



### When was your church founded?, on: 2009/12/1 18:42

Church Year Est. Founder Where Est.

Catholic/Orthodox 33 Jesus Christ Jerusalem

Lutheran 1517 Martin Luther Germany

Anabaptist 1521 Nicholas Storch & Thomas Munzer Germany

Anglican 1534 Henry VIII England

Mennonites 1536 Menno Simons Switzerland

Calvinist 1555 John Calvin Switzerland

Presbyterian 1560 John Knox Scotland

Congregational 1582 Robert Brown Holland

Baptist 1609 John Smyth Amsterdam

Dutch Reformed 1628 Michaelis Jones New York

Congregationalist 1648 Pilgrims and Puritans Massachusetts

Quakers 1649 George Fox England

Amish 1693 Jacob Amman France

Freemasons 1717 Masons from four lodges London

Methodist 1739 John & Charles Wesley England

Unitarian 1774 Theophilus Lindey London

Methodist Episcopal 1784 60 Preachers Baltimore, MD

Episcopalian 1789 Samuel Seabury American Colonies

United Brethren 1800 Philip Otterbein & Martin Boehn Maryland

Disciples of Christ 1827 Thomas & Alexander Campbell Kentucky

Mormon 1830 Joseph Smith New York

Methodist Protestant 1830 Methodist United States

Church of Christ 1836 Warren Stone & Alexander Campbell Kentucky

Seventh Day Adventist 1844 Ellen White Washington, NH

Christadelphian (Brethren of Christ 1844 John Thomas Richmond, VA

Salvation Army 1865 William Booth London

Holiness 1867 Methodist United States

Jehovah's Witnesses 1874 Charles Taze Russell Pennsylvania

Christian Science 1879 Mary Baker Eddy Boston

Church of God in Christ 1895 Various churches of God Arkansas

Church of Nazarene c. 1850-1900 Various religious bodies Pilot Point, TX

Pentecostal 1901 Charles F. Parkham Topeka, KS

Aglipayan 1902 Gregorio Aglipay Philippines

Assemblies of God 1914 Pentecostalism Hot Springs, AZ

Iglesia ni Christo 1914 Felix Manalo Philippines

Four-square Gospel 1917 Aimee Semple McPherson Los Angeles, CA

United Church of Christ 1961 Reformed and Congregationalist Philadelphia, PA

Calvary Chapel 1965 Chuck Smith Costa Mesa, CA

United Methodist 1968 Methodist and United Brethren Dallas, TX

Born-again c. 1970s Various religious bodies United States

Harvest Christian 1972 Greg Laurie Riverside, CA

Saddleback 1982 Rick Warren California

Non-denominational c. 1990s various United States

### Re: When was your church founded? - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2009/12/1 18:54

I am the church, and it was founded a long time before I was ever part of it. Jesus established it.

Re: When was your church founded?, on: 2009/12/1 18:58

My Church was founded at Pentecost, Acts 2:38. :-D

## Re: When was your church founded? - posted by Know-Him, on: 2009/12/1 19:04

It is an interesting point; Most people when they speak of their church, speak of the building they worship in or the deno mination that they belong too. Church for many equals a man made building or organization rather than the Bride of Chri st.

## Re: When was your church founded? - posted by PaulWest (), on: 2009/12/1 19:04

Nice try. These are all denominations and movements and cults. That said, everything looks good here except that the R oman Catholic Church was founded circa 313 AD with Emperor Constantine establishing himself as the head. Funny that you failed to mention that.

Again, this is not a RCC forum, and you will not find many here who are sympathetic to Roman doctrine. It seems we've been through this before and you were politely asked not to promote Rome's error here. Why have you come back to ins tigate? What is the purpose of this provocation?

### Re:, on: 2009/12/1 19:27

It's funny how these guys lift up their "church" rather than the founder, a true mark of a false brethren.

You hear it in their eloquent speech, "come to our church to hear the truth". Whatever happened to come to Jesus and r epent of your sins?

Peter never said to come to a Church to hear the truth, the Holy Ghost has the truth that will lead and guide into all truth, not a Church or all it's creed.

Anyone that points to a Church building is the same as Christs warning: Wherefore if they shall say unto you, Behold, he is in the desert; go not forth: behold, he is in the secret chambers; believe it not. Matthew 24:26

These people will point you to everyone but Christ. Even God said, This is my beloved Son: hear him. Mark 9:7

Every religion has a gimmick to point you away from Jesus Christ. Some of them will even say Jesus is the way, but the y will offer you another book, like the book of Morons...oops, Mormons.

## Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2009/12/1 19:48

Good points, Brother Paul.

Not only that, but there is only one true "Church" -- and it has little to do with the organization or hierarchy of men.

Those of us who know and belong to God are a part of the Body of Jesus Christ. It is not confined to certain prerequisites of obedience to sectarian dogma or "doctrines" (aka *explanations*) of men. When we stand before God, H e isn't going to determine our salvation by which church we attended or whether or not we fulfilled certain doctrinal "requirements" as explained by man. He will know His own by a name that appears in a certain Book of Life.

The inclusion of a name in that Book has nothing to do with denominations or allegiance to particular doctrines as taught by churches, denominations or sects. The ultimate question is what it takes to have your name written in that Book. The Word of God says that everyone who calls upon the Name of the Lord shall be saved (Romans 10:13). Were you willing to trade all of the promises and pleasures of this life to simply know and have a relationship with the Lord? Do you love Him and desire Him above all things -- including the "Church?"

### Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2009/12/1 19:49

2 Corinthians 4:5 For we do not preach ourselves but Christ Jesus as Lord, and ourselves as your bond-servants for Jesus' sake.

Rome does the exact opposite. Rome is no bond servant, it is a master.

## Re: When was your church founded? - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2009/12/1 21:06

havdock

Ok, I am dense, but mind telling me the point of this post?

I see all these dates and names and my mind goes "so what?"

ginnyrose

### Re: - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2009/12/1 21:13

haydock,

Another question: mind telling me where in the scriptures it tells us that belonging to a certain church group has the abilit y to impart salvation, redemption to its members?

ginnyrose

### Re: - posted by Leo\_Grace, on: 2009/12/1 21:14

Quote:
ginnyrose wrote: haydock, Ok, I am dense, but mind telling me the point of this post?
I see all these dates and names and my mind goes "so what?"
ginnyrose

He is boasting erroneously that the RCC was founded by the Lord Jesus himself. As Paul West pointed out, the RCC was actually founded by a politician to latch on to the growing popularity of the Christian movement. Since then, they've be en claiming apostolic succession, which would be true if they would limit themselves to being political apostles of Emper or Constantine.

## Re: - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2009/12/1 21:28

Leo,

Thanks! for the explanation...

Haydock, do you agree with Paul West and Leo?

ginnyrose

## Re: - posted by Miccah (), on: 2009/12/1 23:33

This post reminds me of the "my dad can beat up your dad" arguement in grade school.

Funny thing though, did anybody's dad ever fight it out? :-)

## Re: - posted by Leo\_Grace, on: 2009/12/2 0:19

Quote:
Miccah wrote: This post reminds me of the "my dad can beat up your dad" arguement in grade school
Funny thing though, did anybody's dad ever fight it out? :-)

Well, my Dad, the Lord Jesus Christ, can whip haydock's "dad", the Emperor Constantine, any day of the week and twic e on Sundays. :-?

### Re:, on: 2009/12/2 2:32

Quote:
------by PaulWest on 2009/12/1 16:04:10 Nice try. These are all denominations and movements and cults. That said, everything looks g ood here except that the Roman Catholic Church was founded circa 313 AD with Emperor Constantine establishing himself as the head. Funny that yo u failed to mention that.

Go look and see. Constantine was NEVER a pope or any kind of head of the Church. Do you believe everything you re ad from Jack Chick? This is such an easily disproven misnomer.

Have you ever read the ante-Nicene (before Constantine) church fathers? If you did, you'd probably panic and have to b ecome Catholic.

#### Re:, on: 2009/12/2 2:39

Quote:
------haydock, Another question: mind telling me where in the scriptures it tells us that belonging to a certain church group has the ability to impart salvation, redemption to its members? ginnyrose
-------------

"Because the husband is the head of the wife, as Christ is the head of the church. He is the saviour of his body." - Eph. 5:23

#### Re:, on: 2009/12/2 2:49

Leo,

Quote:
-----Since then, they've been claiming apostolic succession, which would be true if they would limit themselves to being political apostle s of Emperor Constantine.

Since when? Since when have we claimed apostolic succession? Constantine?

May I have the honor of enlightening you with fact? Here you go:

"And thus preaching through countries and cities, they appointed the first-fruits, having first proved them by the Spirit, to be bishops and deacons of those who should afterwards believe. Nor was this any new thing, since indeed many ages before it was written concerning bishops and deacons. For thus saith the Scripture a certain place, 'I will appoint their bis hops s in righteousness, and their deacons in faith.'... Our apostles also knew, through our Lord Jesus Christ, and there would be strife on account of the office of the episcopate. For this reason, therefore, inasmuch as they had obtained a perfect fore-knowledge of this, they appointed those already mentioned, and afterwards gave instructions, that when these should fall asleep, other approved men should succeed them in their ministry...For our sin will not be small, if we eject from the episcopate those who have blamelessly and holily fulfilled its duties." Pope Clement, Epistle to Corinthians, 42, 44 (A.D. 98).

"For what is the bishop but one who beyond all others possesses all power and authority, so far as it is possible for a man to possess it, who according to his ability has been made an imitator of the Christ off God? And what is the presbytery but a sacred assembly, the counselors and assessors of the bishop? And what are the deacons but imitators of the angelic powers, fulfilling a pure and blameless ministry unto him, asÂ...Anencletus and Clement to Peter?" Ignatius, To the Tr

allians, 7 (A.D. 110).

"Hegesippus in the five books of Memoirs which have come down to us has left a most complete record of his own views . In them he states that on a journey to Rome he met a great many bishops, and that he received the same doctrine fro m all. It is fitting to hear what he says after making some remarks about the epistle of Clement to the Corinthians. His wo rds are as follows: 'And the church of Corinth continued in the true faith until Primus was bishop in Corinth. I conversed with them on my way to Rome, and abode with the Corinthians many days, during which we were mutually refreshed in the true doctrine. And when I had come to Rome I remained a there until Anicetus, whose deacon was Eleutherus. And A nicetus was succeeded by Soter, and he by Eleutherus. In every succession, and in every city that is held which is preached by the law and the prophets and the Lord." Hegesippus, Memoirs, fragment in Eusebius Ecclesiatical History, 4:22 (A.D. 180).

"It is possible, then, for everyone in every church, who may wish to know the truth, to contemplate the tradition of the ap ostles which has been made known to us throughout the whole world. And we are in a position to enumerate those who were instituted bishops by the apostles and their successors down to our own times, men who neither knew nor taught a nything like what these heretics rave about" (Against Heresies 3:3:1).

"But since it would be too long to enumerate in such a volume as this the successions of all the churches, we shall confo und all those who, in whatever manner, whether through self-satisfaction or vainglory, or through blindness and wicked o pinion, assemble other than where it is proper, by pointing out here the successions of the bishops of the greatest and m ost ancient church known to all, founded and organized at Rome by the two most glorious apostles, Peter and Paul—th at church which has the tradition and the faith with which comes down to us after having been announced to men by the apostles. For with this Church, because of its superior origin, all churches must agree, that is, all the faithful in the whole world. And it is in her that the faithful everywhere have maintained the apostolic tradition" (ibid., 3:3:2).

"Polycarp also was not only instructed by apostles, and conversed with many who had seen Christ, but was also, by apostles in Asia, appointed bishop of the church in Smyrna, whom I also saw in my early youth, for he tarried a very long time, and, when a very old man, gloriously and most nobly suffering martyrdom, departed this life, having always taught the things which he had learned from the apostles, and which the Church has handed down, and which alone are true. To these things all the Asiatic churches testify, as do also those men who have succeeded Polycarp down to the present time" (ibid., 3:3:4).

"Since therefore we have such proofs, it is not necessary to seek the truth among others which it is easy to obtain from t he Church; since the apostles, like a rich man in a bank, lodged in her hands most copiously all things pertaining to the t ruth, so that every man, whosoever will, can draw from her the water of life. . . . For how stands the case? Suppose ther e arise a dispute relative to some important question among us, should we not have recourse to the most ancient church es with which the apostles held constant conversation, and learn from them what is certain and clear in regard to the pre sent question?" (ibid., 3:4:1).

"t is incumbent to obey the presbyters who are in the Church—those who, as I have shown, possess the succession from the apostles; those who, together with the succession of the episcopate, have received the infallible charism of truth, according to the good pleasure of the Father. But to hold in suspicion others who depart from the primitive succession, and assemble themselves together in any place whatsoever, either as heretics of perverse minds, or as schismatics puffed up and self-pleasing, or again as hypocrites, acting thus for the sake of lucre and vainglory. For all these have fallen from the truth" (ibid., 4:26:2).

"The true knowledge is the doctrine of the apostles, and the ancient organization of the Church throughout the whole wo rld, and the manifestation of the body of Christ according to the succession of bishops, by which succession the bishops have handed down the Church which is found everywhere" (ibid., 4:33:8).

Constantine was an Arian sympathizer. We do not even claim him as a saint or a pope. God knows his fate. But these men above wrote so many years before Constantine that claims that Leo and others have been making are ridiculous.

Leo, do you retract your statement now that you see it is patently false?

Re: - posted by Miccah (), on: 2009/12/2 2:57
haydock wrote: Quote:
Quote:haydock, Another question: mind telling me where in the scriptures it tells us that belonging to a certain church group has the ability to impart salvation, redemption to its members? ginnyrose
"Because the husband is the head of the wife, as Christ is the head of the church. He is the saviour of his body." - Eph. 5:23
Um Not even in the ball park of context of the question asked.
Haydock, try glorifying the Lord, and not a man made institution.
Re: - posted by Know-Him, on: 2009/12/2 3:05
Quote:
haydock wrote:
Have you ever read the ante-Nicene (before Constantine) church fathers? If you did, you'd probably panic and have to become Catholic.
Note that the same to take a second and the same the continue of the same than the same that the same that the

When you begin to take your doctrine and teachings from the writings of men rather than basing them on the Scriptures, then you end up with all sorts of error.

### Re: - posted by Leo\_Grace, on: 2009/12/2 3:10

haydock,

I retract nothing. There is nothing in what you have posted that legitimizes the Roman Catholic Church. Your claims to apostolic succession cannot predate the creation of the RCC by Constantine. On the other hand, here is a factual quote from the Biblical Discernment Ministries:

The Roman Catholic Church, in its pagan form, unofficially came into being in 312 A.D., at the time of the so-called "mira culous conversion" to Christianity of the Roman Emperor Constantine. Although Christianity was not made the official religion of the Roman Empire until the edicts of Theodosius I in 380 and 381 A.D., Constantine, from 312 A.D. until his deat h in 337, was engaged in the process of simultaneously building pagan temples and Christian churches, and was slowly turning over the reigns of his pagan priesthood to the Bishop of Rome. However, the family of Constantine did not give up the last vestige of his priesthood until after the disintegration of the Roman Empire -- that being the title the emperors bore as heads of the pagan priesthood -- Pontifex Maximus -- a title which the popes would inherit. (The popes also inherited Constantine's titles as the self-appointed civil head of the church -- Vicar of Christ and Bishop of Bishops.)

Prior to the time of Constantine's "conversion," Christians were persecuted not so much for their profession of faith in Christ, but because they would not include pagan deities in their faith as well. Then, with Constantine's emphasis on making his new-found Christianity palatable to the heathen in the Empire, the "Christianization" of these pagan deities was facilitated. For example, pagan rituals and idols gradually took on Christian meanings and names and were incorporated into "Christian" worship (e.g., "saints" replaced the cult of pagan gods in both worship and as patrons of cities; mother/son statues were renamed Mary and Jesus; etc.), and pagan holidays were reclassified as Christian holy days (e.g., the Roman Lupercalia and the feast of purification of Isis became the Feast of the Nativity; the Saturnalia celebrations were replaced by Christmas celebrations; an ancient festival of the dead was replaced by All Souls Day, rededicated to Christian heroes; etc.). A transition had occurred -- instead of being persecuted for failure to worship pagan deities, Christians wh

o did not agree with the particular orthodoxy backed by the Emperor were now persecuted in the name of Christ! "Christi anized" Rome had become the legitimate successor of pagan Rome! This is the sad origin of the Roman Catholic Churc h.
You said:
Quote:
Haydock, have you ever read the Bible, the perfect and infallible Word of God? If you did, you would die of shame for the heresies of the Roman Catholic Church that you uphold; you'd probably repent and have to become a Christian instead of a Roman Catholic. I suggest you try reading the Bible before you post again.
Re: , on: 2009/12/3 3:01
Quote:
Hmmlet's seeYOU quote some unicorn fairydust conspiracy website
I quote the actual writings of early Christians. I guess I should still be waiting for the punch line?
I do not believe you are interested in truth.
Quote:Haydock, have you ever read the Bible, the perfect and infallible Word of God?
It is the Bible that made me Catholic. The Bible is a Catholic Book. It is the inspired Holy Written Tradition of the Churc h of Jesus Christ.
And I must say that more of the Bible is publicly read on a Sunday morning in a Catholic church than in almost every Pro testant heretical gathering. I should know.
Quote:
Actually I got really mad that ignorant people like you perpetuated lies and half truths that hid the true Church from me b y misrepresenting it.
If you knew the gift of God and what Jesus' body really looked like, you would die of joy!

I suggest you learn what I believe before you spew this presumptuous bile. Do you even KNOW what your Bible says?

Quote:

------ suggest you try reading the Bible before you post again.

# Re: - posted by enid, on: 2009/12/3 3:05

What a joke!

Hee-hee!