

**Chapter 1 : What is the Restoration Movement?**

*Evangelicalism and the Stone-Campbell Movement is a collection of essays that were given over a period of several years at the Stone-Campbell meeting at the Evangelical Theological Society conference.*

Introduction Rather than review Evangelicalism and the Stone Campbell Movement EatSCM hereafter , I would like to reflect on a number of the essays that comprise the volume as they relate to the doctrine of baptism. While baptism was not the emphasis of all of these articles, it nonetheless came to the fore repeatedly. In that the comparison and contrast of the SCM with evangelicalism clarifies what Restoration is and is becoming, it is important for neo-restoration to note that baptism, an issue of no small historical significance, continues to be vitally important as a talking point between the two groups. In the course of the quest to understand whether or not the CofC and CC manifestations of the SCM are properly evangelical, the distinctives of historical restorationism come into focus, and we are better able to see how those inform our view of baptism as well as what place they hold in the emerging restorationism. Therefore, we are grateful to have a variety of perspectives and emphases regarding baptism surface in the course of this scholarly dialogue. Specifically, I intend to look at some particular arguments and statements in relation to one anotherâ€™s statements that were, in fairness, not necessarily made in relation to each other originally. I have three primary goals in so doing: However, having done my master of arts in Greek at Abilene Christian University, I am aware that many scholars and people among Churches of Christ have moved away from a strict separatism and are less insistent on water baptism as an absolute requirement for justification. Perhaps we are seeing a healthy move to the middle on both our parts , emphasis added. This middle is what EatSCM effectively presents, yet it is a multifaceted middle rather than a simple compromise. It seems, in fact, that the emerging middle is really just movement in the same direction from different starting points , without the assurance that an actual convergence will result, for there are a number of curves along the path. Baptism in relation to faith and works The traditional context of the disagreement over baptism is the evangelical commitment to the salvific binity of sola gratiaand sola fide. While his overall point of view is questionable, we may extrapolate a number of helpful points from his work. The third restorationist view is represented by this quote from K. This is explicitly what his second restorationist example claims to do. How can this be? Regardless of the unnecessary confusion Cottrell creates, the idea we may extrapolate from his work is very helpful. It comes in the form of a question: It is the moment of an ontological transition that is at stake when it comes to who is in and who is out, or who is right with God, or just as has too often been the case who is right. It is the boundary marker implicit in the exclusivity of the Christian religion, and, judgmentalism aside, it is quite reasonable what we should desire to be clear on when and how that boundary is crossed. Thus, despite the conflation in the definitions above of a number of things that do not occur simultaneously, the discussion naturally returns to parse out the pieces and find the moment of transition among the facets of faith. The upshot of this is a question that tends to arise over and over when we settle on answers to reductionistic queries: If faith is the actual instrument of salvation in the temporal sense of the moment of transition from not saved to saved, then is anything else is logically necessary for or, perhaps more accurately, proper to salvation per se? Cottrell, recognizing the implications of the temporal concern, carries the nuancing a step further. Clearly, while faith remains the means instrument of salvation, the moment occasion is transferred to baptism. This clarifies the fundamental difference between evangelical and SCM views. The SCM view carries with it some obvious questions, which will be discussed more below. Thus, the restorationists who attempted, in one way or another, to conflate faith and baptism were accurately if not clearly representing the SCM viewpoint, and it is strangely similar in kind to the majority evangelical view. Yet, another semantical point proves vital. The emphasis here falls on the through. Baptism is not an instrument of grace administered by man ex opere operato , nor is it a meritorious act. God is the one who saves. It is a divine means of grace. Here the trajectory of our previous observations takes an interesting turn. If this is so, why make the distinction? Salvation is by God alone, and our doctrine of faith should not overshadow that fact. Rather, faith continues to be a basis or requisite for salvation, but it is God who saves on that basis when and through what means he chooses.

Getting hung up on rigid classifications of instrument, occasion, etc. This will be important in the discussion of normativeness below, but for now we turn to another facet of the sacramental understanding of baptism. The necessity of assurance. Another dimension of the concern about the moment of transition is assurance. On the personal level, the individual also seeks assurance about himself. The question can take many forms, but the answer must take the form of an identifiable transition from not saved to saved, from unregenerate to regenerate, from guilty to forgiven, from not a people to the people of God, and so forth. Amid the various answers, we may postulate that God understands the need for assurance and affords it in baptism. This is also an act of grace—a sacramental function. Assurance is a real and profound need, and God addressing it with such clarity and, what is more, symbolic power is a gift that is too easily underestimated. Baptism as a sign, efficacious though it be. We may offer another answer as to why God should choose to act in the moment of baptism. For while God works in the sacrament, the believer and the church have roles as well. The difference between what happens and how it is signified should give us pause to consider the role of that signification. Why not just bald efficaciousness? Why not just the inward grace and be done with it? That God chooses to make a sign efficacious—rather than granting an unseen transition in an unseen realm through an unseen faith—is at once missional and holistic. That another believer administers baptism in the presence of the church is not to be minimized. It is holistic in that it challenges the false dichotomy between the physical and the spiritual. While we may presume in the abstract that the transition happens regardless of the sign, that the symbol is not necessary, we must admit in the concrete that baptism as sacrament represents the unity of the two rather than the distinction. While the reactionary nature of this teaching unbalanced it, the turn reintroduced an important point about baptism. The believer does make covenant with God in baptism. Nor is there anything stated here that suggests human work is either meritorious or efficacious in se. Instead, the suggestion is that baptism, as a sacrament, does entail both the work of God and the work of man. Even if we go so far as to say that the rite of baptism is ordained by God, we must admit that the symbolizing realized in baptism is done by humans. That God could save without it does not mean that he in fact does save without it as the typical semantics are used to prove. Therefore, another answer to the question as to why God should save at the moment of baptism is that God may choose to make his work contingent upon the work of both the church and the new believer. That he may, by implication, choose not to employ such means is not grounds to create a fundamental doctrine of salvation apart from those means, if we intend to leave the prerogative with God. This, in fact, points toward the discussion of normativeness that will ensue below. But first, we must consider another perspective. This seems to be so with the doctrine of baptism in particular. Scholarship in recent years has exposed many of the faulty assumptions that have ruled Protestant thinking. Wright, a chief New Perspective spokesperson, when dealing with the Second-Temple milieu. The point to emerge is that a hard distinction between their fundamental meanings is inaccurate. The transition, viewed in this light, is into the people of God—into the covenant people, to put it in the preferred language of the New Perspective. While very different in substance from traditional views, it is no less a transition from excluded to included, not saved to saved. Though Weatherly does not spell this out in any depth, the point is difficult to deny *prima facie*, and with a little more exposition it comprises another vital component of baptism. We naturally think of this transition as a moment of change—a temporal marker. The point is that the NT writings clearly take baptism as that marker. By implication, the moment that the Spirit is gifted may also be taken as a temporal marker of salvation. The idea, stated generally, is that even the passages where baptism and the Spirit are separate, it is clear that the two were expected to go together—that they did not in those instances is precisely what emphasizes the exceptional nature of what is happening in those episodes. The exceptions do beg a question that we cannot ignore, but that will come later. That such a gift should be typically predicated on an act like baptism is surprising only for those who have assumed that such divine gifts must be by definition separated from any particular form of response to the divine initiative, including one that by its nature portrays that divine initiative. In conjunction with the observations so far, the grammar points to a temporal coincidence. In this textually based sense, baptism is indeed an efficacious sign. There may yet be a stepping stone on the way to a middle ground, however, in that the New Perspective is not without acceptance among evangelical scholars, though it remains to be seen who among either of these groups will ultimately accept so

explicitly non-traditional a framework. One point particularly important for the doctrine of baptism, emphasized especially by N. There are two sub-points to make here. The role of baptism in fact clarifies some of the ambiguity that plagues the discussion of these conceptual nuances—that forgiveness, inclusion in Christ, and justification are all associated with baptism creates the temporal coincidence that often causes their conflation. It was that they were a particular kind of boundary marker with particular problems. Baptism then, as much as faith, functioned as a Christian covenant boundary marker. It is important to see the statement for the warning that it entails: The SCM has never advocated a doctrine of baptism apart from faith, and reasserting that belief within the New Perspective framework seems promising, to say the least. This concern makes sense in light of the restorationist impulse toward authoritative NT forms. This, in turn, causes us to admit that the NT writers and likely NT Christians as a whole were not concerned with our questions about the precise moment of salvation or our nuances regarding the instrumentality of faith in relation to the rite of baptism. That is, there was no cause in the NT context to make the point about faith saving over against baptism. NT Christians simply were not Protestants. This does not mean that the distinction does not exist; it only means that it may not be exegetically defensible, as previous comments indicate. And yet, when stated this way, there is nothing objectionable to a great many evangelicals, because the statement itself does not speak to the temporal concern that causes them to make their usual qualifications. What would be particularly restorationist is to make the same statement in relation to the specific temporal concern at issue: Concern for a normal pattern of faith including salvation at the moment of baptism. Blomberg himself ultimately relegates baptism. For Blomberg, it obviously happened at another time.

**Chapter 2 : Book Review: "Evangelicalism in the Stone-Campbell Movement (Nov-Dec)" Wineskins**

*The Stone-Campbell Movement, also known as the Restoration Movement, arose on the frontiers of early nineteenth-century America. Like-minded Methodists, Baptists and Presbyterians abandoned denominational labels in order to be "Christians only."*

Beginning around the fifth century, there was a gradual decline in the permanent diaconate in the Latin church. It has however remained a vital part of the Eastern Catholic Churches. Following the recommendations of the council in Lumen gentium , 29 , in Pope Paul VI issued the motu proprio Sacrum Diaconatus Ordinem, restoring the ancient practice of ordaining to the diaconate men who were not candidates for priestly ordination. These men are known as permanent deacons in contrast to those continuing their formation, who were then called transitional deacons. There is no sacramental or canonical difference between the two, however, as there is only one order of deacons. But it usually entails a year of prayerful preparation, a four- or five-year training period that resembles a collegiate course of study, and a year of post-ordination formation as well as the need for lifelong continuing education credits. Diaconal candidates receive instruction in philosophy , theology , study of the Holy Scriptures the Bible , homiletics , sacramental studies, evangelization , ecclesiology , counseling, and pastoral care and ministry before ordination. The ministry of charity involves service to the poor and marginalized and working with parishioners to help them become more involved in such ministry. As clerics, deacons are required to pray the Liturgy of the Hours. Deacons may preside at funeral rites not involving a Mass e. They can preside over various services such as Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament , and they may give certain blessings. They cannot hear confession and give absolution, anoint the sick, or celebrate Mass. At Mass, the deacon is the ordinary minister of the proclamation of the Gospel in fact, a priest, bishop, or even the Pope should not proclaim the Gospel if a deacon is present [12] and of Holy Communion primarily, of the Precious Blood. As ordained clerics, and if granted faculties by their bishops, deacons may preach the homily at a public Mass, unless the priest celebrant retains that ministry to himself at a given Mass. Catholic deacon wearing a dalmatic The vestments most particularly associated with the Western Rite Catholic deacon are the alb , stole and dalmatic. Deacons, like priests and bishops, must wear their albs and stoles; deacons place the stole over their left shoulder and it hangs across to their right side, while priests and bishops wear it around their necks. The dalmatic, a vestment especially associated with the deacon, is worn during the celebration of the Mass and other liturgical functions; its use is more liberally applied than the corresponding vestment of the priest, the chasuble. In the United States, some deacons only wear the dalmatic at Masses that are considered feasts, solemnities, or solemn or important occasions, such as ordinations, weddings, funerals, Baptisms, or dedication ceremonies. Permanent deacons often serve in parish or other ministry as their time permits, since they typically have other full-time employment. They may also act as parish administrators canon of the Code of Canon Law. With the passage of time, more and more deacons are serving in full-time ministries in parishes, hospitals, prisons, and in diocesan positions. Deacons often work directly in ministry to the marginalized inside and outside the church: The transitional diaconate is to be conferred on seminarians continuing to the priesthood no sooner than 23 years of age canon of the Code of Canon Law. The permanent diaconate can be conferred on single men 25 or older, and on married men 35 or older, but an older age can be required by the episcopal conference. Under some very rare circumstances, however, deacons who have been widowed can receive permission to remarry. This is most commonly done when the deacon is left as a single father. In some cases, a widowed deacon will seek priestly ordination, especially if his children are grown. The wife of a permanent deacon may be sometimes considered a partner in his ordained ministry. In many dioceses, the wife of the diaconal candidate undertakes the same education and training her husband does. Deacon is used as the honorific for permanent deacons in many dioceses e. The decision as to whether deacons wear the Roman collar as street attire is left to the discretion of each bishop for his own diocese. Where clerical garb is approved by the bishop, the deacon can choose to wear or not wear the "collar". It is becoming more common to see deacons wearing a clerical suit especially in prisons and jails. Deacons, like seminarians, religious, and

the two other orders, bishops and priests, pray the Liturgy of the Hours ; however, deacons are usually only required to pray Morning and Evening Prayer. In solemn Masses today and more so in older Rites of the Mass, one deacon will serve as the Deacon of the Word proclaiming the Gospel and the Kyrie, and some other parts , and the Deacon of the Eucharist , who assists the priest during the Liturgy of the Eucharist. Before the reforms of Vatican Council II and the restoration of the permanent diaconate, it was common for a priest to vest as a deacon at High Mass and perform the parts assigned for the deacon. Those who have embraced the reforms of the Council generally consider it an abuse for a priest to vest as a deacon. Eastern Orthodoxy and Eastern Catholicism[ edit ] Greek Orthodox deacon in the Church of the Nativity in Bethlehem , wearing an orarion over his sticharion. On his head he wears the clerical kamilavka. In addition to proclaiming the Gospel and assisting in the distribution of Holy Communion , the deacon censes the icons and people, calls the people to prayer, leads the litanies , and has a role in the dialogue of the Anaphora. In keeping with Eastern tradition, he is not permitted to perform any Sacred Mysteries sacraments on his own, except for Baptism in extremis in danger of death , conditions under which anyone, including the laity, may baptize. When assisting at a normal baptism, it is often the deacon who goes down into the water with the one being baptized Acts 8: In contrast to the Roman Catholic Church , deacons in the Eastern Churches may not preside at the celebration of marriages, as in Eastern theology the sacrament is conferred by the nuptial blessing of a priest. The last are worn under his sticharion, not over it as does a priest or bishop. The deacon usually wears a simple orarion which is only draped over the left shoulder but, if elevated to the rank of archdeacon, he wears the "doubled-orarion", meaning it is passed over the left shoulder, under the right arm, and then crossed over the left shoulder see photograph, right. In modern Greek practice, a deacon wears this doubled orarion from the time of his ordination. Also, in the Greek practice, he wears the clerical kamilavka cylindrical head covering with a rim at the top. In Slavic practice, a hierodeacon monastic deacon wears the simple black kamilavka of a monk without the rim , but he removes the monastic veil see klobuk when he is vested; a married deacon would not wear a kamilavka unless it is given to him by the bishop as an ecclesiastical award ; the honorary kamilavka is purple in colour, and may be awarded to either married or monastic clergy. As far as street clothing is concerned, immediately following his ordination the deacon receives a blessing to wear the Exorasson Arabic: Riassa , an outer cassock with wide sleeves, in addition to the Anterior Slavonic: Podraznik , the inner cassock worn by all orders of clergy. In the Slavic practice, married clergy may wear any of a number of colours, but most often grey, while monastic clergy always wear black. In certain jurisdictions in North America and Western Europe, a Roman collar is often worn, although this is not a traditional or widespread practice. An archdeacon is similar, but is among the monastic clergy. Protodeacons and archdeacons use a double-length orarion even if it is not the local tradition for all deacons to use it. In the Slavic tradition a deacon may be awarded the doubled-orarion even if he is not a protodeacon or archdeacon. Painting of a Russian Orthodox deacon leading an ektenia litany According to the practice of the Greek Orthodox Church of America, in keeping with the tradition of the Ecumenical Patriarchate, the most common way to address a deacon is "Father". The tradition of kissing the hands of ordained clergy extends to the diaconate as well. This practice is rooted in the Holy Eucharist and is in acknowledgement and respect of the eucharistic role members of the clergy play in preparing, handling and disbursing the sacrament during the Divine Liturgy, and in building and serving the church as the Body of Christ. Anciently, the Eastern churches ordained women as deaconesses. This practice fell into desuetude in the second millennium, but has been revived in some Orthodox and Oriental Orthodox churches. Saint Nectarios of Aegina ordained a number of nuns as deaconesses in convents. Deaconesses would assist in anointing and baptising women, and in ministering to the spiritual needs of the women of the community. Anglicanism[ edit ] An Anglican priest vested as a deacon with an alb and a purple stole over his left shoulder In Anglican churches, deacons often work directly in ministry to the marginalized inside and outside the church: Unlike Orthodox and Catholic deacons who may be married only before ordination, Anglican deacons are permitted to marry freely before or after ordination, as are Anglican priests. Most deacons are "transitional", that is, preparing for the priesthood and they are usually ordained priests about a year after their diaconal ordination. However, there are some deacons who do not go on to receive priestly ordination, so called "permanent deacons". Many provinces of the Anglican

Communion ordain both women and men as deacons. Many of those provinces that ordain women to the priesthood previously allowed them to be ordained only to the diaconate. The effect of this was the creation of a large and overwhelmingly female diaconate for a time, as most men proceeded to be ordained priests after a short time as a deacon. February 24, Anglican deacons may baptize and in some dioceses are granted licences to solemnize matrimony, usually under the instruction of their parish priest and bishop. An Anglican deacon wears an identical choir dress to an Anglican priest: However, liturgically, deacons usually wear a stole over their left shoulder and fastened on the right side of their waist. This is worn both over the surplice and the alb. A deacon might also wear a dalmatic. Deaconess The title "woman deacon" or "deaconess" appears in many documents from the early Church period, particularly in the East. Their duties were often different from that of male deacons; women deacons prepared adult women for baptism and they had a general apostolate to female Christians and catechumens typically for the sake of modesty. Liturgies for the ordination of women deacons are quite similar to those for male deacons [22] and the ancient ordination rites have been noted by groups like Womenpriests. Unlike in the case of priestly ordination, the Vatican has declined to state that ordination of women to the diaconate is not possible. The Russian Orthodox Church had a female diaconate into the 20th century. The best-known form of diaconate are trained, paid pastoral workers, often working in parishes with considerable social and economic deprivation. The permanent diaconate was formerly exclusively female, and it was in the centenary year of the diaconate that men were admitted to the office of deacon. Women could not be ordained as ministers until The offices of deacon and minister are now both open to both women and men; deacons are now ordained they were previously "commissioned". However, in some churches the property-functions of the diaconate and session of elders is commended to an independent board of trustees. Deacons are specially charged with ministries of mercy, especially toward the sick and the poor. As such, the deacons are also members of the local church council. A special feature of the Dutch Reformed churches is the fact that the diaconate of each local church is its own legal entity with its own financial means, separated from the church itself, and governed by the deacons. Methodist churches[ edit ] In Methodism, deacons began as a transitional order before ordination as elders presbyters. In , the United Methodist Church ended the transitional deacon and established a new Order of Deacons to be equal in status with the Order of Elders. Both men and women may be ordained as deacons. Deacons serve in a variety of specialized ministries including, but not limited to, Christian education, music, communications and ministries of justice and advocacy. Unlike United Methodist elders, deacons must find their own place of service. Nevertheless, the bishop does officially approve and appoint deacons to their selected ministry. The Methodist Church of Great Britain also has a permanent diaconate based on an understanding of the New Testament that deacons have an equal, but distinct ministry from presbyters. Deacons are called to a ministry of service and witness, and "to hold before them the needs and concerns of the world". The Methodist Conference re-opened the order to both men and women and the first ordinations to the renewed order occurred during the Conference in Cardiff, which coincided with celebrations of years of diaconal service in British Methodism; deaconesses had previously been ordained at their annual convocation. The role of deacon in these denominations varies greatly from denomination to denomination; often, there will be more emphasis on administrative duties than on pastoral or liturgical duties. Elders handle pastoral and other administrative duties.

### Chapter 3 : Account Suspended

*Evangelicalism and the Stone-Campbell Movement is a collection of essays that were given over a period of several years at the Stone-Campbell meeting at the Evangelical Theological Society conference. It contains several back and forth articles that are in dialogue with one another.*

Please click button to get evangelicalism the stone campbell movement book now. This site is like a library, you could find million book here by using search box in the widget. The Stone-Campbell Movement, also known as the Restoration Movement, arose on the frontiers of early nineteenth-century America. Like-minded Methodists, Baptists and Presbyterians abandoned denominational labels in order to be "Christians only. Modern-day inheritors of this movement, including the Churches of Christ a cappella and the Christian Churches independent , find much in common with wider evangelical Christianity as a whole. Both groups are committed to the authority of Scripture and the importance of personal conversion. Yet Restorationists and evangelicals, separated by sociological history as well as points of doctrinal emphasis, have been wary of each other. Evangelicals have often misunderstood Restorationists as exclusivist separatists and baptismal regenerationists. On the other hand, Stone-Campbell adherents have been suspicious of mainstream denominational evangelicals as having compromised key aspects of the Christian faith. In recent years Restoration Movement leaders and churches have moved more freely within evangelical circles. As a result, Stone-Campbell scholars have reconsidered their relationship to evangelicalism, pondering to what extent Restorationists can identify themselves as evangelicals. Gathered here are essays by leading Stone-Campbell thinkers, drawing from their Restoration heritage and offering significant contributions to evangelical discussions of the theology of conversion and ecclesiology. Also included are responses from noted evangelicals, who assess how Stone-Campbell thought both corresponds with and diverges from evangelical perspectives. Along with William R. Wayne House, Robert C. Kurka, Robert Lowery, Edward P. Myers and Jon A. Eerdmans Publishing Format Available: Written by more than contributors, this major reference work contains over original articles covering all of the significant individuals, events, places, and theological tenets that have shaped the Movement. Much more than simply a historical dictionary, this volume also constitutes an interpretive work reflecting historical consensus among Stone-Campbell scholars, even as it attempts to present a fair, representative picture of the rich heritage that is the Stone-Campbell Movement. A Global History tells the story of Christians from around the globe and across time who have sought to witness faithfully to the gospel of reconciliation.

**Chapter 4 : Evangelicalism the Stone-Campbell Movement : Mark Noll :**

*The Stone-Campbell Movement, also known as the Restoration Movement, arose on the frontiers of early nineteenth-century America. Like-minded Methodists, Baptists and Presbyterians abandoned denominational labels in order to be "Christians only." They called followers to join in Christian unity and.*

As denominations 2 , they trace their roots to a number of nineteenth century, dissident Presbyterian and Baptist clergy -- e. Barton Stone, Thomas Campbell and his son, Alexander. At their core, all three are representative of modern-day theistic humanism. Nearly all embrace evangelical Arminianism and are non-dispensational in their interpretation of Scripture. Consequently, none are completely free of first century Judaism, and thus they struggle with various forms of legalism. Their non-dispensational view of Scripture causes them to emphasis the early ministry of Peter, and the Kingdom Gospel, in the Book of Acts 4. Their banner Bible verse is Acts 2: They are unable to grasp why the Apostle Peter and the Apostle Paul placed different emphasis on the act of water baptism, and are baffled why the Holy Spirit would allow Paul to write in 1 Corinthians 1: For Christ did not send me to baptize, but to preach the gospel, not with wisdom of words, lest the cross of Christ should be made of no effect. Consequently, these groups have traditionally and erroneously made water baptism an integral part of salvation. Many teach a baptismal regeneration --i. Similar to Pentecostals and Seventh-Day Adventists, they have worked to build acceptance within mainline evangelicalism by being furtive with their views,--in specific the role of water baptism. If pressed or exposed, they easily become belligerent. For extensive documentation regarding the water baptism issue, see the Wikipedia reference link below. The Campbellite concept of Christianity is largely the form of religion found in the Synoptic Gospels and the transitional period of the early chapters of the Acts before the displacement of Peter and his message of the Kingdom. However, unlike the early Apostles, they reject the sovereignty of God in favor of the so-called free-will of man -- theistic humanism. It is their failure to understand the Pauline revelation that accounts for the spiritual poverty [not numbers] of their fellowships and associations. Also read the Wikipedia entry: Stone, pivotal figures in the history of the movement , the American Reformation and sometimes the Reformation Movement, although this name is easily confused with the Reformation of the 16th century. Some prefer to refer to themselves as a "fellowship" of churches, some absolutely independent. However, the similarities for each of the three groups far outweigh any differences, and the distinction is lost on the average visitor. What success they achieve is largely of the non-doctrinal variety. One of their ploys is to "corporately take upon ourselves no names but those for which there is a Biblical precedent. At Pentecost he was speaking to Israel [Jews] only. This was before the Gentiles were brought into the Church, as recorded in Acts As we read in Acts 2: Then he instructed them, "Repent, and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit. This was the Gospel of the circumcision, and involved water baptism before receiving the gift of the Spirit. They were to repent of having representatively slain their Messiah, and in a figurative way to wash their hands of the crime by being baptized water. Then the Spirit would indwell them. Paul was saved on the basis of this Gospel of the circumcision Acts 9: In the Gospel of the uncircumcision the order is: It is true the movement was started by some disenchanting Baptist and Presbyterian ministers who grew tired of the futile denominational arguing etc. The original goal was to have a church that just followed the bible and reflected that of the first century. Well, as you state, the result was of course the group of churches you talked about, with the Churches of Christ being the most legalistic of the bunch and a very "fundamental" view of the scriptures. To make the story short, these churches have all found out about Grace. Even the Churches of Christ are becoming that way in mass. Of course, there are a few "hold outs" who have dug in their legalistic heels and who are a bit nasty. Some I know personally are what I term "quasi-Calvinists" LOL [laughing out loud] As for baptismal regeneration, it is true that it has been taught in Churches of Christ and it probably is still being taught in some today. However, and believe me I have researched the matter, I am unable to find one contemporary Church of Christ scholar who holds to that theological position. It is my opinion that the people still teaching it do so out of tradition or a lack of education. Today, it is usually preached as an ordinance or part of our faith response to

the Gospel. I am a part of these groups, and in my lifetime I have seen the switch from legalism to grace and it is very exciting. They simply point me to books many I have already read that theologically dissect the orthodoxy and legalism of some of the groups in this movement. Anyway, your prayers and support are appreciated as we try to move forward in grace. Grace and Peace to You and your family! Thank you for your critique of my critique. My observations are, of course, limited to what I read and my personal contact over the years both with church members and those who have left the movement. I will grant you that these denominations have changed over the past several decades; however, your and my view of the nature of that change appears to differ widely. First, while I have never met a single one of your so-called "quasi-Calvinists", I have encountered numerous former members who are now either half-blown or full-blown charismatics. As typically the case, these folks are in the process of exchanging the deadness of their legalism for the wildfire of religious subjectivism. I have yet to meet, or hear of secondhand, a Campbellite or ex-Campbellite who understands or embraces the identificational truths as expounded by the Apostle Paul. It is heartening to see you and others willing to explore outside the walls of your "denomination. We look forward to hearing from you again. By His sovereign love, grace, and mercy, Dan R.

**Chapter 5 : Christians (Stone Movement) - Wikipedia**

*Max Lucado and Gene Appel embody the new engagement between the Stone-Campbell Movement and evangelicalism. Lucado is America's bestselling Christian writer; and Appel was recently appointed successor to Bill Hybels at Willow Creek, America's largest and most influential evangelical church.*

What is the Restoration Movement? Methodists, Baptists, Presbyterians, and others abandoned their formal denominations with hopes of establishing a church based solely on the Christianity taught in the New Testament. Because the different organized denominations had constructed rules and practices that did not come explicitly from the Bible, those with new ideas felt the divisions must be dissolved. Among the most influential leaders of this movement were Alexander Campbell and Barton W. Although the fundamental views remained, in this group split. Over time many additional schisms have formed from these core groups as well. Currently there are three major and several minor groups who trace their roots back to the Stone-Campbell Restoration Movement: Among the key principles of the Restoration Movement are: Overall, the people of this movement try to pattern their practices and rituals as closely as possible to those of the New Testament. In fact, Acts 2: While the desire for there to be nothing dividing believers is a noble one, there is no evidence that attending a Baptist or Presbyterian church divides one from those of other churches any more than attending a Disciples of Christ church divides one from those of other churches within the Restoration Movement. The spirit of unity or disunity is a heart issue, not a matter of church affiliation. Although a key principle of the Restoration Movement is concern for Christian unity, the history of the movement is itself riddled with numerous splits, re-splits and schisms. The adherents to the Restoration Movement are careful to have no other name but Christ in their church titles, believing this to be true to the New Testament. Thus, the name reflects its method of governance, completely in accordance with New Testament church structure. As with any group or organization claiming to represent Christ and His church, what they believe and how it lines up with the Bible is of paramount importance. When examining the Restoration Movement, of particular concern is their doctrine of salvation. You must believe, repent of sin, confess Christ, and be baptized for the remission of sins. One must admit his or her sinfulness and need for forgiveness, then repent and accept Jesus as Lord of his or her life. One must then be baptized by full-body immersion for the remission of sins. At this point, it is believed that one begins a new life, and is reborn. This directly contradicts the biblical doctrine of salvation by grace through faith alone, without the added condition of works Ephesians 2: Baptism is not a requirement for salvation, but is rather evidence of it. Just as once we are born, we cannot be made unborn, we have been made new creatures in Christ 2 Corinthians 5: On the positive side, the Restoration Movement has maintained belief in the deity of Christ, unlike the rest of those in the restorationist movement.

**Chapter 6 : Download [PDF] Evangelicalism The Stone Campbell Movement Free Online | New Books in P**

*Evangelicalism & the Stone-Campbell Movement by William R. Baker, Mark A. Noll The Stone-Campbell Movement, also known as the Restoration Movement, arose on the frontiers of early nineteenth-century America.*

**Chapter 7 : evangelicalism the stone campbell movement | Download eBook PDF/EPUB**

*NEW Book Review. Evangelicalism & The Stone-Campbell Movement, Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, Edited By William R. Baker Foreword by Mark Noll calendrierdelascience.com The founders of the Stone-Campbell Movement (Restoration Movement) set out to right the wrongs of sectarian Christianity.*

**Chapter 8 : Church of Christ, Disciples of Christ, Christian Church, so-called**

*Max Lucado and Gene Appel embody the new engagement between the Stone-Campbell Movement and evangelicalism. Lucado is Americas bestselling Christian writer; and Appel was recently appointed successor to Bill*

*Hybels at Willow Creek, Americas largest and most influential evangelical church. Both men have deep Stone-Campbell Movement roots.*

## Chapter 9 : What is Restorationism?

*--Millennialism in the early Stone-Campbell movement / Richard J. Cheroke --Critique of contemporary preterism in the Stone-Campbell movement and evangelicalism / Edward P. Myers --Response / Grant Osborne --Understanding the Bible through contemplating the role of the Old Testament as Christian scripture.*