

What the Reformers Forgot

by Jacob Prasch

The Reformers forgot that no covenant was ever made with the church, but rather with the Jews, and that biblical Christianity is apostolic and comes from the apostles, while patristic Christianity comes from the church fathers and is not biblical or apostolic.

Duration: 1:17:37

Scripture: Jeremiah 18:2-31

Topics: "Reformation"

Description

In this sermon, the speaker discusses how a cult leader manipulated his followers to the point where they were willing to die for him. The leader conducted 13-hour Bible studies every day, focusing on the book of Revelation, to prepare his followers for the coming apocalypse. He convinced them that he was a semi-divine being and that their salvation depended on their association with him. The speaker also mentions how the cult leader initially deceived his followers by teaching them to live under two covenants and to believe that something could appear to be one thing but actually be something else.

Transcript

Hello dear friends, greetings in the wonderful name of Jesus. Open with me please to the book of Jeremiah the prophet, Jeremiah chapter 31, the 31st chapter of Jeremiah the prophet, Yirmiyahu Hanavi in Hebrew. I've been asked to speak today about the subject, what the reformers forgot, what the reformers forgot.

Heavenly Father, we ask you to meet with us now in the power and presence of your spirit, in your grace and mercy, open our eyes, our minds, and above all our hearts to the glory and the meaning of your word. As always, Lord God, we ask that your word would not simply increase our knowledge with the aim of increasing our knowledge, but increase our knowledge with the aim of serving you, and being more like you, and helping others in your name. The wonderful name above all names, the name of the one who saved us, Jesus, in whose name we pray, amen.

What the reformers forgot. People who grow up in a protestant culture that predominated in South Africa for generations, have a popular misconception. There's a cultural protestantism.

This country had been, and still to some degree is, a bible belt. Like the American South, like Northern Ireland, it is a bible belt. And in bible belts, you generally find the same kinds of things.

One thing you find is an endemic Calvinism. A Calvinistic, not only theology, but a Calvinistic philosophy that comes from the theology, that permeates the social fabric. And with that inevitably comes a gross history of injustice.

A gross history of injustice. In the American South, there were Calvinists trying to theologically legitimize slavery. In South Africa, it was the Dutch Reformed Church trying to theologically legitimize apartheid.

In Northern Ireland, it was these Presbyterians trying to theologically legitimize the expropriation of Catholic land. I'm not defending Catholicism, I'm speaking of Catholic people, of course. You always have this kind of history, wherever you had a hyper-Calvinistic culture, you have injustice.

What are the sources of these things, and where do they come from? The final thing that happens in a Calvinistic or a Reformed bible belt culture, is you have people thinking they're saved, but they're not. Because they grow up in the church, because they were sprinkled as a baby, etc., etc., they wind up thinking they're saved, but they're not. Throughout South Africa, over the years, I've had many South African people from Dutch Reformed backgrounds and other Protestant backgrounds, I've even had Dominese, who were not born again and didn't know it.

Who were not born again and didn't know it. It becomes cultural blindness, where culture becomes mixed with religion. And then the culture, the religious culture, the political philosophy becomes part and parcel of it.

Forgetting that Jesus himself was largely apolitical. He was largely apolitical. The emphasis of the bible on political events, in the New Testament certainly, is recognizing the prophetic significance of prophecy.

When you see political events happening, recognizing what those political events mean in light of prophecy, that's the emphasis of the New Testament. Jesus did not ideologically identify politically with any party. He lived in a politically charged environment and refused to get dragged into it.

That was not his purpose. Nonetheless, let's look at Jeremiah 31, 31. Behold, days are coming, declares the Lord.

Behold, days are coming, declares the Lord, when I will make, literally in Hebrew, I will cut a new covenant with the house of Israel and the house of Judah, not like the covenant which I made with their fathers in the day I took them by the hand and took them out of Egypt, the land of Egypt, my covenant which they broke, although I was a husband to them, declares the Lord. Notice the relationship between covenant and marriage. Between covenant and marriage.

Marriage is a covenant. Now, we normally think of it as a covenant between two people. Covenant is not a marital covenant.

A marital covenant is not primarily a covenant between two people. It's two people making a mutual covenant with God. You understand? You cannot build a marriage on a covenant with the person you're marrying.

Marriages like that will fail. You can only build a covenant on a covenant with God. We're both making a commitment to God.

We're making a vow. Notice the relationship between matrimony and covenant. When someone divorces and remarries for unbiblical reasons, and there's very few reasons in the Bible that would permit that, they're not breaking a covenant with each other.

They're breaking a covenant with God. I will make a new covenant. Now, the Midrash, on Psalm 7, the rabbis admitted, the ancient sages admitted, the Messiah would make a new covenant.

In the Midrashim, the rabbis admitted this. What the Reformers forgot, they had the idea that Luther, Calvin, Zwingli, Akklamparius, Busser, Cranmer, the Protestant Reformers began the Gospel as we know it. Nothing could be further from the truth.

There was never an age or a time when the Lord did not have a people for his own name. A hundred years before Luther, there were the Bohemian Brethren following John as Hus, which taught the same thing. The only thing Luther did was, once feudalism declined and the nation state was born, the Pope no longer had the centralized political power to stop the spread of the Gospel.

So you had Protestant princes and nobles, and you had Catholic ones. The Pope no longer had the centralized political power to stop the spread of the Gospel. Luther simply got away with the things Hus had preached a hundred years earlier.

But Hus was not the first. In England, there were the low lords, the followers of John Wycliffe. This was hundreds of years before the Reformation.

In Europe, for centuries, going back at least to the 9th century, there were people called the Waldencians. In the East, you had other groups, Nestorians among them. Some of these groups went off doctrinally in time, but they began right.

There was never a time when there were not Bible-believing Christians. The schism began with the Novation Schism in the early church. Novation Schism.

Once Constantine relocated his empire from Rome, his capital from Rome, to Constantinople, to Istanbul, Christianity became the state church. It became an institution of the state. Nominalism began becoming institutionalized, and the true believers began to split at an early point.

But at that early point, they began to be persecuted by the established church. The first major martyr we know was a bishop, not in the Catholic sense of bishop, but in the original biblical sense, episcopal, an overseer, named Priscillian in Iberia. Priscillian was the first major martyr who was martyred because he sought to split away from a church that had gone away from the Bible.

The idea is, who are the real descendants of Jesus and the apostles? Is it those who would claim an institutional line, or those who claim a doctrinal line? Who are the real followers of what Jesus and the apostles established? Those who believe what they taught, or those who claim to control the institution they're said to have established? Well, to begin with, they didn't establish an institution. The Roman Catholic Church and the Protestant Church both began with someone called... Their doctrine comes not from the Bible, but from Augustine of Hippo. Augustine.

Augustine was influenced by other people who began to go off, one of which was somebody called... One of the first people to go off was Ignatius of Antioch. Ignatius of Antioch said, well, instead of having a plurality of elders like the Bible teaches, we will have one leader, autocratic leadership. This was Ignatius

of Antioch.

He came at a very early point, and he taught many crazy things, one of which was this idea of mono-episcopacy, one leader. Now, if you go back and you see in the Dutch Reformed culture, the dormant said this, the dormant said that. This is the root.

It goes back to when the early church first went off. It's not important what the Bible says. It's important what the dormant says.

It's important what the priest says. It's important what the pastor says. We call our ministry Moriel, God is my teacher.

What is your teacher who is in heaven, Jesus said. Ignatius of Antioch, and he had a lot of crazy ideas. When Christians were being thrown to the lions, sometimes as a testimony to the unsaved, the lions would be afraid to devour the Christians.

And this would be a testimony. The Shekinah or something was on the Christians. The Shekinah was on them, and the lions would be afraid of them, and the pagans would see it.

So Antiochus taught, don't be robbed of your martyr's crown. If the lions don't attack you, make sure you attack the lions. What you wind up with is the Christian version of suicide bombers.

Absolute lunacy. Now, Jesus said, when they persecute you in one city, flee to another. Another person who influenced Augustine was Oregon in the east.

Oregon was a Gnostic. Oregon spiritualized texts. The Jews who wrote the New Testament never spiritualized texts.

They used midrash. And midrash, and we know they used midrash, because all we have to do is look at the Dead Sea Scrolls. The same way the Dead Sea Scrolls handle the Old Testament is the same way the gospels and the epistles handle the Old Testament.

In midrash, you have a peshet, from the Hebrew word simple, and the pesher interpretation. Okay. The peshet and the pesher.

The peshet. Give bread to the hungry. Okay.

Send food to starving people. The pesher interpretation, give the bread of life, the gospel, those who hunger for truth. Okay, you understand? You never negate the peshet with the pesher.

Or you take a historical event that already happened and say it's going to happen again. Okay. Well, you don't neglect the fact that Jesus is our Passover lamb.

The lamb is a type of Christ. But you don't say that the peshet is not there. There was a literal lamb sacrificed at Passover in Exodus.

You don't negate the fact that there was a literal Exodus and only look to the interpretation of it. What the Gnostics did was forget the peshet. Forget the literal.

Just go for some spiritual interpretation, which could become rather fanciful. This was a pagan idea that first infiltrated not Christianity, but Judaism, with somebody called Philo. Philo.

Yet, Oregon was influenced, or Augustine was influenced by Oregon. Two other influences on him were Cyprian of Carthage. Cyprian of Carthage.

Cyprian believed in keeping the institution of the church as a monolithic institution. He believed in institutionalization. Now, in the Bible, the only thing the church was was a fellowship of fellowships.

There were two biblical definitions of the church. The local congregation and the universal body of Christ. The only thing the church was was a fellowship of fellowships held together by common doctrine.

One faith, one baptism. When you see people beginning to become hierarchical and centralized and getting into archbishops and metropolitans and general superintendents, when you see them getting hierarchical, what they're trying to do is compensate for their lack of spiritual unity with an institutional or an organizational or political unity. They become theocratically unified.

When you have unity of the spirit, when you have common doctrine, you don't need an institution or a hierarchy. All you need is a fellowship of fellowships like they have in the Book of Acts or in the Epistles. They get hierarchical.

Cyprian also pushed the... Cyprian said you can't have God as your father unless the church is your mother, meaning his church. Can't be a Christian unless you're in his church. Additionally, he began pushing the idea of sacramentalism.

Ritual salvation. Salvation comes from rituals. He laid the way for this.

In the Bible, rituals like baptism or anointing with oil are only emblems. They are externalizations. They are rituals which have no power in and of themselves, but they illustrate some spiritual thing which does have power.

And a final one, not the final, but the fourth major one was his mentor who was called Ambrose of Milan. This guy really began pushing the mixture of church and politics. Hence, you get into this idea of the state church, like the Dutch Reformed Church was the state church here.

The Church of England was the state church in England, etc. This is Augustine. Both Roman Catholicism and Protestantism come from Augustine.

The Augustinian monks, an order of monks, followed his teaching very closely. Martin Luther had been an Augustinian monk. The influences of this in the Reformation were right there from the beginning.

Now, that's just historical background. Let's look at the verse again. I will make a new covenant with who? With the house of Israel and the house of Judah.

Jesus Christ never made a covenant with the Church. God never made a covenant with the Church. God never made a covenant with the Church.

Never. Never. No covenant was ever made with the Church.

Covenant was made with the Jews. Romans 11 explains this. It's like two olive trees.

A cultivated one, corresponding to Israel, and a wild one. Non-Jews who reject their Messiah are cut off from the cultivated one. I'm sorry.

Jews who reject their Messiah are cut off from the cultivated one. They're cut off from their own olive tree. Non-Jews, people from the pagan world, are cut off from their wild, uncultivated tree and grafted in to replace Jews who believe.

Believing Gentiles replace non-believing Jews. But one tree does not replace the other. The tree remains Israel, of which the Jews are the natural branches.

And when a Jew believes, he's grafted back in. Now, Paul tells us, don't think God can't graft the natural branches back in. In the last days, he's going to graft them back in, because he's already done something much harder.

He's taken Eskimos and Zulus. He's taken Vikings and made them Christians. He's taken people with no heritage, no basis in the truth, and made them co-heirs of Christ.

He's made them descendants of Abraham by faith. Abraham was both a Jew and a Gentile. He was a Gentile God converted to Judaism.

That's how he could be the father of all who believe. God's already done something harder to make Jews believe in their own Messiah. He's made non-Jews believe in the Jewish Messiah.

No covenant was ever made with the church. Never! Never! Now, what Jeremiah was up against was this. It had become a state religion.

It was a covenant with the nation that by having Brit Milah circumcision, you would be incorporated into the covenant. So people thought, just because they were members of the state religion, as it were, just because they underwent a ritual of circumcision as a baby, and just because they were brought up culturally in a religion, that they were in a relationship with God. They'd go into injustice.

They'd go into idolatry. They'd go into immorality. And they thought they were okay as long as they had practiced their religion.

Just like in the American South, where I'd ever, Saturday night, with Cinderella and my 58 Chevy, get drunk, do my thing in the backseat, go to church Sunday morning, hallelujah. Just the way it is. That's just the way it is.

They thought they were all right because they were members of the state church. What Jeremiah prophesied, what the Holy Spirit told Jeremiah to prophesy, is when the Messiah comes, it's not going to be like that anymore. There'll be a new covenant, not like this covenant.

It's going to be completely different. You're not going to be part of this covenant because you were born into a nation or a culture. To be part of the new covenant, you have to be born again.

You can't be born into it. You have to be born again into it. So therefore, it's going to be completely different.

Now, the very thing that Jeremiah said Jesus was going to get rid of, Jesus did get rid of. John the Baptist prophesied Jesus would get rid of it. The Pharisees and Sadducees were coming and John said the axe was laid at the root of the tree.

You think you're right just because you're Jews? God can raise up Abraham's children out of the stones. So what Jeremiah said Jesus would get rid of, what John the Baptist said Jesus would get rid of, what Jesus didn't get rid of, and what in Romans Paul tells us he got rid of, Augustine puts it back. Why? Constantine's empire was collapsing.

Constantine never even got baptized until he was old. He saw Christendom as a way to stop the moral decline and the political fragmentation of his empire. He saw Christians had more morals and a higher sense of social justice.

It was politically expedient. So they cooked up this idea. He had a vision at Miletus Bridge.

There's no proof of anything like that. When you read the history of Constantine, he had several visions like that of pagan gods as well as the Christian one. He never got baptized.

He continued to have pagan practice in the Roman government. It was a political thing. But after he relocated his capital to Istanbul to hold his empire together, the imperial properties were bequeathed to the bishop in Rome.

In time, this bishop in Rome came to claim primacy over the others. The first pope was not Peter but Gregory I, Gregory the Great. The Roman Catholic Church was begun theologically by Augustine.

And those who influenced them and those who followed them. Okay? The Roman Catholic Church institutionally was begun by Constantine. And the papacy was begun by Gregory I. And then it developed from there and began to evolve and evolve and evolve and a lot of other stuff happened.

At the same time, Christianity was evolving into something very different than the New Testament taught. Judaism was simultaneously evolving into Talmudic Judaism. Something very different than what Moses taught.

Now, my own family is a mixture of Jewish and Roman Catholic. I went to a Catholic school in the Jewish community center. I was both sprinkled and clipped.

As I always tell people, I've seen two false religions in my life. One a total corruption of the Old Testament and the other a total corruption of the New. What you see in the synagogue is not the Judaism of Moses.

It's Talmudic. And what you see in the Roman Church and most Protestant churches and the Greek Orthodox Church is not the Christianity of the New Testament. It's something that comes from the church fathers.

Augustine was the main church father after Constantine, after Nicaea, the Council of Nicaea. This is called patristic Christianity. Patristic from the church fathers.

The Christianity you see is not biblical or apostolic. It is patristic. Patristic.

It does not come from the apostles. Biblical Christianity is apostolic. Biblical Christianity is apostolic.

Institutional Christianity is patristic. It comes from the church fathers. Now, in the Greek Orthodox world it was different.

Augustine was not one of their fathers. Their father was another guy called John Chrysostom. But that doesn't concern us for our purpose today.

We're looking at the West, the Reformers. So the first thing the Reformers forgot was that no covenant was ever made with the church. The covenant was made with the Jews.

But because Augustine was influenced by Gnosticism, he had no problem spiritualizing Israel as the church. Now, Reformed people would claim to put a lot of emphasis on grammatical historical exegesis. But they violate their own principles.

Every time they see something about the millennium, they spiritualize it. Every time they see something about Israel, that's the church, they spiritualize it. They're notoriously good at violating their own principles.

But let's understand something. The very thing that Jesus came to get rid of, Augustine, Constantine put back. Now, in order to restore biblical Christianity, in order to put it back the way it was supposed to be, you would have to replace patristic Christianity with apostolic Christianity.

You would have to also divorce the unbiblical marriage between church and state. Okay? The New Testament wasn't going to be a state religion. You're not going to be part of that covenant by being born into a culture and part of a nation anymore.

You have to be born again to get into it. Nobody can be born in it. You'd have to divorce the unscriptural marriage between church and state.

When the reformers came along, instead of divorcing the unscriptural marriage between church and state, they replaced a Roman Catholic state religion with a Protestant one. Their first mistake? Replacement theology. Replacementism.

Supersessionism. Their second mistake? Erastianism. Making a state church.

And the same as the Roman Catholic Church in the Middle Ages would persecute people in inquisitions for not being Catholic, in England and in continental Europe, the Protestants would persecute people for not being a member of their state church. They turned out to be murderers and anti-Semites like the Popes before them in many cases. Zwingli was an interesting character.

There were people who did try to go back to the New Testament. They, however, were not considered Protestants. They were considered they were called Anna Baptists.

There were some crazy Anna Baptists who were hyper-charismatic. Particularly the ones at Munster in Germany who followed the Zwickau Prophets. They were hyper-charismatic maniacs.

But they were a minority. Other of the Anna Baptists like the Mennonites who followed Menno Simons were entirely Biblical. Much more Biblical than the Reformers.

They didn't believe in a state church. They didn't believe you could be part of a covenant by being part of a church. Only the Reformers persecuted them.

In Zurich, Zwingli cut a hole in the ice in Lake Geneva and drowned them under the ice. You want to be baptized? We'll baptize you again. Calvin's followers burned them alive.

Burned them. In England, they would hang them. They would burn them.

These were the ones who went back to the Bible. The Reformers did not go back to the Bible. They went back to Augustine.

They went back to the source of the problem. Instead of uprooting the problem, they went back to the source of it. Now in fairness, the Reformers were right about three things.

They were right about three things and three things only. One, they were right about justification by faith, salvation by grace. That you can't earn your salvation.

It's a gift. That they were right about. Second thing they were right about is Scriptura Sola.

Only the Bible, in theory, is the basis of doctrinal authority. Now, in practice, it was different. They were patristic.

But in theory, they were right. Scriptura Sola. Third thing they were right about is the corruption of the Roman Catholic Church and the papacy.

There were three things they were right about. The complete and utter corruption of the papacy and the Roman Church, Scriptura Sola, and justification. Those three things they had right.

It was the Anabaptist groups who had the most of it right. If you believe in believer's baptism, during the Reformation, you would not have been considered a Protestant. The Protestants would have killed you in many places.

Probably most places. You would have been persecuted by Catholic and Protestant alike. Now, if you were Presbyterian or Dutch Reformed or Lutheran or Anglican, those are Protestant denominations.

But Baptists, Pentecostals, Brethren, they are Anabaptist sects who would have been persecuted by the Reformers. In terms of historical theology, Pentecostals, Baptists, Plymouth Brethren, groups like that, Mennonites, none of those groups, these non-conformist groups, none of them would have been considered Protestant. They only became counted as Protestant later on.

But originally, they wouldn't be Protestant. They were neither Catholic nor Protestant. They were just Christian.

They were the same as what the Lowlands and the Waldensians and the Bohemian Brethren were before them. Just Christian. Replacement theology, Erastianism.

Satan's first trick to try to seduce and undermine the Church was not Paganization. That came later. That came in the 4th, 5th century.

The influences of Pagan Rome coming into the Church. These mystery religions that began in Babylon and found their way through Asia Minor, particularly the city of Pergamum, into the Greco-Roman world, and then into the Church. That came later.

The Pagan beliefs of Babylon that came through the Roman Church, etc. That came later. Satan's second attempt to destroy the Church was to Paganize it.

His first attempt to seduce the Church, according to the Book of Galatians and the Book of Acts, was Judaization. Not Jewishization. The Church was already Jewish theologically.

But Judaization. To take this new covenant and put it back under the old. Now, there are extreme and obvious examples of this today.

One would be the Seventh-day Adventists. They live under two covenants. When somebody gets into one fundamental error, they become predisposed to a much more serious one.

For instance, remember several years ago that crazy guy in Texas called himself David Kordish in Waco, Waco, Texas? His followers were absolutely crazy. The things they did were unspeakable, were unbelievable. It got to the point they were willing to die following him.

I read 129 pages from the internet by people who left his group shortly before they shot it out with the FBI and the states. How could he get these people to die? He would have 13-hour Bible studies every day, 13 hours, always from the Book of Revelation to prepare them for the coming apocalypse. And he convinced them that he was some kind of a semi-divine being.

That he was one of these angels or something in Revelation and that their salvation was through their association with him. And they'd be rescued from the coming apocalypse or be resurrected if they died in it or something like this. And he just brain-doctored them every day with these Bible studies to the point where they were willing to die.

But it didn't begin that way. Who's going to believe something so crazy? It began by trying to live under two covenants. Every one of his followers had been a Seventh-day Adventist.

Now, for cultural reasons and for my sake of testimony to the Jews, I don't eat pig or shellfish. Not because there's anything wrong with pig or shellfish, but it's just better for my testimony not to do it. But I'm never going to put it on somebody else or say it's necessary for salvation or say it's a way to sanctification.

All things are lawful. Not all things are helpful. If I worked in a street mission with street people where alcohol is a problem, I would never touch a drop of wine.

I wouldn't take the Lord's Supper with wine if I worked with street people. Not because I have any problem taking the Lord's Supper with wine. All things are lawful.

Not all things are helpful. It just wouldn't be good to my testimony. That's fine.

That's not a problem. That's a matter of personal choice, of personal conviction. But when you begin getting legalistic about it and putting it on other people, you're on a dangerous road.

This guy would begin screaming mad if they violated the dietary laws, but then he began to change them suddenly. Then he got the people to believe he was this divine being, and therefore only his... He believed that he was seminally pure, so therefore women should only procreate with him because his seed was semi-divine. So then he got in, not only to adultery, but he got into pedophilia, and they were giving him little girls.

People would actually take their daughters, I mean girls as young as nine, and give it to him sexually. He'd have all the men living downstairs in like a military barracks type thing, and he didn't want anybody to be recognized as any source of authority but him. So he'd emasculate the males, not physically but

psychologically, by humiliating them in front of their wives and children.

They were sexually starved, so he'd bring attractive women up and make them strip and stuff like this, and then he would go stare... Who was aroused by this? Who's turned on... And he'd stare at them as if he could read their mind. And then he'd berate them for lust. And so therefore their wives and children wouldn't look to the husband and father as God's authority.

They'd only look to him. That's the way he did it. Then he'd beat the women with paddles.

They'd cooked the wrong chicken or something, he'd strip them and beat them with these wooden paddles in front of their children. You see what happens to bad mommies? And the women would accept that this was some kind of divine correction or something, and he'd really beat them quite mercilessly, and they would go, how could somebody be so crazy? They're giving little kids to this nut, you let him abuse your wife, and then you're going to die for him? When they shot it out with the FBI, they thought that that was this apocalypse in the book of Revelation. How did it begin? Trying to live under two covenants.

There is also an extreme element of the messianic movement. I don't mean... Most Jewish believers are in churches or they're in moderate messianic fellowships. They follow the teachings of decent Bible teachers like Arnold Fugtenbaum and so on.

I don't mean groups like Jews for Jesus or anything like that. I don't mean the mainstream ones. But you've got these hyper-messianic sects who are not just observant, but they're trying to put Gentiles under the law, putting people in bondage to Jewish observance.

There's even groups here, African people, who are having adult male circumcision of African men. What craziness! Nuts! Judaization was the first thing Satan tried to destroy the church with. Well, under the law, the religion, this church, was an institution of the state.

Erasmianism. So therefore, the Roman Catholic Church becomes a religion of the state. Then the Protestants become a religion of the state.

Under the law, circumcision on the eighth day was the rite of initiation into the covenant. So now, what do you do? We need a rite of initiation. Sprinkle the babies.

Now, in the Bible, baptism is a funeral. You can't baptize, you can't bury somebody unless they're dead. Romans 6 makes it very clear.

We're baptized into his death, his immersion. When you go under the water, you're co-buried. When you come out, you're co-resurrected.

Presbyterians, Reformed churches actually began sprinkling on the eighth day, imitating the Catholics, making it a rite of initiation. Back under the law, Judaization, infant baptism, that is exactly what they did. Judaization, infant baptism becomes the equivalent of circumcision, and so on.

That's what they did. That's what they did. And the same as there were penalties that were carried out publicly in the Old Testament, but you're back under the law now, the church would carry out penalties publicly for failing to observe the law in the church.

The Roman church would practice public floggings, all this kind of stuff, killing people. So what did the Protestants do? The same thing. The same thing.

They replaced one error with a mutation of the same error. They went back to Augustine instead of back to the Bible. The fourth thing they forgot was that the Bible is Judaic literature.

They forgot part and parcel of replacementism was the root supports you. To the Jews belonged the articles of God. So instead of reading the Bible as Jewish literature, they Hellenized the church.

They put it into Greek-Latin culture. And began reading the Bible as Greek or Greco-Latin literature. If you were to read John Calvin's secular work, his commentary on Seneca's De Clementia, the same rules of exegesis with which John Calvin analyzed pagan literature are the same rules of exegesis with which John Calvin mutilated the Bible.

This is not to say that grammatical, historical exegesis is wrong. It is just to say it is incomplete. And that method alone is not the way Scripture handles Scripture.

Look at the book of Galatians. Chapter 4. Verse 24. This is allegorically speaking.

These women are two covenants. One preceding Mount Sinai and bearing children who are to be slaves. So she's Hagar.

Now this Hagar is Mount Sinai in Arabia and corresponds to the present Jerusalem for she is in slavery with her children. But Jerusalem above, she's our mother. And this one she corresponds, of course, to Sarah and so on.

Who, looking at the book of Genesis, would arrive at Paul's conclusion using Protestant exegesis? Nobody would. But if you use Jewish exegesis, you can see what he's talking about. Let's look again.

Look at Jesus in Matthew 24. We looked at this a bit yesterday. Verse 15.

Therefore, when you see the abomination of desolation, ha'shikutz ha-meshu'mem, in Aramaic, spoken of by Daniel, in Gentile, Hellenistic prophecy, it's prediction and fulfillment. Jesus got that wrong. It already happened 160 years earlier with the Maccabees.

Jesus celebrated Hanukkah in John chapter 10. What do you mean when you see the abomination spoken of by Daniel? That happened already. It has no future meaning.

Preterism. Historicism. Preterism.

It's done. Jesus took something that already happened and said it will happen again. Jewish prophecy is pattern.

Multiple fulfillment. Each fulfillment is a type of the final one. Jesus didn't handle the scriptures the way they do.

That it already happened already. This is Hellenistic. The Bible is Judaic.

Look at Matthew chapter 2. Verse 15. When Herod dies, out of Egypt I call my son. Now, in the genealogy of Jesus, it begins with Abraham in verse 2. Chapter 1 verse 2 begins with Abraham.

Prophecy is pattern. Abraham comes out of Egypt and God judges Pharaoh. He's the father of all who believe.

He's the patriarch, the archetype. Abraham comes out of Egypt. God judges Pharaoh.

Abraham's descendants, the Jews, come out of Egypt in the Exodus. God judges Pharaoh. In our salvation, 1 Corinthians 10, we come out of Egypt.

Egypt is the world. Metaphor for the world. Pharaoh is a metaphor for Satan, the god of the world.

And as Moses made the covenant with the blood of the Lamb, brought the people out of Egypt through the Red Sea into the Promised Land, is the way Jesus brings us out of the dominion of Satan in the world through baptism into Heaven. We come out of Egypt. Ultimately, it's the rapture and resurrection.

Those same judgments, most of you know, that were in the book of Revelation or in the book of Revelation, replay the judgments from the Passover in Exodus. Hoshekh, darkness, dam, blood, swardaya, the frogs, etc. Those same judgments come back again.

They bring Joseph's bones with them out in the book of Exodus with them. Why do they bring Joseph's bones? The dead in Christ rise first. We come out together.

Same as Pharaoh's magicians counterfeited the miracles of Moses and Aaron, the Antichrist and false prophet are going to counterfeit the miracles of Jesus and his witnesses. Prophecy is a pattern. So, when you read Matthew chapter 2, out of Egypt I call my son.

Wait a minute, that's quoting from the book of Hosea chapter 11 verse 1. That's about the Exodus. Hosea said it's about the Exodus of the Jews with Moses. Moses said that's about the Exodus.

Now Matthew says it's about Jesus? God judged the wicked king, Abraham came out. God judged the wicked king, the Jews came out. God judges the wicked king, Jesus comes out.

It's a pattern. Multiple fulfillment of the same prophecy, all of it pointing to the end, the return of Christ. You're never going to understand the book of Revelation with the nonsense invented by Protestants.

That's not how Scripture handles Scripture. If you were to follow Protestant exegesis, the Bible handles Scripture unscientifically. When you look at the Dead Sea Scrolls, however, you see that the New Testament writers are only doing what Jews always did.

The theological term is the life situation. You have to interpret something in the light of its own culture and context. They forgot the root! They're trying to read Jewish literature as if it were Western literature.

Go out into the bush and listen to Zulu oral tradition. If you were to write down a Zulu oral tradition, translate it into English or Afrikaans, can a professor of literature analyze that the same way he'd analyze a Shakespearean sonnet? It'd be absurd! You cannot handle Jewish literature the way you would handle Western literature. It's absurd.

But that's what the Reformers did. They forgot. They forgot! That was only the beginning.

An Orthodox Jew to this day will pray, thank God I was not born a dog, a Gentile, or a woman. An ultra-Orthodox Jew will still pray that. In Christ, Gentiles are co-heirs with salvation.

The wall of partition's broken down. Your wife is a co-heir with Christ. She's your equal in Christ.

Now, the husband's the head of the wife as Christ is the head of the church. Greater in function and responsibility, not in nature. Not in nature.

Co-heir. Co-heir. You get this misogynic culture where male authority intended to be protective becomes perverted into something where women become subjugated.

Okay? Now, you've certainly had that in Roman Catholicism, but then you get it in Reformed culture, Protestantism, particularly Calvinistic Protestantism, the subjugation of women. Now, leadership is male. Leadership is male.

Women can only teach other women. That is for sure. Leadership is male.

But this in no way, no way negates the place and function of women in ministry. Women can be deaconesses. Women can teach other women.

And women are called to be helpmates to their husband. How can a woman function in leadership in the church? Through her husband. He is never going to be the man of God God has called him to be unless his wife is being the woman of God He has called her to be.

You understand? That's why Paul says in Timothy, get the marriage right. You want to be a leader? First get your marriage right. Your wife's gifts are going to help you be what God has called you to be and do.

But when you say, she's a woman, get over there. This pseudo-spiritual machoism. That's crazy.

It's crazy. It's easier for women to get saved than men. Why? They are more sensitive.

More sensitive. It's easier for women to hear the voice of God. When a husband and wife are praying together, the wife will hear first and clearest.

Why? More sensitive. Men are reliant on female sensitivity. I've said this many times.

Because of the fall of man, something has happened to us. Men have become insensitive and women have become hypersensitive. Because of the fall of man, because of sin, men have become insensitive and women have become hypersensitive.

So men are reliant on female sensitivity to correct the imbalance. Women are reliant on male protection to correct the imbalance because women can think they're more predisposed to think with their emotions and to be deceived. There's a balance.

Women are reliant on male protection. Men are reliant on female sensitivity. That's what the Bible teaches.

But, now all Judahs, thank God I was not born a dog, a Gentile, or a woman. If it wasn't for a woman, you wouldn't be here, Jack. God doesn't quite see it that way.

See where the mentality gets in? The meaning of the role of women? Now, again, leadership is male. I do not believe in female... That's not biblical. What you see going on in the church today, the feminization of the church, these things are not scriptural.

It's the world. It's the feminism of the world getting into the church. It's not biblical.

But neither is the opposite extreme. And, of course, in the Reformed culture, you have the opposite extreme. Let's see what else happens.

With this replacementism, something else comes about. Israel was an elect nation. Was an elect nation.

So, by Judaizing the church, by going back onto the law, the Reformed people wind up with a perverted idea of election. We are superior to you. I'm elect.

Two religions cannot give people the assurance of salvation. Roman Catholics have to do good works in order to get saved. But they can't get saved, but that's what they think.

Salvation is by the sacraments. It's sacramental regeneration. They believe the ritual has an ex operato power to it.

Grace to a Catholic is not what the Bible means by grace. It's not undeserved favor. It's not the Hebrew word hesed or the Greek word charism.

It's not gift. It's an ethereal substance earned by sacraments. You have actual grace and sanctifying grace.

None of which is any biblical idea of grace. Catholics do works to get saved. Calvinists do good works to prove they are saved.

I must be saved. Look what I'm doing. Neither one, neither extreme Calvinism nor Roman Catholicism can give people an assurance of salvation.

Neither one can give people an assurance of salvation. Neither one. Because if you're elect, you're saved.

How do you know you're elect? Well, your works will prove it. I must be saved. I must be elect.

You let them work. You understand. We don't do good works to get saved.

We do good works because we've been saved. That's the answer to Catholicism. But this idea that you can... Yes, you know them by their fruits.

And yes, you know, if the fruit is there, there'll be works. That's for sure. The faith that works is dead.

That is for sure. That is for sure. But you can have an assurance.

They misunderstand election because now the church is Israel. Let's see how they do this. Turn with me to Romans chapter 11.

Sorry, Romans chapter 9. Romans 9 to 11 deals with the prophetic purposes of God for Israel and the Jews relative to the church. If you want to understand the relationship between the church and the Jews, it's Romans 9, 10 and 11. He's talking about nations.

I wish I could that I myself were a curse separated from the Messiah for the sake of my brethren, my kinsmen, who are Israelites. He's talking about the Jewish nation, the race. For they're not all Israel, descended from Israel.

Being physically Jew is not good enough. Then they go on, just as it's written, Jacob I loved, Esau I hated, in verse 13. What shall we say then? There is no justice with God, as there may it never be.

For he who says to Moses, I will have mercy in whom I will have mercy and have compassion in whom I have compassion. So it does not depend on the man who wills or the man who runs, but on God who has mercy. For the scripture says to Pharaoh, for this very purpose I raised you up to demonstrate my power in you, that my name might be proclaimed throughout the whole earth.

So he has mercy in whom he desires and he hardens the heart of whom he desires. You will say to me then, why does he still find fault with who can resist his will? On the contrary, who are you, O man, who answers back to God? The thing molded will not say to the molder, why did you make me like this, will it? Or does the potter have a right, does not the potter have a right over the clay to make from the lump one vessel for honor and another for common use? So from this, the Calvinists, and remember Calvin did not invent Calvinism, his followers did. Beza and his followers did at something called the remonstrance of Dort.

They came up with the idea of the tulip. Total depravity, unlimited, undeserved grace, limited atonement, meaning Jesus did not die for everybody, irresistible grace, and perseverance. In other words, if you are elect, if you are elect from before the foundation of the world, if you were created to go to heaven, you are going to go to heaven, and if you were created to go to hell, you are going to go to hell.

You can't fall away, you must get saved, and if you're not created for heaven, that's it. Predestination becomes their version of election. Notice it's talking about nations, not people.

Not only is Romans 9 to 11 talking about the election of a nation, not an individual, but so does the Old Testament passages on which it quotes. Look at Jeremiah chapter 18, verse 2, Arise, go down to the potter's house, and there I shall announce my words to you. Then I went down to the potter's house, and there he was making something on the wheel, but the vessel that was making of clay was spoiled in the hand of the potter, so he remade it into another vessel as it pleased the potter to make.

Then the word of the Lord came to me, saying, Can I not, O house of Israel, deal with you as this potter does? Declares the Lord, Behold, like the clay in the potter's hand, so are you in my hand, O house of Israel. Now look, At one moment I might speak concerning a nation or concerning a kingdom, to uproot, to pull it down, or destroy it. If that nation against which I have spoken turns from its evil, I will relent concerning the calamity I plan to bring against it.

Or at another moment, I might speak concerning a nation or concerning a kingdom, to build up or to plant it. If it does evil in my sight by not obeying my voice, then I will think better of the good with which I promise to bless it. Then for chapter 19, verse 1, Thus says the Lord, Go and buy a potter's earthenware jar and take some of the elders of Israel.

And he goes through the whole ritual. Both Romans 9 and Jeremiah 18 and 19 are not speaking of individuals. They are speaking of nations.

So the Calvinists must pervert out of all reasonable context both what the New Testament says and what the Old Testament says. They are misapplying something about the election of a nation to people as individuals. Secondly, notice how the potter will do it.

If you do this, I will do that. But if you repent, I won't do that. It's a total perversion.

Now how did they wind up at something so ridiculous out of context? Calvinists are great at violating their own principles. Pay attention. Again, you do not correct one error with another.

You correct error with truth. What the Reformers did was correct one error with another. This has gone on in the church for centuries.

For instance, in the early church there was a council called Chalcedon. There were people who were denying the deity of Christ. So this was one of the councils held to affirm the deity of Christ and the Trinity.

There were others. However, at this council of Chalcedon, while it is impossible to overstate the deity of Christ, you can't overstate God being God. You can't overstate his deity.

You can understate his humanity. You understand? He was 100% God and 100% man. So they're so anxious to uphold his deity against those who are denying it that they understated his humanity.

And they wound up with something called a Benetarian Christology. They focused on the Father and the Son, but they left the Holy Spirit almost out of it. Why? Jesus was human.

As God, he could have walked on the water, but didn't. As God, he could have fed the 5,000, but didn't. How did Jesus walk on the water? The Holy Spirit empowered him.

How did Jesus do miracles? The same way you and I do. The power of the Holy Spirit. He never once used his divine power.

Satan attempted to tempt him to use his divine power. Satan tried to get Jesus to use his divine power and he refused. He would only do what he saw his Father doing.

He was fully human and fully divine. And so, Jesus did these things because he was God. No, no.

Jesus could have rose from the dead because he was God, but didn't. The Father raised him up. Jesus could have walked on the water because he was God, but he didn't.

The Spirit empowered him to do miracles. So the Holy Spirit becomes downplayed. Now, as a result, you get two errors.

The Holy Spirit becomes downplayed. This is the root of cessationism. This is the root of mariolatry.

Well, Jesus is God and we can't go to God because we're separated from sin, so we need a mediator to God. Instead of that being the Holy Spirit, as the Bible teaches, becomes Mary. Understand? She's the co-mediatrix.

They correct one error with another. Well, that's what the Reformers did. They corrected one error with another.

What was the errors they were trying to correct? The Roman Catholic Church, in order to build the Vatican, to build St. Peter's, to build the great cathedrals of the Renaissance, needed a lot of money. And so the Dominicans, the same murdering hooligans who were responsible for the Inquisitions, and remember, in Rwanda, three years ago, two Dominican nuns were sentenced to prison in Belgium for genocide of 7,000 people in the conflict between the Hutu and Tutsi. The Dominicans are still murderers.

They're still genocidal killers that they were in the Middle Ages. Rome never changes. Jesuits and Dominicans are evil, evil, evil.

They're from Satan. You had Petzl, the Dominican indulgence merchant. When a coin into the box rings, a pole, when a coin into the box rings, a soul from purgatory springs.

And when your mother died, he'd come to send a Dominican to preach at the funeral. Your poor mother's in hell, in purgatory, burning. Sonny, get me out of here.

You want to leave your mother burning like this? The Dominicans taught that you could rape Mary, the mother of Christ, and be forgiven if you had the right price. This inflamed Luther and sparked the Reformation. There was no biblical teaching about purgatory.

The Bible says the blood of Christ cleanses from all sin. But the Roman Church had to say, no, you have to atone for your own in purgatory. Only there's no purgatory in the Bible.

So they had to canonize, make canonical, the Apocrypha. You know the Apocrypha books? First and second Enoch, first and second Maccabees, because there's one verse in Maccabees that says it's a good thing to pray for the dead. One, the Apocrypha is the only biblically important history.

It's not scripture. It's not doctrine. It's the only biblically important history.

And two, that was written to Jews. What it meant was the souls were in the bosom of Abraham waiting for the Messiah to come. Pray for the dead, but pray the Messiah would come so they could go to heaven.

You understand? That's what it meant. The Romans, of course, took these books that the Apostles never considered part of the Canada Scripture, or that the Jews never considered part of it, and they made them part of the Scripture. They got money.

So this idea, you have to atone for your own sin, and you can lose your salvation, and you, you know, you got to do that, you got to do that, no assurance of salvation. So in order to refute this religious psychosis, bred by Roman Catholicism, which exists to this day, they came up with the idea of perseverance. Once saved, always saved.

That's it. If you're elect, you don't have to worry. You can, you understand.

They were trying to refute this error with another error. Now, I'm not saying their intentions were wrong. John Calvin was not one of the Reformers.

The Reformation was triggered when Erasmus of Rome in Rotterdam published his Greek New Testament. Before that, people were only reading Latin Vulgate, the Latin. Now people begin going back to the original Greek.

People say that, that, that Erasmus laid the egg, Luther hatched it. When the Reformation really was, was, came into being with Erasmus, Calvin was not even born. When Luther nailed his 95 thesis to the door of the Wittenberg Cathedral, John Calvin was a baby.

He had nothing to do with the Reformation. The Reformation was going on for two generations before Calvin even arrived in Geneva, before he even showed up. When Calvin arrived in Geneva, he was invited there by people like someone called Pharrell, and he was influenced by another Reformer called Busser.

And Calvin began going back to Augustine. What Augustine did in the early church was this. He took a Hebrew faith, the gospel was Jewish, and made it a Platonic faith, Greek.

He Hellenized it, following Plato's philosophy. To have a Reformation, to go back to what the apostles taught and believed, you had to get rid of this. He didn't.

So what happened was this. You had the original Hebrew gospel, Jesus the Jewish Messiah, Augustine comes, and it becomes Platonic. When it was Hellenized, it first becomes Platonic.

But in the Middle Ages, a Rabbi named Maimonides Aristotelianized Judaism, imitating Muslims, who were into Aristotle's philosophy at that time. And Thomas Aquinas comes along, and he Aristotelianizes Christendom. That's Aristotelian.

Now, Aristotelianism in the church is called Thomist. Thomist. From Thomas Aquinas.

You had Catholic orders following of orders of priests following Aristotle, fighting with the ones who followed Plato. The Franciscans, they hated each other. They hated each other.

There were splits in the Catholic church before the Reformation. The ones who were Platonists fighting the ones who were Aristotelian. Calvin comes along, and he wants to correct what Aristotle did.

Now, one of the things Aristotle did was he tried to explain transubstantiation with Aristotle's philosophy. Aristotle had a debunked view of chemistry and physics called accidents. Accidents.

In 1st, 2nd Peter, chapter 3, you have the word in Greek stoichiometry. In fact, elemental chemistry, you know, like the periodic chart with the gram atomic weight and atomic number, that's called stoichiometry. OK? Stoichiometry.

The Greeks knew about elements, stoichiometry. They knew about atoms, atoms, that which is indivisible. At least they theorized they exist.

But they knew nothing about subatomic particles. Nothing. Nothing.

What they believed was on an elemental level something could be one thing but could appear to be something else. What it appeared to be was its mere accidents. In other words, this may look like a red marker.

It may write like a red marker. But that's only its accidents. In actual fact, it's a cigar.

Give me a light. This may look like water, might taste like water, but actually it's Gordon's gin, 48 rounds a jug. That's not gin, yes it is, but that's only its accidents.

It tastes like water. Now, understand, they didn't call this faith. They really believed chemically that's what it was.

Today, a Roman Catholic says, well, we just accept that it's really the Lord's body and blood by faith. We accept it. When Aquinas said the Eucharist, the bread and wine is human protoplasm, Christ's protoplasm, transubstantiated into his actual protoplasm, to them it wasn't faith.

They thought chemically that's what it was. Of course, with the Enlightenment, people understood that's not what it was. Alchemy disappeared.

Chemistry replaced alchemy. Superstition went out the window. People know that's not what it was.

But they still teach that's what it is. Now they say it's, we believe it by faith, it's by faith. In the beginning it wasn't faith, that's what they thought it was chemically.

That's what they thought it was chemically. For instance, this jacket is not charcoal gray. We know nothing has any color.

The molecular constituency of this jacket simply reflects certain colors that are already in the atmosphere. Now we know that, okay? It appears to be gray, but we can prove with spectrometry, with spectrographic analysis, that it's not gray, okay? We know a physicist can prove this is not gray. Nothing has any color, its constituency only reflects colors in the atmosphere, okay? Seems like hocus-pocus, but it's not.

You can prove it. This seems like hocus-pocus, but you can prove it, because it is hocus-pocus. That's where you get the word hocus-pocus.

In Latin, the vogue, this is my body, in Latin, hoc est corpus meum, hoc est corpus meum, that's where they get the word hocus-pocus. Now, the reformers come along, and they realize this idolatry and cannibalism for what it is, so they try to correct it, so they try to correct it. They throw out this, and go back to this.

The issue is not to go back to this. The aim is not to go back to this. The aim is to go back to this.

I'm not talking about going back under the law. I'm not talking about Judaization, but I'm talking about a Jewish understanding of the scripture. The original Christianity taught by Jesus and the apostles was a Judaic faith.

What you're largely left with is a choice between two errors. Now, in Geneva, when Calvin came and took over, let's think of the Taliban. Women being degraded, mistreated, and beaten.

It's the right of a husband to beat his wife. In fact, it's the responsibility of a husband and father to beat his wife and his daughters. And for public entertainment, the clergy will flog your wife and your daughter for public entertainment, will flog them in public, and will have religious police, the Mutawa in Saudi Arabia, they have different ones and the street with whips.

You see them walking around. I go to the Persian Gulf. They walk around with rods.

And they make sure everybody is observing. You take off the bikir, whack! Then, of course, No other public entertainment, no sports or anything like that. No, bring everybody down to the stadium and watch some decapitations.

Then they put a religious banner over this grotesque, sadistic form of entertainment. Sadistic entertainment, but it becomes something carried out in the name of religion. That was what the Taliban did.

We all know it. That is exactly what John Calvin did in Geneva. And it is what the Puritans did in England.

Well, the husband is the head of the wife as Christ is the head of the church. Christ corrects the church, a husband should correct his wife, so they made rules. You can beat your wife with a rod, but it can't be any thicker than your thumb.

And if she was still insubmissive, bring her to the elders of the church and they'd put her on public pillories, and have your wife publicly humiliated by the clergy. Now, I can understand their point, but when push comes to shove, I couldn't agree with it. I'd say it shouldn't be any thicker than your pinky.

They did the same thing. It was a police state, a theocratic police state that was oppressive. They burst into your house without a warrant, and if they didn't like the way your wife was wearing her hair, they'd arrest her.

They'd arrest you. You didn't go to church, you'd be arrested, publicly flogged. Where'd they get this idea of publicly flogging people for not going to church? Killing people.

Augustine. You know what Augustine said? Well, God used violence to convert St. Paul and knocked him off a horse, so therefore we can use violence to convert people to Christ. Yet they call him St. Augustine.

Augustine refuted a heretic called Pelagius in England who denied original sin. So the Calvinists have it in their mind that if you don't agree with Augustine, and if you're not a Calvinist, you're a Pelagian, you deny original sin. Nothing can be further than the truth.

Don't deny original sin. But you don't have to be a Calvinist to realize there's original sin. Now, there's more to it than this, but let's move on.

In England, the witch hunter general, Cotton Mathers. Colonial Massachusetts, Salem, Massachusetts. The Puritans would use spectral evidence to kill people, mainly women.

You know what spectral evidence is? In rules of jurisprudence, you have forensic evidence. You have circumstantial evidence. You have prima facie evidence.

There's all kinds of evidence. And the law says this is admissible, this isn't. This is evidence you can only use to support other evidence, but it can't be primary evidence to bring a conviction.

The Puritans had spectral evidence. Oh, I was praying last night, and the Lord showed me she had a spirit of witchcraft. You get two people praying.

Oh, the Lord showed me she had a spirit of witchcraft. She's dead. Crazy.

Crazy. Charismania beyond charismania. Calvinists are always the worst at what they're against.

Today they'd be cessationists. They have been the worst at what they claim to be against. Spectral evidence, taking over the institutions of government.

Kingdom now theology, dominion theology. That is where they got this amillennial, postmillennial hogwash. The early church was totally, totally of the belief that the Messiah would come back and fulfill the rest of the messianic prophecies and set up the kingdom.

That's what they all believed. After Constantine makes Christendom the religion of the state, no, now the church is the millennium. In the year 999 A.D., everybody began giving their money to the Pope and their castles and their land, because they thought it was the end of the world, that Jesus was going to come.

It was Pope Sylvester. It was Y1K. Same thing happened at Y1K.

Same thing. Same kind of nut job stuff. Same thing.

Same thing happened. Same thing. So Calvinists say, this is the millennium.

We have to set up the kingdom of God on Earth. Dominion theology, kingdom now theology. The real craziness in the church, the things that I have stood most against, that you see abundant in hyper-charismatics and in extreme Pentecostals.

Those three things, which Bill Randles and myself have most opposed, have not begun with Pentecostals or charismatics. They began with Calvinists. One, subjective revelation.

Not only did they do what you see these other nuts doing today. God showed me you have a spirit of lust. God showed me you have a spirit of greed.

God showed me you have a spirit of witchcraft. They would criminally and capitally sentence people on that basis. Two, post-millennialism, dominion theology, kingdom now.

The Rick Godwin stuff. Rouse's Rush Dooney. This comes from Calvinism, post-millennialism.

A better term is, the actual theological term is, among the charismatics it's called dominionism or triumphalism. The theological term is reconstructionism. All it is, is post-millennialism taken to its natural conclusions.

Third, the gospel of wealth, the money preaching, the mammon worship, the Copeland, Hagin, Ramos stuff. The wealth of the wicked is laid up for the righteous. That's true in the millennium and in heaven.

These people took that and they applied it to the Protestant work ethic. It's fitting that the white people have the money. We're in the Dutch Reformed Church and we're the elect.

The wealth of the wicked is laid up for the righteous. These Zulus went to Muti and St. Gormas and witch doctors. We have Dormenes, the Protestant work ethic and the true God.

We're the elect. Now the hyper-Pentecostals and the charismaniacs have picked up on this stuff. But they didn't invent it.

Calvinists invented it. They're the ones who invented it. And the history of violence in England.

The English Puritan Calvinists and the Scottish Presbyterian Calvinists massacred each other. Why? Well, read the book of Joshua. The church is now Israel, replacement theology.

What happened when the Transjordan tribes thought that the Gadites, the Reubenites and a half-tribe of Menasha were making an idol? They went to war against their Hebrew brothers to uphold the word of God. Church is Israel, we have to do the same thing. Well, how do you make war? Let's see what the Bible says.

Well, Joshua killed every man, woman and child among the Canaanites. Let's go to Ireland and do the same thing to the Catholics. John Wesley made 18 trips to Ireland.

And he said, if this is the way Protestants treat Catholics, no wonder these people don't want to get saved. It's an ugly, grotesque history. Jesus said, you will know them by their roots.

Am I angry at Calvinist people? No. People are born into it and grow up in it and don't know any better. Put it to you this way.

When a sincere person is honestly misled, and he or she is confronted with the truth, when a sincere person who is honestly misled is confronted with the truth, they will either cease to be misled or they will cease to be honest. I accept the fact that there are people in this room who used to be in lunatic asylum churches with crosses on roofs. They were over at Raised Place or something.

They never knew any better. That's all they ever heard. That's all they were ever taught.

But in his grace and mercy, providentially at some point, God caused them to be confronted with the truth of his word. And they came out of it. Well, that is true of Raised Place.

That is no less true of the Dormonees Place. God bless.

Audio: <https://sermonindex1.b-cdn.net/19/SID19017.mp3>

Source: <https://sermonindex.net/speakers/jacob-prasch/what-the-reformers-forgot/>

Grow in Your Walk with Christ

Listen and read messages that will stir your heart for Christ and point you to deeper repentance and devotion.

- 50,000+ Sermons from speakers past and present
- 3,900+ Classic Christian Books freely readable online
- 1,200+ Bible Translations and Commentaries
- Over 450k forum posts — Join our vibrant online Christian forum

www.sermonindex.net