

**General Topics :: Brownsville, Heretics, and so on...**

**Brownsville, Heretics, and so on... - posted by FireinmyBones1 (), on: 2005/12/20 15:05**

Once again I am not one bit disappointed by the abundance of "righteous" discernment and "watchman on the wall", attitudes which seem to prevail on this site. Many of the posts in response to the recent post "Brownsville Revival: the simple truth" only confirmed this. When I first came to this site I thought that I would find a group of like-minded people - in love with Jesus, and Desperate for Revival. I soon found that as soon as I mentioned my background (a graduate of Brownsville Revival School of Ministry) my love for God, hunger for Him, passion for revival, and any fruit in my present ministry was called into question. At first I took offense and typed out lengthy posts using scripture, history as well as quotes from past revival leaders which we all look up to. Yet to no avail - these are all simply ignored and met with a haughty, irrational and biased - "Brownsville is heresy - Awaken the watchmen - the church is deceived and I'm here to tell you about it!"

So I simply decided to rest my case and resolved that in heaven we will both bow before the same king and the arguing will finally cease! Praise God!

I say to you though my friends - TackleBox in particular...

A dear brother or sister going by the name "SJ" posted you their testimony as to how God changed their life at Brownsville. Yet his post (unless I missed it) was almost completely disregarded and instead we squabbled about manifestations, as well as some superfluous references to Toronto's fruit being widespread adultery and split churches (to which I reply: study the first Great Awakening for goodness sake - Johnathon Edwards preaching resulted in suicide once! Is he a heretic? Split churches? and then some...) Come on my dear brothers and sisters! We will ignore the testimony of a changed life and instead base our opinions on videos produced by already biased cessationist brothers and sisters! It is certainly time we grew up! I question if some of us would recognize real revival if it shook hands with us!

Please friends I do not mean to chime in with the critics by presenting my own criticism...I am simply sick and tired of false discernment cloaking itself in righteousness - criticizing brothers and sisters who are actually out doing the work of the Kingdom while we sit behind our monitors typing away!

If you have such a discerning gift then please find a place in the local church and give your keyboard a break! Also if Brownsville was such a heretical botching of the truth and misrepresentation of real revival - then we could have used your keen insight into spiritual matters when the revival was still an issue! (isn't there something in scripture about a word in DUE SEASON? - forgive my sarcasm) I certainly hope some of you will at least THINK about this before passing it off as more heresy - but alas I foresee very few replies to this post - although I do expect the occasional "PURIFY THE TEMPLE! REMNANT UNITE AND ROOT OUT THE HERETICS" type of reply - which is "a" typical to the pharisaical heart.

For an extremely good look at this from a scholar and active participant in the Revival read Dr. Michael Brown's "Let No One Deceive You" reprinted as "The Revival Answer Book".

Burning,  
Jeff

**Re: Brownsville, Heretics, and so on... - posted by crsschk (), on: 2005/12/20 15:30**

Jeff,

I want to both agree and disagree. A couple of dissenting views do not make a majority as to this forum, that's an unfair characterization I believe. At the same time I also have learned much about many things here, one of them is Ravenhill-esque notion that "An experience is at the mercy of an argument" taken in its rightful place. There should be a fair amount of give and take in these things...

Also, it might be better to have this in keeping with the rest of the ongoing thread, even though I can understand your wanting to separate it out for emphasis sake.

Lastly, how much of this has been covered in past threads? At some point there seems to be an unhealthy bitterness that creeps in, that's to both sides.

**Re: Brownsville, Heretics, and so on... - posted by tacklebox (), on: 2005/12/20 15:41**

Fireinmybones,

The post I started on Brownsville didn't begin with me wanting to bash it - at the time I simply had been talking a lot about revival, and this guy who had been there told me to check it out. At the time of posting, I still didn't know much, but among the first things I heard about it were troubling.

I only wanted to arrive at the truth of the matter. That's all. I wanted to keep it simple and had no idea there was a big fuss about it.

If you took some of the comments personally, please reconsider the motive behind those posting. Some might have been quick to condemn, but making bold assumptions about everyone else on this board is a little rash, don't you think?

I know that I want to know God in all His fullness, and I have no problem with Him pushing my boundaries, but we have to know when it's not God doing the pushing.

We are creatures of extremes. When too many people flock to the left side of the boat, we instinctively try to get everyone else flock to the right side. But wisdom tells us the best way to keep the boat afloat is for everyone to stop running around and sit in the middle - to find the balance point.

We need to find the balance here. At least one brother (or sister - not sure) here is offended. Not that unity should trump truth, but let's pick our battles wisely.

I think it's safe to say that Brownsville should no longer be considered a revival - I am seeing full agreement there.

The original thread has taught me some things, and it has sparked my interest more in the early days of Brownsville instead of what it turned into.

As we approach a new year, let's all make sure our focus is on revival here and now. May it break out soon, beginning with our own hearts!

**Re: - posted by sj, on: 2005/12/20 16:16**

I think there is something happening here that only those who actually went to revival can feel and that's this:

Jesus used the revival to change our lives for Him, to hear people criticize it and demonize it in some cases it's like hearing someone curse Jesus. (after all to slander His Spirit is to slander Him). It's infinitely more than some theology or distant doctrine to us. We met God in that place. To have what you hold sacred desecrated invokes a feeling I can't even begin to describe. To have the very whispers of God to your heart be dissected like a frog is such a violating thing I can barely explain it.

It was HOLY. It's like someone criticizing how you and your wife make love. Where do they get the right?? It's repulsive, it's angering, it's violating a lot of things...

But I understand the other point of view which is

that the thing was false. So in which case none of those experiences matter and "anything goes" as far as criticism and fault-finding.

You must remember though some of these people are not names to us they are FACES. They are personal. When you say "the conversions were false" we hear "your conversion and the conversion of your friends and family were false"

So dear brother, don't be offended at those who

criticize what they haven't experienced. Yes some are hostile but others simply don't know. All they have heard is the slander so how CAN they know?

Of course those who refuse to know by finding some first hand evidence and still criticize and go on slandering set themselves up for Judgment but that's their choice. Let them be.

The important thing is you were there. It's not a doctrine it's what you have "seen and heard that we declare". So remember what God has done and press forward!

The important thing (as tacklebox said) is that we seek revival now. You and I and others who experienced it may have somewhat of an insight to a degree of what to expect...but why not just press in together and when He comes just kind of wink at them and say "see...told ya"

As far as the "don't take it personal" advice...try trash taking someone's spouse in front of them...it's pretty hard to be "objective and calm" in the face of that. What you call "revival" we remember as the manifest Glory and Presence of God.

It's just like salvation:

Impossible to describe before you get it, no need to describe once you do.

and the Baptism of the Holy Spirit,

sounds like non-sense before you get it, then it's the most precious thing in the world once you do.  
So is Revival.  
In all cases the experience illuminates the theology.

**Re: Brownsville, Heretics, and so on..., on: 2005/12/20 16:48**

It's interesting that when someone gets upset that others see things differently we are told that we should not judge. Yet the same people who say we should not judge will say things such as:

Quote:  
-----although I do expect the occasional "PURIFY THE TEMPLE! REMNANT UNITE AND ROOT OUT THE HERETICS" type of reply -  
**which is "a" typical to the pharisaical heart.**  
-----

Isn't *that* judgemental? Isn't that a double standard?

In my post I merely pointed out that there are many grievous false teachings in many of the "so-called revivals". I made it clear that we can not judge the heart, but we are certainly commanded to judge the teachings and activities.

To say that there are those here with a "**pharisaical heart**" is the type of judgment that is forbidden. Only God can judge the heart.

I would caution you against making those type of statements.

Krispy

**Re: Brownsville, Heretics, and so on... - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2005/12/20 18:44**

Jeff,

I really am not interested in weighing in on this Brownsville controversy, but I would like for you to be aware of something: it is not impossible for a person to come to Christ, experience forgiveness of sins while under the teaching of a false prophet! I have met a man who was soundly converted under these circumstances and is reluctant to tell people what the situation was in which he met the LORD Jesus. Another person who comes to mind is David Bercot. He and his wife came to the LORD while a Jehovah's Witness and served there for some time before the LORD led them out of it.

The point is that because someone finds the LORD under the ministry of certain people this will not legitimize that person's standing before God. Remember Jesus' words when he described the things people will say when they appear before the judgement throne of God?: 'Many will say to me in that day, "Lord, Lord, did we not prophesy in your name, and in your name cast out demons, and in your name perform many miracles?" And then I will declare to them, I never knew you; depart from me, you who practice lawlessness.' Matthew 7:22 (NASB).

This is serious and sobering.

Also I do not believe the people on this forum are interested in hurting or destroying you. They are people who care very much about protecting themselves and others from deception.

Blessings,  
ginnyrose

**Re: - posted by habakkuk3 (), on: 2005/12/20 21:55**

I would suggest reading Jesse Penn-Lewis "War on the Saints." It's available on this site and both her and Evan Roberts lived through a great revival.

This is from Chapter 12...

We have seen that the period in the believer's life wherein he receives the Baptism of the Holy Spirit is the special time of danger from the evil supernatural world, and the Baptism of the Spirit is THE ESSENCE OF REVIVAL. Revival dawn, is, therefore, the great moment for deceiving spirits to find entrance into the believer by deception through counterfeits, resulting sometimes in the possession dealt with in preceding pages.

The hour of Revival is a time of crisis and possible catastrophe. A crisis in the history of every individual, as well as in the history of a country, a church, or a district. A crisis for the unregenerate man, wherein he settles his eternal destiny, as he accepts, or rejects conversion to God; a crisis to those who receive the fulness of the Holy Spirit, and to those who reject Him; for to the believer who bends and receives the Holy Spirit, it is the day of the visitation of the Most High, but to others it means the decision whether they will become spiritual men or remain carnal (1 Cor. 3: 1); whether they will elect to remain in defeat in the personal life, or determine to press on as overcomers.

Few go through the crisis without deception by the enemy in more or less degree, and only those who cling to the use of their reasoning faculties at this time, can hope to be saved from the catastrophe of becoming a victim to the subtle workings of evil supernatural powers. If the believer does become deceived by evil spirits at the time that he is baptized with the Spirit, almost immediately after the highest point of his experience, he begins through deception to descend into a pit which ultimately means depth of darkness, bondage and misery, until he is undeceived and returns to the normal path. Those who do not discover the deceptions, sink into deeper deception, and become practically useless to God and to the Church.

**Re: Brownsville, Heretics, and so on... - posted by Sir\_Edward (), on: 2005/12/20 22:58**

I for one was not being critical of the revival -- I believe it was one and I believe people were genuinely touched and moved by it. My purpose was to bring some honesty to the assessment of what happened there to avoid problems of what to do when revival strikes somewhere else. I simply do not believe the notion that it stopped because of the critics -- the early church stands against that -- they were far more criticised and persecuted than Brownsville and not only survived -- but thrived. When a revival dies it does so for the same reason it started only in reverse -- people stop being humble, people stop praying and people stop being obedient. All these happened at the end at Brownsville which some who were a part of it will testify to. My point is I don't think trying to assess honestly what happened should automatically be labeled as criticism. I also want the truth. I don't completely agree with anyone, but I do see everyone's point and respect it. Doesn't mean I won't tell you you are wrong. This forum has a place to discuss doctrine this way-- why is religious practice off limits. Iron still sharpens iron.

As for purifying the body of Christ -- our brother is very correct -- you do not do that by getting rid of heretics. But we are called to separate ourselves from anything that is not pure and be holy as HE is holy.

Unfortunately I feel a lot of feelings got involved in this one because of people's experiences -- Experience is not the determining factor of truth -- The Word is. The one thing I did not see a lot of in the other thread was people using Scripture to back up their point (on both sides) -- it was a lot of 'my experience is more authoritative than yours'.

Fireinmybones1,

I don't care where you graduated from. If you the Lord and follow his Word you good to me. If you were there when the fire was hot -- could you tell me what it was like -- I haven't felt a hot fire of the Spirit in a long time. It would be nice to see a little of what I am looking forward to.

Be blessed.

**Re: Brownsville, Heretics, and so on... - posted by ravin, on: 2005/12/20 23:32**

Welcome to the world of micro management. I believe there is too much trying to move God and not letting God move us through the Holy Spirit. whatever happened to simple faith and that God who can rule the universe can point us in the right direction by the Holy Spirit. All of acts is about how the new body of Christ was moved and given direction through prayer and fasting and asking God the father through his son for the power of the comforter who was promised. we are to be humble yet its hard to find a humble person when you need one, all seem to be sitting on thrones and micro managing their fellow man. Paul said of old I to wish I was sitting on a throne with you all. But there was work to do. the world doesn't need to come up against christians, just leave us alone and we will fall apart on our own. each holding to his little scripture that God himself has given him and him alone. when Christ was told of one who was using his name to heal people, well the disciples in their wisdom told him to stop. for that person was not one of them. hmm sound familiar. because God hasn't spoken to us doesn't mean God in his wisdom hasn't spoken to someone else. I think maybe if we stop talking and start listening, praying without ceasing and fasting. looking to the God of heaven and of earth, showing him we are his and really have our heart in tune with him and not our own agenda. the power of God would come... and his might be shown.

quit looking at man and start looking to please God. say what you will it's God who is sitting on his throne and maybe laughing.

**Re: - posted by MD4Christ, on: 2005/12/21 0:02**

I used to be a charismatic. I chased "the anointing" by going out of my way to see Jesse Duplantis, Rod Parsley, David Hogan and Benny Hinn. I am thankful to Jesus that He delivered me from such error and revealed to me that this movement is full of emotionalism and big talking and stories with no real hunger to know the truth or desire to exalt Jesus as Lord. Instead, people are being exalted and the true preaching of God's Word is replaced by singing, dramatic emotional experiences and more singing. And if anyone questions these leaders or the movement, guess what they are called. Yep, that's right-religious pharisees. Well, call me what you will, but I care about the TRUTH being told and I care about your soul. There are many dangerous doctrines in the charismatic movement. If you truly are Christ's, you will obey His Word, rather than following experiences that contradict His Word. Read the Bible and any experience that claims to be of God needs to be tested by the Bible.

**Re:, on: 2005/12/21 6:10**

Quote:  
-----I used to be a charismatic. I chased "the anointing" by going out of my way to see Jesse Duplantis, Rod Parsley, David Hogan and Benny Hinn. I am thankful to Jesus that He delivered me from such error and revealed to me that this movement is full of emotionalism and big talking and stories with no real hunger to know the truth or desire to exalt Jesus as Lord. Instead, people are being exalted and the true preaching of God's Word is replaced by singing, dramatic emotional experiences and more singing. And if anyone questions these leaders or the movement, guess what they are called. Yep, that's right-religious pharisees. Well, call me what you will, but I care about the TRUTH being told and I care about your soul. There are many dangerous doctrines in the charismatic movement. If you truly are Christ's, you will obey His Word, rather than following experiences that contradict His Word. Read the Bible and any experience that claims to be of God needs to be tested by the Bible.  
-----

Ditto... thats my testimony as well.

Krispy

**Re: - posted by sj, on: 2005/12/21 9:28**

I see alot of ignorance arguing against experience.  
blah blah blah, you went there and you cant prove a whit of what you are saying.

**Re: - posted by Sir\_Edward (), on: 2005/12/21 15:04**

It is not ignorance, just a simple understanding that experience is not authoritative. The Word of God is. Experience does indeed authenticate the authority of the Word, but it can never supplant it as authoritative in and of itself. It can validate but not dictate.

Blessings.

**Re: - posted by jimp, on: 2005/12/21 16:11**

hello. the idea that some of us have that the bible has set us up to be judges and juries over everything that happens everywhere is forbidden by scripture. there are three words in the greek that are translated 'judge' 1. krinos 2. anakrinos 3. diakrinos .. do a word study on these before you write your next post. and people ask " why revival tarries' jimp

**Re:, on: 2005/12/22 8:05**

Quote:  
-----hello. the idea that some of us have that the bible has set us up to be judges and juries over everything that happens everywhere is forbidden by scripture. there are three words in the greek that are translated 'judge' 1. krinos 2. anakrinos 3. diakrinos .. do a word study on these before you write your next post. and people ask " why revival tarries' jimp  
-----

I recommend the book "Who Are You To Judge" by Dr. Erwin W. Lutzer. It's a balanced look at what scripture says concerning the Christians responsibility to judge all things with righteous judgement.

I challenge anyone on here who believes that we should not judge doctrine, teachings, movements, etc to read this book . I double dare ya... :-)

Krispy

**Re: - posted by sj, on: 2005/12/22 8:24**

Without experience you cannot possibly understand.  
That IS why Ravenhill said "A man with an experience is NEVER subject to a man with an argument."  
You will call that heresy or whatever but it's a both a Scriptural and experiential fact that the Scriptures only make sense in the Presence of God.  
Proof?  
The entire Jewish nation missed Jesus because of their wrong understanding of what to expect.  
The Disciples who were in His presence seemed to get it more than them but even still struggled.  
Intimacy creates accuracy. There is NO accuracy without intimacy.  
Experience:  
1. You never understood salvation until you experienced it  
2. I'm sure you never understood the Baptism of the Holy Spirit until you experienced it. (if you have not yet than that explains alot)

And i can say as a matter of fact that if you havent experienced it and you discount the experience of those who have you dont have a clue what real revival is. And you are too proud to find out from people who do.

**Re: - posted by Sir\_Edward (), on: 2005/12/22 21:39**

Quote:  
-----There is NO accuracy without intimacy.  
-----

There is also no intimacy without accuracy either. The two go hand in hand. Accuracy about the God we serve also builds intimacy as well. Example: The more I truly see the way my wife really is the more our relationship grows. If I try to make her into something she is not -- relationship suffers. The same is true with God. Many have experienced God's wrath and assumed that is all he is about or his mercy and the same. It is only in Scriptural revelation that we have a hope of seeing God for who he really is. It defines the relationship and the terms of the covenant we must have with him. Reason, experience and tradition cannot do this -- they all have a tendency to shape God into an image that is acceptable to us. This is idolatry.

Blessings.



Re: - posted by Christisking (), on: 2005/12/23 1:10

Quote:  
-----I recommend the book "Who Are You To Judge" by Dr. Erwin W. Lutzer. It's a balanced look at what scripture says concerning the Christians responsibility to judge all things with righteous judgement.

I challenge anyone on here who believes that we should not judge doctrine, teachings, movements, etc to read this book. I double dare ya...

-----  
Hey Krispy - good to see you back around again - your posts (most ;-)) have been a blessing. I'm not much for reading other than the Bible and the "dead guys" (Wesley, Finney, Edwards, Murray, Whitefield, Bounds, etc.) The last book I read by a "living guy" was per your recommendation - Pagan Christianity by Frank Viola. I read the entire book in 2 days and was glad I did. So I think I will take your suggestion again - this book sounds right up my alley and I know Lutzer wrote the forward to K.P.'s book Road To Reality so he already has a mark in the plus column in my mind.

What happens if we a good ministry like World Challenge, Gospel For Asia or Living Waters suddenly take a turn for the worse and head down a path of destruction? I look forward reading this book - thanks for the challenge Krispy.

Re: - posted by jimp, on: 2005/12/23 5:24

hi your honors,lol i will give you a ravenhill quote maybe some of you might not have heard him say" many know the word of God but fewer know the God of the word". critisizm is what makes aqa man like a strong tower,and is really worthless. to tell a roman that the earth is filled with the blood of their victoms and that the error of their doctrine would fill the universe would tend to shut his hearing aid off.you would have the truth, the Lord, the bible but you would never reach him.if we demonstrate JESUS TO PEOPLE and preach the gospelin love and wisdom He will add to the church daily. jimp

Re: - posted by crsschk (), on: 2005/12/23 9:43

Always learning...

Might be more careful in choosing where to insert quotes in the future.

Quote:  
-----  
Without experience you cannot possibly understand.  
That IS why Ravenhill said "A man with an experience is NEVER subject to a man with an argument."  
You will call that heresy or whatever but it's a both a Scriptural and experiential fact that the Scriptures only make sense in the Presence of God.  
Proof?  
The entire Jewish nation missed Jesus because of their wrong understanding of what to expect.  
The Disciples who were in His presence seemed to get it more than them but even still struggled.  
Intimacy creates accuracy. There is NO accuracy without intimacy.  
Experience:  
1. You never understood salvation until you experienced it  
2. I'm sure you never understood the Baptism of the Holy Spirit until you experienced it. (if you have not yet than that explains alot)

And i can say as a matter of fact that if you havent experienced it and you discount the experience of those who have you dont have a clue what real revival is. And you are too proud to find out from people who do.

-----  
Unfortunately it is not all that easy and it might be telling to re-read your own words there in the use of the word; "proud".

Though it was adequately addressed already, a bit of clarification. Ravenhill may not have been the originator of that sentiment but I think the tense of it is brought out here:

*"Neither side can prove with pure powers of logic their argument, and in the end it comes down to the power behind what you believe. That is where the real difference lies. That is why a man with experience is never at the mercy of a man with an argument. It's one thing to wax philosophical about the conditions of war or even how soldiers conduct themselves, but it's another thing to have been there and know why soldiers behave the way they do. The man with philosophy is never at the mercy of the soldier. There is power in experience".*

Came across that looking for the context of Ravenhills particular quotation. The point seems to be at the *mercy* of, not that the proof is in experience *alone*, that what be sure folly, it's only that the burden falls on the one with an argument bearing of any particular 'experience', not just "your" experience.

Sir-Edward grasped it rightly;

Quote:

-----There is also no intimacy without accuracy either. The two go hand in hand.  
-----

It is just as easy to forget that one is talking with other believers here who have had their own particular experiences, not always good and those can range across all kinds of other matters beyond just one particular point in time.

**Re: - posted by GaryE (), on: 2005/12/23 12:41**

I found this surfing the net. The third and fourth chapters fit very well with the discussion on this post. It states what Jonathan Edwards's opinion was supposed to be of that period of the Great Awakening. It seemed a good idea to include the rest of the article.

In Christ,  
GaryE

Stornoway Gazette

week beginning 5 January 2003

The Great Awakener

I have been busy trying to remind people that 2003 marks the three hundredth anniversary of the birth of Jonathan Edwards (not the triple jumper, you understand, but the great theologian and President of Princeton – for further information see our congregational website). There are some men worth remembering – and Edwards is one of them.

Yet I was intrigued by one biography of the great man, which is entitled Jonathan Edwards – The Great Awakener. The title derives from the period known as the First Great Awakening – a period of about four years from 1740 onwards when Edwards' parish in Northampton saw a remarkable revival of interest in spiritual things. Edwards' thoughts on this, and earlier, revivals are of interest, if only to raise a question about the legitimacy of the description of himself as the awakener. Edwards described such revivals as 'a glorious work of God', and was motivated to defend them on account of the many voices which were opposed to them.

Edwards was only too aware of the fact that there were negative aspects to the Great Awakening. "The weakness of human nature," he wrote of the earlier revivals in Northampton, "has always appeared in times of great revival of religion, by a disposition to run to extremes, and get into confusion, and especially in these three things, enthusiasm, superstition and intemperate zeal". Edwards could not defend every element of religious enthusiasm during the period – there were, he acknowledged, 'accidental evils' in every period of revival. But these were in spite of the revival, and not on account of it; and as Edwards was quick to point out, no religious movement can be rubbished in whole simply because of the defects apparent in some of its parts.

Edwards' call was for his people to speak less of experience and more of grace, to do less complaining and more praying, to turn their attentions to the glory of the Gospel rather than to the phenomena of the revival. And he has some pertinent advice about the way in which people ought to talk about ministers. "If some Christians who have been complaining of their ministers, and struggling in vain to deliver themselves from the difficulties complained of under their ministry, had said and acted less before men, and had applied themselves with all their might to cry to God for their ministers... they would have been much more in the way of success". Perhaps we need Edwards more than we realise.

But my point is that Edwards, surrounded as he was with the glorious work of God called the Great Awakening, would have been aghast at the description of himself as the 'Great Awakener'. His Thoughts on the Revival of Religion in New



W England is remarkably free from any reference to himself. Indeed, he is at pains to point out that revival often took place in spite of the blemishes on the ministry. He talks about 'imprudent zeal', 'censorious spirit' and 'intemperate hearts' on the part of some who occupied New England pulpits and yet through whom the Spirit of God did his 'glorious work'. Of course Edwards is not excusing any of these faults; but he is reminding us that these blemishes, perhaps more than any other phenomenon, prove that the work was of God.

But it is a point that historians, secular and spiritual, often fail to realise. Edwards was not the Great Awakener – that work he would ascribe solely to the Holy Spirit of God. In the same way, however, Donald Macdonald, in his history of Lewis wrote of Alexander Macleod of Uig that "he found his parish in a very backward state spiritually but he changed all that".

To write in this way, however, is to confuse the cause of the revivals with the agents of the revivals. Edwards' language is both careful and clear. He warns against judging the revival by the instruments used in it, and reminds us both that it is a work of God and that in doing his glorious work, God used the ministers of New England to build up his church and to strengthen the cause of his kingdom.

In a world given to anti-supernaturalism it is all too easy to make the men the cause of the movement. But the evidence from Jonathan Edwards is quite contrary to this. For Edwards, the Great Awakening was precisely that – an awakening from spiritual slumber and deadness whose efficient cause was the Holy Spirit of God. That there was an awakening Edwards had not doubt; and nor did he doubt but that the awakener was God himself, and not any preacher whose ministry was instrumental in the revival.

It is possible to study the church, and even the history of revivals within the church, from a purely sociological point of view. Indeed, the last resort of postmodernism is to read the remarkable activity of God in history as a story of human achievement, or human failure. Witness, for example, the phrase beloved of the press in recent weeks, which has defined the church in Lewis as 'fundamentalism without power'.

Which is all part of the very position against which Edwards is writing. The church is not a sociological phenomenon, whose vicissitudes can be explained by the influences of strong personalities. As B.B. Warfield put it, "It... it was God who made us men: let us confess with equal heartiness that it is God who makes us Christians". And Edwards would have us confess with equal heartiness that it is the same God who awakens his church at times of religious revival.

One final word – Edwards was of the view that the media should be used to promote the interests of religious revival. He writes: "Great care should be taken that the press should be improved to no purpose contrary to the interest of this work". His justification for this was Judges 5:14, where those 'that handle the pen of the writer' helped the people of God against Sisera. Presumably that would also include those who punch the keyboard; in which case, the longer this column promotes the supernaturalism of the Christian religion, our local press is fulfilling its God-given function.

© Iain D. Campbell 2003

#### Re: - posted by sj, on: 2005/12/23 13:39

It's one thing to wax philosophical about the conditions of war or even how soldiers conduct themselves, but it's another thing to have been there and know why soldiers behave the way they do.

Exactly.

#### Revivals Past and Present, on: 2005/12/23 14:12

I don't know if anyone here has ever read about the Azusa Street Revival but here is a good website with some insight as to what went on there.

[www.sendrevival.com/history/azusa\\_street/](http://www.sendrevival.com/history/azusa_street/)

"...they run, jump, shake all over, shout to the top of their voice, spin around in circles, fall out onto the sawdust blanketed floor, jerking, kicking, and rolling all over it. Some of them pass out and do not move for hours as though they were dead."

**Re: The Great Awakener - posted by crsschk (), on: 2005/12/23 15:19**

Gary,

This is just outstanding. Thank you very much for bringing some needed clarity and expression.

Quote:

-----Edwards's call was for his people to speak less of experience and more of grace, to do less complaining and more praying, to turn their attentions to the glory of the Gospel rather than to the phenomena of the revival. And he has some pertinent advice about the way in which people ought to talk about ministers. "If some Christians who have been complaining of their ministers, and struggling in vain to deliver themselves from the difficulties complained of under their ministry, had said and acted less before men, and had applied themselves with all their might to cry to God for their ministers ... they would have been much more in the way of success". Perhaps we need Edwards more than we realise.

-----

Quote:

-----Which is all part of the very position against which Edwards is writing. The church is not a sociological phenomenon, whose vicissitudes can be explained by the influences of strong personalities. As B.B. Warfield put it, "... it was God who made us men: let us confess with equal heartiness that it is God who makes us Christians". And Edwards would have us confess with equal heartiness that it is the same God who awakens his church at times of religious revival.

-----

It's difficult to clip segments out here, the whole of it speaks volumes to the extremes, to Who is the author of revival and just who is not.

What a fantastic summary.