

The History of Christianity

Church	Year Established	Founder	Where Established
CATHOLIC	33	JESUS CHRIST	JERUSALEM
Orthodox	1054	Schismatic Catholic Bishops	Constantinople
Lutheran	1517	Martin Luther	Germany
Anabaptist	1521	Nicholas Storch & Thomas Munzer	Germany
Anglican	1534	Henry VIII	England
Mennonites	1536	Menno Simons	Switzerland
Calvinist	1555	John Calvin	Switzerland
Presbyterian	1560	John Knox	Scotland
Congregational	1582	Robert Brown	Holland
Baptist	1609	John Smyth	Amsterdam
Dutch Reformed	1628	Michaelis Jones	New York
Congregationalist	1648	Pilgrims and Puritans	Massachusetts
Quakers	1649	George Fox	England
Amish	1693	Jacob Amman	France
Freemasons	1717	Masons from four lodges	London
Methodist	1739	John & Charles Wesley	England
Unitarian	1774	Theophilus Lindsey	London
Methodist Episcopal	1784	60 Preachers	Baltimore, MD
Episcopalian	1789	Samuel Seabury	American Colonies
United Brethren	1800	Philip Otterbein & Martin Bochn	Maryland
Disciples of Christ	1827	Thomas & Alexander Campbell	Kentucky
Mormon	1830	Joseph Smith	New York
Methodist Protestant	1830	Methodist	United States
Church of Christ	1836	Warren Stone & Alexander Campbell	Kentucky
Seventh Day Adventist	1844	Ellen White	Washington, NH
Christadelphian Brethren of Christ	1844	John Thomas	Richmond, VA
Salvation Army	1865	William Booth	London
Holiness	1867	Methodist	United States
Jehovah's Witnesses	1874	Charles Taze Russell	Pennsylvania
Christian Science	1879	Mary Baker Eddy	Boston
Church of God in Christ	1895	Various churches of God	Arkansas
Church of Nazarene	c. 1850-1900	Various religious bodies	Pilot Point, TX
Pentecostal	1901	Charles F. Parkham	Topeka, KS
Aglipayan	1902	Gregorio Aglipay	Philippines
Assemblies of God	1914	Pentecostalism	Hot Springs, AZ
Iglesia ni Christo	1914	Felix Manalo	Philippines
Four-square Gospel	1917	Almee Semple McPherson	Los Angeles, CA
United Church of Christ	1961	Reformed and Congregationalist	Philadelphia, PA
Calvary Chapel	1965	Chuck Smith	Costa Mesa, CA
United Methodist	1968	Methodist and United Brethren	Dallas, TX
Born-again	c. 1970s	Various religious bodies	United States
Harvest Christian	1972	Greg Laurie	Riverside, CA
Saddleback	1982	Rick Warren	California
Non-Denominational	c. 1990s	various	United States

If the Catholic Church was founded in Jerusalem, then why is the head of the church in the Vatican? I know it's where Peter was killed but it started in Jerusalem where they received the Holy Spirit and where Peter first spoke with the whole spirit and converted 5,000 people. It's where it all started!! but it's funny how there is no head of church in Jerusalem which was the birth place of Christianity

Because Jerusalem was doomed. Jesus told his Apostles that "not one stone will remain upon the other." Jerusalem was referred to as Babylon in Revelations, and indeed was completely destroyed by the Romans in 70AD. Peter was the Rock, and Rome was the greatest political power in the world at the time. It made sense for it to be the center of the Christian movement in terms of spreading it to the known world.

Peter was bishop of Antioch. He went to Rome because Gnosticism had raised its ugly head. A man named Simon the magician was teaching a heretical version of Christianity in Rome and causing all sorts of division among the flock. By this time, the Church had already gathered in Jerusalem (described in Acts Chapter 15) and dismissed Judaism and the Mosaic Law as no longer necessary for salvation. Rome, being capital of the empire was a good place to covert the empire from.

James was first bishop of Jerusalem. U can google "all the bishops of Jerusalem" and get a list from James to the present.

Claiming the Orthodox Church was founded in 1054 is ridiculous. I am a faithful Roman Catholic, but all of the Orthodox Churches grew with us and we were all one. The major split occurred in 1054, but the Orthodox Churches were not created then. In fact, the Coptics are still celebrating a liturgy that dates back to Mark the Evangelist.

Prior to the official schism, they were Catholic Churches such as the Eastern Catholic Churches today. Upon their schism, they became Orthodox. The 1054 date is arguable but its the best single date available.

They still call themselves Catholic Churches. Just not Roman Catholic. If they come back into full union with Rome, it would likely be one at a time, not as a group. There are deeper differences with the Greek Orthodox than there are with the Coptics.

well, then the same can be said for literally any of these on the list that are not in communion today with Rome. They all came from something that came from something else that decided to part ways with Rome at some point in the past.

There wasn't any decision in 1054 though. Cardinal Humbert tried to excommunicate Patriarch Michael, but the Pope was dead, so even if he had been supposed to issue a ruling in the name of the Pope, it was an invalid ruling (also sacrilegious! he interrupted the Divine Liturgy & put the unholy paper on the altar). Then Patriarch Michael tried to excommunicate Cardinal Humbert, but of course that was invalid also. There has never been anything further. That's 2 people out of billions, who were never excommunicated from each other anyway, & the billions even less so. The Orthodox are still decreed to be welcome to commune at Catholic churches—I have myself seen them commune (& there is some other minor, misc. interrelation). That's why there are only schisms w/ the Orthodox, & they still have Apostolic Succession & all valid Sacraments.

The Orthodox Churches are all officially Orthodox Catholic Churches. In a certain sense they just added “Orthodox” meaning “Right-Worshipping” to imply others were wrong-worshipping. But also “Orthodox” is a proper term, e.g. St John of Damascus is a Doctor of the Catholic Church, & he wrote An Exact Exposition of the Orthodox Faith. And many have Apostolic Sees & all have Apostolic Succession.

Romans are latecomers, esp. considering that they didn’t even have Mass back in Bible times. They used Greek & had a Greek-based liturgy, but got Latin (source of the word “Mass”) from Latium & the Mass from Carthage. <https://angelusnews.com/.../if-youre-a-western-christian.../>

The Syriac Church is really the original since that Rite is native to Jerusalem, it still uses the Aramaic language, & it still celebrates the oldest liturgy, that of St James Brother of the Lord. It has gotten split into Catholic & Orthodox Churches, but really they are the same: same Faith & Rite in every way. After the Syriac Church in Jerusalem, the Church of Antioch was est., &

THEN of Rome. But the 70 Apostles were sent a lot of other places even earlier: <https://www.christian-pilgrimage-journeys.com/.../the.../>

The See of Byzantium (becoming Constantinople later) was est. by St Andrew, <https://orthochristian.com/43507.html>

but by commission from Christ, as part of the Catholic Church, as all the other Orthodox Sees were.

Protestants though have never had any commission. So this is an unfair meme. The Orthodox don’t deserve this. And rubbing in their faces a triumphalist attitude over them will drive them away. I was driven away by this kind of thing myself while still Orthodox.

There is a new group that is missing from this list that has steadily grown over the last twenty or more years and now represent a sizeable number. They call themselves "NONE" and down through the centuries they have tried to convince everyone that "self" is a religion. Why are they significant because they are attracting our children, our grandchildren and our grass roots Catholic/Christians. Their slogans range from there is no god, to the tabernacle is empty because Christ is not really present there. So to debate when some organization formed a group to break away from the Catholic Church we need to turn our attention to more important issues such as how we as Baptized Catholics who by Baptism and Confirmation have been commissioned to stand up for our faith, protest any changes that differ from the teachings of Jesus Christ and the traditions of the Church. and support the clergy that remains loyal to Jesus Christ. We as Catholic have to stop sticking our heads in the sand and hoping things will get better and start and put on the armor of Faith, Hope and Truth and doing what Jesus did if necessary giving ourselves even to death (death on a cross).

Christ used hyperbole often, for example when he declared, "If your right eye causes you to sin, pluck it out and throw it away, it is better that you lose one of your eyes than that you be thrown into hell." Jesus is not forbidding us to call men "fathers" who actually are such—either literally or spiritually. He is warning people against *inaccurately* attributing fatherhood to them. As the apostolic example shows, some individuals genuinely do have a spiritual fatherhood, meaning that they can be referred to as spiritual fathers. What must be avoided is that throughout the world, some people have been tempted to look upon religious leaders who are mere mortals as if they were an individual's supreme source of spiritual authority. This was also a temptation in the Jewish world of Jesus' day, when famous rabbinical leaders, especially those who founded important schools, such as Hillel and Shammai, were regarded as such. Christ is not forbidding the perfunctory use of honorifics nor forbidding us to recognize that the person *does* have a role as a spiritual father and teacher. The example of the apostles shows the way.

The Apostles Show the Way

The New Testament is filled with examples of and references to spiritual father-son and father-child relationships. It is worth quoting some of them here. Paul regularly referred to Timothy as his child: "Therefore I sent to you Timothy, my beloved and faithful child in the Lord, to remind you of my ways in Christ" (1 Timothy 3:15). He also referred to Timothy as his son: "This charge I commit to you, Timothy, my son, in accordance with the prophetic utterances which pointed to you, that in the future you will be blessed" (2 Timothy 1:6). Paul also referred to other of his converts in this way: "To Titus, my true child in a common faith: grace and peace from God the Father and Christ Jesus our Savior" (Titus 1:4).

Spiritual Fatherhood

Perhaps the most pointed New Testament reference to the theology of the spiritual fatherhood of priests is Paul's statement, "I do not write this to make you ashamed, but to make you bold, as always, when you stand before our Lord Jesus Christ" (2 Timothy 1:7). Peter followed the same custom, referring to Mark as his son: "She who is at Babylon, who is likewise chosen, sends you greetings; and so does my son Mark" (1 Peter 5:13). John said, "My little children, I am writing this to you so that you may not sin; but if any one does sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous" (1 John 2:1). By referring to these people as their spiritual sons and spiritual children, Peter, Paul, and John imply their own roles as spiritual fathers. Since the Bible frequently