

Hello. /We will begin the second lecture on “Criticism of Modern Theology.” /**Liberal theology is a heretical.** /**The reason why liberal theology is heretical is** it denies the Bible’s core doctrines. /Books written by representative liberal theologians confirm this fact.

/1. Liberal theology denies Jesus Christ’s incarnation and his virgin birth.

/Liberal theology denies Christ’s **incarnation**, that is to say, it denies the fact that “the Word became flesh.”

/There is a neo-orthodox theologian by the name of Reinhold Niebuhr. /In his book “Beyond Tragedy,” he says that “the idea of eternity entering time is intellectually absurd.” He also says, “The truth that the Word was made flesh outrages all the canons by which truth is usually judged.”

/Paul Tillich says in his book “Systematic Theology” that “the assertion that God has become man is not a paradoxical but a nonsensical statement.”

/However, Christ’s incarnation is a basic fact. /John 1:14 says, “And the Word became flesh and dwelt among us, and we have seen his glory, glory as of the only Son from the Father, full of grace and truth.” /This verse testifies to the incarnation of Christ.

/The Bible says that to deny Christ’s incarnation is an antichrist belief. /1 John 4:2-3 says, “By this you know the Spirit of God: every spirit that confesses that Jesus Christ has come in the flesh is from God, and every spirit that does not confess Jesus is not from God. This is the spirit of the antichrist...”

/2 John verse 7 reads, “For many deceivers have gone out into the world, those who do not confess the coming of Jesus Christ in the flesh. Such a one is the deceiver and the antichrist.”

/Related to Christ’s incarnation is another truth, the truth of the virgin birth. /The Bible bears witness to the fact that Christ was born to the virgin Mary.

/However, liberal theology denies this. /In “Church Dogmatics,” Karl Barth writes, “The old controversy whether his mother is called a young wife or a virgin does not in any way affect the real sense.” /This blurs the truth of the virgin birth.

/In “Beyond Tragedy,” Reinhold Niebuhr writes, “Men may be deceived by the primitive myth of the Virgin Birth and seek to comprehend as a pure historical fact, what is significant precisely because it points beyond history.”

/Calling the virgin birth a “myth,” Niebuhr says that men who believe this are deceived. / In a book called “The Self and the Dramas of History,” he says that “miracles such as the “virgin birth” are afterthoughts.”

/These people deny the truth of Christ's virgin birth. /However, Christ's virgin birth is clearly made known by the Gospels. /The Gospel according to Matthew bears witness to this fact. It says when Jesus' mother Mary and Joseph were betrothed but before they came together, Mary was found to be with child from the Holy Spirit. An angel of the Lord appeared to her husband Joseph and said, "That which is conceived in her is from the Holy Spirit." Joseph did not know Mary until she gave birth to a son (Matthew 1:18,20,25).

/The Gospel according to Luke says, "And Mary said to the angel, "How will this be, since I am a virgin?" And the angel answered her, "The Holy Spirit will come upon you, and the power of the Most High will overshadow you; therefore the child to be born will be called holy—the Son of God" (Luke 1:34-35).

/Because the supernatural virgin birth of Christ is a standard for our faith, it is important. /Whoever believes in God's omnipotence can believe in the virgin birth. /Furthermore, the virgin birth of Christ is related to his divine nature.

/Luke 1:35 reads, "Therefore the child to be born will be called holy—the Son of God." / Liberal theology does not believe in God's supernatural power and therefore is a theology of unbelief. /This is the mindset of the Sadducees who lived during the time of Jesus and did not believe in resurrection, angels, or spirits.

/The Lord said to them, "You know neither the Scriptures nor the power of God."

/Next, **2. Liberal theology denies Christ's miracles.**

/From the beginning, liberal theology has been suspicious of God's supernatural revelations and miracles, and this suspicion comes from its critical study of Scripture. This is how it still is today.

/There is a theologian by the name of Rudolf Bultmann. /In his book "The Gospel of John," he says, "There is no doubt the story of changing water to wine has been taken over from heathen legend and ascribed to Jesus." /He denies the miracle of changing water to wine.

/Another theologian by the name of Paul Tillich /talks about Christ's deeds as a whole. He says in his book "Systematic Theology" that "As it is with all historical research, we only have fragmentary and hypothetical knowledge of the person of Jesus. Historical research subjects this knowledge to methodological skepticism and to continuous change in particulars as well as essentials." /This is saying he doesn't believe in the Bible's miracles.

/There is another theologian Joachim Jeremias. /In his book "New Testament Theology" he says, "We also find accounts of the expulsions of demons, healings, raisings of the dead, stillings of the storm, miracles with wine, in contemporary popular literature, especially from a Hellenistic milieu. Some of these miracle stories display such close contacts with those in the gospels that we can hardly avoid the conclusion that the

Christian tradition borrowed from its environment and at the least took over some individual themes from it.”

/However, Jesus’ miracles were performed before all people. /Acts 2:22 says, ““Men of Israel, hear these words: Jesus of Nazareth, a man attested to you by God with mighty works and wonders and signs that God did through him in your midst, as you yourselves know.”

/Furthermore, the disciples were eyewitnesses and witnesses to the Lord’s miracles. /They said, “And we are witnesses of all that he did both in the country of the Jews and in Jerusalem” (Acts 10:39). /Therefore, the events recorded in the Bible are supported by the testimonies of honest witnesses (John 20:31; 21:24).

/In Matthew 22:29, Jesus says to the Sadducees, “You are wrong, because you know neither the Scriptures nor the power of God.” This message applies to liberal theologians as well.

/3. Liberal theology denies Christ’s work of atonement.

/In his book “The Romans,” C. H. Dodd writes, “The rendering propitiation is therefore misleading, for it suggests the placating of an angry God, and although this would be in accord with pagan usage, it is foreign to biblical usage.”

/The concept of propitiation is the biblical concept of atonement, but Dodd renounces it as a pagan idea.

/In “Beyond Tragedy,” Reinhold Niebuhr says, “This doctrine of the atoning death of the Son of God upon the cross has led to many theological errors, among them to theories of substitutionary atonement which outrage the moral sense.” /The truth of atonement is a core biblical doctrine, but Niebuhr says it is an error.

/Rudolf Bultmann says the following in his book “Jesus Christ and Mythology.” / “His person is viewed in the light of mythology when he is said to have begotten of the Holy Spirit and born of a virgin... Particularly the concept of the pre-existent Son of God who descended in human guise into the world to redeem mankind is part of the Gnostic doctrine of redemption, and nobody hesitates to call this doctrine mythological.”

/But Jesus Christ’s death was a death for the redemption of many people. /Atonement is the core of the Christian gospel. /According to the biblical concept of atonement, the chosen one takes on guilt and punishment to satisfy the justice of God and placate God’s anger.

/Many Bible verses clearly bear witness about Jesus Christ’s work of atonement. /Matthew 20:28 says, “Even as the Son of Man came not to be served but to serve, and to give his life as a ransom for many.” /Jesus’ death was a ransom for many people.

/Romans 3:24-25 says, “And are justified by his grace as a gift, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, whom God put forward as a propitiation by his blood, to be received by faith.

/Here we find two words. /The first word is “redemption,” /and the other word is “propitiation.” /The word “redemption” means to pay a price and purchase. /“Propitiation” refers to a propitiation sacrifice.

/It is the concept that the previously mentioned C. H. Dodd denied. /It is the idea of placating God’s anger. /2 Corinthians 5:14,21 say, “For the love of Christ controls us, because we have concluded this: that one has died for all, therefore all have died”, and “For our sake he made him to be sin who knew no sin, so that in him we might become the righteousness of God.”

/Galatians 3:13 says, “Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law by becoming a curse for us.” /Hebrews 9:12 says, “He entered once for all into the holy places, not by means of the blood of goats and calves but by means of his own blood, thus securing an eternal redemption.”

/Hebrews 10:10,12,14 say, “And by that will we have been sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all”, “But when Christ had offered for all time a single sacrifice for sins, he sat down at the right hand of God”, and “For by a single offering he has perfected for all time those who are being sanctified.”

/1 Peter 1:18-19 says, “Knowing that you were ransomed from the futile ways inherited from your forefathers, not with perishable things such as silver or gold, but with the precious blood of Christ, like that of a lamb without blemish or spot.”

/Revelation 5:9 says, “For you were slain, and by your blood you ransomed people for God from every tribe and language and people and nation.” /As we have just seen, many verses in the Bible bear witness about Jesus Christ’s work of atonement.

/Jesus is the core of the Bible, and the core of Jesus’ work is atonement. /However, liberal theology denies the core work of atonement of Jesus Christ. /They are clearly heretics.

/4. Liberal theology denies Jesus Christ’s resurrection.

/Karl Barth writes in his book “The Word of God and the Word of Man,” “The resurrection of Christ, or his second coming, which is the same thing, is not a historical event.”

/He is wrong to view the resurrection and the second coming as the same event. /He is also wrong in saying that the two are not historical events. /Barth denies what the Bible teaches about resurrection and the second coming.

/In his book “The Epistle of Romans,” he says, “The Resurrection is therefore an occurrence in history, but it is not an event in history.” /He denies that the resurrection is a historical resurrection as is told by the Bible.

/Though he does state that there was an occurrence of resurrection, he clearly denies the resurrection as explained by the Bible. He believes in this heresy.

/Regarding Christ’s resurrection, he says in his book “Church Dogmatics” that “There is no proof, and there obviously cannot and ought to be any proof, for the fact that this history did take place.”

/He further says, “There is also no reason to protest if in common with the creation story and many others, indeed the decisive elements in biblical history, the history of the resurrection has to be regarded and described—in thought-forms and terminology of modern scholarship—as “saga” or “legend. The death of Jesus Christ can certainly be thought of as history in the modern sense, but not the resurrection.”

/He does not believe in Jesus Christ’s bodily resurrection. /Is he not saying that Jesus’ resurrection is but a saga or legend? /Karl Barth does not believe in Christ’s bodily resurrection. /He is a heretic.

/Rudolf Bultmann, in his book “Theology of the New Testament,” writes, “The accounts of the empty grave, of which Paul still knows nothing, are legends.” /The accounts of the empty grave are accounts of the resurrection. Bultmann claims they are legends. He says Christ’s resurrection is not a historical event.

<Approximately 5 lines deleted>

/In his book “Systematic Theology,” Paul Tillich writes, “While the stories of the Cross probably point to an event that took place in the full light of historical observation, the stories of the Resurrection spread a veil of deep mystery over the event.”

<Approximately 5 lines deleted>

/There is a modern theologian by the name of Wolfhart Pannenberg. /We call his followers the Pannenberg school.

/In his book “Jesus-God and Man,” he writes, “The [resurrection] appearances reported in the Gospels, which are not mentioned by Paul, have a strongly legendary character that one can scarcely find a historical kernel of their own in them.”

/Pannenberg is calling evidence of Jesus’ resurrection “legendary.” /We have taken the example of several representative modern theologians, Karl Barth, Rudolf Bultmann, Paul Tillich, and Pannenberg. We can see these people denying the resurrection of Christ.

/However, this idea of denying the obvious evidence of the New Testament is heresy. /For us to believe in Jesus means we believe in the Jesus of the Bible. /Christianity is based completely on the Bible.

/The Bible is God's accurate and inerrant book that is given to us. /If we are to believe in Jesus, then we are to believe in him according to what the Bible says. /The four Gospels fully bear witness about Jesus Christ's resurrection.

/We must base our belief in Jesus on what the Bible says, and if we are to do this, then we must believe in Jesus' resurrection. /Acts 1:3 says, "He presented himself alive to them after his suffering by many proofs, appearing to them during forty days and speaking about the kingdom of God."

/Romans 1:4 says, "And was declared to be the Son of God in power according to the Spirit of holiness by his resurrection from the dead, Jesus Christ our Lord." /Romans 10:9 says, "Because, if you confess with your mouth that Jesus is Lord and believe in your heart that God raised him from the dead, you will be saved."

/The resurrection of Jesus is the most basic content of our faith. /In other words, can we be saved if we do not believe in the resurrection? /It says that if you "believe in your heart that God raised him from the dead, you will be saved."

/Believing in Christ's resurrection is a necessary element of our faith for receiving salvation. /In other words, if liberal theologians do not believe in the resurrection of Christ, then they will not be saved.

/How can people who do not believe in Christ's resurrection and are not saved be theologians and professors of theology? /It shouldn't be that way. Our generation has given in to apostasy and is being greatly tempted by the devil.

/Let us look at Paul's words in 1 Corinthians 15. /The Apostle Paul emphasizes in 1 Corinthians 15 that Jesus Christ's resurrection is the core of the gospel message and is the basis for the future resurrection of the dead.

/Found in the core of the gospel is Christ's resurrection. /If we deny Christ's resurrection, then we cannot believe in the future resurrection of the dead. /But if we are certain about Christ's resurrection, then we are certain about our future resurrection.

/The resurrection of Jesus Christ is also tied to his ascension and second coming. /If we deny that he rose again from the dead, then we cannot help but deny his ascension and second coming. /Therefore, believing in the resurrection of Jesus Christ is a very fundamental part of our faith.

<Deleted and added>

/Liberal theologians deny Christ's second coming. They deny the resurrection of believers. Finally, they deny the final judgment and hell.

/For these reasons, liberal theology denies Jesus Christ. /2 Corinthians 11:4. /Therefore, liberal theology is heretical. /We must be cautious of these heresies. We must stand firmly in proper faith.

/This concludes the second lecture on “Criticism of Modern Theology.” /Thank you.