



A Quarterly Journal for Church Leadership
Volume 8 • Number 2 • SPRING 1999

JONATHAN EDWARDS ON REVIVAL: AN ANALYSIS
OF HIS THOUGHT AS USED BY PROPONENTS AND
CRITICS OF THE TORONTO BLESSING

Richard D. Easton

The best definition of revival is "times of refreshing . . . from the presence of the Lord."

—J. EDWIN ORR

No more mischievous and misleading theory could be propounded, nor any more dishonoring to the Holy Spirit, than the principle that because the Spirit was poured out at Pentecost the Church has no need, and no warrant, to pray for effusions of the Spirit of God. On the contrary, the more the Church asks for the Spirit and waits for His communications, the more she receives.

—GEORGE SMEATON

Jonathan Edwards continues to be in the minds of cult-watchers as he has been used by both proponents and opponents of the Toronto Blessing. However, I think that both sides have distorted and misused Jonathan Edwards in making their respective cases. In *Catch the Fire*, Guy Chevreau, a proponent of the Blessing, has a subjective, anti-intellectual focus which Edwards would have found distasteful. In addition, he applies Edwards's teaching to the Toronto Blessing without noting the significant difference that there were no recorded healings in the First Great Awakening, whereas they are prominent in Toronto. William DeArteaga, another proponent, makes sweeping statements in *Quenching the Spirit*, alleging negative effects from cessationism, but ignores the fact that Edwards was a cessationist. Hank Hanegraaff, an opponent, in *Counterfeit Revival*, makes generalizations and ignores the public clarifications of views issued by people whose views he has attacked. I will discuss these issues and compare their portrayals of Edwards with selections from his writings.

The Toronto Airport Vineyard revival began in January 1994. It has been characterized by unusual phenomena such as rounds of laughter, shaking, roaring like a lion, loud shouting and screaming, and being "slain in the Spirit."¹

Guy Chevreau discusses a curious phenomenon seen at the Airport meeting where people jump up and down for

extended periods of time (pogoing). He states that there is little biblical basis to prove the validity of any physical manifestation, and advocates the subjective test of whether a person loves Jesus to test the phenomenon's validity.²

Edwards would not have rejected the revival merely because of the presence of unusual phenomena.



Edwards would not have rejected the revival merely because of the presence of unusual phenomena. In "Some Thoughts Concerning the Revival" (1742), Edwards stated that many errors and mistakes are inevitable in times of revival when affections are greatly moved.³ Thus, unusual activities do not rule out the possibility that God is acting.

Chevreau shares with many other charismatics an emphasis on the subjective rather than the objective. Thus, he states:

Understanding that the Gospels were not written as critical history, or even theology, but rather, as the early church's witness of the *experience* of Jesus and His Spirit, we begin to read familiar texts with new eyes, and see things we perhaps never saw before.⁴

In addition, he criticizes Charles Chauncy, one of Edwards's opponents, for his "operative theology of 'Father, Son and Holy Book.'"⁵

This setting of theology against experience would not

please Edwards. In "The Distinguishing Marks," Edwards said that a work of the Spirit of God will create in men a greater regard for the Bible.⁶ Thus, a positive attitude toward the Bible is a result of revival.

Chevreau complains about Calvin's teaching that miraculous signs ended with the early church.⁷ However, he does not point out that Edwards was also a cessationist. In "Distinguishing Marks," Edwards said:

Therefore I don't expect a restoration of these miraculous gifts in the approaching glorious times of the church, nor do I desire it: it appears to me that it would add nothing to the glory of these times, but rather diminish from it. For my part, I would rather enjoy the sweet influences of the Spirit, shewing Christ's spiritual divine beauty, and infinite grace, and dying love, drawing forth the holy exercises of faith, and divine love, and sweet complacence, and humble joy in God, one quarter of an hour, than to have prophetic visions and revelations for a whole year. . . . It don't [sic] appear to me that there is any need of these extraordinary gifts, to introduce this happy state, and set up the kingdom of God through the world: I have seen so much of the power of God in a more excellent way, as to convince me that God can easily do it without [them].⁸

The eager seeking after miracles can lead to a denigration of the great miracle of conversion. Thus, Jesus said: "An evil and adulterous generation seeks after a sign; and a sign will not be given it, except the sign of Jonah" (Matt. 16:4). Similarly, when the seventy-two returned, rejoicing that even the demons submitted to them, Jesus said:

I was watching Satan fall from heaven like lightning. Behold, I have given you authority to tread upon serpents and scorpions, and over all the power of the enemy, and nothing shall injure you. Nevertheless do not rejoice in this, that the spirits

are subject to you, but rejoice that your names are recorded in heaven (Luke 10:18-20).

The miracles focused attention on Jesus and attested to His authority. However, the salvation of the disciples was of much greater importance than their wielding supernatural powers.

Discussing Mrs. Edwards's experiences, Chevreau says that her expressions "'took away my strength,' 'overbear the body,' and 'fainting' seem to be eighteenth-century equivalents to the falling, resting and 'slain' experiences witnessed at the Airport Vineyard."⁹ However, there are critical differences between the manifestations in the First Great Awakening and those in Toronto. There was no touching or any similar psychological manipulations in the First Great Awakening (though there were certainly excesses among the radicals). Mrs. Edwards's experiences resulted from preaching, praying, and the direct action of God. No one caused them by touching her. The power of suggestion probably played a role in the Great Awakening's manifestations, but not to the extent reflected in the Toronto Revival. As stated earlier, there were no recorded miracles in the Awakening:

It being so that though there have been many Pretenses to Revelations in these latter days and yet none appears with the Gifts of miracles. . . . The true Reason why there are so many Pretenses to Revelation, and so few pretenses to the Gift of miracles, is that the latter is not so liable to cheats and Impostures as the former. Tis an Easy thing for a man to say that He has divine Revelations made to him in his mind which is out of [the] other Person's view.¹⁰

The prophecies in Chevreau's book condemning those who question and doubt the blessing would cause concern

to Edwards.¹¹ They reflect a harsh tone toward doubters reminiscent of the Awakening's fanatics such as James Dav-enport. James Beverly characterizes the prophecies as distinctively weak in contrast to the Old Testament prophets, and says that they do not offer a penetrating prophetic analysis that speaks to the heart of our culture.¹²

Jonathan Edwards presented two case studies of conversions at the end of *A Faithful Narrative*. The first was of a woman, Abigail Hutchinson, who died shortly after her conversion; the second was of a little girl, Phoebe Bartlet.¹³ Chevreau gives many case studies at the end of *Catch the Fire*. He mostly describes healings, though his observations include:

8 Evangelism is a steadily growing dynamic. People are witnessing bodily and enthusiastically about their relationship to Jesus Christ everywhere!

9 It's clear God is after a relationship, an intense love affair with his people. People don't watch TV or read the newspaper. They want to be with the Lord and each other.¹⁴

There is nothing here that Edwards would find disagreeable. However, Beverly investigated several of Chevreau's cases and found some of the healing claims to be overblown.¹⁵

Ironically, Chevreau does not mention Edwards's major innovation. In contrast to Puritanism's extended preparationism, Edwards preached in revival for immediate conversions.

WILLIAM DEARTEAGA

William DeArteaga, another defender of the Blessing, eagerly embraces the Edwards mantle in *Quenching the Spirit*. He credits Edwards with keeping Northampton in line,

after Buell's spirited preaching in 1741, by calling a general assembly of Northampton's people and reinstating the covenant.¹⁶ While one can question DeArteaga's interpretation of why Edwards had the covenant renewed (Edwards may have been reacting to a deteriorating situation),¹⁷ he clearly has a high regard for Edwards. Thus, in discussing the nineteenth-century healing controversy, he states:

Jonathan Edwards would have relished this movement. The healing ministry had been debated with discernment and had been cautiously accepted by many. What was needed was a person with the theological genius and stature of Jonathan Edwards himself to bring the discussion to a more positive conclusion.¹⁸

DeArteaga, at the beginning of his book, says:

A Pharisee is a deeply religious person who, among other things, staunchly asserts and defends the status quo with regard to tradition, order and consensus orthodoxy. I use the term consensus orthodoxy throughout this book to refer to the theological interpretations accepted by most religious people of the day.

Most often the Pharisee practices religion conscientiously to the point of legalism, but this is not the most serious error in spirituality. Rather, the Pharisee exaggerates the traditions and truths of consensus orthodoxy to oppose any new work of God.¹⁹

Presumably, if DeArteaga's own views became the consensus orthodoxy, he would so perfectly perceive the works of God that one could never apply the term of Pharisee to him.

DeArteaga also believes that

The doctrine of cessationism had tragic consequences that are only now coming to light, the most serious of which was the decline and fall of Protestantism in Northern Europe. This happened as the Reformed churches attempted to maintain their faithfulness to the gospel but denied the need for spiritual experiences or miraculous acts (such as healing), even though these were intrinsic to biblical spirituality. Reformed Protestantism eventually became a ghost-like faith because of the lack of support from any analogous experience.²⁰

DeArteaga's identifying cessationism as the cause of Protestantism's decline appears simplistic. Edwards's own explanation would probably have been that European Protestantism degenerated from Calvinism to Arminianism to Liberalism. Writers who are Arminians obviously do not find this analysis palatable.



This questionable interpretation does not take into account his enthusiastic approval for at least one cessationist, Jonathan Edwards:

This is the Reason the apostle gives why the extraordinary Gifts of the spirit should cease when the Church comes to its adult state, because they were to be for the use of the Church only while in its minority. . . . But when once the will of God and the many doctrines of the Gospel shall be fully

Revealed, the Canon of the Sacred Scriptures completed, and that complete Revelation thoroughly settled, these things shall vanish away as of no further use.²¹

DeArteaga's identifying cessationism as the cause of Protestantism's decline appears simplistic. Edwards's own explanation would probably have been that European Protestantism degenerated from Calvinism to Arminianism to Liberalism. Writers who are Arminians obviously do not find this analysis palatable. The Enlightenment in the eighteenth-century arose in part because of disgust with the seventeenth-century's religious wars. Cessationists believed that the gifts mentioned in 1 Corinthians 13 had ceased, but many believed that God was still working physical miracles in the world. The miracles claimed by Toronto are not impressive enough to have played a role in the eighteenth-century dispute about miracles.

I think that DeArteaga's analysis would be much more accurate if he used the following categories: (1) Skeptics such as Hume. (2) Hard cessationists who believe that both the New Testament gifts and miracles have ceased. (3) Soft cessationists, such as Edwards, who believe that the New Testament gifts have ceased but miracles can occur if God wills it. (4) Soft noncessationists, or soft charismatics, who believe that both New Testament gifts and miracles continue, but there are no revelations today. (5) Hard noncessationists, or hard charismatics, who believe that New Testament gifts, miracles and revelations continue today. The seventeenth-century Quakers are an example of this.

Note that Edwards was particularly suspicious of the hard charismatics. DeArteaga needs to prove that people in category number two caused the decline in Protestantism. In the absence of his presenting concrete examples, I consider his argument to be erroneous. Note the following contrary evidence:

Calvin notes the abundance of spiritual gifts in Paul's day and comments (on I Cor. 14:32): "Today we see our own slender resources, our own poverty in fact, but this is undoubtedly the punishment we deserve, as the reward for our ingratitude. For God's riches are not exhausted, nor has His liberality grown less, but we are not worthy of His largess, or capable of receiving all that He generously gives."²²

Thus, Calvin does not seem to have been the hard cessationist portrayed by DeArteaga.

DeArteaga claims that "being slain in the Spirit" was common during the Great Awakening.²³ As evidence, he cites Edwards's account of Abigail Hutchison's conversion:

Her mind was so swallowed up with a sense of the glory of God's truth and other perfections, that she said it seemed as though her life was going. . . . Soon after this she went to a private religious meeting, and her mind was full of a sense and view of the glory of God all the time; and when the exercise was ended, some asked her concerning what she had experienced; and she began to give them an account; but as she was relating it, it revived such a sense of the same things that her strength failed; and they were obliged to take her and lay her on the bed.²⁴

DeArteaga suggests that Abigail had been "slain in the Spirit." However, a simpler and more likely explanation is that bodily weakness from her illness overtook her and caused her strength to fail.

Discussing Edwards's conversion, DeArteaga suggests that "His experience of God was significant because it did not fit the Puritan understanding of conversion, which was more intellectual and less experiential."²⁵ This gross generalization belies the Puritan appeal for a heartfelt religion.

DeArteaga says:

Thus for Calvin the only manner in which one could discern God's will and voice was in the reading of Scripture and through the inner witness of the spirit. In fact, practically the only spiritual experience permitted to Christians by Calvin's cessationism was the experience of being converted. Experiences such as revelatory dreams and visions were reserved for biblical persona only.²⁶

This totally ignores Calvin's discussion of sanctification and preparation for heaven:

And this is a much greater reason if in it we reflect that we are in preparation, so to speak, for the glory of the heavenly Kingdom. For the Lord has ordained that those who are one day to be crowned in heaven should first undergo struggles on earth in order that they may not triumph until they have overcome the difficulties of war, and attained victory.

Then there is another reason: we begin in the present life, through various benefits, to taste the sweetness of the divine generosity in order to whet our hope and desire to seek after the full revelation of this. When we are certain that the earthly life we live is a gift of God's kindness, as we are beholden to him for it we ought to remember it and be thankful.²⁷

Thus, Calvin speaks of the trials and tribulations of this life as an essential aspect of our sanctification. And the sweetness of the Holy Spirit's presence encourages us to draw nearer to God. Paul wrote: "But the fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, patience, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, gentleness and self-control" (Gal. 5:22-23). One finds listed many characteristics of a Christ-like spirit, none of which results from miracles except for the great ones of

conversion and the Spirit's indwelling.

DeArteaga also argues that Calvinist theologians claimed that evangelization among the heathen was an apostolic gift which ceased after biblical times. He asserts that this doctrine of missionary cessationism delayed large-scale missionary activity from the Reformed churches for almost a century and a half (from 1650 to 1800).²⁸

This unproven statement belies the facts. Protestantism in 1650 encompassed the English colonies in America, England and Scotland, Germany, Sweden, Netherlands, France, and Switzerland. Some evangelization of Indians took place in America, as DeArteaga acknowledges, but most of the energy went into expanding the colonies at the Indians' expense. Cromwell's government was consolidating power in England and reforming the English church. He raised money to support the Huguenots in France, but after his death the monarchy was restored and Arminianism reigned supreme. The English church declined and recovery came only with the Awakening in the 1740s. Germany was devastated from the Thirty Years' War. Sweden's king, Gustavus Adolphus, was killed in the Thirty Years' War, and many of his soldiers were casualties. Sweden had a centralized government, and most of its energy went into protecting its empire. French Protestants were severely persecuted, especially after the revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685. Switzerland had no fleet, by definition, and missionary activity was hampered by its being landlocked. Large scale missionary movements commenced after the thirteen American Colonies gained their independence and the church in Great Britain was renewed. In addition, there was no sudden change away from cessationism at the end of the eighteenth century. Thus, I see little if any validity to DeArteaga's argument.

DeArteaga also says that 1 Corinthians 14:29-33 applies to normal times only, not to times of revival. I challenge

him to find a major commentary which agrees with him.²⁹

He states that revival leads to a return to biblical truth, and that Pentecostals have always resisted liberal theologies.³⁰ Given that the Azusa Street renewal began about ninety years ago, and the charismatic renewal is about thirty years old, it is too soon to assert their consistent orthodoxy. David DuPlessis, for example, showed no great concern for theology in his discussions with the World Council of Churches.³¹ In addition, Oneness Pentecostals, which number 17 million worldwide and 2.1 million in the United States, deny the Trinity.³² Given DeArteaga's timetable for the supposed decline in Protestantism, Pentecostalism has a while to go before we can trumpet its steadfast orthodoxy.

HANK HANEGRAAFF

In contrast to Chevreau's enthusiasm about the Toronto Blessing, Hank Hanegraaff in *Counterfeit Revival* sees nothing good in it. Hanegraaff groups it with other charismatic movements and calls them the "Counterfeit Revival." He states:

Leaders of the Counterfeit Revival appeal to Jonathan Edwards to validate their lying signs and wonders. Edwards, however, believed that the very signs and wonders to which they appeal felled the First Great Awakening. While imprudences and irregularities were byproducts in the First Great Awakening, in the Second they were the bottom line.³³

Hanegraaff's comment about the Second Great Awakening shows his lack of familiarity with the situation under the Edwardsean clergy in New England:

Such physical exercises and disorderly behavior apparently played little or no role in the Congregational revivals. Orthodox ministers consistently described the "marvelous displays of divine power" in their parishes as "solemn." Their people evinced remarkable "seriousness" and received "deep

impressions" of their guilt and helplessness.³⁴

In discussing the Toronto advocates' use of Jonathan Edwards, Hanegraaff says that Edwards focused on eternal verities such as sin, salvation and sanctification, whereas the Toronto Blessing personifies a priority for parties.³⁵

The passage cited from "Some Thoughts Concerning the Revival" on page two shows Edwards's belief that unusual manifestations can be consistent with a movement being of God. However, some aspects of the Toronto Blessing would disturb him. Beverly laments Toronto's weak preaching, which lacks clarity, exegetical skill and focus.³⁶

Complaints have been made that Hanegraaff attacks people, such as John Wimber, for holding views they have publicly disavowed.³⁷ An example of this in *Counterfeit Revival* is:

Counterfeit Revival "historian" William DeArteaga, for example, uses the Toronto Airport Vineyard as his bully pulpit to simultaneously condemn Calvinism and commend the theology of Jonathan Edwards. DeArteaga compounds the deception by telling devotees that Edwards's contemporary critic, Charles Chauncy, "ensured the defeat of the Awakening" by "using the assumption of Calvinist theology."

In fact, far from using Calvinism to ensure the defeat of the great Awakening, Chauncy was an Arminian who opposed "the resurgence of Calvinist theology—especially as preached by Jonathan Edwards."³⁸

Hanegraaff has some legitimate complaints about DeArteaga unfairly attacking Calvinism as discussed above. However, *Counterfeit Revival* was published in the latter half of 1997. DeArteaga says:

MacArthur claims I asserted that Edwards was an Arminian and Charles Chauncy a Calvinist. Although I affirmed that

Chauncy was dependent on Calvin for his theology of cessationism, nowhere did I even imply that Edwards was Arminian. The reader may well satisfy himself on how ridiculous MacArthur's assertion is by reading pp. 30, 32 and 41 of the first edition. In this revised edition I made word changes to assure no such interpretation is even remotely possible. The most unfortunate aspect of MacArthur's wild misinterpretation is that Hank Hanegraaff picked it up and broadcast it as true in his Bible Answer Man program (21 April and 11 May 1995).³⁹

Thus, Hanegraaff was sloppy in not verifying his original accusation and even more so in not correcting it in his book, especially since DeArteaga's Second Edition was published in March 1996⁴⁰ whereas Hanegraaff's book was published in April 1997.⁴¹ Thus, DeArteaga's book was published more than a year before Hanegraaff's. Since Hanegraaff attacks DeArteaga at length, a careful scholar would have reviewed DeArteaga's new edition before publishing misinformation.

In addition, Hanegraaff attacks people based on their association at some point in their ministry with heretics. Beverly uses the term guilt by association and refutes several of Hanegraaff's accusations.⁴² DeArteaga illustrates how apparently impressive citations can be unfair:

Suppose also that I wished to expose the origins of Protestantism by showing that Martin Luther, the first Reformer, was a boorish, prejudiced lout, and therefore could not have led a movement of God. This could be easily accomplished by going to his collected writings (over fifty volumes) and selecting his most imprudent writings. . . . Also I would *avoid* any of Luther's better writings, such as his classic *Commentary on Romans*, which has enlightened generation upon generation of Christians. My anthology would be completely true, and presuming that I took care, all the footnotes and

quotes would be correct. But on a deeper level it would be untrue and unfair.⁴³

For that matter, Jonathan Edwards used the Amyraut formulation of moral ability and natural inability. Amyraut and his school were widely thought of by Calvinists as bordering on Arminianism, but Edwards used their formulation to combat Arminianism in *The Freedom of the Will*.⁴⁴

CONCLUSION

The disagreement over the Toronto Blessing illustrates the principle that the person controlling the terms wins the battle. Is it the Toronto Blessing or the Counterfeit Revival? I used Toronto Blessing throughout this paper because it is a moderately positive term, but a more neutral one would be the Toronto Manifestation. DeArteaga calls vigorous opponents of the charismatic renewal Pharisees (and includes Hanegraaff among them).⁴⁵ These harsh terms should be avoided since they contribute nothing toward reasonably discussing the important issues raised by the Toronto Blessing.

Anyone who has listened to the *Bible Answer Man* program knows that Hanegraaff can be open and generous in his comments. In this debate he believes orthodoxy is at risk; this understandably makes him firm in his stand. However, he has been uncharitable in some of his comments about the controversy as reflected in his response to Beverly's review of his book.⁴⁶

DeArteaga generally treats Hanegraaff with respect in his book and should be commended for this. In addition, he acknowledges the legitimacy of some criticisms of the Toronto Blessing. He makes the following helpful point, though it uses the Pharisee characterization that should have been avoided:

We should note the difference between authentic Christian reproof and Pharisaism. The former has a quality of sadness and mercy, while the latter is filled with righteous glee and a spirit of "I told you so!" Farah's classic *From the Pinnacle of the Temple* has those qualities of sadness and moderation which show that the author disliked the task. Additionally, there was no sequel to his book. On the other hand numerous teachers seem to have made professions of criticizing their fellow Christians. The Christian community needs to be especially wary of such persons. Genuine Christian reproof hopes for repentance, correction and restoration. It also gladly recognizes the positive elements of those movements or persons criticized. Pharisees do none of these things, and their only interests are in pouring out the errors and winning the cases.⁴⁷

If this spirit had been consistently shown by both sides of the debate, we would have had a more charitable and fruitful discussion of the important issues raised by the manifestations in Toronto.

Evangelicals and charismatics both should cultivate Moses' attitude:

But two men had remained in the camp; the name of one was Eldad and the name of the other Medad. And the Spirit rested upon them (now they were among those who had been registered, but had not gone out to the tent), and they prophesied in the camp. So a young man ran and told Moses and said, "Eldad and Medad are prophesying in the camp." Then Joshua the son of Nun, the attendant of Moses from his youth, answered and said, "Moses, my lord, restrain them." But Moses said to him, "Are you jealous for my sake? Would that all the Lord's people were prophets, that the Lord would put His Spirit upon them!" (Num. 11:26-29).

In conclusion, both sides in this debate need to be

more careful in their historical analysis. The charismatics, in particular, must read the whole Edwards and not isolated snippets which appear to support their position.

Author

Richard D. Easton is an actuary for Kemper in Long Grove, Illinois. He received an Sc.B. degree from Brown University and an M. L. A. from the University of Chicago. Richard is presently engaged in an M. A. degree program in church history at Trinity Evangelical Divinity School. His interest is apologetics and the defense of the historic faith. This is his first contribution to *Reformation & Revival Journal*.

Notes

1. James Beverly, *Holy Laughter and the Toronto Blessing: An Investigative Report* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1995), 14-15.
2. Guy Chevreau, *Catch the Fire, The Toronto Blessing, An Experience of Renewal and Revival* (London: Marshall Pickering, 1994), 52-53.
3. Jonathan Edwards, *The Great Awakening, Works of Jonathan Edwards* (New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1972), IV:317.
4. Chevreau, 59-60.
5. *Ibid.*, 113.
6. Edwards, 253.
7. Chevreau, 8-9.
8. Edwards, 281-82.
9. Chevreau, 77.
10. Jonathan Edwards, 1 Corinthians 13:8-13 [May 1748], unpublished sermon, L. 39r-v. This unpublished manuscript, and others cited in this article, are located in the Beinecke Rare Book and Main Library at Yale University.
11. Chevreau, 29,31.
12. Beverly, 144.
13. Edwards, *The Works of Jonathan Edwards* (Carlisle, Pennsylvania: Banner of Truth, 1974), I:359-64.
14. Chevreau, 153
15. Beverly, 119.
16. William DeArteaga, *Quenching the Spirit* (Orlando, Florida: Creation House, 1996), 40.
17. See Patricia Tracy, *Jonathan Edwards, Pastor* (New York, New York: Hill and Wang, 1980), 154. Tracy thinks that Edwards was reacting to the ending of the Awakening in Connecticut.
18. DeArteaga, 127.

19. Ibid., 16.
20. Ibid., 90.
21. Edwards, May 1748 Sermon, L. 3v.
22. Wayne Grudem, *Systematic Theology* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1994), 1044.
23. DeArteaga, 29.
24. Ibid., 37
25. Ibid., 35
26. Ibid., 86.
27. John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, III: 9.3.
28. DeArteaga, 87.
29. Ibid., 275.
30. Ibid., 287.
31. See the comments of Lloyd-Jones in Iain H. Murray's *D. Martyn Lloyd-Jones, The Fight of Faith, 1939-1981* (Carlisle, Pennsylvania: Banner of Truth, 1990), 481.
32. *Christian Research Report*, Volume 11, issue 1, January 1998, 1.
33. Hank Hanegraaff, *Counterfeit Revivals* (Dallas, Texas: Word, 1997), 14.
34. James R. Rohrer, *Keepers of the Covenant, Frontier Missions and the Decline of Congregationalism 1774-1818* (New York, New York: Oxford, 1995), 79.
35. Hanegraaff, 82-83.
36. Beverly, *Holy Laughter*, 153.
37. Beverly, *Revival Wars*, 79.
38. Hanegraaff, 82.
39. DeArteaga, 332.
40. Based on a call to Creation House, the publisher.
41. *Christian Research Report*, 4.
42. Beverly, *Revival Wars*, 20-22.
43. DeArteaga, 269.
44. Brian G. Armstrong explains the distinctive teachings of the Amyraut school in *Calvinism and the Amyraut Heresy* (Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press, 1969).
45. DeArteaga, chapter 22.
46. *Christianity Today*, October 27, 1997, 10.
47. DeArteaga, 298.