

**The \_\_\_\_\_ view of the Godhead**

When looking at \_\_\_\_\_ we must realize we cannot look blindly at what others may teach.

David Bernard outlines in his book "A history of Christian Doctrine : Vol 1"

**There are six reasons we can't go blindly from the history that is taught**

1 \_\_\_\_\_ can affect writers and historians then and now as well as the victors choosing

2 writers during a certain age don't always represent the

\_\_\_\_\_

3 there is always a strong possibility of \_\_\_\_\_ (insertions) in ancient writings

4 \_\_\_\_\_ existed since the earliest days

5 early \_\_\_\_\_ were often imprecise especially in light of later controversies

6 sources of church history are neither authorities or \_\_\_\_\_ only scripture is

**The \_\_\_\_\_ after the apostles and Paul didn't leave any writings**

The third generation \_\_\_\_\_ AD left many writings we still have today

Clement, Polycarp, Ignatius, Hermus, and Papias were prominent \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_writers

These writings show they believed in the \_\_\_\_\_ of God, baptism in Jesus name, manifestation of the holy ghost, and living a holy life of separation

There were also some heretical groups of the time who's writings have survived including the \_\_\_\_\_

The Greek Apologists \_\_\_\_\_AD

Some major writers include Marcianus, Justin, Tatian, Melito, Theophilus, and Athenagorus

This is when we start to see a shift from the \_\_\_\_\_ beliefs

They were trying to find a common ground with the \_\_\_\_\_

They went away from using the \_\_\_\_\_ as the primary source and started using Greeks terms and using pagan examples to explain Christian beliefs

**the major shift started when they started separating the \_\_\_\_\_  
(the word) from the father**

The \_\_\_\_\_ used the term Logos as the reason for God or the reason for the creation of the universe

When \_\_\_\_\_ by pagans and Greeks arose some apologists made god the father and Jesus the logos separate to help ease the philosophical differences between them and to show it was the best philosophy

They still believed in the Holy Ghost and holiness but not necessarily

\_\_\_\_\_ they were already separated and trying to fit in

About 150 AD \_\_\_\_\_ introduces a precursor to the Trinitarian formula

"In the name of God, the father and Lord of the universe, and of our Savior Jesus Christ, and of the Holy spirit"

**The old catholic age \_\_\_\_\_ AD**

Six men shaped the age

Irenaeus and Hippolytus , Tertullian and Cyprian, Clement of Alexandria and Origen

Only \_\_\_\_\_ held a prominent position in the church Cyprian and Irenaeus were bishops

Tertullian and Origen never held prominent positions but their writings greatly shaped the future of the church

Tertullian formally introduces the trinity

By Tertullian's own admission, "the majority of believers" rejected his doctrine of the trinity on the ground that it denied the cardinal Christian doctrine of monotheism (belief in one God) and contradicted the "rule of faith," which was a standard confession of fundamental doctrine that all Christians made, probably at baptism. Tertullian retorted that his opponents were "simple," as the majority "always" is, insinuated that they were "unwise and unlearned," and stated that they did not understand the "economy" of God in that He is "three in one." Tertullian went on to record that his opponents, whom historians call the modalists, affirmed the absolute oneness of God and deity of Jesus Christ.

Origen modifies the trinity by proclaiming the eternal son not just the son

### **The Ecumenical Catholic Age 325-787 AD**

This age is defined by its councils starting with the first council of Nicaea the councils were called to put an end to the fighting over doctrine

Emperor Constantine called it to unify the Christians

The council of Nicaea in 325 ad partially endorsed the trinity

Now Constantine was not a full convert to Christianity actually him and his brother in law were co emperors and agreed to give full religious freedom to the Christians in 313 but Constantine didn't repent or receive the Holy Ghost and refused to be baptized until his death bed because he believed he could continue to live in sin and have the full remission benefits of baptism just before he died

The Nicæan \_\_\_\_\_ used by Trinitarians didn't come from the council of Nicæa it came about around 500ad

In \_\_\_\_\_ AD he betrayed Licinius defeated him in battle

In \_\_\_\_\_ AD against his own promise he executed him

In \_\_\_\_\_ AD just after Nicæa he plotted and murdered those he felt as threats to his throne

(1) his eldest \_\_\_\_\_

(2) his 11 year old \_\_\_\_\_ Licinius Jr

(3) his \_\_\_\_\_ although he didn't take credit for her death it's widely believed he was the one who had her killed

This is the man who oversaw those at the council and demanded action

David Bernard said

"The Council of Nicæa is a milestone of church history for several reasons.

(1) It was the first, but not final, official step in the formulation of orthodox trinitarianism.

(2) It marked the beginning of the use of ecumenical \_\_\_\_\_ to resolve doctrinal disputes.

(3) To a great extent it helped effect the merger of church and \_\_\_\_\_.

With regard to the last point, the Roman emperor powerfully influenced the decision of the council. Afterwards, he pronounced its decrees to be divinely inspired, promulgated them as laws of the empire, and made disobedience punishable by death. For the first time a political ruler convened an ecclesiastical council, became a decisive factor in determining doctrine, and instituted a church creed. For the first time Christendom adopted a creed other than scripture and made subscription to it mandatory. And for the first time the state inflicted civil penalties on people who did not conform to church dogma."

The big controversy was between the Arians (Arius) and the Athanasians (Athanasius)

Arius taught a form of the trinity in which the father is a supreme one god but Jesus was a \_\_\_\_\_ similar to Greek traditions.

Athanasius taught the \_\_\_\_\_ Trinitarian view

A third group was involved in the debates but it was a conglomerate of multiple beliefs but they opposed the \_\_\_\_\_ view of Jesus

\_\_\_\_\_ held two other small councils in 327 and 335 to combat arguments that arose

He died in \_\_\_\_\_ then his three sons battled for the kingdom until only one remained and the kingdom stayed in turmoil

\_\_\_\_\_ became prominent as a rebuttal

it's similar in a way to \_\_\_\_\_ when it comes to the view of God they possibly had some contradicting doctrines in other areas though since no actual writings survived other than from their opponents

\_\_\_\_\_ was the most famous his followers were called sabalians

The council of Constantinople in 381 officially endorsed the \_\_\_\_\_

It also condemned the Sabalian \_\_\_\_\_ formula was condemned at this council in 381

Some historians distinguish Sabellius from the older \_\_\_\_\_ by saying that Sabellius taught a successive revelation of God: He was first the Father, then He became the Son, and finally he became the Holy Spirit. He did not operate simultaneously as Father, Son, and Spirit, but successively. If this is indeed what Sabellius taught, then it is different from the older modalism and from Oneness today.

It is speculated that he may have been misunderstood by his \_\_\_\_\_ opponents and that Sabellius actually taught that we know God as Father in creation, Son in redemption, and Holy Spirit in regeneration and sanctification

The \_\_\_\_\_ Code of 529 condemned both anti-trinitarianism and rebaptism.

The Council of Constantinople in \_\_\_\_\_ again condemned Sabellian baptism

But in the near 60 years between Nicaea and Constantinople its believed that more Christian's died at the hands of other \_\_\_\_\_ over theses doctrinal differences than during the great persecutions

Many other councils ensued to discuss other controversies i.e. differing opinions on the nature of \_\_\_\_\_

"In short, in the second, third, and early fourth centuries, many people were born of water and the Spirit just as in the Book of Acts. By the end of the fourth century and beginning of the fifth, however, the institutional church had largely lost not only the \_\_\_\_\_ doctrine of God but also the biblical doctrine and experience of the new birth. From then through the Middle Ages, we have to look primarily outside the structure of the institutional \_\_\_\_\_ to find people who proclaimed and received the full apostolic message."

One more major stop to the traditional \_\_\_\_\_ happened after bishop Leo took office in 440 he was the actual first pope leading the other bishops and it was his theory that Peter was the first pope and every other bishop of Rome should be called pope which the Catholic Church later during the Middle Ages endorsed and still believes today

The first bishop that exercised full papal power wasn't until \_\_\_\_AD with Gregory the 1st

It was Gregory that started the practice that \_\_\_\_\_ was equal in authority with the Scriptures. Therefore, the official pronouncements of the church were just as valid as those of the Bible

About this time receiving the \_\_\_\_\_ was almost non existent in the majority of the church writings show they knew it existed but wasn't expected or taught as essential they started saying you were filled at baptism but no requirement for an actual experience i.e. no tongues

### **People or Groups throughout history that baptized in \_\_\_\_\_ by century**

- 1 Apostolic church
- 2 Early post-apostolic church, Marcionites, some Montanists, Modalists
- 3 Many in the institutional church; "heretics"; opponents of Cyprian; Sabellians; endorsement by Stephen, bishop of Rome
- 4 Sabellians, endorsement by Ambrose
- 5-6 Sabellians
- 7 Endorsement by Bede
- 8 Endorsement by Council of Frejus
- 9 Endorsement by Pope Nicholas I
- 12 Mention by Peter Lombard and Hugo Victor
- 13 Mention by Bonaventure and Thomas Aquinas
- 16 Some antitrinitarians, some Anabaptists, people known to Martin Luther
- 17 Some English "heretics," some Baptists
- 19 Some Plymouth Brethren, John Miller (Presbyterian)



We cannot use scriptures to prove a "\_\_\_\_\_ " because the trinity did not come directly from the pages of the Word of God, but rather from the blending of philosophy, pagan worship, and Christianity into a "universal" religion in the fourth century that would later become the Roman Catholic Church.

In fact, the concept of "\_\_\_\_\_" was not accepted until toward the end of the fourth century in church councils that took place over 300 years after the time of Christ.

These councils were the efforts of a non-believing emperor, \_\_\_\_\_, to force a universal system of beliefs in his kingdom. The theological decisions were based not upon scripture, but upon "finding a \_\_\_\_\_ for all beliefs."

The Early Apostolic Church of the book of Acts did not \_\_\_\_\_ in a trinity but simply believed that Jesus was the one God of the Old Testament and that the Holy Spirit was His Spirit living within them.

Here are some quotes from eminent Bible scholars (most are Trinitarians) which show that even the learned scholars admit that the trinity is a later invention by man:

1. Jaroslav Pelikan in *The Emergence of the Catholic Tradition (100-600)*, vol. 1 of *The Christian Tradition: A History of the Development of Doctrine*: You are not entitled to the beliefs you cherish about such things as the Holy Trinity without a sense of what you owe to those who have worked this out for you. To circumvent Saint Athanasius on the assumption that if you put me alone in a room with the \_\_\_\_\_, I will come up with the doctrine of the Trinity, is naive. . . . The dogma of the Trinity . . . was hammered out during the third quarter of the fourth century. (pgs 210-211)

2. Jaroslav Pelikan in The New \_\_\_\_\_ Encyclopedia: When one does speak of an unqualified Trinitarianism, one has moved from the period of Christian origins to, say, the last quadrant of the fourth century. It was only then that what might be called the definitive Trinitarian dogma "one God in three Persons" became thoroughly assimilated into Christian life and thought. . . . The formulation "one God in three \_\_\_\_\_" was not solidly established, certainly not fully assimilated into Christian life and it's profession of faith, prior to the end of the \_\_\_\_\_ century. (under "Trinity, Holy")
3. W. Fulton in Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics: At first the Christian faith was not \_\_\_\_\_. . . . It was not so in the apostolic and sub-apostolic ages, as reflected in the NT and other early Christian writings. Nor was it so even in the age of the Christian apologists. And even Tertulian, who founded the nomenclature of the orthodox doctrine, knew as little of an ontological Trinity as did the apologists . . . (see article, "Trinity")
4. John Baillie in The Library of Christian Classics: The assertion that the Trinity is the distinctively \_\_\_\_\_ idea of God is seriously misleading. . . . What is true is that from the third century onwards the distinctively Christian idea of God began to fit itself into a \_\_\_\_\_ mould. This mould was adopted and adapted from Hellenistic (ie. . Greek) philosophy . . . (The Place of Jesus Christ in Modern Theology, pg 185)

The concept of the trinity was introduced due to the failure of many religious leaders to heed and obey the warning of Colossians 2:8-9.

<sup>8</sup> Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ.

<sup>9</sup> For in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily.

One of the many hurdles that you must overcome in your walk with God is to decide who you will believe: the Word of God or the \_\_\_\_\_ of men.

In this lesson, we have given scripture after scripture defining who God is and they explicitly declare " \_\_\_\_\_ " and His name is **Jesus!**