

United Theological Seminary of the Twin Cities
Fall 2010

CH 461: "Introduction to Historical Theology"
Tuesday evenings 6:00-9:15 p.m.

Instructor: Paul E. Capetz

Student Assistants: Steve Tyykila, David Kraemer, and Richard Pemberton

The Course and its Purpose:

"The history of the church is the history of its interpretation of scripture."
Gerhard Ebeling

"Tradition is the living faith of the dead, traditionalism is the dead faith of the living."
Jaroslav Pelikan

"Our constant endeavor, day and night, is not just to transmit the tradition faithfully, but also to put it in the form we think will prove best."
John Calvin

"What you have inherited from your ancestors, you must earn in order to possess it."
Goethe

This course introduces students to the study of classical Christian theology, i.e., pre-modern theology before the Enlightenment (ca. 1750). Its purpose is not only to teach historical knowledge about the growth and development of the Christian tradition but also to highlight some of the perennial issues that have shaped the theological discussions within Christianity. Hence, this course encourages students to use their study of these classic figures, documents, and controversies for the sake of learning how to become critically reflective theologians in their own right.

Learning Objectives:

1. Students will understand and be able to articulate the major theological emphases of the three main traditions of classical Christianity: Eastern Orthodoxy, Roman Catholicism, and Protestantism (including the varieties of Protestantism).
2. Students will understand and be able to articulate the theological thought of the major figures within each of these traditions (e.g., Athanasius, Augustine, Luther).
3. Students will be able to read classical theological texts of the Christian tradition intelligently and be able to locate them in their respective historical contexts.

4. Students will be able to reflect theologically on the major questions and issues that are raised in the classic texts being studied in this class (e.g., the nature of sin and salvation, christology and the trinity, justification and sanctification, etc.).

Learning Activities (designed to enable students to meet the “Learning Objectives”):

1. Students will write three short (3 double-spaced pages) analytical papers interpreting the major theological arguments in selected texts.
2. Students will be given short ten-minute “pop quizzes” at the end of each class session to test their understanding of the assigned readings and the content of the lectures. These little quizzes will not be counted as part of the final grade.
3. Students will be given the opportunity to take an optional in-class written midterm examination that will reflect what they can expect on the final exam. If students elect to take this exam, they may choose beforehand whether or not they wish it to count towards their final grade.
4. Students will demonstrate their mastery of the content of the material by completing an in-class, closed book final exam comprised of identification of technical theological terms and an essay question.

Further Explanations and Clarifications:

The three short papers will be written on topics to be assigned beforehand. Their purpose is to indicate the extent to which students understand the primary texts and are able to articulate their central ideas succinctly and coherently. **The instructor does not accept papers that are sent via e-mail.** A paper may be sent via U.S. mail without penalty, provided that it is postmarked on the original due date. **It will also be necessary to bring these three, graded papers to the final exam;** this way the instructor can look over the entire body of students’ work throughout the course of the semester when writing his final evaluation.

The “Study Guide” at the back of the syllabus is designed to assist in the preparation for the final exam. Students will be responsible for knowing the meaning of any technical terms referred to in this set of questions (including foreign words). **There will be nothing on the final exam that is not already included in the Study Guide. Students should make sure that they understand and can answer each question posed there.**

The lectures will enrich students’ knowledge and supply broader perspectives that assist in placing the texts in their relevant historical and theological contexts.

The discussion groups led by the student assistants will provide students an opportunity to discuss these readings with others. **Students are expected to have completed the assigned readings prior to attending the book discussions. Moreover, it is expected**

that students will not only read the assigned texts but also learn their contents thoroughly. This is the only way it is possible to master the material of this course.

Required Primary Texts: these texts are available for purchase in the bookstore

Creeds of the Churches, ed. John H. Leith (Louisville: John Knox, 1982).

Athanasius, *On the Incarnation* (Crestwood, N.Y.: St. Vladimir's, 1982).

The Christological Controversy, ed. Richard A. Norris, Jr., (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980).

The Trinitarian Controversy, ed. William G. Rusch (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980).

Augustine, *Confessions*, trans. R. S. Pine-Coffin (New York: Penguin, 1961).

Augustine, *Enchiridion on Faith, Hope, and Love* (Washington, D.C.: Regnery, 1961).

Martin Luther, *Selections from His Writings*, ed. John Dillenberger (Garden City, N.Y.: Anchor, 1961).

John Calvin and Jacopo Sadoletto, *A Reformation Debate* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1976).

Required Primary Texts: these texts are on reserve in the library

John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, ed. John T. McNeill, Library of Christian Classics, 2 vols. (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1960).

David B. Parke, *The Epic of Unitarianism* (Boston: Starr King Press, 1957).

Required Secondary Text: available for purchase at the bookstore

Van A. Harvey, *A Handbook of Theological Terms* (New York: Macmillan, 1964)

Recommended Secondary Texts: these texts are on reserve in the library and may be available for purchase in the bookstore

Paul E. Capetz, *God: A Brief History, Facets* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2003).

Alister McGrath, *Historical Theology: An Introduction to the History of Christian Thought* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1998).

Paul Tillich, *A History of Christian Thought*, ed. Carl E. Braaten (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1967-1968).

Barbara J. MacHaffie, Her Story: Women in Christian Tradition, second edition (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2006).

Justo L. Gonzalez, The Story of Christianity, 2 vols. (San Francisco: Harper, 1984, 1985).

A Note about the Bible:

Students should work from a scholarly translation of the Bible. The best translation in English currently available is the New Revised Standard Version which can be had in 2 excellent formats, either *The Harper Collins Study Bible* or *The New Oxford Annotated Bible*, both of which are available in our bookstore. Since so much of the focus in this class will be upon the interpretation of scripture, it behooves students to get into the habit of looking up biblical references cited by our authors. This is also a very good way of getting to know major sections of the Bible itself.

Schedule: The notations a) and b) refer to the first and second halves of each weekly class sessions (ordinarily about 1 and ½ hours with a 15-minute break between them).

Sept. 14: a) Introduction to the Class
b) Presuppositions of Classical Christianity: the Apostolic Tradition

Sept. 21: a) The Arian Controversy and the Nicene Creed
b) Alexandrian and Antiochene Christologies in Conflict

Read: Athanasius, *On the Incarnation*, pp. 25-96
“The Creed of Nicaea” and “The Constantinopolitan Creed,” in
Leith, *Creeeds*, pp. 28-33

Sept. 28: a) Chalcedonian Christology and the Doctrine of the Trinity
b) Discussion Group

Read: Norris, *The Christological Controversy*, pp. 103-159
Rusch, *The Trinitarian Controversy*, pp. 131-161
“The Definition of Chalcedon,” in Leith, *Creeeds*, pp. 34-36

Oct. 5: a) Augustine’s Conversion
b) Neo-Platonism and the Privation Theory of Evil

Read: Augustine, *Confessions*, pp. 21-132

FIRST PAPER DUE

Oct. 12: a) Grace and the Proper Ordering of Love
b) The Donatist Controversy and the Doctrine of the Church

Read: Augustine, *Confessions*, pp. 133-205

- Oct. 19: a) The Pelagian Controversy
b) Discussion Group
- Read: Augustine, *Enchiridion*, pp. 1-141;
“The Council of Orange,” in Leith, *Creeds*, pp. 37-45

Oct. 26: READING WEEK

- Nov. 2: a) Medieval Discussions of Grace and Merit
b) Luther: Justification by Faith Alone
- Read: Luther, *Writings*, pp. 3-96
“The Augsburg Confession,” in Leith, *Creeds*, pp. 61-107
“The Small Catechism,” in Leith, *Creeds*, pp. 107-126

SECOND PAPER DUE

- Nov. 9: a) Luther: Law and Gospel
b) Luther and Zwingli: The Sacramental Controversy
- Read: “Doctrine of Medieval Catholicism” and “Doctrine of the Seven Sacraments,” in Leith, *Creeds*, pp. 56-61;
Luther, “Pagan Servitude of the Church,” in *Writings*, pp. 249-359

- Nov. 16: a) The Nature of Authority in Catholicism and Protestantism
b) Discussion Group
- Read: Calvin and Sadoleto, *A Reformation Debate*, pp. 29-94
“The Council of Trent,” in Leith, *Creeds*, 399-442

- Nov. 23: a) Calvin: Third Use of the Law
b) The Radical Reformation: The Anabaptists
- Read: Calvin, *Institutes*, 1:348-464
“Anabaptist Confessions,” in Leith, *Creeds*, pp. 281-308

THIRD PAPER DUE

- Nov. 30: a) The Radical Reformation: The Unitarians
b) The English Reformation and the Rise of Puritanism
- Read: Parke, *Epic of Unitarianism*, pp. 1-29
“The English Reformation,” in Leith, *Creeds*, pp. 230-281
“The Cambridge Platform,” in Leith, *Creeds*, pp. 385-399

- Dec. 7: a) The Arminian Controversy and Wesley
 b) Discussion Group

Read: "The Westminster Confession," in Leith, *Creeds*, pp. 192-230
 "Methodism," in Leith, *Creeds*, pp. 353-385

Dec. 14: **FINAL EXAM**

Policy on Extensions:

Written work is to be handed in on the date assigned in the syllabus unless arrangements have been made in advance with the instructor. But late work will be accepted by the instructor only for reasons of extreme duress (e.g., an illness or a death in the family). If a student is not able to complete all work by the end of the semester, the student is obligated to file a formal petition (which includes securing the instructor's signature) by the last official meeting of the course at the latest.

Policy on Auditors:

Auditors are welcome in the class, provided they commit themselves to keeping up with the assigned reading so that their comments and questions in class discussion are informed by knowledge of the content of the texts being studied.

Policy on Inclusive Language:

In speaking and writings students are expected to use "inclusive" language for human beings (e.g., "humankind," not "mankind," etc.) For fuller explanation, see the statement in the *UTS Masters Student Handbook*.

Note about Common Courtesy: Please turn off all cell-phones prior to entering the classroom. **If a cell phone rings during class, there will be much wailing and gnashing of teeth for the offender.**

Note about Use of Computers and other Technology: If it comes to the instructor's attention that any student is using computers or other technology during class time for purposes alien to the class, that student will henceforth be prohibited from utilizing these tools in the classroom.

Office Hours:

The instructor is available on a regular basis to meet with students (Mondays 3:00-5:00 p.m. and Tuesdays 3:00-5:00 p.m.). Students are encouraged to make an appointment to discuss any aspect of the class.

Plagiarism:

Handing in written work that contains unacknowledged borrowings from the work of others (including lecture notes) is a serious moral infraction against academic integrity. Any incident of plagiarism, knowing or unknowing, will be penalized with immediate failure from the course. Please read the policy on plagiarism in the Student Handbook.

Writing Style:

Academic writing has its own conventions that students are required to observe when submitting papers to the instructor for evaluation. For reference, consult Kate Turabian, *The Chicago Manual of Style* which has appeared in many editions, including an online version that can be found at: <http://www.eturabian.com/turabian/index.html>.

Study Guide
CH 461: “Introduction to Historical Theology”

Athanasius, On the Incarnation

1. What was the meaning of the *logos* in ancient philosophy and why did Christians apply this concept to designate the identity and significance of Jesus?
Why did Athanasius and the Nicene Creed insist that the “Word of God” or “Son of God” (*logos*) incarnate in Jesus is “of the same substance” (*homoousion*) with God the father?
What does it mean to say that the *logos* is “eternally begotten, not made”?
What is wrong, according to Athanasius, with the alternative view, represented by Arius, that “there once was a time when he was not”?
2. How is the Athanasian view of christology inextricably bound up with the Athanasian view of soteriology? In other words, from what do we need to be saved and who must Christ be in order to accomplish this salvation?
In what way did Athanasius believe that the Arian christology jeopardizes human salvation?
Does this suggest that Athanasius and Arius operated with different understandings of human salvation?
3. What is the understanding of the human condition and its existential predicament according to Athanasius?
How is finitude related to sin or, in other words, how is the doctrine of creation related to the doctrine of the fall?
Why did Athanasius believe that the fall of Adam and Eve led to a loss of immortality for the human race?
How does the incarnation of the *logos* save human beings from death?
What is meant by *theosis* in orthodox theology?
4. What does it mean, according to Athanasius, to say that human beings are made in “the image of God” (*imago Dei*)?
What are the roles of “reason” and “free will” in Athanasius’ anthropology?

Apollinaris, Theodore, Nestorius, and Cyril

1. Why did Apollinaris deny that Jesus had a rational human soul? Did he view his position as in keeping with that of Athanasius and the Nicene Creed?
What was the ambiguity in Athanasius’ position that allowed for the possibility of Apollinaris’ denial of Jesus’ full humanity?
2. What was the original meaning of “docetism” in Christian theology and why was it considered a heresy? In what way do both Athanasius and Apollinaris believe that their positions are anti-docetic?

3. What is meant by “monophysitism”? Why is this the proper characterization of Apollinaris’ position? Why was this view later condemned as heretical by the Definition of Chalcedon?
4. What is the *logos/sarx* model of christology that characterized the Alexandrian school? What is the *logos/anthropos* model of christology that characterized the Antiochene school?
5. Why did Theodore and the Antiochenes insist upon making a sharp distinction between the two natures of Christ? What was it about the Alexandrian school’s emphasis upon the “unity of person” or “hypostatic union” that most worried the Antiochene school?
Why did the Antiochenes accuse the Alexandrians of docetism and what did *they* mean by this accusation? Did the Alexandrians think of themselves as docetists? Why not? What did they mean by this heresy?
6. What was the major worry of Cyril and the Alexandrians about the Antiochene insistence upon the distinction of two natures in Christ?
7. What was the controversy concerning the *theotokos* really about? What was meant by the *communicatio idiomatum* and how did Nestorius’ denial of this principle of christological predication reflect the distinctive emphases of Antiochene theology?
If, with Nestorius, Mary is not called the *theotokos*, what is being said about Jesus? If, with Cyril, Mary is called the *theotokos*, what is being affirmed about Jesus?
8. Explain the ways in which the Chalcedonian Definition represents an attempt at a compromise between the Alexandrian and Antiochene schools? Was this an effective and internally stable compromise?
Which of the two schools got the upper hand in the Chalcedonian Definition?
What were the two heresies excluded by the Definition of Chalcedon?
Is the Definition of Chalcedon a rejection of Nicea or does it consider itself to be Nicea’s definitive interpretation?
According to Chalcedon, what is the orthodox definition of Christ’s person?

The Cappadocians: Gregory of Nazianzus and Gregory of Nyssa

1. How did the problem to which the doctrine of the trinity is intended as the solution necessarily arise out of the way the doctrine of christology developed in the patristic period?
2. Is the orthodox doctrine of the trinity monotheistic or tritheistic and, hence, polytheistic? How did Gregory of Nyssa answer this question? How does Gregory’s argument illustrate the ways in which christology has already determined why Christians will have to conceive of God as trinitarian?

3. How does Gregory of Nyssa understand the relations between the three persons of the trinity? In what ways are they one and in what ways are they distinct? Why does he say that the nature of God is “unnameable and unutterable”? What does this imply about the limits of rationality in penetrating the mystery of the triune God?
4. How does Gregory Nazianzus distinguish between the properties peculiar to the individual persons of the trinity and that which is common to the divine nature? Can one say of the father that he is “begotten”? What does it mean to say that the father is the “cause” of divinity in the other two persons? What is the relation of the Holy Spirit to the other two persons? Is the Spirit also *homoousion* with the father as is the son?
5. What is the orthodox definition of the trinity? What was the *filioque* clause later added to the Latin version of the Nicene Creed and why did this create a rift between East and West? What is the theological issue at stake here?

Augustine

1. What were the stages of Augustine’s conversion to Christianity? Why did the young Augustine initially reject Christianity? What role did Ambrose of Milan play in Augustine’s religious development? How did Ambrose interpret the Bible and why did this hermeneutic make it possible for Augustine to take Christianity seriously as an intellectual engaged with religious questions in a philosophical manner? Who was Antony and why did the story of his life make such a deep impression upon Augustine?
2. What were the other religio-philosophical options in the late ancient world that Augustine explored before his conversion to Christianity? What attracted him to these alternatives and why did he eventually repudiate them? In particular, what was Manichaeism and why with Augustine ultimately dissatisfied with it?
3. What is Augustine’s understanding of the origin and nature of evil? How does this differ from the dualistic view he had previously learned from the Manichees? How did Augustine appropriate the monistic philosophy of the neo-Platonists in order to explain evil within a monotheistic framework? What is meant by “monism” and how is this different from “dualism”? Why is it difficult to explain evil from a monotheistic perspective?
4. What is the role of desire in Augustine’s anthropology? Why is this religiously and morally significant?

Why did Augustine employ the word “desire” to explain what he meant by “love”?

According to Augustine, are we free to choose what we love or desire? What does his answer to this question imply about the question of free will?

5. What is the meaning of the distinction between two types of love: *uti* (use) and *frui* (enjoyment)?
What is the meaning of the distinction between *cupiditas* (“concupiscence”) and *caritas* (Greek: *agape*)? What are the respective objects of *uti* and *frui* according to *cupiditas* and *caritas*?
What role, if any, does “self-love” play in *caritas*? Is there a proper way to love oneself?
How does Augustine understand these distinctions to be a re-statement of Jesus’ summary of the law?
6. What was the Donatist controversy and what is meant by a “sectarian” ecclesiology? What was Augustine’s alternative ecclesiology?
What is meant by the doctrine that the sacraments are efficacious *ex opere operato*? What does this doctrine imply about the question of the validity of a sacrament performed by a morally unworthy priest?
What is meant by the Donatist view that a sacrament is valid *ex opere operantis*?
7. What was the Pelagian Controversy? What did Augustine see as being at stake in this controversy? Why did he view Pelagianism as a denial of the doctrine that we are saved “by grace alone” (*sola gratia*)?
Why is Pelagianism identified with “works righteousness,” i.e., the doctrine that we can merit our salvation through good deeds? What does the Pelagian doctrine imply about free will after the fall and the human ability to do what the law requires of us?
In what sense is Augustine’s doctrine of predestination (or “election”) a logical inference from his insistence upon *sola gratia*? Is this doctrine biblical?
Why are “free will” and the “justice of God” the twin objections in the Pelagian response to Augustine?
What was the response of the Council of Orange to both Pelagius and Augustine?
In what way did the Roman Catholic tradition embrace Augustine’s anti-Pelagian theology of grace albeit with reservations about his doctrine of predestination?
Is Augustine considered a “church father” in Eastern Orthodoxy? Did the Pelagian controversy put its stamp upon Eastern Orthodox theology?
8. What is the Roman Catholic understanding of grace and how it works in the soul?
Is grace a spiritual substance infused into the soul? What is meant by saying that the sacraments are the “means of grace”?
9. What are the three “theological virtues” in Roman Catholic theology? Why is “love” considered to be the chief theological virtue? What is the relation

of love to the other two theological virtues, faith and hope? How is “faith” defined?

When we see God face to face in the “beatific vision” which is the goal of the Christian life, will we need faith and hope? Why not? Will love continue? What biblical verse are these ideas based on?

10. What is the relation between justification and sanctification in Roman Catholic theology? What does it mean to say that grace is “sanctifying grace” or that “grace makes the sinner pleasing to God” (*gratia gratum faciens*)? Are we justified by faith alone? What does it mean to say that we are justified by “faith formed by love” (*fides caritate formata*)?

Luther and the Augsburg Confession

1. What is the central religious or existential question for Luther? Does this indicate a shift in religious sensibilities during the late Middle Ages? What does the Augsburg Confession declare to be the chief doctrine of Christian faith? What is Luther’s doctrine of justification? What does it mean to say that we are justified by “faith alone” (*sola fide*)? How does this differ from the Roman doctrine that faith must be formed by love (*fides caritate formata*)? Is sanctification necessary to justification in the Lutheran view?
2. What does Luther understand by the distinction between “law” and “gospel”? How does this distinction serve him as the hermeneutical key for unlocking the entire scripture? What is the law’s purpose and its relation to the gospel? How does the distinction between law and gospel relate to the distinction between Old and New Testaments? Are they identical?
3. How did Luther understand Paul’s statement in Rom. 1:17 that the gospel reveals “the righteousness of God”? Why did Luther interpret this phrase to mean the “passive righteousness” that God imputes to sinners instead of the “active righteousness” with which God is a righteous judge of sin? What role does Paul’s citation of Hab. 2:4 play in Luther’s understanding of Pauline theology?
4. What is the Lutheran view of “faith”? How is this different from the Roman Catholic understanding of it? What is the meaning of “grace” in Luther’s theology? How is this different from the Roman Catholic doctrine? What role does the sermon as the proclamation of the gospel play in Luther’s theology and what implications does this have for the understanding of the sacraments? How did Luther understand the sacraments? Are they efficacious *ex opere operato*? What were the conflicts between various groups of Protestants

on the questions of sacramental theology? Whose view is being rejected when the Augsburg Confession states that “the sacraments were instituted not only to be signs by which people might be outwardly identified as Christians, but that they are signs and testimonies of God’s will toward us for the purpose of awakening and strengthening faith”?

5. What is the relation between faith and love in Luther’s theology? How does he understand Paul’s statement that “faith is active in love” (Gal. 5:6)? How does the distinction between faith and love correspond to the distinction between our relation to God (*coram Deo*) and our relation to our neighbors (*coram hominibus*)? How do these distinctions express Luther’s repudiation of the Roman Catholic understanding of the relation between sanctification and justification? How does Luther resolve the paradox suggested by his statement that “A Christian is a perfectly free lord of all, subject to none; a Christian is a perfectly dutiful servant of all, subject to all”?
6. Why did Luther insist that Christian doctrine must be based on “scripture alone” (*sola scriptura*)? What does Luther’s insistence in this respect suggest about the Protestant view of the post-biblical tradition? Is it inspired as scripture is inspired? What is the Roman Catholic view of the relation between scripture and tradition? With which scriptural passage does the Roman church authorize its notion of tradition as also inspired by the Holy Spirit? What is meant by speaking of *sola scriptura* as “the formal principle of the Reformation” and *sola fide* as “the material principle of the Reformation”? Why did the Epistle of James present Luther with a choice between them? How did Luther redefine the meaning of “apostolic” to justify his position that James should never have been admitted into the canon of the New Testament? What was the ancient and medieval understanding of “apostolicity”?
7. How is Luther’s “perspectival” approach to the meaning of sin and salvation different from the Roman view according to which grace is a supernatural substance that makes the sinner pleasing to God (*gratia gratum faciens*)? By contrast, what does it mean in Protestant theology to say that grace makes God pleasing to the sinner? How does this perspectival approach shed light on the distinction between God as “judge” and God as “father”? Does God undergo a change from being angry with us on account of sin to being reconciled to us on account of Christ’s death?

Calvin and Sadoletto

1. What is meant by “humanism”? What was the Renaissance and what impact did its studies of classical languages and literature have upon the

- Reformation? Is there a parallel between the humanist slogan *ad fontes* (“back to the sources”) and the Protestant call to return to *sola scriptura*? What does it mean to say of Calvin that he, like Zwingli, was a humanist? Was Luther a humanist? How about Sadoleto?
- Why did humanists believe that a revival of classical languages (Greek and Latin) would lead to a renewal of culture? What is the role of eloquence in this vision of educational reform?
- How did humanism enrich Protestant biblical scholarship and what implications did this have for the Protestant understanding of the text and canon of scripture? Do Protestants have the same canon of scripture as do Roman Catholics? What was considered the official text of the Bible according to the medieval Catholic church? What did humanist scholarship demonstrate about the *Vulgate*?
- Why did Protestants reject the allegorical method of exegesis in favor of the literal sense of the text?
- Why did some humanists, such as Erasmus and Sadoleto, refuse to become Protestants? What was the difference between their call for “reform” of the church and the Protestant call for “reformation”? What was meant by charging Protestants with “innovation” and what did this charge connote?
2. How did Protestants understand the church? Wherein lay its authority? How did they use the Augustinian distinction between the visible and the invisible church to defend themselves against the Roman charge that Protestants were heretics and schismatics?

What is meant by “the power of the keys”? What biblical passage is this discussion referring to? How was it understood by Catholics? Why did this passage create difficulties for Protestants that necessitated a new exegesis of it? How did they interpret it?
 3. In spite of their rejection of Augustine’s doctrine that the sacraments are efficacious *ex opere operato*, did this imply that the Protestants embraced a Donatist ecclesiology? In what way did Protestants transfer this Augustinian idea to the role of preaching and the person of the preacher? Can the Word of God be authentically proclaimed by a sinful minister?

What are the two marks of the church according to Protestants?

What is the understanding of the church according to Anabaptist theology? What is the relation of this view to that of the Donatists?

How did the sacramental theology of Calvin differ from that of Luther, on the one hand, and Zwingli, on the other? In spite of his own distinctive understanding of the mode of Christ’s presence in the Eucharist (or the Lord’s Supper), were Calvin’s sympathies more Lutheran or Zwinglian?
 4. How does Calvin understand the relation between the Old and New Testaments? How many covenants are to be found in the entire Bible?

Did Christ come to teach a “new law” in Calvin’s view? Did he abolish the law? How does this differ from the Anabaptist view of the Old and New Testaments?

What is meant by the “third use” of the law in Calvin’s theology? What are the other two uses of the law? Which of these three was deemed to be the “principal use” by Calvin? Is this the same or different from Luther’s view of the law? What danger do Lutherans detect in Calvin’s discussion of this set of questions?

How does Calvin interpret the Decalogue? What is the relation between its teachings and what nature (or the “natural law”) teaches?

5. Why did Protestants reject monasticism and clerical celibacy? What does their rejection of these practices suggest about their valuation of marriage and secular work? What is the Protestant doctrine of vocation? Are some forms of work more “spiritual” or “religious” than others?
6. What is meant by “the Reformed tradition”? Who were its two major Reformers? Did they view their reforming activity as an alternative to that of Luther? Do the Reformed see themselves as anti-Lutheran? Or are they Lutheran in their basic understanding of the meaning of the gospel? Why is there a Reformed tradition distinct from Lutheranism?
7. To what fear of the Genevans did Sadoletto appeal in his attempt to persuade them to return to the Roman church?
Why did Calvin think Sadoletto’s argument is “anthropocentric”?
What does it mean to say that Calvin’s argument, by contrast, is “theocentric”?
What is the relation in Calvin’s thought between human salvation and the service (or “glory”) of God?

The Schleithem Confession and the Dordrecht Confession

1. Why did the Anabaptists reject the practice of infant baptism? What was their criticism of the leaders of the so-called “Magisterial Reformation” (Luther, Zwingli, and Calvin)?
What understanding of “sacraments” in general is implied in the reasons given by the Anabaptists for their rejection of infant baptism in particular? Given that the Anabaptists arose out of Zwingli’s circle, does it make sense to seek a connection between Zwingli’s doctrine of the purpose of the sacraments and the rise of the Anabaptist movement?
What were the two major arguments advanced against infant baptism?
What does the name “Anabaptist” mean and where did it come from?
What is meant by “the Radical Reformation”? What other groups besides the Anabaptists are to be included under this rubric? In general, what criticism did Radical Reformers make of the leaders of the Magisterial Reformation?

2. What understanding of ecclesiology is implied by their rejection of infant baptism? Which ancient understanding of ecclesiology comes to expression anew in the Anabaptist doctrine? What does it mean to call this a “sectarian” ecclesiology? What role does discipline play in this form of ecclesiology?
 What does this sectarian ecclesiology imply about “Christendom”? What is meant by this term? How is their view in this matter related to the Anabaptist refusal to take oaths?
 Why are the Anabaptists pacifists? Are Roman Catholics and other types of Protestants also pacifists?
 Is justification *sola fide* the “main doctrine” of Christian faith for the Anabaptists as it is for Luther and his followers? What is the heart of the New Testament for the Anabaptists? Do they believe that Jesus taught a new law superior to that found in the OT?

The Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent

1. What did the Council of Trent declare about the doctrine of justification? What is the relation of sanctification to justification?
 What is its view of scripture and tradition? Which text of the Bible is authoritative?
 What is the position on predestination?
 What is the relation of grace and merit?
 What did the Council of Trent have to say about the Protestant doctrine of assurance of salvation?
2. What is meant when the Council speaks of the sacrament of penance as “a second plank after the shipwreck of grace lost”?
 How is a “mortal sin” defined?
 How are the sacraments defined? How is the Eucharist defined?
 How is the authority of the church understood? How is the church defined? Is it necessary to believe the Catholic faith in order to be saved?

Unitarians (or Socinians)

1. What were the Unitarian objections to the patristic doctrine of the Trinity? Did the Unitarians think this doctrine was truly biblical?
 Did the Reformers (Luther, Zwingli, and Calvin) set aside the trinitarian doctrine when they insisted that the church’s tradition had to be tested according to the principle of *sola scriptura*?
 Like the Anabaptists, the Unitarians made a general criticism of the leaders of the magisterial Reformation: what was it?
 Who was Servetus and what fate did he undergo and where? Had Calvin’s own commitment to the trinitarian doctrine ever been called into question?

2. What was Castellio's argument about heresy?
 What was Schwenckfeld's argument about the relation between church and civil government?
 How did the persecution of Unitarians and Anabaptists occasion serious reflection upon the question of religious liberty?
 Did Luther, Zwingli, and Calvin believe in freedom of religion? Did the pope?
 Why did Protestant and Catholic alike view heresy as a threat to society?

The Edwardian Homilies, The Thirty-Nine Articles,
 The Westminster Confession, and The Cambridge Platform

1. Why is Anglicanism spoken of as a *via media* and what does this mean? Between what two alternatives does it strive to be a "middle way"?
 What was the Elizabethan Settlement? How does this explain the doctrinal imprecision of the English church?
 What doctrinal views are upheld in the Edwardian Homilies and the Thirty-Nine Articles? Are they more Catholic or Protestant?
2. Who were the Puritans and what is their origin? What does the name "Puritan" mean? Why were they disappointed with the Elizabethan Settlement?
 What were the three denominational expressions of Puritanism?
 What are the three historic forms of polity (church government)?
 Over what two issues did the Puritans divide?
 On what issue did Congregationalists and Baptists agree over against the Presbyterians?
 On what issue did Presbyterians and Congregationalists agree over against the Baptists? Are the Baptists directly descended from the Anabaptist movement that arose in Switzerland?
 Which group of Puritans authored the Westminster Confession? Why did this document become so important in the history of English-speaking Presbyterianism?

Arminianism, Wesley, and Methodism

1. What was the Arminian controversy? Who was Arminius?
 What objections did the Arminians make against the doctrine of double predestination? What is this doctrine and who first formulated it?
 Did Luther, and Zwingli also believe in double predestination or was Calvin alone among the Protestants in teaching it? What position does the Westminster Confession adopt on this issue?
 What arguments did the Synod of Dort offer to counter the Arminian objections to this doctrine?
 What came to be seen as "the five points of Calvinism"? What does the acronym TULIP stand for?

2. Who was John Wesley? What position did he take in the Arminian controversy? Were all Methodists Arminians? Is it possible to be both a Methodist and a Calvinist?
- What did Wesley mean by “perfection”? What position on perfection did Luther and Calvin adopt? What was Augustine’s view on this question?
- What is Wesley’s view of sanctification? Does Wesley’s doctrine strike you as more Protestant or Catholic?