

Verdict

An International Journal of Theology

Vol.4 / No.3

March 1981

The Sectarian Spirit

Robert D. Brinsmead

The Gospel versus the Sectarian Spirit

Unless otherwise noted, Scripture quotations are from the New International version

One of the most striking features of the Christian movement is its great diversity. It is fragmented into many denominations, sects, groups and subgroups. A forceful demonstration of the divided church confronts us in American cities such as Nashville, Tennessee, where an entire row of church structures will line a single boulevard. Most of the congregations worship on the same day of the week, each in their own little "box" separated from the others, yet all confessing that there is one Lord, one faith, one baptism" (Eph. 4:5). The church is often divided into many hostile camps. They arrange themselves in battle array— sometimes more ready to battle one another than to make war on the world, the flesh and the devil.

In reading the history of the church, one might conclude that Christians are a pugnacious community. And they have not always been content to merely rain verbal blows upon one another. The state has often had to intervene to prevent factions from physically attacking each other. Julian the Apostate passed an edict of religious toleration in the Roman Empire. Someone has suggested that Julian, who hated Christianity, had a sinister motive for making this edict, supposing that if he granted toleration to the Christians, they would soon destroy each other.

We can thank the ecumenical movement for making us more conscious of the scandal of a divided Christian church. Sometimes the present state of pluralism is sharply contrasted with the magnificent state of unity which supposedly existed in the

primitive Christian church. We say "supposedly existed" because there has been a tendency to idealize primitive Christianity and to romanticize the past. In recent years a number of scholars have challenged the myth of an ideal early church.¹ A reconstruction of the actual situation in the primitive church reveals much greater diversity than is generally imagined. Someone has quipped that if the 120 were all of one accord on the day of Pentecost; it was only because they were not discussing theology!

The Christian faith took root successively in different ethnic groups. The first Christians were Palestinian Jewish Christians. They tended to remain fiercely loyal to the law, and even, to many of the traditions of Judaism. Then there were the Hellenistic (Greek-speaking) Jewish Christians. They saw that the old temple was superseded and were more relaxed in their attitude to Jewish ways than were the Palestinian Jewish Christians. Finally, there were the Gentile Christians, who had no roots in Judaism. They did not want to conform to the Law of Moses except in its truly universal moral principles.

Because these believers came to Christianity from different ethnic, cultural and religious backgrounds, and because Christianity does not needlessly upset existing cultures, these early Christian communities developed different patterns of worship. F. F. Bruce ² and James D. G. Dunn ³ have conclusively shown that the Palestinian Jewish Christians, led by James the Just, maintained a rather orthodox Jewish way of life in Jerusalem. They worshiped at the temple, kept the Sabbath, circumcised their children and continued to live in harmony with the dietary laws of Moses. Among the Jews with whom they lived for many years— often quite amicably— there was no accusation that James and his group had forsaken the law. Many years after the church had been established in other lands, Luke could record that many of the Palestinian Jewish Christians were still zealous for the law (Acts 21:20). As far as this branch of the Christian church is concerned, therefore, we must exclude any sharp or sudden break with Judaism on such matters as the sacred calendar, diet and other lifestyle patterns.

Many of the Gentile Christians were slaves living in a Greco-Roman world. They came to Christianity from a wholly different cultural background and developed different patterns of worship. The Jerusalem Christians, who were still devoted to the law, wanted the Gentiles to conform to certain aspects of the law. It was probably obvious that Gentile slaves could not refrain from work during all the festivals of the Jewish calendar. But the Judaizers insisted that they should at least be circumcised. Paul argued that if they did this, they were obligated to go the whole way and keep the entire law— which they evidently were not intending to do (Gal. 5:3).

It is certain that those early churches also developed their individual patterns of

church life. Not too many worship services today would function like a Corinthian gathering in which one had a psalm, another a tongue, and still another an exhortation—and all of them so enthusiastic that the next speaker often could not wait until the others had stopped talking. There was no Book of Common Prayer in those days. Headquarters (was there any?) did not provide a church manual on how to conduct a baptism, how to administer the Eucharist or how to officiate at a funeral. Would not the New Testament have avoided a great deal of controversy if the apostles had precisely defined the correct mode of baptism so that there would be no room for dispute? The New Testament is so brief and vague on many questions of form that Christians who are equally dedicated to the Bible have differed sharply on many of these things. The arguments continue, not always because Christian groups are willfully disobedient, but because they cannot find scriptures that would wholly squelch Christians with a contrary view.

We could even speak of different theological or spiritual emphases in the primitive church. There were authentic apocalyptic, enthusiastic and pietistic elements within the churches. There was great diversity. Even Peter and Paul could not work harmoniously together. Neither could Paul and Barnabus. The "First Church of Jerusalem" distrusted Paul. If they were reconciled to the Gentiles' ignoring the Law of Moses, they were not reconciled to the report that Paul was encouraging Jewish Christians of the Diaspora to become lax toward the law. Luke recounts the fascinating story:

When we arrived at Jerusalem, the brothers received us warmly. The next day Paul and the rest of us went to see James, and all the elders were present. Paul greeted them and reported in detail what God had done among the Gentiles through his ministry.

When they heard this, they praised God. Then they said to Paul: "You see brother, how many thousands of Jews have believed, and all of them are zealous for the law. They have been informed that you teach all the Jews who live among the Gentiles to turn away from Moses, telling them not to circumcise their children or live according to our customs. What shall we do? They will certainly hear that you have come, so do what we tell you. There are four men with us who have made a vow. Take these men, join in their purification rites and pay their expenses, so that they can have their heads shaved. Then everybody will know there is no truth in these reports about you, but that you yourself are living in obedience to the law. As for the Gentile believers, we have written to them our decision that they should abstain from food sacrificed to idols, from blood, from the meat of strangled animals and from sexual immorality" – Acts 21:17-25.

The great difference between Judaism and Christianity is that one is cultic and the other is catholic. Christianity is transnational and transcultural. It must not be identified with any culture. Yet Christianity has often become almost completely identified with Western culture, including its political and economic institutions. For example, being a "good Christian" may mean conforming to the culture of white, middle-class, Anglo-Saxon Americanism. And if we listen to some flag-waving, Bible-thumping, "evangelical" preachers, it is difficult to distinguish between Christianity and American civil religion.

We too easily forget that Christianity arose in an Eastern culture. Those of us who search for appropriate proof-texts in order to read back into the New Testament our modern patterns of worship or forms of church organization are being exceedingly naive. Moreover, on what basis can we say that the New Testament patterns of church worship and church organization must be rigidly-applied norms for today?

Consider the diversity which must have existed in the first church at Rome. Some had scruples about eating certain foods. Others did not. Some wholly abstained from wine. Others did not. (Romans 14, is not talking about grape juice.) Some observed the sanctity of certain days. Others regarded all days alike. In writing to these Roman Christians, the great apostle showed no disposition to enter into any dispute on these matters (Rom. 14). Would Paul, then, become involved in many of the hotly-disputed points among Christians today?

We must not, however, emphasize the great diversity in the New Testament church without also emphasizing its unity. This was not an organizational unity. It was not a unity in which all conducted their church services from the same book of church order. If we look for the unity of the New Testament church in such things as forms of worship, we will be disappointed. Neither will we find it in loyalty to the right denomination, because denominations are a relatively recent phenomenon. The unity of the church consisted in its commitment to the gospel of Christ. The only worship or behavior pattern to which Paul objected was that which was not "in line with the truth of the gospel" (Gal. 2:14).

Paul was both tolerant and intolerant. He circumcised Timothy as a concession to Jewish scruples. Yet with Titus he would yield nothing to the demands of the Judaizers (Gal. 2:3-5). To those observing special days in Rome, the apostle had no word of condemnation (Rom. 14). But to those observing special days in Galatia he had nothing but hot indignation (Gal. 4:10). Was he making fish of one and fowl of the other? No. But when a manner of life or a pattern of worship denied the gospel of salvation by unconditional love, Paul was vehemently opposed to it.

The apostolic gospel was greater than any single thread of thought. Jesus Christ cannot be contained in a closed system of theology. His grace is greater than all the "isms" that have tried to circumscribe the boundaries of infinite truth.

The Unity of Orthodoxy

If we should look for magnificent unity in Christian forms, patterns of worship and organization, we will not find it in the primitive period of the church. That began to develop in the second and third centuries. Ignatius proposed that the only way to

protect the church from wandering prophets (charismatic enthusiasts), from schism and from heresy was to establish the rule of the bishops. The church became increasingly institutionalized and gravitated toward centralized authority. Orthodoxy was more and more closely defined. Creeds were developed with increasing particularity. By the time of Constantine, heresy was outlawed. It was finally stamped out with great brutality. When monolithic Christianity fully developed, the Dark Ages of the church began. The unity, that the Catholic Church achieved not only quenched heresy, but also the Spirit. Someone has well said that the church which cannot produce a heresy is dead.

The Reformation was a breaking forth of the prophetic spirit of Christianity. It transformed the earth— economically, socially, politically and culturally as well as religiously. Protestantism brought with it a breath of the spirit of apostolic Christianity. Because it brought vitality, it brought diversity— as the critics of Protestantism have been quick to observe.

The Reformers rebelled against the papal monopoly, but they were too ready to establish one of their own. The Lutherans were first. But if they thought they could establish a Protestant monopoly, they were soon disappointed. The Swiss Protestants (Zwingli), the French Protestants (Calvin) and the Anabaptists quickly followed.

We are far enough removed from the bitter conflicts within fledgling Protestantism to look more objectively at the reality of the human situation. The Swiss Protestants were different from the German Protestants. Luther bitterly charged that the Swiss had another spirit, and he refused to give them the hand of fellowship. But the Swiss came to Protestantism from a different background and a slightly different culture. (What would have happened if they had come to the gospel from a culture wholly alien to the Germans?)

Paul Gerhardt (1606-1676), one of the great theologians of Lutheran orthodoxy declared, "I cannot regard the Calvinists, *quatenus tales*, as Christians." 4 The Lutherans succeeded in driving the Anabaptists out of their German territories and established a religious monopoly. But today even Lutheran historians acknowledge that being deprived of the prophetic ministry of the sects was one of the worst things that happened to the Lutheran Church.

Neither Luther nor Calvin could answer the Anabaptists without irritation. These Reformers could not see as clearly as we can today that a kind Providence had something to do with sending them that irritation. Experience has taught us that no political or economic monopoly is good. And a religious monopoly is the worst monopoly of all. The Lord of history permits a political balance of power in the world today. It should be obvious that Providence did not want a monopoly within the

Christian movement. The division of the Reformation into different streams was not an unmitigated disaster.

Of course, Protestant orthodoxy did its best to establish unity of doctrine, form and fellowship. To its creeds it added its systematic theologies, where every aspect of the faith was carefully defined and given its precise place in the theological system. The church is greatly indebted to the labors of Protestant scholasticism, although time has also taught us that the kind of unity sought by orthodoxy was not an unmitigated blessing to the church. Ardent advocates of orthodoxy zealously suppressed heresy, but they often quenched the Spirit as well.

The sects frequently made war on the great churches, and the great churches often responded in kind. Today wiser observers acknowledge that the sectarian groups, despite all their limitations or distortions, have often nourished a more virile and challenging religious life than the great churches. Lutheran scholar William Hordern even speaks of the necessary prophetic witness that the sects bear toward the great churches. 5 Robert McAfee Brown declares:

The multiplication of the sect groups today is first of all a judgment on denominational Protestantism. When the children of this age have cried for bread, the denominations have given them stones. The sects have clearly provided bread. Some Protestants will feel that the bread is a bit mouldy. Others will feel, on the contrary, that it has not been fully baked. A few will claim that improper hands have been laid upon it. But it is bread nevertheless, and the bread of life.

There is a degree of concern and a sense of contagion about sectarian Christianity that makes most respectable church Christianity seem pale and insipid. There is a glow in the life of the twice-born sectarian that would embarrass the conventional Protestant, and yet looks suspiciously like the life of the New Testament Christian. There is an assurance in the faith of the sectarian that more sophisticated Protestants, carefully balancing intellectual probabilities, do not even begin to attain. There is a willingness to go to the four corners of the earth and preach the sectarian gospel to every creature, that makes the missionary concern of organized Protestantism look puny in proportion to the vaster resources available to it. Denominational Protestants must be grateful that the sectarians are witnessing to these things. 6

Most of the great churches began as sect groups, often in response to the movement of the Spirit in the life of a single man (e.g., Martin Luther, Menno Simons, and John Wesley). In a recent article L. A. King made these disturbing comments:

To date, no denomination (we are assuming that all of them represented new movings of the Spirit) has maintained its original distinctiveness and power... Of course, the power of God must not be discounted, but I fear that restoration is most unlikely... Arthritis is not curable. 7

In an unpublished paper on the subject of doctrinal unity in the church, Robert M. Johnston made this plea to his own church, which is disturbed by a polarization between traditionalists and reformists:

C. Northcote Parkinson has somewhere stated as one of his famous "laws" the principle that

perfection of layout is achieved only by institutions on the verge of collapse. He cites the example of the Vatican, which completed construction of St. Peter's just as the Protestant Reformation broke out. Perhaps we can formulate a parallel "law": Absolute doctrinal unity is achieved only by religious movements on the verge of senility. Let us not hasten too rapidly toward our Trent. When we pass from youth to maturity we lose some things and we gain some things, but the process is inevitable till death. Let us yearn neither for an infancy which is past nor for denominational death. Where there is the Spirit, there is life; and where there is life, there is thought; and where there is thought, there is risk of difference; but this is no tragedy where there is love and fellowship and devotion to our Lord. 8

Where is the greatest vitality being manifested in the Christian movement today? Not within the old religious structures. Most of them appear to be in an advanced state of senility. If the greatest vitality is not found in offbeat sects, then it is found in parachurch ministries— such as Francis Schaeffer's L'Abri Fellowship, the Billy Graham Evangelistic Association, Full Gospel Business Men's Fellowship International, Campus Crusade for Christ, Inter-Varsity Christian Fellowship and countless other agencies, large and small, which seem to be doing something the old church structures are not doing. We say this without making a value judgment on these ministries. Some of them are doubtlessly involved in heresy. But even in the face of this, we must say with P. T. Forsyth, "A live heresy is better than a dead orthodoxy." 9

The church is being swept by all kinds of movements which give particular emphasis to various aspects of religion and life. The two biggest developments at present seem to be the apocalyptic movement and the new Pentecostal movement.

The Sectarian Spirit

While diversity is inevitable and even beneficial to the church, the sectarian spirit which often accompanies it is to be deplored. The sectarian spirit is not limited to small Christian groups. It can exist in the large churches as well. It is found wherever there are sinful human beings. Just as no one is entirely free from sin, so no one is entirely free from sectarianism. Even those who most vigorously condemn it are sometimes guilty of it.

We will now try to identify the sectarian spirit and bring it under the judgment of the gospel.

The sectarian spirit majors on minors. This appears to be the almost inevitable result of denominationalism. It cannot be denied that the church is often enriched by the distinctive emphases of different Christian groups. By these means valuable insights into the Christian faith may be retained or emphasized. But the distinctive "truth" of a group too easily becomes the thing which justifies that group's existence. The fellowship within the group tends to be based more on commitment to the distinctive "truth" than on the faith common to the entire Christian church. Opposition to the distinctive "truth" by other Christians causes the members of the group to rally

around the belief under attack. It becomes almost impossible to resist elevating the distinctive "truth" to a place of importance which the Bible does not recognize. Says Hubert Jedin:

Thus the form and rise of the denominations were greatly influenced by the "anti" to the other. People were in danger of overlooking the common inheritance because of the emphasis on differences and even of becoming impoverished and narrow. 10

At this point sectarianism becomes heresy.

Heresy means selected truth; it does not mean error; heresy and error are very different things. Heresy is truth, but truth pushed into undue importance, to the disparagement of the truth upon the other side. 11

Instead of asking each other, "What is your particular theological commitment?" perhaps we should ask, "What is your particular heresy?"

The sectarian spirit subordinates the gospel to its distinctive truth (heresy). If a particular sect finds the reason for its existence in its distinctive truth, that distinctive truth becomes more important than the gospel. For example, members of a sect may hold the most diverse views regarding the gospel of how a poor sinner is justified before God without disturbing the peace of the community. But if a member questions the validity of a distinctive truth, there is a mad scramble to defend the theological ramparts. Does not this prove that the sect has made its distinctive truth more important than the gospel?

While every denomination, sect, group and subgroup is busy witnessing to its distinctive truth, the glorious gospel becomes a poor Cinderella in the Christian family. No wonder the gospel is the most ignored and misunderstood doctrine in the community! Yet only the gospel can make a Christian person and create a Christian church. What sect has made the gospel its distinctive witness? Any sect doing this would not be a sect in the true sense of the word because it would not have the sectarian spirit. Would it not be refreshing to have a new "sect" in the church which unashamedly confessed, "Our heresy is the gospel"?

The sectarian spirit may not only subordinate the gospel to its pet doctrine (at which point it becomes a heresy), but it may preach its distinctive doctrine as the gospel. Thus, an emphasis on holiness of life and the work of the Holy Spirit in Christian experience has encouraged the development of new Christian movements. Who would question the importance of holiness and the indwelling life of the Spirit? Insofar as these movements have drawn attention to neglected biblical truths, they have performed a prophetic ministry to the church. But when a fellowship is based on something other than the gospel, that "something" is in serious danger of becoming another gospel. We need to remember that the ultimate deception occurs when a very

good thing is put in the room of the best thing.

As far as the New Testament is concerned, there is no such thing as the gospel of the Holy Spirit. The gospel is about Christ (Rom. 1:3). He is its decisive content. The gospel is about a historical thing, a saving event which took place two thousand years ago. That event was final and unrepeatable. Jesus Christ fulfilled the Old Testament—all its demands and all its promises. As the new Adam and the new Israel, Jesus rewrote human history. He took the curses of the old history, bore them and buried them. Sin, death, hell and the devil were overcome, and by His resurrection He inaugurated the new history of humanity. All of God's power, love and wisdom are concentrated in this one, unique act of redemption.

The Holy Spirit adds nothing to the finished work of Jesus Christ. The Spirit's chief work is the proclamation of the gospel (Isa. 61:1; 1 Cor. 2:2-4; 1 Thess. 1:5; 1 Pet. 1:12). All who are genuinely filled with the Spirit (Eph. 5:18) will make the gospel their chief work. Next to proclaiming the gospel, the Spirit's chief work is giving sinners faith in it, for it is by faith in Jesus that a sinner receives all that God and the future have to give (John 5:24; Rom. 8:32; Eph. 1:3). The fruit of the gospel is to take the sinner out of himself, out of preoccupation with himself, so that he has a new center and lives by what Another has done. The Spirit-directed life cannot be preoccupied with itself and cannot fall in love with its own experience.

Under the guise of honoring the Holy Spirit, some groups make their new-found experience of love, joy and peace the central point of their witness. Instead of witnessing to the objective reality of what has been done in Christ, they witness to what the Holy Spirit is doing in their lives. If Christian experience remains a handmaiden of the gospel, all is well. But when Hagar thinks she can supplant Sarah, it is time for her to be cast out.

The sectarian spirit may offer its distinctive truth as an addition to the gospel. The gospel is not explicitly denied. In fact, it may be confessed as absolutely necessary. "But, in addition to the gospel..."

Insofar as sectarianism offers an addition to the gospel, it is a denial of the gospel. The gospel will be a final thing, a complete thing and an all-sufficient thing, or it will be nothing at all. In the gospel God has spoken His final word to man. There is no way of going on from hearing the gospel to some more profound experience of God. If we may borrow the words of Kasemann, "The gospel is . . . the final word beyond which there is no more to be said or experienced." ¹² If anyone suggests that believers can go outside or beyond the gospel for a fuller revelation of truth (be it in some prophetic interpretation or in some charismatic experience), he is advocating a heresy.

The sectarian spirit makes its distinctive thing a “testing truth” which is supposed to determine whether other people are genuinely Christian. Even worse, the sectarian spirit may make its "testing truth" something which is supposed to determine who shall be saved or lost. As far as the New Testament is concerned, the gospel of Christ is the decisive, final test which comes to the whole world (John 3:18, 19). If the New Testament does not clearly make a certain pattern of worship, a form of church government or a point of theology a test of salvation, neither should we.

The sectarian spirit will not accept other Christians as worthy of fellowship unless they subscribe to its distinctive doctrinal emphasis.

Luther repented of sin; he received Jesus as Lord and Savior; and he believed all that was spoken by the prophets and apostles. But these virtues fell short of Roman requirements. An offense against the form of the church was the same as an offense against fellowship and doctrine....

In an alarmingly short time, however, Lutheranism converted to an institution which defined faith as assent to right doctrine, and which granted the prince many of the rights enjoyed by the Roman bishop. Lutherans were no more charitable to dissenters than Roman Catholics were. An Anabaptist could repent of sin; he could receive Jesus as Lord and Savior; and he could believe all that was spoken by the prophets and apostles. But these virtues fell short of Lutheran requirements. Unless a penitent affirmed, according to the Wittenberg Concord, "that with the bread and wine are truly and substantially present, offered, and received the body and blood of Christ," he was not part of the fellowship....

But when Calvinism converted to a theological system, it turned out that the "elect of God" were those who accepted the distinctive teachings of John Calvin. Once again, doctrine and form ranked higher than fellowship. An Arminian could repent of sin; he could receive Jesus as Lord and Savior; and he could believe all that was spoken by the prophets and apostles. But these virtues fell short of Calvinistic requirements. Unless a believer accepted the doctrine of irresistible grace, he was not a part of the fellowship....

The religious wars in England trace, in great part, to the intransigence of the established church. Dissenters could repent of sin; they could receive Jesus as Lord and Savior; and they could believe all that was spoken by the prophets and apostles. But these virtues fell short of Anglican requirements. Unless a believer supported the traditions of the established church, he was not part of the fellowship....

The Puritans restored the classical standards in theology. They composed a body of literature which was a credit to that or any other day. No major topic in the theological encyclopedia was left unexplored.

But the Puritans (with notable exceptions) tended to be parochial in outlook, for they never succeeded in transcending the limitations of Calvinism. They used the distinctive elements in this theology as a measure of correct doctrine, and thus of fit fellowship. 13

We all know that the sad story of sectarianism does not end with Puritan history.

The sectarian spirit may even manifest itself by claiming to be the one true

church which has “the truth.” All other churches and patterns of worship are said to be illegitimate. Very often this extreme sectarian attitude is associated with making loyalty to a particular religious organization the test of orthodoxy. Insofar as this attitude confuses loyalty to an ecclesiastical system with loyalty to Jesus Christ, it becomes an antichrist. Perhaps the word "sect" becomes too weak at this point, and we should substitute the word "cult" to describe a group which claims exclusive possession of the truth.

The sectarian spirit is a denial of justification by faith alone. A simple way to test whether any group of Christians has the sectarian spirit is to enquire whether it requires any tests for acceptance within the group that God does not insist upon for acceptance with Himself. What is sufficient for acceptance with God, ought to be sufficient for acceptance with a truly Christian community. Whereas the sectarian spirit is anxious to draw a line which identifies the spiritual elite, the gospel is accompanied by the catholic spirit, which is anxious to draw a circle that makes the Christian fellowship as wide as Christ intended.

A divided church may often be an expression of how seriously God's people are taking their commitment to the truth. But unless diversity is kept subordinate to the gospel, it may exceed its bounds. We need the graciousness and humility to recognize that despite our best endeavors to be true to what the Bible says, we all bring to our study of the Bible the inhibiting influence of our own background, culture and sinful limitations. The article of justification by grace alone means that we cannot be saved by theological rectitude any more than by ethical rectitude. The gospel must continually call into question all that we do or teach. Just as no one is without sin, so no one is without error. We must forgive the theological blunders of our fellow Christians, even as we ask God to forgive ours.

We would gain nothing if, after fleeing from the bear of sectarianism, we were bitten by the viper of compromise. The agony of divisions is better than the complacency of indifference. The passionate commitment to our sectarian distinctives needs to be channeled into a passionate commitment to the gospel of Christ. A fellowship based on sectarian distinctives needs to be sublimated by fellowship based on the gospel. It would be a welcome change to have a sect whose "heresy" (its distinctive thing) unashamedly pointed away from its own history to the holy history of Jesus Christ.

Notes and References

1. See Walter Bauer, *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971); James D. C. Dunn, *Unity and Diversity in the New Testament: An Inquiry into the Character of Earliest Christianity* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1977); Peter Toon, *The Development of Doctrine in the Church* (Grand Rapids: Win. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1978); Robert L. Wilken, *The Myth of Christian Beginnings: History's Impact on Belief* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday & Co., 1972).

2. See F. F. Bruce, *Paul: Apostle of the Heart Set Free* (Grand Rapids: Win. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1977).
3. See Dunn, *Unity and Diversity in the New Testament*.
4. Quoted in Hubert Jedin and John P. Dolan, eds., *The History of the Church*, vol.5, Erwin Iserloh, Joseph Glazik, and Hubert Jedin. *Reformation and Counter Reformation*, tr, Anselm Biggs and Peter W. Becker (New York: Seabury Press, 1980), p. 429.
5. See William Hordern, *Christianity, Communism, and History* (New York: Abingdon Press, 1954), pp. 17-18.
6. Robert McAfee Brown, *The Spirit of Protestantism* (London: Oxford University Press, 1961), p. 212.
7. L. A. King, "Legalism or Permissiveness": An Inescapable Dilemma? *Christian Century*, 16 Apr. 1980, pp. 434-38.
8. Robert M. Johnston, Unpublished Manuscript, 12 Aug. 1980, p. 5.
9. Quoted in Brown, *Spirit of Protestantism*, p. 128.
10. Jedin and Dolan, *History of the Church*, 5:428.
11. William Lincoln, quoted in Augustus Hopkins Strong, *Systematic Theology* (1907: reprint ed. [3 vols. In 1], Old Tappan, N.J.: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1974), p. 800.
12. Ernst Kasemann. *Commentary on Romans* (Grand Rapids: Win. B. Eerdinans Publishing Co., 1980), p. 10.
13. Edward John Camell, *The Case for Biblical Christianity* (Grand Rapids: Win. B. Eerdinans Publishing Co., 1969). pp. 14-17.

Each page in this document contains a true word for word unexpurgated transmission of the original journal: *"The Sectarian Spirit- R.D.B."*, *Journal Vol. 4, No. 3, 1981*. Permission to photocopy, fax or otherwise electronically transmit in unexpurgated form has been granted. Passages may be quoted within the limits of "fair use."
Greatest1command.com