit, while in the second the Spirit is *the* key to living the life of active faith (cf. Rom. 8:4). This proves, beyond reasonable doubt, two great truths that

have always sparked reformation and revival: (1) There is a righteousness which is of faith that is done for us, and, (2) The righteousness of life is what is done inside of us. The analogy of root and fruit captures the essence of Paul's thought here.

The line of argument in the Roman epistle could be stated as follows:

1) "Faith alone" is our acknowledgment that the righteousness which God has provided and made known to us in the gospel is all-sufficient. It has been wrought out, presented to God on our behalf, and accepted. Faith does not bring this righteousness into existence but rather confesses its existence. "Faith alone" means that the righteousness of God's provision is everything necessary for our salvation, and nothing remains to be added to that perfect and finished work.

2) "Faith alone" means that the righteousness which God has provided for our salvation is "apart from the law," "apart from works of the law" and "apart from works" (cf. Rom. 3:21, 28; 4:5-6). Luther referred to this as "passive righteousness: precisely because here all our efforts, works, cooperation and participation are shut out."

This is why it is *improper* to speak of sanctification as being "by faith alone." Living a life of holiness depends on faith, but not "faith alone." The old Religious Tract Society published a little tract in 1840 that noted correctly, "True Protestants never maintained the absurd position that we are sanctified by faith only." Even Luther, often accused of not having an adequate doctrine of sanctification, called living a holy life "active righteousness."

The evangelical Anglican bishop, J. C. Ryle, once noted that "... not once are we told that we are 'sanctified by faith without the deeds of the law.'"

3) "By faith alone" means that only faith is counted for righteousness (cf. Rom. 4:3, 5-6; also 4:20-24).

Faith is not our righteousness, as if it summed up all that is in love, hope, etc., but rather faith is God's gift given to us in order that we might accept the "righteousness of Christ" in the gospel. There are two sides to the transaction of the righteousness by faith: (1) faith, and (2) counted for righteousness by God. Consider both of these:

1) The Human Side (Faith). The poor condemned sinner hears that God has acted for sinners in Christ, providing a perfect righteousness which is in His Son. He hears that Christ's sinless life, bitter sufferings and death were for sinners. God is prepared to count Christ's life and death as His own if we will accept them. But the sinner is so helpless that of himself he cannot believe. God calls him by the Word, enlightens him by the Holy Spirit, and enables him to believe savingly so that he cries out, to use Martin Luther's words: "Mine are Christ's living, doing, and speaking, His suffering and dying, mine as much as if I had lived, done, spoken, suffered, and died as He did."

2) The Divine Side of the Transaction (Imputation). Romans 5:18-19 says that this righteousness is "the righteousness of One" or "the obedience of One." The word impute (*logizomai*) means "to reckon or to account." It does not in itself change the object, but it changes the way the object is regarded. The believer stands before the bar of God as if all the works and deeds of Christ were His own.

Justification, then, is a decree; it is a judgment, a verdict of the Judge. Is this "legal fiction," as some have been prone to say?

Think about this for a moment. The law demands righteousness, and the sinner owes the law, which he is incapable of satisfying. By faith the righteousness of Christ—all that the law requires of him, the obedience of Christ—is placed to the sinner's account. He is made righteous by imputation, thus God declares him righteous. Strictly speaking, then, being justified is the result of becoming

righteous (imputatively) by faith.

Romans 4:5 becomes the key text. What could be clearer than this word? “But to the one who does not work, but believes in Him who justifies the ungodly, his faith is reckoned as righteousness.”

Christianity is positively unique in this fact—it proclaims a perfectly holy and righteous God who justifies the ungodly through the activity of another.

This is why the Reformers did not hesitate to speak of this doctrine in terms of an “as if” idea. By this they meant two things: (1) The Savior is treated “as if” He were a sinner on the cross, and (2) The believing sinner is treated “as if” the sinless life and vicarious death of the Savior were his own. This can be well stated in the following manner:

For if righteousness consists in the observance of the law, who will deny that Christ merited favor for us when, by taking that burden upon Himself, He reconciled us to God as if all had kept the law.²

And, further:

We define justification as follows: the sinner received into communion with Christ, is reconciled to God by His grace. While cleansed by Christ’s blood, the sinner obtains forgiveness of sins, and clothed with Christ’s righteousness as if it were his own, he stands confident before the heavenly judgment seat.³

Rome has consistently rejected this doctrine, and still rejects it. We can’t say what she will do in the centuries to come, if the Lord tarries, but there is little reason to think she will “go back” on the teaching she firmly committed herself to at the Council of Trent. This doctrine was, and still remains, as one has called it, “The rock of offense.”

All Christians, Roman Catholic and Protestant alike, believe that Christ died for the ungodly. What all do not accept is this—that God justifies the ungodly *solely on the basis of imputed righteousness* based on the death of Christ for him. Not all of us understand that the believing sinner can be *simul justus et peccator*, “simultaneously sinful, yet righteous (just).”

There has been, and will continue to be, a temptation to ground God’s verdict of justification on something *within* the person. We are tempted, even within present evangelical scholarship (as we will see within this issue), to avoid saying that a person *is righteous*, while at the same time he is *not made righteous* by something going on inside of him. (In theological categories this means that we are always in danger of confusing and synthesizing justification and sanctification.)

Justification: The Cardinal Doctrine of the Reformation

This great truth of imputed righteousness is the very heart of the Reformation and of true evangelical faith. Take this out and the church is removed from the gospel. For both Lutheran and Reformed evangelical belief this has always been the hinge upon which the door opens. Even within these confessing evangelical circles countless theologians are not quite so certain today, while multitudes of laymen are not even sure that there is any cardinal doctrine at all.

John Calvin, in his *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, devotes one chapter (in Book III) to the illumination of the Holy Spirit, one to faith, eight to the life of faith, and eight chapters to justification by faith. He then gives one chapter to liberty of conscience and another to prayer. Finally he writes three chapters on predestination. (So much for stereotypes!)

There is a grand recovery going on today of the theo-

gy of the great Reformers, Luther and Calvin. But there is a real danger in this recovery effort, and at this crucial point. What we need is Luther to balance Augustine, as one Presbyterian put it, and we need not only a theocentric recovery, as the Reformed properly insist, but also a Christocentric one, as Lutherans are more prone to note.

Martin Luther's Story

Perhaps no conversion is better known than that of Martin Luther, the Augustinian monk, yet it bears brief recollection at this point.

As a young student he vowed to be a monk. He feared that only in this way could he do enough to make God gracious to him, a sinner. He observed the rules of his order with strictness which won him great praise. He went to confession for hours a day. He faithfully partook of the sacraments. He sought to climb to heaven on the three ladders of mystical piety, scholastic theology, and practical devotion.

Try as he did, he found no peace, no assurance. With Paul he cried, "Wretched man that I am! Who will set me free from the body of this death?" (Rom. 7:24).

Then the Spirit of God opened to him the meaning of Romans 1:16-17 so that he was enabled to see that he could do nothing for himself but it had been done. He wrote on Romans 4:24: "Christ's death not only signifies, but also accomplishes the remission of sins as a most sufficient satisfaction." And on John 3:16, "Whoever believes in Him has rendered satisfaction through Christ alone."

Luther wrote:

Whence, then, is our defense? Nowhere save from Christ and in Christ. For if there shall come some reproof, against the heart which believes in Christ, testifying against him for some evil deed, then it turns away from itself, and turns to

Christ (*ad Christum*) and says: But He made satisfaction. He is the Righteous One. This is my defense. He died for me. He made His righteousness to be mine, and made my sins to be His own. Because if He made my sin His own, then I can have it now no longer, and I am free. If, moreover, He had made His righteousness mine, I am righteous with the same righteousness as He is. But my sin cannot swallow Him up, but is swallowed up in the infinite abyss of His righteousness since He is God, blessed forever. And so, God is greater than the accuser. God is the defender, the heart is the accuser. What, is that the proportion? So, even so it is. Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect? Nobody. Why? Because it is Jesus Christ, who also is God, who died, nay rather who is risen again. If God be for us, then who can be against us.⁴

This same teaching is the doctrine of the Church of England, the Presbyterians, the Baptists, indeed, even the early Methodists.

John Bunyan, an immersionist in his view of the sacrament of baptism, wrote autobiographically of his understanding of this truth:

[in a woeful state of mind] this sentence fell upon my soul: Thy righteousness is in heaven. And I saw that it was not my good frame of heart that made my righteousness better, nor yet my bad frame that made my righteousness worse; for my righteousness was Jesus Christ Himself, the same yesterday, today and forever.⁵

Jonathan Edwards, in November 1734, saw a great awakening burst forth in his church in Northampton, Massachusetts. Edwards was preaching on this grand doctrine when revival mercies came with blessing upon his people. He commented once: "[While defending this doc-

trine in his pulpit] God's work wonderfully broke forth among us and souls began to flock to Christ in whose righteousness alone they hoped to be justified."

This truth of *sola fide* truly was the *great doctrine* of the First Great Awakening!

Even John Wesley once professed that here he agreed with Calvin:

... that the righteousness of Christ, both his active and passive righteousness, is the meritorious cause of our justification, and has procured at God's hand that, upon our believing, we should be accounted righteous by Him. [As Wesley lay dying he said] There is no way into the holiest but by the blood of Jesus.⁶

More importantly the apostle Paul confessed his utter confidence in the same truth when he wrote:

... and may be found in Him, not having a righteousness of mine own derived from the Law, but that which is through faith in Christ, the righteousness which comes from God on the basis of faith" (Phil. 3:9).

This prompted our century's greatest American Reformed theologian, B. B. Warfield, to call this "*alien righteousness*." Warfield correctly noted that justification by faith is *not* to be set in contradiction to justification by works. (This is a mistake many modern evangelicals make in their confused state!) Justification by faith, as Warfield noted, is properly to be set in contradiction to justification by our *own* works. It must always be understood as justification by Christ's works.

How are we to preach this justifying work of Christ?

In view of a grand text such as Isaiah 6:1-8 I think it is appropriate to answer that we must preach the law and the

gospel.

C. F. W. Walther, a wise American Lutheran theologian, once commented that "every sermon ought to have some of the law to humble the proud and some of the gospel to comfort the depressed."

It is important that we have some understanding of both Luther and Calvin at this point. Never have two students of Scripture understood more plainly these grand truths of the gospel, and particularly of justification by faith alone. Pastors, and serious lay leaders as well, would do well to give more time to Luther and Calvin (finding that they are not nearly as hard to understand as they may have thought) and less to Barna and Peretti.

Roman Catholic scholars in the sixteenth century were willing to concede that salvation was by grace through faith (but not *alone*). They said a man could be justified by faith if that faith were clothed with love. This is what is still said by Rome today.

But the Reformers countered this by noting that love is the fulfillment of the law; thus this was still a veiled attempt to support righteousness *by the fulfillment of the law*. Protestants, therefore, insisted on *sola fide*. They never denied the need for love, but always saw it as the *fruit* of man's experience of sanctification. (Cf. Rom. 5:1-5. Here love is clearly the *fruit* of justification!) Rome always countered this by insisting that justification was God "making a person righteous in his own person" by the work of the Spirit.

Rome, therefore, reasons this way: How can God pronounce a person righteous in His sight unless he really is righteous?

Rome answers: A man must be born again, transformed by God, and only then can he have right standing with God. He can never have real and lasting assurance since he never knows for sure if the Spirit has done enough in him

to make him righteous enough before God.

Conclusion

Does this make much difference in our day, or is this historical tempest in a teapot?

I answer, "Yes, it has much to do with our time!"

This is particularly true when we begin to address the rampant subjectivism of our time. It will also be true when we seriously address the anti-intellectualism which fuels this subjectivist direction.

The Christian religion must always be seen as unique from all subjective religious plans and systems. Why? It is the only religion which proclaims a salvation based on concrete historical facts—namely, the life, death, burial and resurrection of Jesus of Nazareth in human history. These acts were outside of my experience. This is, therefore, an objective reality.

The human tendency is always to forget these objective facts and to gravitate back to subjectivism. Failing to see the glory of the mystery of Christ in the gospel we will always look for an experience *higher* than the revelation of Christ crucified.

Several theological observations illustrate this tendency quite plainly:

1) The Holy Spirit is given on the basis of the atonement and Christ's finished work, not on the basis of anything that we do, attain, or experience. Yet most of the practical Christian life teaching of our time flies in the face of this truth. Whether it is the Promise Keepers men's movement or the next "deeper life" emphasis recycled, it makes no difference.

2) Miracles may or may not be given, but faith never rests on demonstrations of power, but on the promises of God which are revealed entirely in the Word by the Spirit. Almost every modern revival movement, without any seri-

ous exception, has fallen into this trap over and over again.

3) Modern Pentecostalism, especially toward the end of this century, is a *complete denial* of justification by faith alone. Why do I make such a strong accusation? Please note:

a) Justification, in modern movements of this kind, does not bring the Holy Spirit in fullness. If God's greatest gift doesn't bring the Spirit, then I ask, What does? Psychological gimmicks, i.e., the Pentecostal "letting go," or "emptyings," or "absolute surrender."

b) Something greater than and beyond justification which comes by faith. (It makes the down payment of the Spirit greater than the reality which is given!)

c) An unfortunate dichotomy created between receiving Christ and receiving the Holy Spirit. Anything that offers Christ plus something else is a new Judaizing theology.

d) It makes two kinds of Christians: ordinary (carnal) and extraordinary (spiritual).

4) Contemporary concerns for revival are essentially wrong and will land us in more trouble unless we recover this *sola fide* emphasis.

In Luther's time the sects began to arise and wanted "more" and to "go higher" than the Reformers. Luther wrote:

Whoever departs from the article of justification does not know God and is an idolater. For when this article has been taken away, nothing remains but error, hypocrisy, godlessness, and idolatry, although it may seem to be the height of truth, worship of God, and holiness.⁷

These hyper-spiritual men in Luther's era cried out, "The Spirit, the Spirit," to which Luther once replied, "I will not follow their Spirit."

Following the Reformation the church went into a time

called “Protestant Orthodoxy.” (This was, to some extent, a kind of “new scholasticism,” as some have noted.) Some teaching, at times, became over intellectualized again. This is a constant danger. Reactions came in various ways, even as they still do in our time.

A good illustration of my point can be seen in the movement called German Pietism. Here earnest believers sought to get back the life of faith and personal trust in Christ in a living and vital relationship. Godly men were often clearly wrought upon by the Spirit. The problem was this—they consistently moved the church back toward subjectivism, thus further away from the gospel. This pietism actually recaptured much of the Catholic mysticism of another era. The end result was tragic!

Wesleyanism was another reaction. This reaction came to the deadness and formality of the Church of England in the eighteenth century. John Wesley taught, as we noted above, that justification was by faith alone, but his long suit became a unique doctrine of sanctification. He was determined to fight back against antinomianism. Correction was needed. He wanted to reform the church. His efforts left damage everywhere, even though there was immense blessing mixed with it.

Reinhold Niebuhr said it well, regarding Wesley:

... [Wesley's] thought is rooted in the New Testament doctrine of forgiveness and justification. However, he regards justification in essentially Augustinian terms, as forgiveness for sins that are past; and he thinks of sanctification as the higher stage of redemption.⁸

American revivalism, down to the present time, essentially follows this same course. Charles Finney, who blatantly attacked *sola fide* as you will see in this issue, is the greatest exemplar of this direction. His stress on experi-

ence resulted in *emotional experience* being made central again.

One cannot disparage all of these movements as entirely bad, for that would be a stilted view of the matter, but my central point is clear: The objective nature and value of justification by faith alone and the forgiveness of God in Christ cease to be the center of the Christian life and thought whenever anything else is made central.

Some amazing comments about this can be found in some rather unusual places. Louis Bouyer, a Protestant turned Roman Catholic scholar, once noted that revivalism was the great open door back to Rome.

What does all of this mean for us as contemporary evangelicals?

We who minister the Word of God as preachers must labor in doctrine. We must “give ourselves to the Word and prayer.” This is our full-time job! This is our calling of God. If we would be faithful to the gospel of grace then we must labor at making this great truth clearer and clearer to all who are under our ministry. It will surprise you—how little people really understand if you seek to find out.

By this effort I believe ministers will be judged in the final day. The following might be the way you will be judged by the truth regarding your labors as a shepherd:

“How faithful were you in teaching and living out the implications of the gospel of My Son, Jesus Christ?”

End Notes

- 1 Calvin, John. *Institutes*, (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1960) Bk. 3, Ch. 17, sec. 5.
- 2 *Institutes*, Bk. 3 Ch. 17, sec. 5.
- 3 *Institutes*, Bk. 3, Ch. 17, sec. 8.
- 4 Quoted by William C. Robinson in a lecture, “Justification: The Article of the Reformation,” delivered October 24, 1975, at Columbia Theological Seminary.

Published in *Present Truth*, Vol. 5, No. 4, July 1976, 8.

5 Ibid., 9.

6 Ibid., 9.

7 *What Luther Says*, (St. Louis: Concordia, 1959), 702-704.

8 Neibuhr, Reinhold. *The Nature and Destiny of Man*, (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1953), 2:180.