CHAPTER IX

LIMITED ATONEMENT

A. BACKGROUND

To understand the place of the doctrine of limited atonement in the Hyper-Calvinist controversy we must first review the history of the doctrine itself. Those holding to the doctrine (hereafter referred to as Particularists) contend that the doctrine can be traced from Scripture through earliest church history, while those rejecting it (Universalists or Dualists) argue that it was developed quite late. Gill listed the following as teaching it in the first few centuries of the Church:


Gill quotes extensively from these writers but his proof is strained. His own presuppositions greatly govern his interpretation of them. Often he argues that such-and-such was Particularist because he said that Christ died for the Church, even though the writer does not say that Christ died only for the Church or that He did not die for the non-elect. This is usually how Particularists exegete the relevant portions of Scripture. Most of Gill's evidence is irrelevant to the whole inquiry.

The earliest hint of Particularism that we have found is in Ambrose: "Although Christ suffered for all, yet he suffered specially for us, because he suffered for his church..."² This, however, is not the

¹. Cause, Part IV. This Part was unfortunately removed from the Sovereign Grace (Jay Green) reprint, together with most of the notes to the rest of the volume. More recently, however, Baker Book House has reprinted the entire work with the full notes and Part IV. As with the Body and Commentary, pagination differs with the various editions.

². Cont'd:
Particularist position but the Dualist view stated in its purest form. Davenant, Morison and others have collected large quotations which, we feel, show that Particularism did not in fact arise at least until the time of Augustine.

It is with Augustine that the real debate begins. Both Particularists and non-Particularists claim Augustine. Curiously Gill omits Augustine,
presumably because he felt that the evidence was irrefutable or that nobody claimed otherwise. The best study of Augustine in this context is Browne's article appended to the Oxford translation of the Homilies on John. ⁶

Treating Augustine's views on any subject is never easy. Here we have no exception. In some places, says Browne, ⁷ the African Doctor seems to imply Particularism, while in others the reverse is true. Most of the allegedly Particularist citations are in the Homilies on John. For example:

He hath made all those His sheep, for whom He suffered, seeing He also, that He might suffer for all, Himself became a sheep. ⁸

How then said He to these, 'Ye are not of my sheep?' Because He saw them predestined to everlasting destruction, not purchased by the price of His blood unto everlasting life. ⁹

Therefore in that prayer (John 17:9), our Redeemer prayed for all whom He hath redeemed, whether then living in the flesh, or to be thereafter. ¹⁰

There is dispute whether Augustine taught that Christ died for Judas. ¹¹ Custance ¹² credits Augustine with the origin of the dictum,

Cont'd:...

Zanchius claimed that Augustine taught the limited scheme (Predestination, p.54; in Toplady, Works, vol.V, p.198). Hodges: "However, he is not always consistent, for sometimes speaks of Christ as having been offered universally to the nations and of all sins as having been expiated by Christ. Moreover, he can also describe the work of Christ as being for any who will believe and receive it" (The Doctrine of the Mediator, pp.65-66). Similarly, the Arminian John Fletcher says that Augustine wavered between Universalism and Particularism, switching from one to the other according to what other topic he was discussing (Works, vol.III, pp.225-226). He does not indicate in his Retractions that he changed his position on the matter.

9. Homilies on John, Number 48, Section 4, p.639.
10. Homilies on John, Number 109, Section 5.
11. Cf. Homilies on John, Number 55, Section 6, p.721; Number 92, Section 1, p.874.
"Christ died sufficiently for all but efficiently only for the elect". However, Custance gives no documentation, nor have we found anything that even approaches it. Chrysostom, on the other hand, said something similar: "Truly the Sacrifice was offered for all mankind, and was sufficient to save all, but those who enjoy the blessing are believers only". If this is the origin of the dictum, which we doubt, it clearly teaches the Universal scheme. The limitation is in the reception (application), not the atonement itself. To our knowledge, Augustine did not use the formula.

The three statements above might be taken in a Particularist fashion. The first two could imply that Christ died only for the sheep. The third implies that those for whom Christ prayed are the same as those for whom He died; the former number is limited, therefore so is the latter. These are possible, but we feel improbable, interpretations.

There are some Universalist quotations as well. Even though some confusion occasionally arises in his use of the word 'world' (see the last Section in this Chapter), we do find several quotations such as the following:

For with righteousness shall He judge the world: not a part of it, for He bought not a part: He will judge the whole, for it was the whole of which He paid the price.  

The argument seems to be that Christ will judge all because He died for all (cf. Romans 14:9, Phil. 2:11). Later Universal writers often employed this argument. Those whom Christ judges are identical with those for whom He died; the former number is unlimited, therefore so is

13. Homily on Gal. 2:20. Chrysostom's explicit Universalism with respect to the extent of the atonement is quite clear. Of Heb. 9:28 he says: "Why 'of many', and not 'of all'? Because not all believed. For He died indeed for all, that is His part: for that death was a counterbalance against the destruction of all men. But He did not bear the sins of all men, because they were not willing" (Homily XVII on Hebrews). This was similar to Augustine's view that redemption has two stages: atonement and the application through faith. Christ accomplished the former for all, but the latter is restricted to the elect/believers. Hence, the atonement is universal. Of Heb. 2:9 he comments: "That by the grace of God He should taste death for every man", not for the faithful only, but even for the whole world: for He indeed died for all; But what if all have not believed? He (Christ) hath fulfilled His own (part)" (Homily on Hebrews). Similarly, of Rom. 14:15 he says: "And yet with it all Christ was not to gain all, yet still He died for all; so fulfilling His own part" (Homily XXVI on Romans). On Chrysostom see Goodwin, Redemption, p.680; Daille, vol.II, pp.808-818; Davenant, p.333; Douty, p.95.

14. Homily on Psalms 96 (Latin 95), Section 15.
the latter. Note the words 'not a part' and 'the whole'.

Similar to this is the following:

The Redeemer came, and gave a price; He poured forth His blood, and bought the whole world. Ye ask what He bought? Ye see what He hath given; find out then what He bought. The blood of Christ was the price. What is equal to this? What, but the whole world? What, but all nations? They are very ungrateful for their price, or very proud, who say that the price is so small that it bought the Africans only; or that they are so great, as that it were given for them alone... He gave what He gave for the whole world.  

Augustine seems to ground the Universal aspect of the atonement in the infinite worth of the atonement. The purchase is equal to the price; neither is limited. Note that he singles out those who would limit either. Granted, he speaks only of the Africans rather than of the elect or believers or sheep, but distinct parallels can be seen. Those who limit the atonement to just some men limit the worth of the death of Christ, says Augustine. Moreover, such who say that Christ died only for themselves are very proud and greedy. These are arguments and allegations which are sometimes employed by non-Particularists. Later we will show how late medieval theologians also grounded the universal aspect of the atonement on the infinite worth of the death of Christ.

Browne suggests that the problem may be resolved by seeing that Augustine saw redemption as including both atonement and application/reception by faith. Since some men do not believe, God did not give them faith; if so, God did not purpose their full redemption and therefore did not send Christ to make atonement for them. Davenant and Baxter, however, felt otherwise. They said that Augustine taught that redemption does indeed include both stages but that while the first stage (atonement) is unlimited, the second stage (application/reception) is limited. In fact, Davenant produces some interesting evidence that suggests that it was actually Pelagius, not Augustine, who was the Particularist.

---

15. Homily on Psalm 96 (Latin 95), Section 5.
Prosper, one of Augustine's apologists, is also cited by both sides. Fortunately he supplies us with more and clearer data. Davenant and others\(^\text{18}\) claim that Prosper taught a Dualist view which reflects Augustine's views, while Particularists claim Prosper for their cause.\(^\text{19}\) Browne says that he followed Augustine's Particularism but toned down some of the extreme language.\(^\text{20}\) Against the Gauls Prosper argued as follows:

Accordingly, though it is right to say that the Saviour was crucified for the redemption of the entire world, because He truly took our human nature and because all men were lost in the first man, yet it may also be said that He was crucified only for those who were to profit by His death.\(^\text{21}\)

Likewise, he who says that the Saviour was not crucified for the redemption of the entire world does not take into account the power of the mystery of the cross, but considers only the portion of mankind who have no faith. For it is certain that the blood of our Lord Jesus Christ is the price for the redemption of the entire world. But they do not share in the application of this price ... nor was the redemption of the world frustrated of its effect.\(^\text{22}\)

Against the Vincentians he argued similarly:

... the blood of Christ is the redemption of the entire world. But they who pass through this world without coming to the faith and without having been reborn in baptism, remain untouched by the redemption... It is right to say that all have been redeemed, and that nevertheless not all are actually liberated from the slavery of sin ... the redemption is actually applied only to those from whom the Prince of the World has been cast out.\(^\text{23}\)

Finally Prosper clearly states that Christ died for all:

There can be no reason, therefore, to doubt that Jesus Christ our Lord died for the unbelievers and sinners. If there

---

18. Davenant, pp.319ff., 345, 349, and often; Douty, pp.96-97; Richards, Theology, p.302. From the Universal side, see Barclay, Apology, pp.88-89; Goodwin, Redemption, pp.691-692.
22. Answer to the Gauls, Qualification of Article 9 (pp.159-160).
23. Answer to the Vincentian Articles, Article 1 (p.164).
had been any one who did not belong to these, then Christ would not have died for all. But He did die for all without exception."24

Several observations can be made. First, Prosper says that Christ died for all humanity because He became a man. Secondly, He died for all men because all men are sinners. The second Adam died for all the sons of the first Adam. (Cf. Romans 5 and I Cor. 15). Thirdly, there evidently were some in Prosper's day who said that Christ died only for some. These may have been the Gauls. But Prosper does not class himself in their number. He upbraids them for overlooking the mystery of the Cross. For Prosper, there is a sense in which Christ died for all and a sense in which He did not die for all. This is not the same as strict Particularism, which says that Christ died only for some. Next, he may be implying that the extent of the atonement is equal to the worth of the blood of Christ, as per Augustine. Fifthly, Prosper distinguishes atonement and application; the latter is certainly limited. Sixthly, the design of the atonement is not frustrated by the unbelief of some. He does not elucidate this, however. He could mean that the atonement purchased all and therefore Christ will judge all men, especially unbelievers. Or he could be referring to the Dualist design in the special aspect. He does not say. Next, he employs the actual-virtual scheme. Christ redeemed all but not all are 'actually liberated'. No one is actually saved until he believes, which is the actual application of redemption. Lastly, Christ died "for all without exception" because all men without exception are sinners. Our conclusion follows that of Davenant, that Prosper taught a Dualist view. Christ died for all men without exception and especially for those to whom it will be applied. The application is limited and the foundation is Dual. This was prefigured to some extent in the views of Ambrose, Augustine and Chrysostom. It was certainly not Particularist in the Federalist sense.

The strictly Particularist theory seems to have lingered in places. Davenant contends that Lucidus (fifth century) taught Particularism but was opposed by Faustus of Ries and condemned by a Synod. There is some possibility that he altered his views after the condemnation. Robert Barclay says that the Arelutensian Synod (c.490) "pronounced him

---

24. The Call of All Nations, Book II, Chapter 16 (pp.118-119).
(whomever) accursed, who should say that Christ hath not died for all, or that he would not have all men to be saved".  

If there is disagreement in the interpretation of the Fathers up till this point, there is no disagreement about Gottschalk (c.804-869). He was clearly a Particularist. One of his main propositions was

That out Lord Jesus Christ was not crucified and put to death for the redemption of the whole world, that is, not for the salvation and redemption of all mankind, but only for those who are saved.

Gottschalk defended himself by appealing to Augustine. He was joined in the Predestination Controversy by Ratramnus, Servatus Lupius, Prudentius of Troyes and Remigius of Lyon. These were opposed by Rabanus Maurus, Joannes Erigena and Hincmar. Both Gottschalk and his views were condemned by several French Councils. The issue then lay dormant for a while.

It was again discussed by Schoolmen. But it is significant that, to our knowledge, none of them actually disputed the condemnation of Gottschalk on this point. The Universal position clearly was in the ascendancy. Anselm raised new questions about the atonement but did not discuss at length the identity of those for whom Christ died. Some even dispute whether Anselm even taught substitutionary atonement. His main thrust was that the atonement was made by Christ to God, not to Satan, in order to appease the wrath of God. Maintaining the honour of

---


27. Davenant, p.336. This is often overlooked by Particularists who attempt to prove that the Schoolmen were Particularists. Something similar attaches to their use of Augustine, who was considered the prince of the Fathers. Reference to Gottschalk is rare with the Reformers.

28. Universalism is assumed in his epochal Cur Deus Homo. Elsewhere he is more explicit, as when he comments on I Tim. 2: "God the Mediator, which God hath placed between himself and men, underwent death for all men, that he might redeem all men from death" (quoted in Goodwin, Redemption, p.896). Hence, in order to be the perfect Mediator, Christ the God-Man represented God to all men and stood in the place of all men before God.
God was the central aim. God was offended by sin. God's holiness is pure and therefore infinite. Only a pure and infinitely worthy atonement could appease (or satisfy?) God. Sin itself was not infinite, for man is finite, but the object of sin is infinite. Christ was a man and therefore finite, but He was also God and therefore could supply an infinitely worthy atonement. And He did just that.

Abelard offered a different theory. He contended that a payment was not strictly necessary because God is sovereign and could forgive sin merely out of sovereign grace. The atonement is mainly a display of that sovereign grace. As such it is limited in its nature. Not all men will believe, for God will not give them the sovereign grace to believe. Since this is reflected in the atonement, one may suppose that there are parallels between Abelard's theory and Particularism. But his views were rejected by most of the Schoolmen.

The predominant theory was that of Peter Lombard. He summed up his views on the extent of the atonement in its classic formula in his Sentences:

Christ offered himself on the cross for all men, as to the sufficiency of the price; but for the elect alone, as to the efficacy, in that He effected salvation for the elect alone. 29

Whether this was Particularist, Dualist or even Universalist has been debated ever since it was first stated. Lombard mostly built upon Anselm's foundation. As Anselm mostly dealt with the atonement as it concerned God, Lombard dealt with it here as it concerns men. Whether Lombard was consistent in following Anselm has been debated.

What did Lombard mean by the dictum? May we judge by the explanations given by his followers? Alexander of Hales followed Anselm and Lombard in opposition to Abelard in contending that the atonement

29. Sentences, Book III, Section 20, Paragraph E. It is unfortunate to students of historical theology that Lombard's important Sentences has not been translated in its entirety; it is hoped that this will be rectified in the future. Translations of the 'sufficient-efficient' dictum are found in a number of relevant places: Franks, vol. I, p. 222; Davenant, p. 542; Ursinus, Summa, p. 528; Collection, p. 141. On the dictum among the Schoolmen, see Davenant, pp. 360, 378, 402-417, 528-530, 542-555; Richards, Theology, p. 302. Pareus quotes Innocent III: "The blood of Christ was shed for the predestinate alone as touching the efficacy thereof" (in Ursinus, Collection, p. 140), which is similar to the Lombardian formula.
had infinite worth because of Christ's Deity. As such, "the passion of Christ is sufficient for satisfaction of every kind and for all things". The atonement of Christ is as universal as the sin of Adam "as regards sufficiency, though not as regards efficiency; just as the sun is the sufficient cause of the illumination in all, for he is not so in the blind". This became a popular illustration of the dictum. Lombard must be understood in the context of the scholastic theory of causality. Christ is the sufficient cause of salvation for all but the efficient cause only for the elect. What is sufficient is not always efficient. Compare the doctrine of grace: sufficient grace is not always efficient in those to whom it is given. Christ died for all. His death had infinite worth. Yet the death of Christ is not efficient for salvation for all men but for the elect alone. The limitation is mainly in the application. The atonement is the sufficient cause, whereas its application is the efficient cause.

The Anselmian doctrine of the infinite worth of the atonement was questioned by Duns Scotus and Biel. Scotus tended to follow Abelard in saying that the atonement did not necessarily have intrinsically infinite worth. Christ's deity did not guarantee that the atonement had infinite worth, for Christ was also a finite man. The question is not so much of nature as intent. God did not have to accept Christ's atonement, nor does He have to forgive any, but He does both because He decreed to do so. God decreed to accept the atonement as payment for the elect alone. The atonement, therefore, is limited both in nature and intent. Furthermore, says Scotus, if Christ had died for all men, then all men must be saved. Since not all will be saved, Christ did not die for

31. Cf. Franks, vol. I, pp.306-318; Ritschl, A Critical History of the Christian Doctrine of Justification and Reconciliation, pp.41-72, especially pp. 63-68. On precedents in Abelard, see Richard Ernest Weingart, The Atonement in the Writings of Peter Abelard. Our comments should not be construed as suggesting that Abelard and Duns Scotus taught limited atonement in the way advocated by classic Particularists such as Owen and Turretin. One notable difference must be kept in mind, that Abelard's doctrine of atonement was basically that of the so-called Moral Influence Theory. Hence, there are difficulties in Abelard respecting the extent of the atone-ment concerning universal grace on the one hand and particular election on the other. That Abelard's views were in the minority during the era of the Schoolmen further indicates that alterations had to be made by Duns Scotus. That Scotus tended to accept Abelard's idea that God could have forgiven sin without the death of Christ does not necessarily indicate a Supra-lapsarian doctrine of the decrees. Their views must be seen in their proper context - as alternatives to Anselm's theory and the modifications of Lombard and Aquinas.
Lombard's view of universal sufficiency is rejected, as well as the Lombardian dictum. The extent of sufficiency is equal to that of efficiency; the latter is limited, therefore so is the former. Intent and foresight is crucial:

As the Word foresaw that His passion would be offered to the Father for the elect, so He offered it effectually in the event, and the whole Trinity effectually accepted His passion for them; and for no others was it effectually offered, nor from eternity accepted.  

Scotus tended to Gottschalk as well as Abelard. For Scotus, the atonement has no intrinsic sufficiency but only attributed (decreed) sufficiency. Divine intent governs it, and God intended it to be both sufficient and efficient only for the elect.

Biel followed Duns Scotus part of the way and Lombard part of the way. For Biel, the merit of Christ was essentially finite but was accepted as infinite because of the decree. As such it is sufficient for all. Nevertheless, "He efficaciously merited final grace and glory for the predestined alone".  

Thomas Aquinas expounded the position of Lombard in a way that decisively preferred the foundation laid by Anselm to that of Abelard. His views became that most accepted by the medieval scholastics, so much so that when later writers say "the Schoolmen say" they usually mean "Aquinas said". Since Aquinas's views were nearly as important as those of Augustine, it is not surprising that there has been some confusion as to what he exactly had to say. It is necessary, then, for us to treat them at some depth.

The first place in which Aquinas treated the subject in a way pertinent to the controversy was in the Summa Contra Gentiles. Respecting the Anselmian position, the argument had been put forth from certain quarters: "If, then, the Incarnation of God is ordered to the salvation of men, it appears that it was becoming that He should have

saved the entire human race, even all men's salvation seems to be useful enough that so great a work should have been done for it" (IV, 53, 8). In other words, if God sent Christ to die for all men, it would seem that He intended to save all men. But not all men will be saved, so there is a problem. Aquinas's answer includes the following explanation:

The tradition of the Church, moreover, teaches us that the whole human race was infected by sin. But the order of divine justice ... requires that God should not remit sin without satisfaction. But to satisfy for the sin of the whole human race was beyond the power of any pure man, because any pure man is something less than the whole human race in its entirety. Therefore, in order to free the human race from its common sin, someone had to satisfy who was both man and so proportioned to the satisfaction, and something above man that the merit might be enough to satisfy for the sin of the whole human race. But there is no greater than man in the order of beatitude, except God, for angels although superior to man in the condition of nature, are not superior in the order of end, because the same end beatifies them. Therefore, it was necessary for man's achievement of beatitude that God should become man to take away the sin of the human race. And this is what John the Baptist said of Christ: 'Behold the Lamb of God, behold Him who taketh away the sin of the world'.

This is to reject Abelard's idea that sin needed no sacrifice to satisfy God in order to forgive men. The question concerns the infinite satisfaction required, for God is infinitely holy and demands an infinite satisfaction. God, then, became Man to give that satisfaction. But the problem still remains why all men are not saved, to which Aquinas answers as he continues:

To be sure, the power of the divine Incarnation is equal to the salvation of all men, but the fact that some are not saved thereby comes from their indisposition: they are unwilling to take unto themselves the fruit of the Incarnation;

35. *Summa Contra Gentiles*, IV, 54, 9. Also: "it was necessary that God assume flesh to satisfy for the sin of the human race... The death of Christ was sufficient for the expiation of all sins, and this by reason of the extraordinary charity in which He bore death, as well as by reason of the dignity of the satisfying person who was God and man... Of course, for the satisfaction of the sin of the entire human race the death of Christ was sufficient. For, although He died only in His human nature ... the dignity of the person suffering — and this is the Person of the Son of God — renders His death precious" (IV, 55, 14, 26 and 27). Aquinas is accepting the Anselmian view that Christ's Incarnation matches His mediatorship, which has to do also with the atonement, and that these concern the human race as an entirety.
they do not cleave to the Incarnate God by faith and love.\textsuperscript{36}

This is also the explanation given in the \textit{Summa Theologica} and elsewhere, viz:

of the redemption purchased by the passion of Christ we may speak in a double sense and signification, either respecting the sufficiency thereof; and so his passion redeemed all, because as concerning himself he redeemed all. For his passion is sufficient to serve and redeem all, yes if there were a thousand worlds as saith Anselm in his 2. booke and 14. chapter Cur Deus Homo etc. or else we speak thereof respecting the efficacy and in this sense he redeemed not all by his passion, because all cleave not fast unto the Redeemer, and therefore feel not nor perceive the virtue of redemption.\textsuperscript{37}

Christ's passion, then, was not only sufficient but super-abundant atonement for the sins of mankind; as John says [I John 2:2] ... Christ's passion was sufficient, and more than sufficient, to satisfy for the sins even of those who crucified him.\textsuperscript{38}

No man is actually redeemed until this infinitely sufficient atonement is applied, at which point it becomes efficient,\textsuperscript{39} for "an efficient cause acts only through contact".\textsuperscript{40} "Christ's passion accomplishes man's salvation efficiently ... it secures its efficacy by spiritual contact -

\textsuperscript{36} IV, 55, 10. The dichotomy seems to parallel that of Augustine and especially Chrysostom; that Christ has done His part but unbelievers do not do their part. The blame is not in want of atonement but in the failure to appropriate it.

\textsuperscript{37} Quoted by Pareus, in Ursinus, Collection, p.140. Also, "The very least of Christ's sufferings was sufficient of itself to redeem the human race from all sins" (\textit{Summa Theologica}, III, 45, 5). Cf. III, 49, 3; \textit{Compendium of Theology}, pp.272, 279. Christ did "atone for the sins of all men... It was fitting for Christ to die ... to satisfy for the whole human race" (\textit{Summa Theologica}, III, 46, 6; 50, 1). That Aquinas could so often use such explicitly universal language without qualification indicates that he did not teach the rigid Particularism of those such as Owen or Turretin, who could not speak so boldly for fear that they would be misunderstood. Aquinas had no such fears for the simple reason that he was not Particularist. Some see traces of Dualism in the quotation of Pareus elsewhere.

\textsuperscript{38} \textit{Summa Theologica}, III, 48, 2 (cf.4). Cf. Rashdall, p.375; Franks, vol.I, p.286. That Aquinas appeals to I John 2:2 is significant and helpful for our later discussion of Calvin's views. Calvin mentions the 'sufficient-efficient' formula in his Commentary on I John 2:2 and elsewhere, but we will show that while accepting Aquinas's theory he did not apply it to I John 2:2 in the same manner. Aquinas and Lombard felt that I John 2:2 spoke of the atonement itself, while Calvin held that it respected the application of the atonement.

\textsuperscript{39} Cf. Davenant, pp.348, 460.

\textsuperscript{40} \textit{Summa Theologica}, III, 56, 1.
namely, by faith and the sacraments of faith..."1 The atonement is the sufficient cause of redemption; the application is the efficient cause of redemption.2 Moreover,

Christ's merit bears the same relation to all men in point of sufficiency, not in point of efficacy. This happens partly from men's free choice, partly from divine election, through which the effect of Christ's merits is mercifully bestowed upon some but by a just judgement is withdrawn from others... The merit of Christ is operative with sufficient efficacy as a universal cause of the salvation of men, but this cause must be applied to each by means of the sacraments and of informed faith, which works through love. Thus something else besides merit is needed for our salvation, though the merit of Christ is the cause of that other factor as well.3

'Informed faith', says Thomas, is necessary for the salvation of those who are guilty of both original and actual sin. Elsewhere he implies that the atonement is necessarily efficient in cleansing infants dying in original but not actual sin.4 Problems, however, arise when dealing with baptism. An unbaptized dying infant is cleansed and goes to Limbo; a baptized dying infant is cleansed and goes to Heaven.

Douty feels that the Schoolmen's use of the sufficient-efficient formula placed the sufficiency in Christ's intention rather than merely in His infinite worth, as maintained by Particularists.5 Gerhard, a

41. Summa Theologica, III, 48, 6. Moreover, "Christ's passion works its effect in them to whom it is applied, through faith and charity and the sacraments of faith" (III, 49, 3). Cf. III, 49, 1. The same argument had been set forth in the Summa Contra Gentiles: "Since ... the death of Christ is, so to say, the universal cause of human salvation, and since a universal cause must be applied singly to each of its effects, it was necessary to show men some remedies through which the benefits of Christ's death could somehow be conjoined to them. It is of this sort, of course, that the sacraments of the Church are said to be" (IV, 56, 1).

42. Cf. Summa Theologica, III, 49, 1 and 3; Compendium of Theology, p.279. Aquinas compares the relation of atonement and application, to that of Adam's sin and individual damnation: "Granted, of course, that Christ has sufficiently satisfied for the sins of the human race by His death ... every single one, for all that, must seek the remedies of his own salvation. For the death of Christ is, so to say, a kind of universal cause of salvation, as the sin of the first man was a kind of universal cause of damnation. But a universal cause must be applied specially to each one, that he may receive the effect of the universal cause. The effect, then, of the sin of the first parent comes to each one in the origin of the flesh, but the effect of the death of Christ comes to each one in a spiritual regeneration in which the man is somehow conjoined with Christ and incorporated into Him. And for this reason each must seek to be regenerated through Christ, and must himself undertake to do those things in which the power of Christ's death operates" (Summa Contra Gentiles, IV, 55, 29).


44. Summa Theologica, III, 49, 5. ... Cont'd.
Lutheran, argues similarly and adds that the Thomistic doctrine placed the cause of inefficiency in the sin of men rather than in the atonement or in the eternal intention of God. We feel that the last quotation above shows that Thomas placed it in both the decree of God ('divine election') and in men's sin ('free choice').

At this point Duns Scotus asked whether Christ merited for all the gift of efficient grace, which always produces faith. If Christ did, does He give that grace to all men? Does not Christ give all that He merited to all for whom He merited it? If not, is there not a contradiction between the atonement and application, between the intent and the gift? Since not all believe, said Scotus, it has not been given to all and this is because God did not intend for them to believe. Therefore Christ did not intend to give to all men what He merited. It is contradictory to speak of Christ meriting sufficiently for all if He does not efficiently give His merits to all. The majority of Schoolmen, however, were slow to speak of faith being purchased in the atonement. Efficient faith is simply and freely given.

Later Roman Catholic writers like Estius and Suárez continued the debate, at times tending towards Duns Scotus, at times towards Thomas. But the views of Thomas certainly were predominant down until the time of the Reformation.

We now come to the Reformation itself. It will become apparent that as the later Medieval Scholastics divided into two Schools, so the two main branches of the Reformation (the Lutheran and Calvinistic) eventually divided on this point. But scholars disagree over the point in time at which the division occurred. Let us look at Luther first.

Cont'd:...

45. Douty, p.36. Douty approvingly quotes Davenant: "it never occurred to the Schoolmen to defend this sufficiency only, and to deny absolutely that Christ die for all" (Davenant, p.378). This is the position of Davenant as well: how can it be said that Christ died sufficiently for all men if He did not die at all for some of them? How could Christ die for an unbeliever if He did not die at all for him? See below.


48. Cf. Davenant, pp.529, 531, 545-546. The medieval mystics were especially emphatic on the infinite value and universal sufficiency of the atonement. Battista Varani said that Christ "shed all His Blood for us, one single drop of which had sufficed to save mankind" (True Devotion to the Passion, p.77).
While still an Augustinian monk the early Luther seemed to have tended towards Particularism. For example, in his Commentary on Romans he said that I Timothy 2:4 and similar verses must always be understood as pertaining to the elect only....

For in an absolute sense Christ did not die for all, because He says: 'This is my blood which is poured out for you' and 'for many' - He does not say: for all - 'for the forgiveness of sins'.

Later he added that I Tim. 2:4 concerns the general, not the secret, will and that 2:6 concerned the elect rather than all men (though he does not explicitly exclude all men from the atonement as he did in the Romans Commentary).

Most Luther scholars agree that Luther taught universal atonement in most if not all of his writings. We could produce many instances

---

49. Works, vol. 25, p. 376. Kendall (p. 14) points this out but overlooks the evidence suggesting that Luther changed his views. Kendall is one of the very few who have suggested Luther was Particularist. This is especially harmful to Kendall's argument that it was Beza who introduced limited atonement into Reformed theology. That this excerpt occurs in the Romans Commentary is significant for several reasons. It is one of Luther's earliest efforts and is rather unrefined. Though similar in content to his Galatians Commentary, the latter is his masterpiece and exhibits the mature scholarship of the master theologian. Moreover, the Romans Commentary contains assertions which Luther later altered, as also in other early works which show vestiges of his Roman Catholicism. On the other hand, it is just possible that the quotation can be taken in a Dualist fashion (though we prefer at present to view it as Particularist). That is, when Luther says "in an absolute sense", it is possible that in a "relative" or "universal sense" Christ did die for all men. Many Dualists (e.g. Baxter) held that there is a sense in which Christ died only for the elect. But we know of no place where Luther explicitly makes the Dualist dichotomy in the Romans Commentary, much less anywhere else.


51. See the following: Franks, vol. I, pp. 353-388; Douty, pp. 97-98; Aulen, pp. 117-144; Althaus, pp. 25-34; Morris, pp. 156-175; Rashdall, pp. 397-431; John MacLeod Campbell, The Nature of the Atonement, pp. 28-42; Daille, Apologia, vol. II, pp. 980-983; V.J.K. Brook, in Grensted, The Atonement in History and in Life, pp. 214-228; Siggins, Martin Luther's Doctrine of Christ, especially pp. 108-143; Hyslop, pp. 263-278; Goodwin, Redemption, p. 706; and W.V. Loewenich, Luther's Theology of the Cross. On the differences and similarities between the Lutherans and Calvinists respecting the atonement, see Ritschl, op. cit., pp. 280-289; Schmid, pp. 357-358; Richards, Theology, pp. 304-306. There is no doubt that Melancthon (Goodwin, Redemption, p. 704; Daille, Apologia, vol. II, pp. 983-984), Hyperius (Daille, pp. 1115-1118), or other early Lutherans were Universalists on the atonement. We know of nobody who has suggested otherwise, and certainly all later Lutherans were Universalists. Kuiper has expressed the unusual view that Luther taught limited atonement, but unlike Kendall has not given any documentation to the allegation (For Whom Did Christ Die, p. 62). Kuiper lists numerous obvious Particularists, but he errs in listing Augustine, Luther and even Wycliffe, not to mention Calvin and Pink: "We may admit that our interpretation of John 3:16 is no novel one invented by us, but one almost uniformly given by the Reformers and Puritans, and many others since then" (Sovereignty, p. 252. Cf. pp. 311-314; Commentary on John in loc.). This may include Luther, but we cannot say with certainty. We mention in passing the alleged interpretation of John 3:16 attributed to Luther, to this effect: ... Cont'd;
of explicit statements from him which could by no stretch of the imagination be construed as Particularist. But note especially the context in which they are found, for they often touch upon the issues relating to the controversy as it preceded and followed the Reformation. Consider the following explicitly Universal statements which neither contain nor need any qualification:

He bore the sins of the entire world... He has and bears all the sins of all men in his body... The sins of the whole world, which are committed from the first man to the last day thereof, lie upon the back of that one man who was born of Mary. 32

It is needless to comment that such statements could not have proceeded from the pen of John Owen, given Owen's famous 'triple choice' in which he rejects that Christ died for "all the sins of all men" (see below). Luther includes all men everywhere and at all times from Adam to the last generation, including Judas and unbelievers. Consequently, Luther was able to write and preach 'the Bold Proclamation', viz:

He bears all the sins of the world from its inception; this implies that He also bears yours, and offers you grace... Christ was given ... not for one or two sins, but for all sins ... Christ has taken away not only the sins of some men but your sins and those of the whole world. The offering was for the sins of the whole world, even though the whole world does not believe. So do not permit your sins to be merely sins; let them be your very own sins. That is, believe that Christ was given not only for the sins of others but also for yours. 33

Cont'd:...

"I am glad that it does not say, 'For God so loved Martin Luther, that He gave His only begotten son, that if Martin Luther believeth he should not perish but have everlasting life'. I am such a scoundrel full of doubts that I would go through life wondering if that meant another man named Martin Luther, in which case I could never believe. But since it says 'the world', I know that this includes me, and so I can and do believe and have everlasting life". The sentiments of this anecdote are sometimes expressed by Low Calvinists, but they are not found in Luther's Commentary on John's Gospel nor, to our knowledge, in any of the translated Works. It may be one of the many apocryphal stories attributed to Luther, such as some of the less authoritative versions of Table-Talk. In our opinion it sounds like Luther, but we found nothing upon it.

52. Works, vol.26, pp.285, 277; Sermon I on the Passion, quoted in Goodwin, Redemption, p.708. Luther was fond of reminding his readers that Christ did not die for only Peter or Paul or Mary, but for all men. See, for example, Works, vol.22, pp.169, 381; vol.30, p.237. Parallels to this can be found in Calvin, as we shall see later. This argument was put forth also by the English Reformers such as Becon, according to Morison, pp.130-132; and Douty, p.99.

53. Works, vol.22, p.169; vol.26, pp.35, 38. Note the context in which the latter remarks were made. In commenting on Gal. 1:4, Luther states that as 'the whole world' lies in the grip of Satan, so Christ died for 'the whole world' to deliver us from 'the world'. See Works, vol.26, ... Cont'd:
Here he again rules out the idea later put by Owen, that Christ atoned only for "all the sins of some men". Luther was aware that no man can believe "Christ died for me" unless Christ died for all. That Christ atoned for all men means that He atoned for all to whom the Gospel comes. Hence, Luther could make the 'Bold Proclamation' that "Christ died for you", regardless of whom he was addressing. Men are not damned for lack of atonement but for lack of faith. That it is essential to saving faith to believe that "Christ died for me" has been rejected by almost all Particularists. This assurance can come later, though. But this was emphatically not the view of Luther. He went on to say concerning Gal 1:4 the following:

But do not pass over this pronoun 'our' with contempt. For it will profit you nothing to believe that Christ was delivered for the sins of other saints and to doubt that He was delivered for your sins. For both the ungodly and the demons believe this. No, you must take for granted in steadfast confidence that He was delivered for your sins too, and that you are one of those for whose sins He was delivered. This faith justifies you...".

Following in the Anselm-Aquinas tradition, Luther grounded the universal sufficiency of the atonement in the infinite value of the God-Man. Compare the following:

Even one little drop of his blood helps the entire world; for this Person is very God ... He cannot be placated except by this immense, infinite price, the death and the blood of the Son of God, one drop of which is more precious than all creation ... He might have made satisfaction for all the sins of the world with only one drop of His blood, but now He has made abundant satisfaction... Just one drop of this

Cont'd:...

pp.32-43. Hence, Luther implies what many Low Calvinists have asserted, that the 'whole world' of I John 2:2 is the same 'whole world' of I John 5:19. Thus, Christ died for all who are in the grip of the Devil; every man everywhere is in the grip of the Devil; therefore Christ died for every man everywhere. Calvin used a similar argument in his treatment of Isa. 53:6, equating the 'all' for whom Christ died with the 'all' who have sinned.

54. Works, vol.27, p.172. The implications of Luther's doctrine of universal atonement and the assurance of justifying faith were brought out by John Macleod Campbell in The Nature of the Atonement, pp.28-42. Luther's treatment of Gal. 1:4 here is a vital backdrop for his treatment of Gal. 2:20 and 3:13. There he does not dwell upon the extent of the atonement in the same explicit manner as here for the simple reason that he assumes that the reader has read his earlier comments. The earlier argument is foundational to the latter development. One sees a considerable similarity between Luther and Calvin's treatment of these three verses, in marked contradistinction to those of High Calvinists such as Perkins or Hendriksen, or Hyper-Calvinists such as Gill or James Haldane.
innocent blood would have been more than enough for the sin of the whole world."

When we come to discuss Calvin's position we find ourselves in controversial waters, waters which have been troubled for several centuries and which have recently received no small attempt to stir them up further or settle them (depending upon one's personal position). Several factors involve the issue. Firstly, there is an abundance of material to sift through. Then there is the matter of the development of Calvin's thought, including the question of whether he changed his views on the subject. Some even contend that Calvin did not deal with the subject, which we find rather difficult to accept in the light of the plethora of citations in which Calvin spoke of substitutionary atonement. Surely Calvin felt that if Christ was a substitute, He was a substitute for somebody! We find it incredible that Calvin had no idea of the identity of those for whom the Redeemer suffered, whether all or some.

Moreover, it cannot be ignored that the controversy was not a new one. Some writers feel that the matter did not arise until the generation immediately following Calvin. While granting that the controversy reached fever pitch at the time of the Synod of Dort, we cannot for a minute ignore what church history plainly teaches. In the present section we have shown that the controversy did not even begin with Luther and the Reformation. It was hotly debated by the Schoolmen and even earlier by Augustine and Prosper, not to mention Gottschalk. Our opinion, rather, is that instead of it becoming a new issue when certain heterodox Calvinists such as Davenant began to teach Universalism or Dualism, the exact opposite is the case. That is to say, there was discussion from the earliest times in the Reformation about the extent of the atonement and that, barring Luther's early comments in the Romans Commentary, virtually all of the Reformers were of the Universal or Dualist persuasion. What made for the controversy was not the rejection but the introduction of Particularism.

This is in keeping with the overall proposition of the present enterprise that the development of Hyper-Calvinism is not due to the introduction of that which was foreign to Calvin (i.e., the Free Offer),

but rather the opposite – that Reformed history shows that from earliest times the Free Offer was taught, but with the introduction of such things as Particularism and the rejection of the doctrine that assurance was of the essence of faith, slowly High Calvinist theology opened the door to the rejection of the Free Offer. When it was actually rejected, Hyper-Calvinism was born. Thus, to retrace our steps, what we have called High Calvinism was born when the theory of 'Limited Atonement' was introduced into Reformed theology.

What makes the matter especially difficult is that the name of Calvin has been so zealously claimed and guarded by several factions in a way reminiscent of the Scholastic debates. Calvinistic tradition is at stake. To point out that Calvin did not teach the doctrine upon which a tradition is built shakes the foundation and rather tends to leave its proponents standing with their shoes united. Part of the difficulty here could easily be resolved if it were recognized that, as great as his influence was at the time, Calvin was not a Reformed Pope. Luther may or may not have dominated early German Reformation theology and practice, but even then there was a degree of diversity (witness Melanchthon, of all people). By contrast, Calvin was driven out of town by those whom many later 'Calvinists' would claim as their own number.

In the same vein it should be remembered that Calvin had relied heavily upon certain predecessors and senior theologians. The case of Zwingli and Oecolampadius is crucial here, as we shall see. Then there were those contemporary with Calvin, such as Bucer, Bullinger, Musculus and so on. Only by perverting or ignoring the records could it be demonstrated that they looked to Calvin as their leader or Pope. And each of these dwelt with the controversy at hand. As for later Calvinists, we must not fall prey to two twin but opposite errors. The first is to read post-Reformational Calvinist theology back into Calvin himself, often done by those who would imply that Calvin was the virtual author of the Canons of Dort or the Westminster Confession. This is the error to which Particularists are prone. The second is that to which Universalists sometimes succumb, namely that there was supposedly a dramatic rift between Calvin and his immediate followers so drastic that Calvin would have anathematized the symbols of Westminster. While agreeing that those such as Beza and Perkins taught some things different from Calvin respecting the extent of the atonement and the assurance of faith, the development of the difference must be seen in its
historical context. That is, as Calvin was not the Reformed Pope in his lifetime, neither were Beza or Perkins, much less Owen, in theirs. Beza lived and wrote much during Calvin's own lifetime. Conversely, more than a few post-Reformational Calvinists taught Universal or Dual atonement. Our opinion is that the change came gradually so that by the time of the Westminster Assembly at least half of those who could be called Calvinists, or Reformed proper, were advocates of Particularism.

Because of the enormity of source-data to be investigated in Calvin's works, and because of the various strains involved in that material, we have chosen to devote a separate part of the present treatise to the subject. As large as our effort there may be, however, it will be but an introduction, in the same manner in which the present history of the debate is but a cursory overview.

Calvin owed as much to Zwingli as to Luther. In some things he agreed with the German against the Swiss; in other areas he positioned himself between the two (e.g., the Lord's Supper). One would be tempted to claim that Calvin was a mixture of the best of both, in a dialectical way in which Calvin was the later synthesis of the earliest thesis (Luther) and the later antithesis (Zwingli). True or false as that may be in their overall theologies, we will not pursue that line of investigation. However, we will point out that there may well be some truth to the recent suggestions of those such as Letham, Baker and Locher that the 'high' elements which later blossomed in post-Reformational Calvinism could be found in germ form in Beza, Zanchius, Bullinger, Bucer and Zwingli (in reverse order).

It would be difficult to imagine how Zwingli could have fitted the doctrine of limited atonement into his otherwise relatively broad theology. Bearing in mind certain elements in the Universalist teaching of Aquinas and Luther, we point out the following statements:

Who can sufficiently admire the riches of divine goodness, whereby He so loved the world, i.e., the human race, as to give His Son for its life?

For if by sinning, Adam could ruin the entire race, and Christ by dying did not quicken and redeem the entire race from the calamity given by the former, the salvation given by Christ is no longer the same, and in the like manner (which be it far from us to assert) is not true: 'For as in
Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive'.

'Except ye eat', i.e., except ye firmly and heartily believe that Christ was slain for you, to redeem you, and that His blood was shed for you, to wash you thus redeemed ... 'Ye have no life in you'. Since, therefore, Christ alone was sacrificed for the human race, He is the Only One through whom we can come to the Father. 66

Accordingly, Zwingli brought together several vital strands relevant to the discussion. The atonement is the fullest display of divine grace, which is universal in this respect. Furthermore, Christ is the head of a new race and was their representative in judgement. By dying for them all, He can now give them all life. The way in which this life is received is partly by faith in the truth that Christ died for oneself. Through this process one comes to the Father and the enjoyment of the grace which sent the Redeemer to the Cross.

Moving on, Bucer developed Luther's and Zwingli's thoughts with a few innovations of his own, but we are not convinced that he taught the Particularist scheme any more than the English Reformers whom he so strongly influenced. 57 The earliest English Reformers seem unanimously Universalist regarding the scope of the atonement. This found expression

56. Quotations are from Jackson, Huldreich Zwingli, pp. 457, 461; Zwingli, Works, vol. III, p. 128. See also his Universalism in Works, vol. III, pp. 113, 122-124, 129-130, 155-156. That Zwingli taught universal atonement is accepted by Locher, Zwingli's Thought, p. 136; Letham, Saving Faith and Assurance in Reformed Theology, vol. I, pp. 28, 33-34; Daille, Apologia, vol. II, pp. 984-987. Oecolampadius, an associate of Zwingli, seems to have been of the same persuasion on the point in hand. For example, he taught that saving faith is reflected in the true partaking of the Lord's Table, which faith necessarily includes the persuasion that Christ died for oneself. See Charles Herbert, The Lord's Supper, vol. II, pp. 371-373; Daille, Apologia, vol. II, pp. 987-992. This is challenged by Letham, who says that Oecolampadius taught that Christ suffered "for many, and not for all, since many are called but few are chosen" (Letham, vol. I, pp. 39-40).

57. The contention that Bucer advocated limited atonement has been set forth by Zanchius, Predestination (S.G.U. edition), p. 54, and in Toplady, Works, vol. V, p. 198; and by Toplady himself, Works, vol. I, p. 322. Zanchius produces no evidence, and Toplady's merely states that Bucer taught that Christ died for the elect - this does not necessarily mean 'only the elect'. That Bucer was not Particularist was the position of Goodwin, Redemption, pp. 712-713; and Daille, vol. II, pp. 998-1008. Letham has recently argued that Bucer did in fact advocate Particularism (vol. I, pp. 11, 80; vol. II, p. 44). Cf. Stephens, Bucer, pp. 106, 114. Some difficulty arises from Bucer's view of the Lord's Supper. He seems to have held that the faith of true partaking includes faith that Christ died for oneself (Common Places, pp. 318, 323; cf. Stephens, pp. 62-65), while he also questions whether Judas was at the first Table. In any case, the words "which is delivered up for you ... which is shed for the remission of sins" did not apply to Judas, to whom they were not addressed (p. 331).
in Article 31 of the Thirty-nine Articles: "The offering of Christ once made is that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual; and there is no other satisfaction for sin, but that alone". Similar Universal sentiments can be found in Tyndale, Cranmer, Becon, Hooper and the Book of Common Prayer, among others.

Heinrich Bullinger was another advocate of the Universal scheme, at least in some of his writings, notably in the Decades. He was of the mind that Christ sufficiently made atonement for all men "and that only sacrifice is always effectual to make satisfaction for all the sins of all men in the whole world". Again, this excludes the "some of all" position. Wolfgang Musculus also evidences many definite marks of being of the Universalist persuasion, though some have challenged this. Of special relevance are the views of Peter Martyr (Vermigli):

They grant also, that Christ died for us all; and thereof they infer, that his benefite is common unto all men. Which we also will casilie grant, if only the worthiness of the death of Christ be considered; for as touching it, it might be sufficient for all the sins of the world. But although in itself it be sufficient; yet it neither had, nor hath, nor shall have effect in all men. Which the Schoolmen also confess, when they affirm, that Christ hath redeemed all

58. Decades, vol. IV, p. 287. Cf. vol. I, pp. 43-44; vol. IV, pp. 285-288. Davenant says that Bullinger taught, "The Lord died for all: but all are not partakers of this redemption, through their own fault" (pp. 337-338). Goodwin also quotes Bullinger: "It remains then an indubitable truth, that the Lord Christ is a full propitiation, satisfaction, offering, and sacrifice for the sins, for the punishment, (I say) and for the fault of the whole world" (Redemption, pp. 715-717). Others claiming Bullinger taught universal atonement include Daille, Apologia, vol. II, pp. 1007-1108; Douty, p. 98; Morison, pp. 178-179; Baxter, Catholic Theologie, Part II, p. 51. Letham challenges this estimation: "Thus, in expounding Matthew 20: 28, Bullinger can limit the extent of the atonement to believers and thus to the elect" (vol. I, p. 52); and yet Letham admits that elsewhere Bullinger taught the Universal scheme (vol. I, pp. 69-70, 74; vol. II, pp. 32-34). Thus, Letham traces the origins from Bucer through Bullinger and Martyr, with Calvin (like Bullinger) wavering and Beza being explicitly Particularist.

59. In addition to the numerous explicit statements in his Common Places (e.g., pp. 129 verso and recto), we point out the following: "Christ died not for his friends alone, but for his enemies also: not for some men only, but for all men"; and "a universal redemption, insuch as it is prepared for all, and all are called unto it" (in Goodwin, Redemption, p. 711). "John places before us no one particular person whose sin the Lamb has come to take away; but under the expression 'the world', he comprehends the whole race of mortals from the very beginning of the world to the end of it" (in J.C. Ryle, Expository Thoughts on John, vol. I, p. 63). Paul Helm says that William Young feels that Musculus taught that the atonement is universal but Christ's intercession is limited to the elect, thus paralleling the theory Kendall puts forth about Calvin (Helm, Calvin, p. 36). Cf. Daille, Apologia, vol. II, pp. 1013-1044; Douty, pp. 77, 98; Davenant, p. 339; R.B. Ives, The Theology of Wolfgang Musculus.
men sufficiently, but not effectually: for thereunto it is necessary, that the death of Christ be healthful unto us, that we take hold of it; which cannot otherwise be done, but by faith: which saith we have before abundantly declared to be the gift of God, and not to be given unto all men."

Letham feels that this is the Particularist position, but we take a different line of interpretation. Note that Martyr agrees with the Schoolmen, particularly with reference to the 'worthiness' (value) of the atonement. Accepting the Lombardian dictum, Martyr denies that the atonement is effectual for all. He then explains wherein the effect lies - in its application/reception by the gift of faith, not in the appeasement of divine wrath. That is, he follows the orthodox view that Christ satisfied the wrath of God sufficiently for all men, but the reason that all men are not saved is because they do not believe. He does not state that they are not saved because Christ did not die for them, which is basically the Particularist line. The limitation is not in the atonement but in the gift of faith. Letham and others feel that this view is compatible with the Particularist theory because it centres the question around the intent rather than the extent. However, this evades the issue, in our opinion. The Particularists did not limit the value of the atonement any more than the Universalists, at least in pre-Hyperist Reformed theology. The Universalists state that though Christ actually died for all men by the intention of God, it is not the intention of God to give faith whereby the atonement is applied to all men. Hence, the limitation is in the application stage, not in the atonement stage proper. Particularists, however, place the limitation in both because they see the decree of election producing the decree of faith, both of which must precede the decree of atonement. Universalists place the decree of atonement before the other two. This is crucial to the understanding of the debate.

Some of the first definite signs of Particularism can be found arising at this time. We know of none who questions the explicitly limited view of Beza. Note that while Calvin, Martyr and most of the Reformers accepted the Lombardian formula because they were Universalists, Beza rejected it because he was Particularist:

60. Common Places, Part II, p.31. Martyr is claimed by Goodwin and Daille on the one side, and Godfrey and Letham on the other.
That expression, Christ died for the sins of all men, sufficiently, but not efficaciously, though in a rectified sense it be true, yet is it extremely harsh, and no less ambiguous than barbaric. For the particle 'for' imports either the counsel of the Father, according to which Christ suffered, or else the effect itself of his sufferings, or rather both; whereas neither of them belong to any but the elect.\footnote{61}

Beza felt that the only way to continue to use the formula was by drastically redefining it so that the effect is so governed by election that the sufficiency of the atonement merely becomes its intrinsic worth. Hence, Christ's death had reference to the reprobate only in the hypothetical sense that the worth of it would be sufficient for them had they been elected. Christ would not have had to suffer any more had any more been elected. But since only some persons were elected, the atonement's extent matches the intent and thus Christ died only for the elect. Furthermore, Beza is aware of the significance of the word 'for' in the formula. Hence, he would have agreed with the Universalists who argued that it cannot be said in any sense that Christ died for all men (e.g., sufficiently) if in fact He did not die at all for them. The Universalists therefore accepted the dictum, the Particularist Beza rejected it.

There is some difficulty with respect to the position of Zanchius. In some places he seems in agreement with the unlimited position because of the infinite worth of the sufferings of Christ, but elsewhere he takes the Particularist line:

As God doth not will that each individual of mankind should be saved, so neither did He will that Christ should properly and immediately die for each individual of mankind, whence it follows that, though the blood of Christ, from its own intrinsic dignity, was sufficient for the redemption of all men, yet, in consequence of His Father's appointment, He shed it intentionally, and therefore effectually and immediately, for the elect alone.\footnote{62}

\footnote{61. Quoted in Goodwin, Redemption, p.158. See Godfrey, 'Extent', pp.138-143; Letham, vol.I, p.147.}

\footnote{62. The Doctrine of Absolute Predestination (S.G.U. edition), p.53. Also found in Toplady, Works, vol.V, pp.197-198. See also p.117 of the S.G.U. edition. Davenant feels that Zanchius taught that Christ died for all men in the conditional (revealed) will, but efficiently for the elect alone in the omnipotent (secret) will. See Davenant, pp.339, 548. Elsewhere, Zanchius calls it "a sacrifice of infinite virtue, and a price of redemption of the greatest efficacie, for it ... Cont'd:}
It is only an outside possibility that Zanchius is here teaching the Dualist position. If this were true, his words here mean that as to the worth and sufficiency Christ did die for all but "properly and immediately ... intentionally, and therefore effectually and immediately, for the elect alone". But we do not feel that he is setting up that dichotomy, which would be analogous to the Dualist system. Rather, Zanchius makes the doctrine of election govern the atonement, so that not only was it not the intention of the Father not to give faith to all but also it was not the divine intention that Christ die for all. God elected only some; therefore Christ died only for some.

This was not the view of others at Heidelberg at the time of Zanchius. Note the words of the Heidelberg Catechism:

That all the time he lived on earth, but especially at the end of his life, he bore, in body and soul, the wrath of God against the sin of the whole human race, in order that by his passion, as the only atoning sacrifice, he might redeem our body and soul from everlasting damnation, and obtain for us the grace of God, righteousness, and eternal life.63

Olevianus, co-author of the Heidelberg Catechism, seems to have accepted the Lombardian formula at face value (i.e., not Particularism).64 Ursinus, the other co-author, has a pertinent explanation about the formula in his Summe. In the chapter commenting on the above question and answer he mentions the formula, accepts it, and mentions Thomas and Lombard, in apparent approval of the formula. He also shows an awareness of the arguments put forth by Duns Scotus. Of

Cont'd:...

was the blood of God" (The Whole Body of Christian Religion, pp. 78, 101-104). This follows the view that the point of efficacy was at the atonement itself rather than at the application per se. Hence, Christ does not effect salvation in the reprobate because He did not effect salvation for them at the Cross. See further in Daillé, Apologia, vol.II, pp. 1125-1129; Douty, p. 99; Godfrey, 'Extent', pp. 146-147; Baxter, Catholick Theologie, Part II, p. 52; Letham, vol.II, p. 111. On the other hand, there may have been something akin to Dualism in Zanchius: "It is not false that Christ died for all men: for the passion of Christ is offered to all in the Gospel" (quoted in Davenant, p. 548; Douty, p. 40).

63. Question 37. See Godfrey, 'Extent', pp. 151-152; Douty, p. 100; Richards, Theology, p. 396; etc. On the early Reformed symbols, see Daillé, Apologia, vol.II, pp. 946-980; Douty, pp. 99-100; Morison, pp. 132-135. Herman Hoeksema expounded the Heidelberg Catechism throughout his ministry, the fruit of which is found in his massive The Triple Knowledge (3 volumes). Unfortunately, Hoeksema usually ignores the Universal passages or explains them away by a dubious exegesis.
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special note was the problem of 'double payment':

Objection 4: If Christ satisfied perfectly for all, then all must be saved. But all are not saved: therefore he satisfied not perfectly for all. Answer: Christ satisfied for all men, as concerning the application of his merite and satisfaction ... For we then applie unto ourselves the merite of Christ, when by a true faith we are persuaded that God remitteth our sins for his Sonne's sacrifice and satisfaction: and without this application Christ's satisfaction availeth us nothing."

Ursinus thus rejects the argument that all for whom Christ died will necessarily be saved. Instead he says that the reason that men are not saved is because they do not apply Christ's merits to themselves. Note that Ursinus feels that essential to saving faith is the persuasion that we are forgiven only because of Christ's death. In other words, in saving faith one believes that Christ died for him. Elsewhere he says that Christ did "offer himself a sacrifice and ransome, full, sufficient, and acceptable unto God for the sins of the world", which was "a sacrifice propitiatory for the sinnes of all mankind". Yet Christ will "apply effectually his sacrifice" only to those for whom He prays - the elect alone. Ursinus further implies that the decree of election followed that of atonement, which also followed the decree of universal grace. He asserts that there are two "causes impellent, or motives of Christ's passion", which are "The love of God towards mankind (John 3:16)" and "The mercy of God towards men fallen into sin".

Even so, Ursinus was aware of the Particularist arguments and tended slightly towards them. In an important section in his Summe (pp.525-529) he discusses the issue at length. He lists the Scriptures in dispute and then lists several of the popular interpretations. Of special interest is his comments on his Lombardian dichotomy of sufficiency and efficiency. Ursinus interprets the formula to mean that the inefficiency is due to men's unbelief. And Christ's will in the atonement matches that of the application: "as he died, so would he die" but "for the

65. Ursinus, Summe, pp.516-517 (cf. pp.520-521). Cf. Godfrey's 'Extent', pp.148-149; Daille, Apologia, vol.II, pp.1118-1119; Goodwin, Redemption, p.714. Godfrey feels that the sections in the Summe were actually written by Pareus. While not fully accepting or rejecting this, we agree that the section in Collection was the work of Pareus.


67. Summe, p.518.
elect alone he would die, as touching the efficacy of his merite, that is, he would not only sufficiently merit grace and salvation, but also effectually impart them on the elect alone" in the application. Therefore "in this sense Christ is well said to have died in a different manner for the faithful and unfaithful". Finally Ursinus quotes some of the Schoolmen. His own views are very difficult to ascertain in his excursus. At times he mocks the Schoolmen as wrangling and hypocritical, while elsewhere he seems to agree with them. His final judgement is this:

Christ died for all, as touching the merite and sufficiencie of his ransome: for the faithfull only, as touching the application and efficacite thereof. For in as much as the death of Christ is imparted unto them, and profiteth them only, it is rightly said to appertaine properly unto them alone, as before hath beene proved at large."

David Pareus translated the Summe of Ursinus and also a collection of his essays entitled A Collection of Certaine Learned Discourses (1600). Pareus himself added an essay on the question of the extent of the atonement and carried Ursinus's views further. Ursinus, we feel, was basically a Dualist with strong Universalist tendencies; Pareus was a Dualist with strong Particularist tendencies. He identifies the 'all' for whom Christ died with 'all the elect', for Christ prayed for the elect alone. To believe otherwise is to cast pearls before swine. As for the Lombardian dichotomy he observes:

Christ died for all men absolutely and without exception, to wit, if you respect the sufficiencie of the merite, and the price which he paid ... But the question concerneth the efficacie and participation itself of the fruits which we mainly deny to be common to the believing, and unbelieving, or to be generally promised or given in the Gospel; and we hold it no sound doctrine to say, that in this respect Christ died alike for all both elect and reprobate."

Pareus claims that this was basically the view of Cyril, Prosper, Gregory, Innocent, Thomas Aquinas and Lombard. Furthermore he

68. Summe, pp.527-528.
69. Summe, p.529.
71. Collection, pp.138-141.
appeals to the double payment argument which refers to those already in Hell at the time of the atonement.\(^\text{72}\) He sets up 'a practicall Syllogism' of saving faith: "Christ died and prayed for all that believe. But I believe. Therefore he prayed and died for me." He then rejects the universal syllogism which reads: "Christ died for all men. But I am a man. Therefore Christ died for me".\(^\text{73}\) In other words, saving faith does not include the content that Christ died for oneself, as Ursinus had held. But Pareus, a close associate of Ursinus, was merely carrying further the reservations of Ursinus.

Other Particularists came to question and reject the Lombardian formula because it implied Universal atonement.\(^\text{74}\) Others felt that the formula could still be used if properly understood, though strictly speaking it was an incorrect statement of the truth about the atonement.\(^\text{75}\) Ames said that the formula was correct in that the atonement was intended to be infinite and therefore sufficient for all, but this sufficiency was still hypothetical because Christ did not really die for all.\(^\text{76}\) Piscator rejected the dictum altogether.\(^\text{77}\)

An extreme reaction against High Calvinism began in Holland when Jacobus Arminius challenged Beza and Perkins on several issues. Of relevance here is his clear Universalism with respect to the atonement. After his death his views were put forth in more or less the same substance by the Remonstants at the Synod of Dort. The Synod condemned Universalism and explicitly stated Particularism in classic terms. The Canons stated that the infinite worth of the atonement was "abundantly

---

\(^{72}\) *Collection*, p.144-145.

\(^{73}\) *Collection*, p.149. Perkins rejected this syllogism, especially as it applies to the 'Bold Proclamation'. See his *Works*, vol.I, p.110.


\(^{75}\) Perkins seems to have accepted the formula (*Works*, vol.I, p.206). Note that Perkins was a Supralapsarian in the direct tradition of Beza. It has been correctly noted by Kendall and others that no other single writer influenced the subsequent development of Puritan theology as much as William Perkins.


\(^{77}\) "The proposition laid down is false, viz. that Christ died sufficiently for every particular or single man; this is thy assertion. For Christ died most sufficiently for the elect, paying the price of their redemption, I mean his precious blood, that blood of the Son of God. But for reprobates Christ died neither in one kind nor other, neither sufficiently nor efficaciously" (quoted in Goodwin, *Redemption*, p.158). Cf. Godfrey, *Extent*, pp.161-162; Letham, vol.I, p.230. Piscator and Beza thus represented the 'only' line in a purer form than most, though less than certain Hyperists.
sufficient to expiate the sins of the whole world" (II, 3) but added that the application extends to the elect alone. The atonement could have redeemed all men but in fact it did not. The eternal intent governs the atonement, for Christ redeemed "all those, and those only" who were elect (II, 8)."

One of the British delegates to the Synod of Dort was Bishop John Davenant. Davenant disagreed with the Synod's Canon on redemption, at least as popularly understood, and wrote the definitive Puritan treatise on Calvinistic Dualism (some say Universalism), The Death of Christ. In it he produces such evidence from writers of all ages up to and including his own and deals with nearly all the main Particularist arguments. Davenant agreed that the atonement has infinite sufficiency as to its intrinsic value, which was not disputed by any of the Calvinists, but he added that this sufficiency was more than just intrinsic worth. It was intended to be infinite in worth and was intended to be made for all men. He says that it is foolish to accept the Lombardian formula, as some Particularists still did, and hold that Christ "died for all sufficiently who is affirmed to have died only for the elect". Infinite sufficiency without universal extent is meaningless. This is not to say that Davenant agreed with the Remonstrants' Universalism. He explicitly denies this. The Arminians said that Christ died for all men equally. High Calvinists said that Christ died only for the elect. Davenant said that Christ died for all men but especially for

---

78. We quote from Schaff's translation in Creeds of Christendom, vol. III, p. 586-587. The fullest discussion on Dort and the controversy is Godfrey's dissertation, to which we have not yet access. See also H.D. Foster, 'Liberal Calvinism; The Remonstrants at the Synod of Dort in 1619', p. 20. Homer Hoeksema's large Voice of Our Fathers is a sympathetic discussion of Dort, with historical background and translations of relevant documents. It betrays signs of special pleading, however, as when the author claims that it is not entirely accurate to say that the Canons taught the Lombardian formula (p. 341). See also Herman Hoeksema, TK, vol. I, p. 642. Our judgement is that the Synod accepted the formula but only in the Particularist sense. It did not reject it in the Supralapsarian sense of Piscator or even Beza. In addition to the views of Arminius in his Works, see also the important volume by Grotius, A Defence of the Catholic Faith Concerning the Satisfaction of Christ, Against Faustus Socinus. This is usually given as the classical statement of the Governmental theory of the atonement. Note that it was written against Socinianism, thus giving the lie to the allegation that Arminianism immediately led to the earlier errors of Socinus. Grotius's views went beyond those of Arminius in certain respects. Later in the century something more approaching the position of Arminius was presented by John Goodwin in his extensive effort entitled Redemption Redeemed.


80. Davenant, p. 514.
the elect. Moreover, God intended to send Christ for all men and does apply the atonement to all men, but He does not apply it to all men with saving faith. Because God intended to apply it to the elect alone with saving faith, there was a 'special intent' in the atonement for the elect. Christ therefore died for all but not equally for all. The benefits of the atonement which are applied to all men are non-salvific.

Davenant further disagreed with the Particularist tendency to say that Christ 'actually' saved men at Calvary. This would, in essence, be the same as justification before faith. Davenant strongly denies that the atonement actually saved any, much less all. The atonement was, as it was intended to be, an actual payment for all men; but no man is actually saved until he believes. And one always believes when the atonement is applied with faith. As for the order of the decrees, Davenant was a very low Sublapsarian. The order then was this:

1. Decree to create all men out of universal love.
2. Decree to permit the fall of all men.
3. Decree to send Christ to die for all men out of universal love.
4. Decree to choose some men to be saved by the atonement. This is election by special grace.
5. Decree to make the salvation of the elect actual by the application of the atonement to them with saving faith.

But Davenant runs into a difficulty here. He sees that there is a special intent for the elect in the atonement because election in eternity precedes atonement in time, and he tends to read this back into the third decree above. Moreover, he does not completely distinguish his view of special intent from that of the Particularists who assert that Christ died for the elect alone while leaving open the aspect that He died for all men in a non-salvific way. Some might see the difference

81. Davenant, pp. 513ff.
82. Davenant, pp. 528, 542-543, etc.
83. Davenant, pp. 538, 352-354.
84. Davenant, pp. 440-441, 452-453.
85. Davenant, p. 391.
86. Cf. Chapter IV above for the problems involved in the terms Sublapsarian and Infralapsarian. Our point is merely that Davenant was not a Supralapsarian. It would be awkward to describe him as an Amyraldian, as his career generally preceded that of Amyraut.
between Davenant’s Dualism and the lower form of Federalist Particularism as mainly one of emphasis.

As Davenant was arguing his Dualism in England there arose in France a similar school led by John Cameron. The leading names in this school were Cameron, Jean Daille, David Blondel, but especially Moise Amyraut. Their school has often been termed 'Hypothetical Universalism', a term that they rejected and never used of themselves. Others spoke of it as Amyraldism (or Amyraldianism). Unfortunately very little has been translated from the pertinent documents, but there are three excellent dissertations which deal with the school and provide representative quotations in translation. They are: Nicole, Moyse Amyraut (1596-1664) and the Controversy on Universal Grace: First Phase (1634-1637); Armstrong, Calvinism and the Amyraut Heresy; and Proctor, The Theology of Moise Amyraut Considered as a Reaction Against Seventeenth-Century Calvinism.

Amyraut held that the atonement had infinite value and universal sufficiency because of the infinite dignity of Christ. Like Davenant he rejected pure Arminian Universalism and preferred to speak of Christ dying especially for the elect. Christ intended to die, and did die, for the reprobate but they are not saved because the atonement is not applied to them with faith. So far Amyraut agreed with Davenant. At

88. Another university thesis touches on the controversy to a lesser extent: Pope, Aspects of Controversies Concerning the Doctrine of Grace Aroused by the Teachings of Claude Pajon. James Nichols gives a helpful discussion of certain strains in the controversy in Calvinism and Arminianism Compared in Their Principles and Tendency, especially pp.202-241. Amyraut is covered in most of the standard church histories and encyclopaedias. See especially Nicole's The Encyclopaedia of Christianity, and Lindsay's in Hasting's Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics. Further bibliographical data can be found in Nicole, Moyse Amyraut: A Bibliography, With Special Reference to the Controversy on Universal Grace. Armstrong, Proctor and probably Lindsay see Amyraut as more or less correct in his attempt to return to the Calvinism of John Calvin, whereas Nicole challenges this viewpoint.

89. Amyraut based this upon the Anselmian doctrine that "Sin committed against an infinite Majesty deserves an infinite punishment" (Religions, p.462. Cf. pp.459-491). See also Proctor, pp.233, 242, 244.

90. Proctor, p.249. Much of the difficulty with Amyraut is that at times he can sound like a strict Universalist rather than a Dualist in the manner of Davenant and Baxter. For example, sometimes he stated "Christ died equally for all" (in Nicole, Bibliography, pp.9, 11). Sweeton gives the following excerpt: "The sacrifice which Jesus Christ offered was equally for all; and the salvation which He received from His Father, in the sanctification of the spirit and the glorification of the body, was destined equally for all - provided the necessary disposition for receiving it were equal" (op. cit., p.541). Hence, in the revealed or conditional will Christ died equally for all, while in the secret will He died especially for the elect.

91. Armstrong, p.211.
this point he departs from, or at least develops, Davenant in the 'hypothetical' aspect of the atonement and its intent. Amyraut seems to have taught that the dual aspects of the atonement correspond with the dual wills of God. The universal aspect matches common grace; the special aspect matches special grace and election. The universal is not strictly hypothetical because Christ did actually die for all men and God does indeed love all men; Particularists either deny or minimize this. But it is hypothetical in the sense that it is not actuated by application to all men. Special grace flows through the special aspect of the atonement; Christ died especially for the elect. Proctor feels that Amyraut differed from the Particularists only in degree, not in content. This was because Amyraut wanted to maintain the doctrine of common grace, which he felt the Particularists were about to reject, as well as the universal aspect of the atonement. Indeed, many contemporary Particularists had already denied that there was a universal aspect in the atonement and said that common grace was merely providence and had no relevance to the work of Christ.

Amyraut's views were opposed mainly by Spanheim, Dumoulin, Rivet and Francis Turretin. Their main argument was that of secret intention: if Christ died for all, then He intended to save all by the application of the atonement to all with faith; since He does not apply it to all in this way, He did not die for all. The double payment argument was also employed. Amyraut was tried for heresy several times and then exonerated. His views were eventually rejected by the Helvetic Consensus Formula of 1675 at the instigation of Turretin.

93. Proctor, p. 246. Sell correctly notes that "Among the factors which motivated Amyraut was the hope that his position might make Reformed teaching more acceptable to the Lutherans" (The Great Debate, p.31). The rift between the Lutheran and Calvinist branches of the Reformation had been growing increasingly larger, while all along there had been those who had sought to bring them back together. The most extreme Calvinists had opposed Lutheranism as being too similar to what they opposed in Arminianism. The latter, of course, was further from the views of Calvin than were the former. A study comparing the relevant points of Amyraldism and the different strands of Lutheranism would prove interesting.

94. See Proctor, pp. 250-251. Turretin's Institutes was one of the larger expositions of classical High Calvinism of the period and exerted considerable influence on later High Calvinist theologians, especially those of the Princeton school in the nineteenth century. Charles Hodge patterned his own Systematic Theology on it, which has since taken its place as the standard Federalist systematic theology of its depth. Unfortunately, only a few portions of Turretin's massive enterprise have been translated. Of special pertinence is his The Atonement of Christ, recently reprinted. Not as extensive as Owen's Death of Death, it remains a classic presentation of the stricter form of Particularism.
By the 1640's Particularism predominated in English Calvinism but was by no means the only theory around. Low Calvinism was one alternative. Another alternative was Antinomian Calvinism. The Antinomians also discussed the atonement. Some occasionally sounded Universalist, like Robert Towne:

Christ intended by his death, fulness, perfection, or sufficiency of salvation for all, and that so it should be tendered to all, though the elect only can conceive it through faith."

Towne's literary style is occasionally difficult to interpret. Some might view this quotation as teaching Universalism, grounding the universal offer in the universal atonement. Others would say that Towne is merely asserting that Christ intended an atonement of infinite worth. Most of the other Antinomians are clearer in maintaining Particularism. Saltmarsh rejected the argument which runs, "Christ died for all, else the Gospel cannot be preached to all". For him this argument is based on reason rather than on revelation. Saltmarsh prefers to rely on mystery. Note that both Saltmarsh and Towne maintain the free offer."

Crisp's unguarded literary style left him open to misinterpretation on this point. Hoornbeck thought that Crisp was a Universalist because of his acceptance of the free offer, but Gill corrected him on this." Crisp interpreted the 'whole world' of 1 John 2:2 as 'all his elect people' both Jews and Gentiles" and explicitly defended the double payment argument in several places." His Particularism is especially evident in his sermon entitled 'Christ the Great Paymaster of All the Debts of His People'."
The Westminster Assembly reacted firmly against both Low and Antinomian Calvinism, though its standards dealt with the issue rather less than one would have expected. The Confession states: "To those for whom Christ hath purchased redemption, he doth certainly and effectually apply and communicate the same..." (VIII:8). The Larger Catechism says much the same thing (Question 59). Neither document says that Christ died only for the elect or that He did not die for the reprobate. But in the light of its other statements that not all men will receive the benefits of redemption, the conclusion is obvious. Now some of those at Westminster were Dualists and it has been suggested that the Standards are intentionally vague so that these delegates could sign the documents. After all, it is true that a few of the divines were Supralapsarian (e.g., Twisse, the Moderator), yet the Standards avoid taking a stand on the decree issue, though perhaps tending towards Sublapsarianism. But we cannot accept this for the reasons above, that the documents do indeed teach Particularism. Lindsay contends that the minutes show that the Confession was not meant to exclude Amyraldism, but his documentation is sketchy. At best the minutes show that there was a considerable discussion on the subject but that the Particularists won out.

Who were these non-Particularist divines at Westminster? Beveridge names Calamy, Seaman, Vines, Marshall and Arrowsmith. Douty and Baxter add Twisse to this list, but we find this most difficult to accept. Even so, these were certainly prominent divines. Most prominent of all was Archbishop Ussher of Armagh, who was clearly not

---

103. Douty, p.102; Baxter, Catholick Theologie, Part II, p.51. Any view other than the strictest view of limited atonement would be incompatible with Supralapsarianism, of which Twisse was the foremost exponent (see Chapter IV above). And yet there may be a case for the view that Twisse wavered, contradicted himself, or taught a doctrine of atonement reflecting his views of the Gospel and the assurance of faith. At times he can even sound like Amyraut: "Now like as God is ready to bestow these benefits on all and every one, and that for Christ's sake, in case they believe: so Christ hath merited pardon of sin and salvation for all and every one, in case they believe. Such is the sufficiency of Christ's merit" (Riches, Part I, p.109). And yet in other places Twisse notes that election is definite, not hypothetical in any way. Since the atonement flows from electing grace, "pardon of sin and salvation is procured by Christ, for none but such as believe" (Part I, p.272). Cf. Daille, Apologia, vol.II, p.1211.
a Particularist (whether he was a Dualist as per Davenant and Amyraut or a Universalist as per the Arminians or later Calvinistic Universalists, is disputed)." Furthermore it must not be overlooked, as it often is by post-Puritan Particularists, that many other leading Puritans were not advocates of the strict limited atonement theory. Most notable was Richard Baxter. Baxter was just beginning to write at the time of the Westminster Assembly and became something of the Amyraut of England. He was more controversial for his views of justification than for his rejection of Particularism and followed closely in the trail of Davenant and Ussher. His position can be summed up in the following statement: "Christ therefore died for all, but not for all equally, or with the same intent, design or purpose." Again, this is Dualism, not Universalism. Baxter also claimed that up to half of the divines in England taught the same view, listing Preston, Whately, Ball, Culverwell, Vines, Hall, Fenner, Davenant and Ussher.

Whether Preston did in fact reject Particularism has been debated, notably in the Marrow controversy. The Marrow quoted Preston's

---

104. See especially Ussher's tract, 'The Judgement of the Late Archbishop of Armagh, and Primate of Ireland, on the True Intent and Extent of Christ's Death and Satisfaction Upon the Cross', in Works, vol.XII, pp.551-560. Note that this was written in 1617, thus closely bearing in mind his fellow Bishop Davenant's reservations about the trends pertinent to the Remonstrance. Ussher, like Davenant, warned of two opposite extremes: the purely universal theory of Arminius, Grotius et al; and the limited theory of Beza, Perkins and Ames. The Gospel of limited atonement, he said, requires "that a man should be bound in conscience to believe that which is untrue" (Works, vol.XII, p.554). That is, it was inconsistent to tell a man that he must believe that Christ made atonement for him if you tell him at the same time that Christ died for only some and hence may not have died for him. Ussher was aware that there were some Particularists who inconsistently held that this assurance was of the essence of faith. Ussher gives the classic Dualist formula: "So, in one respect he may be said to have died for all, and in another respect not to have died for all" (ibid., p.559). The former is not merely hypothetical but, as in Davenant, quite actual. See Godfrey, 'Extent', pp.167-170; Douty, pp.35, 100-101; Baxter, Catholick Theologie, Part II, pp.50, 52; Morison, pp.189-190.


106. Catholick Theologie, Part II, pp.50-59. Cf. Toon, HC, p.23; Lachman, p.25. Polhill could be added to the list as well since he taught the Dualist principle that Christ atoned for all men but not equally for all men. See his A View of Some Divine Truths, pp.143-174. Cf. Douty, p.103. Though John Milton, the post-divine, distinctly accepted the Universalist position, we are slow to classify him as Low Calvinist. His other views on matters such as election tend more towards Arminianism, though with some considerable innovation. Concerning universal atonement, see Works, vol.VI, pp.444-449.
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evangelistic mandate: "Go and tell every man without exception, that there is good news for him, Christ is dead for him".107 Some, such as Lachman, interpret these words to mean "Go and tell men that Christ is dead for them to receive as atonement for sin", thereby merely proclaiming a substitutionary atonement with no reference to the identity of those for whom the Saviour died.

One other notable Puritan often ignored in the controversy was John Bunyan. Some Bunyan scholars feel that he was a Particularist,108 but we find this difficult to accept in the light of Bunyan's clear and repeated statements to the contrary in Reprobation Asserted. He often states that the Gospel is to be preached to all men "and the reason is, because Christ died for all".109 Moreover, says Bunyan, there could be no penalty for rejecting the Gospel if the atonement were limited.110 Elsewhere he says that all men now live because Christ died for all; that is, common grace flows through the atonement.111 Some passages are vague and could be taken for or against Particularism.112 Greaves feels that Bunyan taught limited atonement and therefore did not write Reprobation Asserted. Helm feels that Bunyan probably wrote the work but he adds that the treatise taught Particularism. The debate over the authorship of this important work is an unusual one. Their disagreement centres more upon internal arguments than external arguments; that is, only a little is actually said about title pages, first editions, publishers, etc.113 We feel Bunyan indeed wrote it, and in it and elsewhere taught the Universal scheme.

We mention Bunyan because he was one of the few prominent Baptist Puritans. One would have expected Gill to quote him often but in fact we have not found even a single reference to Bunyan in Gill's works. This may well have been because Gill was aware of Bunyan's views in

108. E.g., Greaves, Bunyan, pp.43-45; Pittman, Questions, p.7. Douty disagrees (p.103).
110. Ibid. See below.
Reprobation Asserted.

Shortly after the Westminster Assembly John Owen wrote the definitive work defending limited atonement: The Death of Death in the Death of Christ. A detailed and highly scholastic volume, it employs virtually all of the arguments ever put forth for limited atonement and has been the foundation for most subsequent treatises on the subject. In it Owen relies heavily on simple and compound syllogism as well as Scriptural exegesis. The double payment argument is repeatedly used, including the treble choice: Christ died for either all the sins of all men (but why then are not all saved?) or all the sins of some men (which Owen accepts) or some sins of all men (in which case no man will be saved, for then they would have to answer for sins which have not been atoned for, unless man is a co-saviour and can atone for his own sins). He interprets passages like John 1:29, 3:16, II Cor.5, I John 2:2 in a strictly Particularist fashion.

Another favourite argument of Owen's was this: if Christ died for all, then God must love all; if God loves all, then He wills all men to be saved; if God wills all men to be saved, then all men will be saved, for God's will cannot be resisted. Since therefore all men will not be saved, the logical chain is reversed: God does not will all to be saved, therefore He does not love all men, therefore Christ did not die for all.

114. In Works, vol.X. We refer to the pagination in the collected edition rather than the separately published editions, either the original or the more recent Banner of Truth reprint. The latter contains an important introductory essay by J.I. Packer, which has been reprinted on its own by several other publishers. In addition to DNB and Orme's biography, more recent studies should be consulted on Owen, notably the biography of Peter Toon and the university thesis of Sinclair Ferguson. None of these, however, deals with Owen's soteriology in the same depth as Alan Clifford's thesis, currently in progress, in which Owen's views are compared with Wesley's and Baxter's. Dutky often takes Owen task in The Death of Christ. That Owen's work is the standard effort from the Particularist perspective is seen, for instance, in the oft-heard allegation that it is "unanswered and unanswerable". As for Owen's theological affinities, Sell comments: "Owen thus placed himself in the line of Alexander of Hales, and on a par with the Synod of Dort and with Reformed confessionalism generally" (The Great Debate, p.114). Sell's comment respecting Alexander is unclear, whereas Owen was certainly in agreement with Dort. However, we question whether he would have agreed with the earlier Reformed symbols, such as Heidelberg.

115. Whitely, Calvinism and Evangelicalism in England, p.12. The complexity of Owen's literary and theological style often elicits the descriptions 'prolix' and 'Aristotelian'. He is often classed with Perkins as one of the foremost exponents of Puritan scholasticism.

Essential to this argument is that the atonement flows from special grace, not common grace, and that both the atonement and common grace belong to the secret and determinative will of God, which cannot be resisted. This does not mean that the atonement does not have infinite worth. But Owen denies that Christ died in any way for the reprobate as such. Little is said about the Lombardian formula. Owen's book is Particularism in one of its purest forms.

Keach followed Owen in all basic points, including the double payment argument. He too seems to have rejected the Lombardian dictum, for he asserted that "whatsoever is not efficient is not sufficient to attain the end thereof". Universal sufficiency is therefore rejected, though Keach clearly accepted infinite worth. He held to the free offer, saying that it did not contradict the doctrine of limited atonement. Keach was the first great leader among the Calvinistic Baptists. Being Particularists they became known as Particular Baptists in contradistinction to the General (Arminian) Baptists. At this time (1690's) it was practically unheard of for a Calvinistic Baptist to be Universalist, as Bunyan had been. There were, however, some Low Calvinists among the Independents.

In the Neonomian Controversy of the 1690's the Low Calvinists tended to follow Baxter and Williams into Neonomianism, while many High Calvinists followed Hussey and Davis into Hyper-Calvinism. Many of both schools, however, stayed the same. In this Controversy was discussed the extent of the atonement in relation to the preaching of the Gospel. This was not new but the Hyper-Calvinists stressed Particularism so much that they felt impelled by logic to redefine the ministry of preaching. Hussey's great argument was that a free offer implies and rests upon a Universal atonement; since the atonement was limited, our


119. In one place Owen affirms, "And on this universal sufficiency of his death and passion is grounded the universality of evangelical promises" (vol.X, p.89). This 'universal sufficiency', however, is not the same as that of Universalism. When Owen writes, "So that, in some sense, Christ may be said to die for 'all' and 'the whole world'", he merely is pointing to the infinite worth of the sufferings of Christ endured and that 'all' means 'all sorts'.

120. Cf. Display, pp.91-92, 163, 201.

121. Display, pp.163-164.

122. Display, pp.158ff.

preaching must be limited. There are no free offers.

Richard Davis's views were Particularist. In one place he says that "Christ died for all", but the 'all' are all those who will be saved.\(^{126}\) We can offer Christ to all men, says Davis, but God does not offer Christ to all men, for God did not send Christ to die for all:

Christ died intentionally only for the elect, therefore the saving benefits of his death in the general tenders of the Gospel, are intended only by God for the elect; and sure none will deny this position, but a rank Arminian.\(^{128}\)

Later Davis more explicitly denied the free offer doctrine in the way Hussey had. Soon Skepp and then Gill and Brine would follow in their trail. Our comments on Gill are reserved for the next section because they deserve closer scrutiny. But we may here take a glance at the views of some of his contemporaries.

Whitby and Wesley, of course, were Gill's main Arminian antagonists. Both wrote extensively in defence of Arminian Universalism. Whitby rejected the Lombardan formula, or at least the way in which it was re-interpreted by Particularists who wished to employ it. For Whitby it was absurd to say that Christ died sufficiently for all but intentionally only for the elect. Surely if Christ died for all men at all, He intended to die for them. How could one say that Christ died sufficiently for all if He did not die for all?\(^{124}\)

The 1720's saw the Marrow Controversy in Scotland debate the same issue of the relationship between the free offer and the extent of the atonement. Much of it centred around the Marrow's use of Preston's mandate. Boston and Marrowmen denied that either they, the Marrow, or Preston taught Universalism.\(^{127}\) They even interpreted as Particularist the Marrow's statement that Christ "hath taken upon him the sins of all men".\(^{128}\) Naturally they still maintained the doctrine of the infinite worth (and therefore sufficiency) of the atonement.\(^{129}\)

---

... Cont'd:
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The eighteenth century saw the continuance of the Dualist position in Watts, Doddridge and Bellamy. Edwards maintained the limited view from his distinctive theology, but his works were neither as emphatically or explicitly Particularist as those such as Owen. As for Whitefield, at times he sounded Universalist but at other times is explicitly Particularist. He even appeals to the double payment argument. In his famous letter to Wesley he asked "whether it is not a greater blasphemy" to say, "Christ died for souls now in hell". Abraham Taylor was a free offer Particularist, contrary to what some Hyper-Calvinists felt about him.

Fuller was more successful than Taylor in weaning Particular Baptists away from the non-offer position. But he still advocated Particularism. He seems to have accepted the Lombardian formula in that the atonement is infinitely valuable but actually applied only to the elect, but spoke in lower terms than did Owen: "The particularity of redemption consists in the sovereign pleasure of God with regard to the application of the atonement; that is, with regard to the persons to whom it shall be applied". To some of Fuller's Hyper- and even High Calvinist contemporaries this sounded like a clear statement of Universalism. In fact, however, it seems more likely that Fuller was a

---

130. Watt's main work from the Dualist perspective was The Ruin and Recovery of Mankind. See Works, vol.VI, pp.283ff.; Toon, HC, p.121; Griffin, in Park, The Atonement, pp.381-386; Wright, Isaac Watts and Contemporary Hymn-Writers, pp.219-220. This piece was originally written anonymously, but it soon became common knowledge that Watts was the author. Brine answered it in The Certain Efficacy of the Death of Christ. Watts followed Ussher's warning against the two extremes represented at Dort. Doddridge's Dualism can be found in several places in his works, especially the Lectures in Divinity. One should be careful in reading only Doddridge's comments in The Family Expositor, for several entries only deal with one aspect of the atonement. Bellamy, a protege of Jonathan Edwards, wrote True Religion Delineated (in Works, vol.I) and is a candidate for the distinction of being the father of the 'New England Theology' variety of Low Calvinism. Several important variations differentiate him from Edwards on the one hand and Hopkins on the other.


132. Letters, p.212. As we shall see later, Whitefield contradicted his Particularism by making the 'Bold Proclamation' that "Christ died for you" to unbelievers on occasion, probably out of evangelistic zeal.

133. Cf. Address, p.3.


135. Works, p.314. Cf. pp.315-316, 321. Smeaton: "Andrew Fuller, sometimes claimed as not a strict Calvinist, with much more correctness represents the atonement as securing its own application" (op. cit., p.542).
low High Calvinist, even as Davenant was a high Low Calvinist. That is, as Davenant, Amyraut and Baxter all accepted that Christ died for all and especially for the elect, so Fuller taught that Christ really died only for the elect but was very careful to point out the universal non-salvific benefits respecting the free offer. The distinction is extremely fine and constitutes the difference between Particularism and Dualism. To Particularists, Dualists are really Universalists; to Universalists, they are Particularists. Fuller came precariously close to advocating Dualism, even as Davenant approached Particularism. Both were reactions against pure Particularism but both were reluctant to accept pure Universalism. Fuller also had some interesting thoughts on the intent of the atonement. Christ died "for sinners as sinners", evidently irrespective of election, even though election was eternal and the atonement was temporal. However, Fuller still held that there was a special intent in the atonement for the elect as elect. Divine grace, says Fuller, is more glorified in a definite and particular atonement than in an indefinite and universal atonement. But he is quick to add that though the atonement is definite, it did not actually redeem anyone (even the elect), for actual redemption occurs only in the application.

It is easy to see how Fuller left himself open to Rushton's charge that he was either a Universalist or paved the way for Universalism. Rushton was an early nineteenth-century Hyper-Calvinist who advocated Owen's pure Particularism together with Hussey's non-offer in his Defence of Particular Redemption. It is a highly polemical book. For example, Rushton says that Fuller falsely claimed to teach limited atonement. The book is marred with suspicion and innuendo, as is

137. Works, p.316.
138. Works, pp.315-316.
139. The Hyper-Calvinist John Stevens also made this allegation in his dispute over the relation of the free offer to the extent of the atonement. He quoted Fuller as saying, "If the atonement of Christ excluded a part of mankind in the same sense as it excludes fallen angels, why is the Gospel addressed to the one any more than to the other?" (in Help, vol.I, p.183). Stevens followed the strict Particularist line that there are no benefits whatsoever in the atonement for the reprobate. What Fuller was saying was that there are some benefits for the reprobate which concern the free offer. Fuller went further in this area than most Particularists did, causing some controversy with mainstream Particularists such as Abraham Booth. The latter wrote Glad Tidings to Perishing Sinners (in Works, vol.II, pp.3-232) to correct Fuller's position. Cf. Reed, Atonement, p.112.
140. Rushton, p.19.
common in Hyper-Calvinist works. Rushton also took exception with Fuller's statement (see above) that the only particularity is in the atonement's application rather than in the atonement itself.¹⁴¹

This led Rushton to a clear denial of universal sufficiency: "The atonement, therefore, is in no sense sufficient for a man, unless Jesus died for that man".¹⁴² This tended to sound like 'Equivalentism' (see below) and even Abelardianism. Rushton rejected the Lombardian formula because he felt that it was Universalist.

Other early nineteenth-century Hyper-Calvinists followed Gill and Hussey and paralleled Rushton. Huntington, Gadsby and Philpot were all ardent Particularists and relied especially on the double payment argument.¹⁴³ By this time Rushton's rejection of universal sufficiency was becoming more controversial in Particularist circles. For example, the Hyper-Calvinist William Palmer countered Spurgeon as follows:

You believe in the atonement to be sufficient for all the world, and that the price paid for a part of mankind was more than sufficient for the whole ... we believe the application of the atonement is determined by its intrinsic value; you, or your associates, hold that it is ruled by extrinsic value which arises out of a divine intention.¹⁴⁴

Spurgeon's Particularism is well-known, easily documented, and well within the tradition of Westminster,¹⁴⁵ though it is strange that some of his biographers have considered him less than Particularist.¹⁴⁶ Spurgeon

¹⁴¹. Rushton, p. 27.
¹⁴². Rushton, p. 23.
¹⁴³. E.g., Huntington, Works, vol.II, pp. 56ff., 84; Philpot, Answer, pp. 8-10; Gadsby, Works, vol.I, pp. 150-151. We treat the Hyperist views of limited atonement in subsequent sections, but it is important to the overall view of the history of the debate to see how the Hyperists tended to be the highest of all defenders of Particularism. This is especially obvious in the rejection of infinite sufficiency in some quarters, as shown here, and in the rejection of the free offer (see Section C below).
¹⁴⁶. E.g., Colquitt, pp. 104-106, 278, 390. Colquitt was taken to task on this and other points by Thornton (p. 132) in his excellent thesis on Spurgeon, one of the most thorough studies of the Baptist preacher ever compiled. Part of the difficulty with assessing Spurgeon's views is the enormity of source material to be sifted through, for Spurgeon probably published more material in the field of religion than any other person in the English-speaking world before or since. In fact, he was exceeded probably only by Luther and Calvin for output. Thornton, ... Cont'd:
appealed to the double payment argument, especially with reference to those already in Hell, and the argument from design (i.e., election): "The only limit of the atonement is in its design." The atonement is infinite in sufficiency but finite in design. But there are still non-salvific benefits in the atonement which 'accrue' to the non-elect.

The first half of the nineteenth century saw new developments in the Universal school of Calvinism, notably in Scotland. Thomas Erskine appears to have been the first to pioneer this field and influence can be seen from James Fraser of Brea and the Marrow of Modern Divinity. Moderates in the school included James Morison, Ralph Wardlaw and Thomas Jenkyn, while John MacLeod Campbell introduced the rather radical theory of Christ's vicarious repentance into the system. Morison and Wardlaw more approached the Dualist scheme, but there are important differences between each of them and the others. In England, Calvinistic Universalism was represented at this time by J.C. Ryle and Thomas Scott, among others. In America, Albert Barnes popularized the viewpoint, and Timothy Dwight added some rather Neonomian embellishments.

Cont'd:...

unlike Colquitt, displays a mastery of Spurgeonalia.

151. Thornton, p.145.

152. On Morison, see especially Kirsh, The Theology of James Morison. Morison offered several peculiar theories relevant to the nature of the atonement, often employing bold language that can even sound like he denied the need of atonement. These statements must not be interpreted out of the context of his overall system. Part of Morison's uniqueness arises from his emphasis on differentiating redemption, atonement, propitiation and other aspects of salvation.

153. See especially Discourses on the Nature and Extent of the Atonement. A helpful study is Hyslop, Ralph Wardlaw. Wardlaw opposed Particularism mainly by equating it with the extremes of the views of those such as Rushton. Repeatedly emphasizing the sufficient/efficient motif, he paralleled Davenant on several points, as when he asked "How can a ground, with any propriety, be affirmed to be sufficient for all, which is not at all for all?" (Discourses, p.lxvii).

154. See especially The Nature of the Atonement. A good study is Tuttle, The Place of John Macleod Campbell in British Thought Concerning the Atonement. The influence of Luther is fairly evident in Campbell.
The Particularist position was propagated in Scotland mainly by those who seceded to form the Free Church of Scotland. These include Duncan, Buchanan, Cunningham, Candlish, Crawford and Smeaton (the last three of which produced important defences). In America the discussion introduced some modifications through Charles Hodge and W.G.T. Shedd, both of whom tended to point out more than other Particularists the non-salvific, Universal aspect of the atonement. However, their position still remained that of limited atonement, though Shedd's at times approached that of Fuller's. Thornwell, Dabney, A.A. Hodge and Warfield represented the slightly higher Particularism that was more in keeping with Owen and Turretin. Their position has been propagated more or less purely in America by Louis Berkof, Cornelius Van Til, John Murray, R.B. Kuiper, Lorraine Boettner, Arthur Custance and J.O. Buswell, among others.

The Dualist and Universalist positions have continued to be represented by L.S. Chafer, Henry Thiessen, Charles Baker, Griffith Thomas, and others, many of whom received influence from A.H. Strong. More recently the position has received impetus from Norman Douty and, R.T. Kendall. Lower down the scale, Karl Barth brought Low Calvinism into new areas qualitatively different from mainstream Lows, mainly through incorporating other sources and developments. Scotland has seen the rise of a school paralleling Barthian Calvinism though

155. Hodge can even sound Dualist, as when he writes "There is a sense, therefore, in which He died for all, and there is a sense in which He died for the elect alone" (Systematic Theology, vol. II, p.546). What differentiates this from the Dualist position is that Hodge makes the universal aspect merely hypothetical (in a non-Amyraldian sense) sense, preferring to speak of the non-salvific benefits coming from infinite value. For Hodge, the atonement is still restricted by election.

156. "Atonement is unlimited, and redemption is limited. This statement includes all the Scripture texts: those which assert that Christ died for all men, and those which assert that He died for His people" (D dogmatic Theology, vol. II, p.470). Hence, it is the sinner, not God, who limits the atonement - for man, not God, is the author of unbelief (vol. II, p.484). This closely approaches the Dualist position except that Shedd denies that the Gospel makes the 'Bold Proclamation' with the call that hearers are required to believe that Christ died for them (vol. II, p.485). This was also the position of the senior Hodge.

157. Kuiper's monograph, For Whom Did Christ Die, basically takes the position of Charles Hodge. In sum he teaches: "The particular design of the atonement and its universal design in no way contradict each other. Nor do they merely complement each other. They support and strengthen each other. In final analysis they stand and fall together". He concludes, "Therefore the statement, so often heard from Reformed pulpits that Christ died only for the elect, must be rated a careless one" (pp.78-79). The book deals with the situation from both sides, but tends to give more stress on the particular side. Hence, we feel that Kuiper was basically a Particularist, though his effort has correctly brought out the difficulties in drawing a hard and fast line between Particularism and Dualism.

... Cont'd:
historical antecedents such as Campbell. Representatives of this variety include H.R. Mackintosh, John Baillie, J.K.S. Reid, and Thomas and James Torrance.

This brings our survey of the history of the debate up to date, but a few comments should be made before investigating further the Hyper-Calvinist view. It should be obvious to all that it is exceptionally difficult to draw the lines between the several representative viewpoints. As Kuiper has warned, too many of those involved in the debate at the popular level tend to over-simplify the question in terms of 'only some' or 'equally all'. A mere glance at the theologians mentioned in this survey shows that this has not been the case with those claimed by each side.

In popular terms, Particularism teaches that "Christ died only for the elect". This is the position of those such as Rushton who deny any benefits for the reprobate at all through the atonement. Any benefits they receive come directly through Providence or indirectly through contact with the elect, for the reprobate are created for the purpose of serving the elect. This is the ultimate version of limited atonement.

Lower down from this is what we may call classic Particularism, that of Dort, Westminster, Owen and Turretin. They usually speak in terms of 'only'. They leave open the possibility of non-salvific benefits for the reprobate, but these tend to be simply the shadow of the infinite

Cont'd:

158. Douty's The Death of Christ presents the Dualist theory in classic terms, relying heavily upon Davenant and Morison. In it he deals with the issue Biblically, theologically and historically. He complements Kuiper's book in placing slightly more stress on the universal aspect. His historical data is very helpful but often needs confirmation from the original sources themselves. Re-iterating the idea of 'special intent' of Davenant, Douty's views are summed up in the following excerpts: "Christ died to make possible the salvation of all, but to make actual the salvation of the elect alone ... the cross had a special reference to the elect ... Christ's redemptive work was primarily for the elect, and only secondarily for the rest of men ... Thus God's intention in the death of Christ was not the same with reference to the two groups. But though God's design in Christ's death was dual, we must not think that the death itself was ... the sense in which Christ died for the elect and non-elect was single, but His object in doing so was double ... His death had a special reference to the elect, but we strongly deny that it had an exclusive reference to them" (pp.30, 44, 49, 50).

159. Cunningham: "no Calvinist, not even Dr. Twisse, the great champion of high Supralapsarianism, has ever denied that there is a sense in which it may be affirmed that Christ died for all men" (Reformers, p.396). Cunningham, however, makes this merely a non-Amyraldian 'hypothetical' sense, for he accepts the position which he describes as particular redemption: "Christ did not die for all men, but only for the elect, for those who are actually saved" (p.395). Hence, Cunningham and others of the limited school revert to saying 'only'. His statement also overlooks ... Cont'd:
value of the atonement itself. They tend to stress the infinite value but also the limited intent or design. They almost never use language which could be interpreted out of context as indicating that there is a universal aspect of the atonement.

Still lower than this is the modified Particularist position which speaks of particular and universal aspects, though properly speaking it feels that it is sometimes appropriate to take the 'only' line (e.g. Hodge and Kuiper upheld the Westminster Standards).

There is difficulty in differentiating this from the Dualist position, which is summed up in the dictum "Christ died for all but especially for the elect" (or "but not equally for all"). This position aims at distinguishing but balancing the two aspects.

Then there is the Universal position, which is generally summed up in the dictum "Christ died equally for all". The atonement decree preceded the election decree.

There are other ways of differentiating the system. One concerns the nature of the Gospel in terms of the 'Bold Proclamation', "Christ died for you". Particularists cannot consistently make this proclamation to all men. Even those modified Particularists are loathe to use it, for to them it implies the Universalist position. Particularists are very slow to state that it is of the essence of saving faith to believe that Christ died for oneself.

Dualists and Universalists, on the other hand, can quite freely make the 'Bold Proclamation' and state that this assurance is of the essence of faith. Hence, this is a useful way of differentiating the schools, even if it has certain drawbacks.

Another way of differentiating the positions is to look at the various ways in which the atonement passages in the Bible are dealt with. Particularists are prone to interpret 'all', 'world' and 'every one' as

Cont'd...
the Hyper-Calvinist rejection of universal sufficiency. Positions similar to that of Cunningham are found in R.C. Reed, The Gospel as Taught by Calvin, pp.82, 85; G.W. Tuttle, John MacLeod Campbell, p.22. Cf. Candlish, Inquiry, pp.4-8.
meaning 'all sorts' or 'all the elect', whereas the Dualists and Universalists take them in the plain, unrestricted sense. Conversely, the different schools deal appropriately with the passages which speak of 'us', 'the Church', and 'the sheep'. The Universalists claim that as Christ died for all, then He certainly also died for the Church. Dualists differ in stating that these verses speak of the special intent of the atonement, not to be confused with the other variety, and Particularists virtually identify them with the other verses.

But even this distinction is not fully adequate, as in the case of Kuiper. Kuiper applies the 'all' verses to the universal aspect, and the 'sheep' verses to the elect. What makes his position more Particularist than Dualist appears to be his placing the election decree before that of atonement: "Briefly stated, the particularist view of the divine design of the atonement is that God purposed by the atonement to save only the elect and consequently all the elect, and they alone, are saved". The Universalists place the election decree after that of atonement, while Dualists vary. Some agree with the Universalists, while others take the 'co-ordinate' view of the order of the decrees. This view states that there is no sub-ordinate or logical order to the decrees: they all stand on an equal level. Hence, atonement is neither greater nor lesser than election. An extension of this is the Neo-Orthodox position of Barth and the modern Scottish school, but that view sees the whole question of the decrees differently to even the most generous of the Dualists or Universalists. But an elucidation of that theory lies outside the scope of the present work.

The relation between the different positions to the order of the decrees is vital if for no other reason than that it shows how the tendency is to over-emphasize either divine sovereignty (the special intent) or human responsibility (the universal aspect). While it appears that the Dualists make the greatest efforts to maintain the balance, it may equally be thought that the Universalists are discounting the relationship between unconditional election and atonement as it applies to them. By the same standard, the Particularists threaten the balance by down-playing the universal aspect, with the immediate danger of

160. For Whom Did Christ Die, p.62. Homer Hoeksema offers what is more representative of the popularly accepted definition: "It means that Christ died, according to God's intention, for all the elect, and for them alone" (Voice, p.373).
doing harm to the assurance of faith and the indirect threat of negating the free offer. Moderate and mainstream Particularists hold to the free offer, but they certainly have much in common with the Hyper-Calvinists who reject the free offer precisely because of limited atonement. We will investigate this further in Section C.

Finally, another way in which to measure the different positions is in their advocacy or rejection of different arguments. Thus, most Calvinists accept or reject them in toto. Dualists sometimes accept some and reject others, but generally they come down on the side of the Universalists because the arguments we are concerned with usually speak of the Biblical data concerning the 'all' passages. That is, the way in which each school deals with the pertinent Biblical verses greatly affects the manner in which they deal with the theological arguments. It is right, then, that these arguments be investigated.
B. THE HYPER-CALVINIST DEFENCE OF LIMITED ATONEMENT

A number of writers have defined Hyper-Calvinism in terms of limited atonement, but this is not the predominant factor in a correct definition. Granted all Hyper-Calvinists have held to the doctrine, but so did many others before them who could not correctly be labelled as Hyper-Calvinists. Even so, many of the distinctive doctrines of this school arose from the emphasis on limited atonement. High Calvinists believe in all five points of Dort and often contend that all five stand or fall together. Hyper-Calvinists go further than this in implying that the five points stand or fall on Hyper-Calvinist distinctives (such as the non-offer doctrine). Critics of both schools have sometimes said that these Calvinists were more governed by logic than by Scripture in formulating this doctrine. There is some truth in this.

Similarly, there is much Calvinistic traditionalism seen here, though the leading Hyper-Calvinists themselves do not seem to have been overly concerned about the precise points in the debate about whether Calvin was a Particularist. Gill, for example, never seems to refer to Calvin in his attempts to prove this doctrine, though he doubtlessly thought that Calvin was a Particularist. He prefers to rely on Owen and Turretin.

The differences, we feel, between High and Hyper-Calvinism on this doctrine are minimal. As on most points discussed in our study, the two

1. Eg., Cave, Sacrifice and Atonement, pp.350-355, 374-375; Williams, Systematic Theology, vol.I, p.232; S.M. Jackson, Concise Dictionary, p.395; Wardlaw, Systematic Theology, vol.II, pp.439-444; Clipsham, p.104; Rice, Hyper-Calvinism, p.11; Hell, often. Cf. Good, p.126; Baker, A Dispensational Theology, p.160. In contrast to Modern Antinomians (Hyper-Calvinists), said Palmer, "Moderate Calvinists consider the atonement to be general in its nature, but specific in its application" (Erroneous Views, p.1). Pink defended limited atonement thusly: "For our part we had rather be railed at as a narrow-minded, out-of-date, hyper-Calvinist, than be found repudiating God's truth by reducing the Divinely-efficacious atonement to a mere fiction" (Sovereignty, p.320). Alexander described 'Hyper-Calvinist' in its relation to limited atonement: "a name which has been given, not because those to whom it is attached are regarded as having gone beyond Calvin in their doctrine, but because they carry the views of Calvin on this head to their utmost extent, and hold them with unbending rigidity" (Biblical Theology, vol.II, p.102).

2. E.g., Custance, The Sovereignty of Grace, p.71. But see also Good, pp.74, 81. Even Kuiper admits, "Of the five the particular atonement is perhaps the least popular" (For Whom Did Christ Die, p.5). Kuiper is moderate compared with William Gadsby, who seriously questions whether those who believe in universal as opposed to limited atonement are really saved (Sermons, p.40).


schools are virtually the same. We will look at Gill's explanations and defence of Particularism in this chapter because, again as in most other areas of our study, he is the definitive Hyper-Calvinist and wrote more on the subject than did most of the others.5

Gill directs his readers to the Scriptures to resolve the controversy,6 for he says that limited atonement is taught in both Testaments.7 To understand the doctrine best, one must also go back to the Covenant of Grace. In that Covenant Christ volunteered to die for the elect and for them alone. His promise to provide their atonement constituted Him as the lamb slain from the foundation of the world. Naturally, Christ was not actually slain from eternity, but since His promise was sure and binding he was therefore reckoned as slain. Eternal atonement is virtual, not actual. The promise was accepted by the Father. When Christ actually died in time, the Father was not bound to accept the atonement by anything except His stipulating promise in the Covenant.8 It all gets back to the Covenant, then. It was necessary for Christ actually to exist at the time of His promise to die, but it was not

5. On Gill's doctrine of limited atonement, see especially Body, pp.390-406, 427-439, 454-493; relevant sections in the Commentary and Cause; and Seymour, pp.119-124; Reed, Atonement (a study of Gill and others). Expositions and defences of limited atonement are numerous. In addition to sections in treatments of the 'Five Points' (Parks, Hanko et al), see the following: Brine, The Certain Efficacy; and The Doctrine of the Imputation of Sin to Christ; Hussey, Glory, pp.640-676; Atkinson, The Atonement; Stevens, The Words of Truth, pp.72-85; Haldane, The Doctrine of the Atonement; and Man's Responsibility, The Nature and Extent of the Atonement, and the Work of the Holy Spirit; Palmer, A Digression Concerning Distinctions Between the Atonement and Redemption; Erroneous Views of the Atonement Calmly Considered; and Concluding Reflections on the Atonement; Pink, The Atonement; The Seven Sayings; Sovereignty, pp.72-85, 311-320; The Doctrine of Reconciliation; Homer Hoeksema, Voice, pp.325-423; Herman Hoeksema, TK, vol.I, pp.508-543, 631-672; Dogmatics, pp.363-412; and his Christological sermons, especially those in When I Survey. Perhaps the most representative of the extreme Hyperist view is Rushton, A Defence of Particular Redemption, written against Fuller and recently reprinted.


7. S & T', vol.I, p.129. Hanko goes so far as to affirm that "limited atonement ... is taught on every page of Scripture" (in Hanko et al, p.34). Some Hyper-Calvinists admit that there are some places in Scripture which at first glance appear to teach universal atonement (Hoeksema, TK, vol.I, pp.532, 538; Pink, Sovereignty, p.81). Critics point out that it is strange that there are so many seemingly 'universal' texts and no explicitly 'limited' texts. Some add that it is otherwise inexplicable that the writers of Scripture would have used these universal phrases in such a seemingly careless manner had they not actually believed in Universalism - certainly the Hyperists would not have written them in the same fashion! Philpot admits that the terms 'limited atonement' and 'particular redemption' are not found in the Bible (Eternal Sonship, pp.86-87).

8. S & T', vol.I, p.528. See Chapter V. Irons argued that Arminians are not really Trinitarians, for they divide the Trinity. That is, they say that Christ died for some whom the Father did not choose or to whom the Spirit will never give faith (Grove Chapel Pulpit, vol.III, pp.356-357. Cf. Parks, Five Points, p.46.)
necessary for the elect to exist actually (only virtually) in order for the Father to apply the promised atonement to them in the Covenant. This is necessary for a proper understanding of eternal justification.

One may ask, "If the elect were eternally justified, why did Christ have to die in time?" Gill's answer is that eternal justification is founded upon the eternal promise of atonement, which promise was accepted as grounds for justification because it was sealed with an unbreakable oath. We have already seen in Chapters V and VI how this presents special problems. For instance, does not this scheme require Gill to place the decree (promise) of atonement after that of election and before that of justification? But then he said that nothing lay between election and justification; the two are complementary and virtually the same thing. Gill apparently does not see the problem. At any rate he does not comment on it and we can see why. The Supralapsarian scheme could not place the atonement decree before the election decree (for that would mean a universal atonement) nor after the justification decree (else men would be justified other than on the basis of the atonement). And the problem is not peculiar to Supralapsarians alone. Sublapsarian Particularists face the same problem. They still end up with a justification based on election rather than on atonement, unless they choose to place atonement before justification and after election. But then election is not based on atonement either.

As for the relationship between atonement and justification in time, Gill is somewhat in the Anselmian tradition. He disagreed with the view of other Supralapsarians like Twisse, Goodwin and Rutherford that "God could forgive sin, and save sinners, without a satisfaction". For Gill

11. Body, p.477. So too Philpot, Meditations, vol.III, p.55; Pink, Reconciliation, p.36; Hoeksema, IX, vol.I, pp.518, 522. The position of Twisse et al bears remarkable affinity to the theory of Abelard as opposed to that of Anselm on this point (see previous section). Palmer wrote that it is the universal, not the limited, theory which posits that God could have saved sinners without an atonement (see Erroneous Views, pp.19-20), and adds, "I believe that the necessity of the atonement and satisfaction of Christ did not arise out of the will of God, (as some people think) but out of the essential nature of divine Justice; the strict exercise of which is, both natural and necessary to the Divine Nature. That it was willed only because it was necessary, and not necessary only because it was willed" (Epitome, p.18). This is significant in the light of Palmer's views of sovereignty/responsibility and universal sufficiency (see below). Cf. Toon, HC, p.139. The difficulty concerns the place of the atonement decree in the order of the decrees, presenting a special problem for the Supralapsarians. By placing the decrees of election and justification before that of atonement, Particularists open themselves to the charge that they ... Cont'd:
sins are not merely pecuniary debts but criminal debts which require satisfaction.  

Christ's death therefore was substitutionary and penal. Against the Socinian argument that this made God pay a debt to Himself, which would be nonsense, Gill replied that the justice of God required such a payment. God required Man to pay but only God could pay, so God became Man (the God-Man) to pay. Naturally, then, the ransom was paid to the Father not to the Devil. It was necessary for the sacrifice

Cont'd:

hold that so far as the decrees are concerned God could decree to elect and justify without the atonement. Sublapsarian Particularists thus have the problem of this in its relationship to the link between atonement and justification by faith. That is, if the order of the decrees is the pattern for the historical order of salvation, why does election and salvation precede atonement in the one (eternity) but generally follow it in the other (time)? And why is it that the atonement happened in the middle of salvation history, though relatively speaking, more will be saved in the new dispensation than in the old? As for the Supralapsarians, they must deal with the question of the division of decrees of the Incarnation and atonement (the person and work of Christ). Supras, especially Pre-Existerians, usually place the decree of the Incarnation before that of the election of men and that of sin and the atonement. But, they are asked, does this not imply that Christ would have been incarnated had not God decreed man to Fall or be saved? Indeed, does it not imply that Christ would have become a man even if there would have been no other men? Few Hyperists dealt with the issue, but Pink did. He implied that, yes, Christ would have become human even if Adam had not sinned. This is because the end of all things is the glory of God and not the salvation of the creatures. Thus, the decree of the 'subsistence' and election of Christ preceded the Fall decree. See Atonement, p.29; and note 28 below.

12. Body, p.477-478. Stevens quoted Fuller as saying, "If the atonement of Christ were considered as the literal payment of debt, it might, for aught I know, be inconsistent with indefinite invitations" (in Help, vol.1, p.170). See Section C below.


14. Comm on Acts 20:28. So too Hoeksema, TK, vol.I, p.597. This clearly follows the Anselmian view as opposed to that of many of the early Church Fathers. God cannot suffer or die because He is impassible, but the God-Man could and did die (Gadsby, Sermons, p.11; Rogers, in Bentley, Helper, p.51). This necessitates that Christ suffered and died only in His humanity, not in His deity. See Huntington, Works, vol.XII, p.229; Hoeksema, TK, vol.1, pp.670-671; Roe, p.118; Irons, Grove Chapel Pulpit, vol. II, p.460; Sawyer, p.166; Perkins, Works, vol.I, pp.5, 187; vol.III, p.238. Some Hyperists questioned this. Stevens often used the controversial phrase "a suffering and dying God", for which he was rebuked in Foxwell, A Check to Lordly Pastors. Styles, following Stevens, held "He suffered as a complex person. To dissociate His deity from His humanity, in connection with His death, is to invalidate the mystery of the passion in a futile attempt to solve it" (Manual, pp.45-46). So, similarly, Triggs, Christ Alone Exalted, p.51. This is peculiar in the light of the views of Stevens and Styles in rejecting the usual doctrine of infinite sufficiency (see below). The root of the view may be traced back to the Antinomian William Dell, who had rather mystical views about the atonement. To Dell, the atonement had infinite worth because Christ took up His humanity into His deity, suffering wrath in the one person and evidently in both natures. The divine swallowed up the human; the outer merely showed what was occurring in the inner. Therefore we are crucified with Christ by inner and spiritual union with Christ, not by anything outward or physical. See Works, pp.281-284. But cf. p.23 as well. On impassibility, see Chapter III above. Some Lows feel that God was externally impassible - nothing outside of God can make Him suffer, much less die. But God is internally possible, the very epitome of emotion, and can choose to suffer in love and wrath. Thus, when Christ died as a complex God-Man, He suffered in both natures because He was sent out of divine love, as the expression of love, and suffered the full brunt of divine wrath. It would make an interesting study to compare the views of this controversy with those of John MacLeod Campbell, Count Zinzendorf and Jurgen Moltmann.
to have the infinite worth of Deity united to humanity, but Gill does not elaborate further. He does not deal with the arguments going back to Prosper et al that the atonement had universal relevance because Christ took on humanity. Nor does he deal with the argument that the atonement is universal because Christ alone became human, while neither the Father nor the Spirit became incarnate. According to this argument, election is particular because the Father did not become incarnate, and efficacious grace is particular because the Spirit did not become incarnate. But Gill does not answer this.

Now Gill explicitly states that satisfaction for the elect was made by "the infinite value of the blood of Christ" and "so (was) a sufficient price for their redemption". This is not acceptance of the Lombardian dictum. Indeed Gill seems to have rejected it. Later Hyper-Calvinists sometimes explicitly denied that the atonement was sufficient for all, for it was not given for all. This was especially the position of those of the school of Stevens. Because of the extremeness of this position, a few words need to be said here. Stevens summed up the theory: "it cannot

18. Comm on I Peter 1:19. Infinite value is often associated with universal sufficiency (e.g., Homer Hoeksema, Voice, p.342; Pink, Comfort, p.81). Pink: "It is neither fanaticism nor presumption for faith to receive at its face value what God has declared concerning the sufficiency of Christ's sacrifice" (Sanctification, p.193). Sufficiency and efficacy are also related: "there is sufficient efficacy in His precious blood" (Gadsby, Works, vol.II, p.162). Popham: "His blood has more efficacy to save than our sin has to damn" (Sermons, vol.IV, p.51). S.F. Paul spoke of "infinite sufficiency" (Bible Truths, p.153). Cf. Sawyer, p.166.
19. See Cause, p.98; Comm on II Cor. 12:19. It was also probably rejected by Hussey, Glory, p.645; Hewlitt, Defending the Faith, p.12.
be sufficient for any more than those whom the Father ordained to life by it", for the Father elected only some and these are the same few whom the Spirit efficaciously calls — and the Trinity cannot be divided. Palmer explained more fully:

to say that in point of sufficiency he made an atonement is to confound sufficiency with purpose ... can the atonement be generally sufficient without being as generally efficient? Or, is it sufficient for all the purposes of salvation where it is not efficacious? If this is the case, does it not imply a contradiction? because it must be sufficient and deficient, at one and the same time ... instead of a general sufficiency, there seems to have been a general deficiency...

The same views were held later by W.J. Styles:

We differ from those who hold that the value of the atonement is infinite, although its benefits are confined to the elect... We believe the design, the worth and the application of the atonement to be co-extensive, regarding it, as in all respects, commensurate with the claims of justice on those for whom it was intended... The assertion that an infinite atonement was needful, because sin is an infinite evil, is also untenable... From its very nature, the Atonement could not have been of infinite extent, or have been made for sin in the abstract.

It comes as something of a surprise to find similar sentiments found in A.W. Pink:

The atonement, therefore is in no sense sufficient for a man, unless the Lord Jesus died for that man... Its sufficiency lies not in affording men a possibility of salvation, but in accomplishing their salvation with invincible power. Hence the Word of God never represents the sufficiency of the atonement as wider than the design of the atonement.

---

21. Erroneous Views, p.5; Free Enquiry, pp.34, 304. See Letter to Spurgeon, p.6, quoted in Section A above; and Concluding Reflections on the Atonement.
23. John, vol.II, p.221. Note that Pink quotes Rushton on the rejection of universal sufficiency and the non-offer (ibid.; Atonement, pp.256-257). This view also cropped up in Primitive Baptist... Cont'd:
The result of these exceptional views was a view of the sufferings of the Saviour sometimes referred to as 'Equivalentism'. It is granted, say some exponents of this view, that the complexity of the natures of Christ gave Him the capacity for infinite suffering, but it is denied that He did in fact suffer to that full extent. Since His sufferings were commensurate with the penal deserts of those whom He represented, Christ's sufferings were necessarily limited. Thusly, Christ suffered in exact proportion to the number of the sins of the elect. This is to deny that sin is infinite in its object (the holiness of God), for if that were true then Christ would have needed to have suffered eternally. If more persons had been elected, then Christ would have suffered more (though of course, still dying but once). To some exponents (but not Styles) of this view, the theory assumes that Christ suffered only in His finite humanity. Moreover, had His sufferings been infinite, then he would not have needed to suffer as long as He did — only one pang would have sufficed for the end contemplated. Hence, Christ did not suffer any more or any less than was absolutely necessary. It should be clear, they argued, that this view negates the possibility of a free offer.24

Orthodox Particularists stress the infinite value and sufficiency rather than any exact equivalent.25 Charles Hodge represented this position by noting that all of Christ's sufferings would have been necessary had there been only a single elect person, yet nothing more

Cont'd:...
circles. Craig, for example, uses virtually exact words of Pink: "The atonement is in no sense sufficient for any man unless Christ died for that man ... This great atonement of Jesus Christ possesses all the virtue and efficacy of divine appointment, and the Father in His redeeming love and decrees has set the bounds of its application" (Articles, p.9). Infinite sufficiency was also rejected by Hawker, Works, vol.IX, p.544; and probably John Gadsby, Letter to Alkamen, pp.22-23; while Wilks felt that the doctrine of universal sufficiency was a mark of Modern Calvinism (pp.20-23). Cf. Clipsham, p.104.

24. See especially Stevens, Help, vol.I, pp.175, 182; Palmer, Free Enquiry, pp.262, 277-279, 314-329 (especially pp.314-317); Erroneous Views, pp.10; Wilks, pp.20-21; Styles, Manual, pp.47-49. Styles warned about pressing the view to the extent of questioning whether there would have been more suffering had more persons been elected. The theory also suggests that the sufferings would have been greater had the elect sinned more. Naming Gill (wrongly we feel) and Styles as exponents, Sheehan considers 'Equivalentism' to be basically the Commercial Theory of the Atonement ('Presentation', p.34). Something similar to the theory is found in Sarrells, Systematic Theology, p.247.

would have been necessary had all humans who ever lived been elected. The Hoeksemas apparently held to a view between that of Hodge and Stevens. They held that Christ did not suffer any more than was necessary, but none of His sufferings were in vain. It was impossible that Christ endured what He did and it also be possible that somehow it remain complete without being applied. Hence, it has been called infinite value, but it is universally sufficient only in a hypothetical way. This is not to be confused in the least with Amyraut's 'Hypothetical Universalism'. Indeed, the general impression is that the Particularist scheme, particularly that of the Hoeksemas and 'Equivalentists', has something in common with the theory of Duns Scotus.

This 'hypothetical' sufficiency bears noting because all Particularists stress that their common view of the extent of the atonement does justice to the actuality of the work of Christ. Limited atonement is often called 'Definite Atonement'. Universal or Dualist atonement is said to be 'Indefinite Atonement' for no man is particular, thus for nobody. One is tempted to speculate that this outlook of the Particularists touches upon the actual-virtual scheme again, according to which Christ actually (efficiently) died for the elect and virtually (sufficiently) for the reprobate. Though there may be some truth in this analysis for certain moderate Particularists such as Kuiper and Hodge, it could also apply to certain Dualists or possibly even Aquinas and Lombard. We do not press the point.

What does need stressing, on the other hand, is that Particularists of all schools tend to emphasize that the atonement was no mere abstraction, no hypothetical plan, no faint hope. Something definite occurred. Actual payment was made for the elect and for the elect alone. Thus, representatives of the various strains of Particularism never tire of asserting that Christ actually redeemed and saved men at the Cross. Redemption was definite, not merely potential, as they say Universalist atonement is. Gill speaks of the atonement as "the actual


27. See Herman Hoeksema, TK, vol.I, p.642; Homer Hoeksema, Voice, pp.338-342. The latter differs from pure 'Equivalentism' by stating "that value cannot be stated in terms of a mathematical equation" (p.345), thus resisting the extremes of Stevens and the others.
Redemption" of the elect. Redemption has only one stage: atonement. They then tend to say that Christ actually saved the elect at the Cross (even as Hyper-Calvinists and Antinomians tend to say that the elect were justified from eternity). It was not necessary that the elect actually exist at the time of the atonement. Indeed, according to the Federal scheme it was only necessary that the elect would exist, and some had already existed and were justified on the basis of the atonement to be worked out later. The elect must exist Federally and that in a double sense: as sinners in Adam and as elect in Christ.

Thus Particularists stress that the atonement made salvation definite and actual for those for whom Christ died while (they say) Universalism says that the atonement actually saves none, as it makes salvation only possible, which really means precarious, indefinite, uncertain and unlikely, if not impossible in the light of total depravity. Christ actually saved the elect. Gill explains this in relation to 11 Cor. 5:19, which

must be understood of his doing it either intentionally, or actually; if intentionally only, that is, if he intended to reconcile the world to himself by Christ, and drew the scheme of reconciliation in him, can (his) intentions be frustrated?... but if the words are to be understood of an actual reconciliation by Christ ... then it is beyond dispute that the word world cannot be taken in so large a sense as to include every man and woman in the world; since there are multitudes who die in their sins...

28. E.g., Body, p.90. Cf. p.206. The Antinomian concept of the atonement is sometimes portrayed by its critics as that of "actual, finished salvation" (e.g., Fletcher, Works; Bellamy, True Religion, pp.325-326; Williams, Systematic Theology, vol. I, p.233).

29. S & T, vol.I, p.304. Particularism is not only substitutionary but also Federal. Hoeksema alleged that the theory of universal atonement denies the vicariousness of the atonement (IX, vol.I, pp.463, 540; vol.II, p.201). Particularism also builds upon the actual-virtual motif. Christ actually died, and "the wife of Christ virtually stood, and suffered, and died, and rose again, and ascended up to heaven in Christ" (Gadsby, Works, vol.II, p.196). However, Federal Particularists point out that the Second Adam did not represent all the sons of the First Adam. Christ died only for those in Adam who were also in Him via eternal union and election. See Parks Five Points, pp.48-50. Defending Spurgeon, Isaac McCarthy attacked the inconsistency of the Supralapsarian James Wells on this point by paraphrasing Well's position to show its ridiculousness: "some are to be damned not because of Adam's sin, nor their own actual sin, but because God has determined it to be so. So, in like manner, others are elected, and that election secures their eternal happiness of course without the death of Christ. It would, therefore, be absurd for Christ to die for the redemption of a people who never were lost. Now if this be the fact, Adam was only the way of ingress - for both of the parties in question come into the world. The one has lost nothing by the fall of the first Adam, the other has gained nothing by the death of the Second Adam (What, Then, Does Mr. Spurgeon Preach, p.10). This concurs with the problems we mentioned in Chapters IV, V and VI, and in note II above. See below.

... Cont'd:
Fuller, a very low Particularist who bordered on the Dualist position, denied that the atonement actually redeemed anyone. It merely made it possible, in the same way that no man is actually justified until he believes – for how can a man be redeemed but not justified? Redemption has several stages. Gill’s reply to this objection was that “there is a two-fold reconciliation, one of which is the work of Christ, and was made at his death; the other is the work of his Spirit, at conversion.” Particularists usually say that redemption is not the exact same as reconciliation. Redemption is the first stage of reconciliation. Redemption is past. Non-Particularists point out that redemption is spoken of as future in Luke 21:28 and Eph. 4:30, therefore redemption has at least two stages (past at Calvary and future at the Resurrection of the saints) and probably there is a third stage (justification by faith). The Particularist reply is usually that these Scriptures refer to the body not the soul.

The key to the problem is that actual redemption (the first stage of reconciliation) guarantees and necessitates justification (the second stage). Gill: “Christ certainly saves all whom he redeems”. The one flows necessarily from the other; they are inseparable. “... the persons for whom Christ died cannot be condemned.” Since not all escape...
condemnation, Christ died not for all men. Seymour says "His logic was just the reverse of that of a (strict) universalist who reasons that since Christ died to save all men, then all must eventually be saved". Consequently it is not surprising to find Gill repeatedly saying that if Christ died for all, and any for whom He died are not eventually saved, then Christ died in vain (note the dubious reference to Gal. 2:21). Christ will not, cannot lose His purchase. Universalism and Dualism, according to Gill's Particularism, results in a waste of Christ's blood.

In the light of this theory of jurisprudence we are not surprised to read the criticism that this theory opens the door to practical Antinomianism. After all, if we can deduce that we are elect and one of those for whom Christ died, and therefore actually redeemed, why not sin, etc.?

This brings us to what has always been one of the most repeated and important arguments for Particularism. This is the famous 'double payment' argument. It is at the very core of Particularism. Virtually every limited atonement defender since Duns Scotus has used it, Hyper-Calvinists included. Gill stated it in the traditional formula of Owen:

Cont'd:...

34. Cause, p.10.
35. S & T', vol.I, p.318; Cause, p.101; Body, p.463. Reed feels that this was Gill's basic argument for limited atonement (Atonement, p.65). It was a favourite argument of other Particularists: Parks, Five Points, pp.50-51; Craig, Articles, p.9; Hoeksema, TK, vol.I, p.542. Even non-Hyperists employed it, such as Whitefield, Works, vol.IV, p.71.
40. So Cave, pp.350ff., cf. Berkouwer, Faith and Justification, pp.148-149, and often in Fletcher. See Chapter X.
41. A few examples: Brine, Certain Efficacy, pp.4f., 203; Refutation of Arminian Principles, p.43; Huntington, Works, vol.V, pp.250-251; Wilks, p.21; Barry, The Only Refuge, p.31; Stevens, Recollections, p.31; Kershaw, Autobiography, pp.129-130; Parks, Five Points, p.47; Windridge, p.283; Hoeksema, Dogmatics, pp.401-753; TK, vol.I, pp.541, 677; Homer Hoeksema, in Hanko et al, pp.50-51; Pink, 1 John, p.70; Reconciliation, p.102; The Atonement, p.244. That it was used by Tobias Crisp is probable because his son Samuel employed it (Christ Made Sin, p.62). Hyper-... Cont'd:
... to inflict punishment twice for the same sins, once upon the surety, and again upon the believer, is contrary to the justice of God, as well as derogatory to the satisfaction of Christ; for either he has borne the whole of punishment, or only a part; if the whole, which is the truth, then none can be laid upon the believer; but if only a part, Christ's satisfaction is not complete, and then the believer must be a co-bearer and co-saviour with Christ...  

Rarely is there ever any attempt to justify this principle from explicit statements in Scripture. Non-Particularists hold that it is possible to be guilty of the death of Christ and so receive from Christ one's own punishment, which Christ suffered. Gill prefers to rely on logic. "It is reckoned unjust with men, to punish twice for the same offence." Many Universalists point out that if one wishes to argue from human jurisprudence, then the atonement was neither penal nor substitutionary, for human justice usually deems it unjust to punish the innocent and let the guilty go free. Perhaps Gill is merely arguing from the lesser to the greater. If so with men, how much more so with God. Furthermore, Gill holds that "Where one sin is forgiven, all are forgiven", in relation to the same person, and this includes the sin of unbelief. Some men are not forgiven the sin of unbelief, therefore Christ did not die for them. Similarly,

The universal scheme affords no encouragement to faith and hope in Christ... According to the universal scheme, men may be redeemed by Christ, and yet not saved, but eternally perish: what hope of salvation can a man have upon such a scheme?  

Cont'd:...

Calvinists are specially fond of quoting the verses from Toplady's hymn, "Payment cannot God twice demand/ First at my bleeding Surety's hand/ And then again at mine". Thusly Popham, Sermons vol.IV, pp.136, 144; Roe, p.192; Windridge, p.282; Sawyer, p.302; William Gadsby, Sermons, p.382; John Gadsby, Slavery, p.87; Pink, Sovereignty, p.76; The Atonement, pp.80, 196.

42. This is a favourite dictum in Gill (e.g., S & T, vol.III, pp.46, 82).


44. Body, p.464.


46. Body, pp.466-467. Cf. Cause, p.178. Craig wrote that limited atonement is more "comforting to awakened sinners" (Articles, p.9), while Wayman observed that "it may check presumption, but not discourage hope" (Sermon, p.34). See Section C below.
The fact that some men were already in Hell at the time Christ died proves that Christ did not die to redeem them. And if He died for those already in Hell, then He did not die for literally all, and therefore not for the non-elect. Nor did Christ die for Pharoah, Ahab or even Judas. Nor did Christ die for those whom He foresaw would never receive the atonement's benefits. To make a payment and not receive the goods is a waste of payment and is absurd; Christ knows who will and who will not believe; it insults Christ's omniscience. Divine wisdom is also insulted, says Gill, if the intent of the atonement is frustrated, for "to fall short of what a man intends argues a deficiency in point of wisdom."

The argument from intention, or design, is another favourite of Particularists. Owen relied heavily on it and even Davenant spoke of a 'special intent' for the elect in the atonement. Particularists have often contended that the whole issue concerns the intent more than the extent

47. Body, p.466; Warburton, Mercies, p.115; H.A. Long, Calvinism, p.72; Philpot, Sermons, vol.IV, pp.115-117; Styles, Guide, p.42. So also A.A. Hodge, The Atonement, p.384; and other High Calvinists. Similarly Wells: "As for saying that some are in hell for whom Christ died, you might as well say that Christ Himself is in hell" (Letters to Theophilus, vol.II, p.204). Even Whitefield asked Wesley if it were not blasphemy to hold that "Christ died for souls now in hell" (Letters, p.212). Low Calvinists reply in several ways. One concerns the nature of eternity and its relation to time. That is, as eternity infinitely encompasses time both before and after, it could be said that in a sense no souls were "yet" in Hell when time and eternity met in the death of the eternal Son of God. Others state that the manner in which the Saviour died for those already in Hell differed from the way for those not yet there. He died in order to purchase the former and the right to be their judge, but died in order to save the latter and validate the Gospel offer and the ground of the assurance of faith.

48. Particularists feel that Christ died for all the Apostles except Judas (Cf. Stevens, Help, vol.I, p.14). The instance of Judas is given special attention because at the Last Supper Christ gave the 'Bold Proclamation' to those present in the words, "This is my body which is broken for you, my blood shed for you" (Luke 22:19-20). Gill held that Judas was at the Table (Come on Luke 22:21. Cf. on Matt. 26, Mark 14, John 13), but he does not see the contradiction. Calvin held that Judas was at the Table (Tracts and Treatises, vol.II, pp.93, 234, 297, 370-371, 378; Come on Matt. 26:21; John 6:56. See our appended excursus). Most Particularists say that Judas had already gone out to betray Christ and was not there to receive the 'Bold Proclamation' (e.g., Gosden, Baptism, p.17; Philpot, Answers, pp.138-139). That one held that Judas was or was not there does not necessarily mean that he was or was not Universalist, of course. But our impression is that most non-Particularists say he was there, for Christ died for Him; while most Particularists deny that he was there, for Christ did not die for him. There is no inconsistency for a Universalist or Dualist to say that he had left, but the problem of the 'Bold Proclamation' remains for Particularists who say that Judas was in fact present. See further in Section C below.

49. Cause, p.175. So, similarly, Philpot, Sermons, vol.IV, pp.115-116; Hoeksema, TK, vol.I, p.539. This is not to say that Gill, Philpot and Hoeksema felt that Christ died for the elect because He foresaw their faith; rather, faith is a gift of God and a blessing of election, which preceded the atonement in the decrees.

of the atonement or the infinite sufficiency doctrine. Or, in other words, the extent is governed by and is equal to the intent. The intent is limited, therefore so is the extent. If God intended to save all, all would be saved, for God's intents cannot be frustrated. Since the atonement is governed by the secret will, which is the intent of God, the application of it must be uniform with the intent. The application is limited, therefore so is the intent and therefore the extent also. If the atonement was intended for all, then all would be saved; all are not saved, therefore it was not intended for all. Since some are saved, it was intended for them; since some are not saved, it was not intended for them. Universal atonement logically demands a universal salvation, for God's intentions cannot be thwarted.

Reed correctly says that Gill taught that "Christ must have died for the elect only, or else he would have been guilty of trying to frustrate the will of God". Gill says that Christ's sacrifice was "effectual to the purposes for which it was offered". Christ died intentionally and effectually for the elect alone. His atonement, therefore, is sufficient for the non-elect only in a hypothetical way. He contends that universalism separates the intent and effect of the atonement. The problem, however, is in pinpointing the date of the effectiveness of the atonement. Usually Particularists like Gill place the effectiveness (efficiency) at Calvary, while Universalists and most Dualists place it at the application. At other times Particularists call conversion the effect of the atonement, meaning that it is the necessary result of

Cont'd:...

51. See Berkho, Systematic Theology, p.394; Custance, The Sovereignty of Grace, p.153; Roe, p.45. For the Dualist view, see Bellamy, True Religion, p.vii. For the meaning of the term 'extent' from the Particularist perspective, see Shedd, Dogmatic Theology, vol.II, pp.464ff.

52. Cf. Cause, p.43; Comm on I Tim. 1:15; Berkho, Systematic Theology, p.395; Cunningham, Reformers, p.399.

53. Reed, Atonement, p.125.

54. Comm on Pro. 9:2. Popham: "The extent of the atonement is such, and the efficacy of it such before God, that all to whom it is applied are perfect" (Sermons, vol.III, p.107). Hence, as the atonement was intrinsically efficacious in atoning for those for whom it was meant (only the elect), so it will be efficacious in the application of those same persons. It cannot but be limited in both, for it is efficacious in both stages.


atonement.

The atonement basically belongs to the secret will not the revealed will, to special grace rather than to common grace. Since the secret will cannot be frustrated, the logical conclusion is that all those for whom Christ died will necessarily be saved. The ramifications are enormous. Since the Gospel concerns the atonement, the Gospel must needs contain much about the secret will; but since no man's place in the secret will can be known, the atonement is fenced. That is, we can preach that Christ died for sinners but we cannot (nor need we) specify whom those sinners are. The Gospel, moreover, can be frustrated in its sense as revealed will but not in its secret sense. The conclusion is that the Gospel explicitly or implicitly says that all those for whom Christ died will be saved. It is in this context that Toon says that Hyper-Calvinists interpreted the extent of the atonement in the light of the presupposition of particular election. Reed traces it further back to the determinative view of divine sovereignty.

Gill defends limited atonement because he feels that universalism insults God in six of His attributes: wisdom, justice, immutability (in intent and grace), power, glory and love. The first two and part of the third have already been discussed. The fourth, omnipotence, is illustrated in the following dichotomistic reasoning:

... if Christ has redeemed all men, and all men are not saved, it must be either from want of will in God to save them, or from want of power: not from want of will; for according to this [universalist] scheme, it is the will of God that every individual man should be saved; it must be therefore for want of power; and so he is not omnipotent.

57. See Chapter VIII above and Section C below.
58. HC, p.122. Defending Spurgeon, McCarthy asked: "Will Mr. Wells rest his salvation solely upon election, and quietly set aside the blood of atonement?" (What, Then, Does Mr. Spurgeon Preach, p.9).
Since God is omnipotent, all this is reversed and Christ has not redeemed all men.

The argument from God's glory is this: God is glorified in the final salvation of men. Universalism eliminates the certainty (and therefore the possibility) of salvation for any. Therefore universalism deprives God of glory and must be a false theory. 62

The argument from grace and love is crucial. Firstly, says Gill, Universalism teaches that God's grace is immutable and universal, in that God loves all men enough to send Christ to die for them but (says Gill) God later changes His love on the Day of Judgement and condemns some. Of course, Gill omits all reference to faith in this argument. Secondly, Universalism says that grace makes salvation only possible, not definite — and what kind of love is that? 63 Thirdly, Universalism wrongly says that the atonement flows from the common grace rather than special grace, which concerns election not creation. 64 Special grace, says Gill, is "distinguishing" and "particular" and therefore so is the atonement. 65 Another syllogism is set up:

Those for whom Christ died, he loves with the greatest love: but he does not love every individual man with the greatest love; therefore he died not for every individual man. 66

62. Body, p.464. Universalists and Dualists argue in the opposite manner. By limiting the number of those for whom the Saviour redeemed, Particularists limit the glory of God.


64. Body, p.461, 463. Reed, Atonement, p.51. Most Hyper-Calvinists and many other Particularists feel that Christ did not purchase grace at the Cross but He came as a result of grace. Hence, the election decree preceded the atonement decree, though Supralapsarians face the difficulty of the reversal of the order of history on this point. Both Supras and Infras generally hold that though Christ did not purchase grace, He did purchase the communication of it for the elect (e.g., Hussey, Glory, pp.172-173). Since, then, Christ does not communicate this special grace to all men, He did not purchase the communication of it for all men and hence did not die for all. Furthermore, it is said to be inconceivable that Christ would purchase something and not take possession of it (see above). Thus, why would Christ purchase the communication of special grace and not communicate it to those for whom it was purchased?


66. Cause, p.104. Parks argued that Christ redeemed His wife (the elect Church) and only her, else He would have been guilty of a form of adultery or bigamy (Five Points, p.43). Cf. Philpot, Sermons, vol.IV, p.115. To understand this one must understand the Supralapsarian scheme - that the betrothal of the Church to Christ took place in the Covenant of Grace before the decree of atonement. See Chapters IV and V above. Moreover, it reflects the opinion of more than a few Particularists that it is election and not atonement that is the greatest display of grace (so Parks, Five Points, p.37).
Limited atonement gives greater glory to divine grace and so must be the correct scheme. This argument is based on his determinative view of sovereignty as well. Divine sovereignty is seen as governing divine grace. The two are not equal. Sovereignty is universal and necessary, but grace is not universal in its special aspect nor is it necessary. God need not and does not love all men in this special sense. That He loves any in this way is the outcome of the exercise of His determinative, sovereign will. There is an unbroken chain from sovereignty to special grace to atonement to glorification. (More will be said on this in Chapter XI.)

Gill adds yet another argument. This is the one from justification and resurrection:

Christ died for no more nor for other than those for whom he rose again; such for whom he rose again, he rose for their justification; if Christ rose for the justification of all men, all men would be justified, or the end of Christ's resurrection would not be answered; but all men are not, nor will be justified; some will be condemned; it follows, that Christ did not rise from the dead for all men, and consequently did not die for all men.

This argument is based on the presupposition that all that God does by way of salvation is inseparable from all else He does in salvation. Grace is distinguishing and is different from Nature (Creation), which is universal. The argument from the particularity of Christ's intercession is similar. Christ died only for those for whom He prays; He prays only for the elect; therefore He died only for the elect.

Gill has yet other arguments. One is this: "none will say Christ died for the sun, moon, and stars, etc.", therefore Christ did not die for literally all. If 'all' does not include literally all things in passages like Heb. 2:9, why cannot it be limited to "all the elect"? Another is

67. Cause, pp.171, 173. Also, "One who believes that Christ died for all sinners, can not believe the truth of irresistible grace" (Van Baren, in Hanco et al, p.73).

68. Cause, p.42. Cf. Body, p.470; Comm on II Cor. 5:14. Popham: "All for whom Christ died are justified; all were justified when He said on the cross, 'It is finished'" (Sessions, vol.III, p.183). See Chapter VI above.


70. CAE, vol.I, p.60 note. See Section E below.
well-known: the Bible says that Christ died for the church, His sheep, His people, His brethren and His children. Not all men are such as these, therefore Christ did not die for them. ̊ However, Gill does not apply this logic to Gal. 2:20, in which Paul says that Christ died for him. Gill's logic compels him to set up this syllogism: Christ died for Paul; not all men are Paul; therefore Christ died not for all men. But this is absurd. Gill, we imagine, would reply that Paul elsewhere says that Christ died for others than himself. Universalists agree: Paul says Christ died for the Church but also says that He died for all men. Furthermore, Gill does not produce any Scripture texts that assert that (A) Christ died only for the elect, or (B) Christ did not die for the non-elect, or (C) a man is ultimately condemned because Christ did not die for him. ̊ On the contrary, argue Universalists, Scripture explicitly and repeatedly says that Christ died for all — which logically includes elect and non-elect — and that a man is ultimately condemned because of his own sin, especially lack of faith in Christ, not for want of atonement.

Universalists also contend that Particularists like Gill ignore the argument based on Phil. 2, Rom. 14:9, John 5:22, 27 and Mark 10:45. This argument says that Christ is the judge of all men because He died for all men. ̊ The right to judge all belongs to the Father by divine nature but the Father has given this right to the Son because He is the Son of Man who laid down His life for all men. The Son can justify or

71. S & I, vol. II, pp. 484-485; Body, p. 463; Cause, p. 100; and the relevant passages in the Commentary; Parks, Five Points, p. 43; Pink, The Atonement, pp. 250-252; N.A. Long, Calvinism, pp. 66-67. As noted in Section A above, many Dualists and even a few rare moderate Particularists (notably R.B. Kuper) state that the sheep and Church verses concern the 'special intent' aspect in which Christ died especially for the elect, while the 'all' verses speak of the universal aspect.

72. Stevens commented that "No man can be saved but by the redemption of Christ, still no man perishes because Christ did not redeem him" (Memoirs, p. 233). This must be interpreted in the light of several things. Firstly, Stevens believed that no man is required to believe that Christ redeemed him. Secondly, he added that no man is condemned for not believing that Christ redeemed him; nor is their additional penalty for failure to believe the Gospel. Thirdly, the direct (formal) cause of a man's damnation is his own sin. The ultimate cause is the decree of reprobation. Since reprobation and the decree to allow the Fall both precede the decree of the atonement, obviously damnation has nothing to do with the atonement so far as eternity goes. In time, there may be an informal or improper sense in which it could be said that a man perishes because of lack of atonement, but this is similar to the decree and enactment of the existence of evil. The blame lies in Man, not God. Hence, the sufficient cause of damnation is reprobation, the effective cause is Man's own sin, and the defective cause is lack of grace and atonement and faith. But again, all this presents enormous difficulties for the Supralapsarian scheme, and so there is hardly any comment in this area. See McCarthy's criticisms above.

73. The Universalist argument was accepted by Calvin (see our excursus) but rejected by Owen (Works, vol. X, p. 402).
condemn whomever He wishes. He chooses to justify some through faith and leave the rest without faith and justification. The atonement is not in vain, for the wrath that Christ suffered for the non-elect is transferred back to them at Judgement Day. This argument is usually ignored by Particularists. Because of this and other deficiencies mentioned above, some critics question the honesty of Gill's hermeneutics and theological method."

Some may be surprised to read that Gill felt that there are non-salvific benefits in the atonement that are given efficaciously to all men:

... those who have no interest in that special blessing of grace, have reason to love the Lord on account of it; since it is owing to Christ's engagement to redeem his own people, that the rest are continued in their being, and supplied with the blessings of providence, which were forfeited by sin."

The non-elect are created and rejected for the purpose of 'serving' the elect, as we saw in Chapters IV and V. Whatever God gives to them is non-salvific, temporary and indirect. These benefits come through Nature, Creation and Providence rather than through special grace. They pass through the atonement only indirectly. Reformed theologians have often debated whether common grace flows through the atonement or comes only through divine sovereignty, but Hyper-Calvinists usually feel that the latter is the only view that accords with the peculiarity and design of the atonement. This was especially the case with Herman Hoeksema in his staunch rejection of common grace (see Chapter XI below). But what about the others, especially those who questioned infinite worth and universal sufficiency? Styles sets forth his position:

It is fully conceded that the mediation of Christ has a universal aspect, and that His sufferings and death were the source of unspeakable benefit to all men... It is, however, denied that the special blessings which His sufferings secured ... were ever designed for any but those who were chosen..."

74. E.g., Seymour, pp.199, 201. See Chapter II above and Section E below.
Pretty much the same explanation was given by John Johnson:

"That redemption by Christ Jesus, is in some sense of a universal extent, is a truth undeniable. But that it is so in every sense, cannot be true."77

This could be interpreted as the more moderate view of limited atonement, a patent contradiction in their theology, or simply an inexplicable warp. What Styles and Johnson were saying is that the blessings of common grace are linked to this 'universal aspect', but these blessings are entirely non-salvific. Therefore, there is no free offer, for the concept of free offer is that of salvation, not Providence. Seeing this in this light, a number of Hyperists denied that "In some sense Christ died for the sins of mankind".78 The fine point here is that the 'universal aspect' is indirect, whereas the special aspect is direct. The one covers all sins by Christ taking the penalty Himself, whereas in the other the penalty for the sins of the reprobate is merely delayed until Judgement Day. But does not even this suggest a Dualistic approach? No, for these Hyperists contend that the stay of execution is mean as a means to increase the guilt of the reprobate; it has nothing soteriological about it at all.

This is similar to another tenet of Dualism and it is this: Dualists often state that in order for Christ to own the elect, He had to purchase the reprobate as well. The two are mixed in the world, and this is one reason why we must preach and offer to all. The argument sometimes uses the Parable of the Treasure in the Field (Matt. 13:44) as an analogy. In that parable, a man desires to own the treasure - that is his main intention. He realizes that he cannot buy the treasure by itself, for it is hidden in the field. He must buy the field in order to get the treasure and this is what he does: he sells all he had and buys them both. Once he gets the treasure, he takes pleasure in it. Meanwhile he lives on the land he purchased. Now it is said that this speaks of the atonement. Christ is the man, the elect are the treasure, the field is the world. Christ buys the world with the ultimate (but by no means the only) end of owning and taking pleasure in the treasure.

77. The Election of God, p.24.
78. Stevens charged Hawker with holding to this sentiment, but Hawker denied it in A (First) Letter to the Rev. John Stevens, p.6.
He sold everything by dying, giving and full payment sufficient for the whole world. Owning both, He delights in the elect and lives in or governs the world not merely by divine right but because He bought them. Since these are reprobate sinners, they are judged by Christ.

This is similar to the argument of Phil. 2 mentioned earlier, but Particularists cannot accept it in all consistency. Gill, for example, takes the treasure to be the Gospel hidden in the Scriptures, and the man is a sinner who searches for the way of salvation and through the surrender of faith 'buys' it, improperly speaking. Other Particularists interpret it to mean that a sinner must sell all he has to gain Christ. In other words, the parable speaks of men seeking Christ, not Christ seeking men. This is seen to be the case in the Parable of the Pearl of Great Price that follows. Pink, however, does not take the usual Particularist line here. Pink admits that he is one of the few commentators who interprets the lesson of Christ buying the elect rather than men buying Christ. But even Pink does not accept the Dualist interpretation in all its ramifications.

Perhaps the closest that a Particularist has come to accepting the Dualist principle expressed in these parables is when C.H. Spurgeon used the following comparison:

> When God wants to water my garden, He sends a shower all over Clapham, and yet it is for my garden He does it. This is how Christians view their mercies. 'Who loved me, and gave Himself for me'.

---


80. The Parables of Matthew Thirteen.

81. Quoted in Williams, Reminiscences of Spurgeon, p.196. All sides would admit that this is but one of many examples of Spurgeon's inconsistencies with respect to the doctrine of limited atonement. In the next Section we will see how he sometimes displayed this sort of inconsistency regarding the 'Bold Proclamation'. Some Particularists may be tempted to assess this anecdote as another apocryphal bit of hearsay, but we would point out that though it is not found (to our knowledge) in any of Spurgeon's own works themselves, Williams was perhaps Spurgeon's most intimate friend. Most Spurgeon students acknowledge that Williams is almost always reliable, if only because of his modesty, in contrast to the sometimes dubious nature of anecdotes of other compliers (some of which we have been reluctant to mention in the present work). One quote from such a source is reminiscent of the sentiments expressed in the Williams quote above: "Christ hath bought some good things for all men - the common mercies of life" (Anecdotes and Stories, p.140). But this says no more than mainstream Particularists would concede, or even Gill and Styles. Note especially the context in which the words occur - discussion of assurance and the 'Bold Proclamation'.
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Earlier we mentioned that one of Owen's greatest arguments was the famous 'Triple Choice', in which it must be determined whether Christ died: for all the sins of some, some of the sins of all, or some of the sins of all. The argument has been used by several Hyper-Calvinists, several of whom have referred to Owen. Universalists and Dualists, of course, reject the argument if for no other reason than that it is scholastic and not Biblical. Particularists reply that when Scripture says "Christ died for our sins", we must determine who the "our" are and one way is by determining what the "sins" are. Thus, if Christ died for all sins, why are sinners over damned? Because of their unbelief, say the opposition. But unbelief is a sin which Christ died for, say the Particularists. The replies of the critics then are several. One is that men are still damned because they are guilty of this sin — Owen's choice is based upon the 'double payment' assumption, which is equally absent from Scripture. Some point to the Treasure analogy, the argument of 'double culpability' (cf. Calvin), and some even say that Christ died for all sins but the unforgiveable sin of unbelief.

The question of faith in relation to the extent of the atonement touches on the matter of communication of special grace purchased at the Cross, previously mentioned. It bears even more directly upon the nature of faith in relation to the atonement. This immediately brings up two topics of vital importance to the whole Hyper-Calvinist controversy. The first is Duty-Faith and the second is the Free Offer. These subjects bring us to the very heart of the dispute.

C. LIMITED ATONEMENT AND THE FREE OFFER

The subject of this section needs to be looked at from several perspectives. The first is historical. We earlier stated that we knew of no Calvinist before Hussey and Davis who rejected the giving of free offers.¹ No evidence has been found which shows that any of the earlier Supralapsarians (Beza, Perkins, or even Twisse) actually rejected free offers, much less grounded that rejection in Particularism.² Nevertheless, there were strong undercurrents which revealed some difficulties. The Universalists such as Calvin believed that Christ died for all, with the Gospel proclaiming this in the 'Bold Proclamation'. This also meant that included in the essence of saving faith was the persuasion that Christ died for oneself. It naturally followed that to limit the extent of the atonement necessarily placed limitations on the Gospel and assurance. And Calvin warned of this limitation.

As Calvinism developed, slowly more and more Calvinists began to believe in limited as opposed to universal atonement. Concurrent with this, or perhaps slightly behind it, came the view that faith did not include 'the Bold Assurance' that Christ died for oneself. It was inevitable that the Gospel itself would suffer the same consequences, and that is what happened when Hussey and Davis rejected free offers. One of their main reasons — indeed, probably the most important reason of all — for rejecting free offers and Duty-Faith was that of limited atonement. As we noted earlier, the content of saving faith matches the content of the Gospel, which in turn displays the work of Christ. Since

¹ Two errors are often made in historical studies of the subject of this section. The first is that of Hagenbach: "as regards the extent of the atonement, all denominations, with the exception of the Calvinists, hold that salvation was offered to all" (History of Doctrines, vol. II, p.255). The opposite error is that of Goold, editor of the works of John Owen: "among the Calvinists that adhere to the doctrine of a definite atonement, it has been matter of debate, not whether the gospel should be universally offered, but on what basis - the simple command and warrant of the Word, or the intrinsic and infinite sufficiency of the atonement" (in Owen, Works, vol. X, p.141). The one would make all Calvinists out to be Hyper, the other would deny that there are any at all. The truth is in the middle: some few Calvinists have been Hyperists, but they are not as few as some would allege. Tending towards Goold's view, Buswell stated "The atonement is offered to all. On this point no firm Calvinist has the slightest doubt" (Systematic Theology, vol.II, p.142). Buswell's qualifying adjective 'firm' may indicate that the offer of the atonement was rejected by some less stable Calvinists, but we think that Buswell meant to imply what Goold explicitly affirms. Cunningham says that all Particularists believe in indiscriminate offers —which is a manifest error (Reformers, p.397).

² For example, Perkins explicitly denied that limiting the atonement negated our giving a free offer (see especially Works, vol.I, p.297).
the work of Christ was restricted, so also is saving faith. That is, one
need not be assured that Christ died for oneself, for that conviction is
seen as much the same thing as Duty-Faith. Conversely, the Gospel
cannot demand anyone to believe that which is not of the essence of
faith, so this led to the rejection of free offers.

Our contention is that with the rejection of universal atonement the
Hyper-Calvinists were consistent to deny Duty-Faith and free offers.
Whether they were right to do so is another matter. But it is significant
that the Hyperist controversy has viewed the matter in the terms
outlined above from the very beginning. This rough outline needs a
closer investigation, and that is what we plan to do in the present
section.

First let us take a look at the matter of assurance on this point,
since it appears that the restriction of faith preceded the restriction of
the Gospel offer. Most of the Reformers believed in universal atonement
and that the 'Bold Assurance' was of the essence of saving faith. This
was what effected salvation in the soul. It had a dramatic impact on
those who heard the 'Bold Proclamation'. Take the case of Luther.
A.H. Strong records the effect that this had on the Reformer when it
first came home to his heart: "Martin Luther, when he realized the truth
of the Atonement, was found sobbing before a crucifix and moaning:
'Für mich! Für mich!' - 'For me! For me.'" In Chapter VII we showed
that this was the view of most Reformers and many of the early
confessions. It was specially emphasized in the Heidelberg Catechism.
It was expressed in the Marrow of Modern Divinity, but the Marrowmen
reinterpreted the passages in a way that hindered assurance. Boston,
for example, denied that this assurance was basic to faith; it is rather
the highest development of faith. But Boston made a concession which
many Particularists would be slow to make. This personal conviction is
"believed, if not explicitly, yet virtually, by all who receive and rest
on Christ for salvation". That is, one virtually but not actually

3. Systematic Theology, p.765. See Section A above for further on Luther. On Luther and the 'Bold
Assurance', see Works, vol.17, pp.221-225, 229; Grensted, pp.203-204; Rashdall, p.409. This was
the position of the Formula of Concord as well (V:IV).

4. See Questions 1, 21, 37, 39, 56, 60, 61, 66, 67, 75, 81, 84. Note the explanation of one of its
co-authors, Zacharias Ursinus: "What is it then 'To believe in Christ crucified'? Answer.
It is to believe that Christ was made obnoxious, for my sake to God's curse, to redeem me from
the same" (Summe, p.521). On the curse, see Section D below. The same sentiment was expressed
in the Belgic Confession of 1561, Article XXIII.
believes in the 'Bold Assurance'.

This was the first stage of compromise of the original Reformed position. The next stage was more blunt: it fully denied that this persuasion was of such vital importance. Some even went so far as to charge it with presumption, even discouraging sinners or new converts from holding it. But in our opinion this was a departure from the theology of Calvin. For the Genevan Reformer, the atonement matches the demand for faith in such a way that the only way to maintain personal faith is by an atonement for all. The universal speaks to the particular; universal atonement is part of the ground of assurance, which is essential to saving faith. All need to have the confession of faith "Christ died for me"; therefore the preacher must be able to say "Christ died for you" to all. And for that to be possible, Christ needed to have died for all, which is what Calvin asserts in many places. That the 'Bold Assurance' was the position of most of the Reformers has been admitted by no less than Charles Hodge.

Beginning even during the Reformation some divines began to reject this position. Most Particularists have thus rejected that one needs to have this assurance. Most relevant to our discussion, however, is the way in which it was dealt with by those for and against free offers and Duty-Faith. Following Alverey Jackson, Andrew Fuller denied that the offer required one to believe that Christ had died for him. In fact, said Fuller, if that were the case then there could be no free offer, for Christ did not die for all men. Hyper-Calvinists partially agreed with

Cont'd:

5. Narrow of Modern Divinity, pp.120, 128, with Boston's notes.
6. Calvin's Commentary and Sermon on Gal. 2:20 is one of the clearest examples of his views as outlined above. In our appended excursus we will point out more examples.
8. This is admitted by Hulse, Free Offer, p.11. Examples are many: Owen, Works, vol.X, pp.409-410; Goodwin, Works, vol.IV, p.89; Ness, p.52; John Murray, Works, vol.I, pp.84, 147; Packer, Introduction to Owen, pp.15-16; Evangelism and the Sovereignty of God, p.68; Iain Murray, 'Free Offer and the Narrow', p.12; Stebbins, p.80. See Chapter VII, Section B. Spurgeon: "According to some men, faith is to say, 'Christ died for me'. Those very men teach Christ died for everybody; and if He died for everybody, He died for me. That is not faith - for I may believe that Christ died for me, and find out, after all, that I am not saved" (Anecdotes and Stories, pp.139-140).
9. "For, as this assurance is the reflex act of faith, so the direct act of faith must necessarily go before it, without which it cannot be" (Question, pp.11-12).
They usually agreed that men need not believe in this manner, but they concluded contra Jackson and Fuller that there is indeed no offer.

But the Hyper-Calvinists have not always been consistent on this point. Some of them have indeed stated that this assurance is essential to faith, others have implied it. Gill wrote that the believer trusts in Christ in a personal way, "not merely as a Saviour of others, but to him as a Saviour, and Redeemer suitable to him". This echoes his comments on Gal. 2:20 ("the Son of God, who loved me and gave Himself for me"), in which Paul speaks ... as if almost he was the only person Christ loved and died for; which shows that faith deals with Christ not in a general way, as the Saviour of the world, but with a special regard to man's self.

This implies the 'Bold Assurance' position but still leaves some room for doubt. Pink held that "Christ took my place, and faith appropriates that fact", but he may merely be saying that those who are already believers need assurance. Hussey was usually of the non-assurance line, but occasionally he wavers: "through Grace I'll believe it was made for me (before) my motion faith; that is, before I come to Christ, I am experimentally encouraged to believe it was for me". This is to be understood in terms of Experimentalism. One is to wait until effectual calling, when the Spirit "shows thou art one to whom this Blood of the atonement belongs". And, as noted previously, Hoeksema followed the 'Bold Assurance' view of Heidelberg while rejecting its universal atonement. Other Hypers took this view.

11. E.g., Wayman, Enquiry, pp. 23, 31; Pink, The Atonement, pp. 281, 307; Pink: "The first act of faith does not consist in believing that Christ died for me, but that He died for sinners" (The Atonement, p. 288).
15. Cf. The Atonement, pp. 41-42.
17. Glory, p. 149.

... Cont'd:
This wavering reflects the influence of several sources. With Hoeksema it was Heidelberg but with others it was the Antinomians. That the so-called English Antinomians took the 'Bold Assurance' position is quite clear. One of Crisp's maxims was: "he that confesses his sin, confesses he had perished if Christ had not died for him". Saltmarsh held that part of the faith that receives the Gospel includes "that ye be persuaded of such a thing, that Christ was crucified for sins, and for your sins". This implies the 'Bold Proclamation', but this does not mean that either Crisp or Saltmarsh were Universalists regarding the atonement. Not at all. Their view of assurance was held by a few inconsistent Particularists, notably Twisse:

everyone who hears the Gospel (without distinction between elect or reprobate) is bound to believe that Christ died for him so far as to procure both the pardon of his sins and the salvation of his soul, in case he believes and repents.

The clue to Crisp and Saltmarsh was the doctrine of the necessary inner testimony of the Spirit, while the key to Twisse's position is the phrase, "in case he believes and repents". At first sight it sounds almost Amyraldian, whereas it is really more in line with the other Particularists' view of the 'Bold Proclamation' (see below).

The 'Bold Assurance' position was also taken by all those who believe in Universal atonement, such as the Arminians and Calvinistic Universalists. These do not assert that this is the sole content of saving

Cont'd:

18. Coming to Christ in faith "means that I am confident that He died for me" (Whosoever Will, p.114). This sentiment is often found in Hoeksema. See his comments in TK under the Questions listed above from the Heidelberg Catechism.


21. Free Grace, p.192. Cf. pp.64, 202-203. Also: "There needs no more on our sides, to work or warrant salvation for us, but to be persuaded that Jesus Christ died for us" (p.194).


23. E.g., Whitby: "if you assert that Christ died for all, then you may rationally exhort all men to believe, since everyone must know that he who died for all, died for him also, and therefore it is his duty to believe in him for salvation" (Five Points, p.164).
faith; they merely contend that it is an integral part of the trust in
Christ that is part of salvation.

The consistencies and inconsistencies of the Particularist position
respecting the "Christ died for me" persuasion can be seen in what they
say about the warrant of faith in regard to the atonement. A good
illustration of this is how different persons have dealt with the famous
hymn 'Just As I Am' by Charlotte Eliot. Note the first verse of this
hymn:

Just as I am, without one plea,
But that Thy blood was shed for me,
And that Thou biddest me come to Thee,
O Lamb of God, I come, I come.

On the one hand there are those who echo the sentiments of this
hymn. Several have actually quoted it in approval; others have quoted
other verses of it. The position expressed in the hymn is taken even
by some of the staunchest Particularists. H.A. Long wrote, "In reference
to justification, we can but stand on this rocky basis, 'Jesus died for
me'". Gadsby: "My ground, therefore, of rejoicing has been and still
is, that Christ was made sin for me". Raven quoted another hymn:

Base as I am, yet blessed Lord,
I dare to make this plea;
As Jesus died to save the lost,
Perhaps he died for me.

Instances of this could be multiplied, but not all have taken this

24. E.g., Roe, p.142; Spurgeon, Anecdotes and Stories, pp.51, 120. Elsewhere Spurgeon said, "My
29. Samuel Crisp: "What is my plea, why I should not go to hell? I plead Jesus, what he hath
done and suffered for me; I plead his righteousness, believing in him" (CAE, vol.I, 'To the
Reader', p.xvi). Popham: "My plea is this - the blood of Jesus Christ, nothing else" (Sermons,
vol.III, p.195). "The plea for pardon is a strong plea because it is founded on the blood of
Jesus" (vol.IV, p.119). Also, "Come boldly to the throne of grace and plead what Christ has done"
(vol.III, p.196). Roe portrays Christ as saying, "Plead my blood only" (p.16). Sawyer: "Mercy
through blood I make my plea, o God be merciful to me!" (p.257).
line. W.J. Styles explicitly rejected the hymn of Charlotte Eliot. Specifying the first verse he states, "This plea is never given in the Gospel". Styles was consistent, for how can a Particularist claim that his only plea is that Jesus died for him? How can a sinner know that Christ died for him if in fact Christ did not die for any but the elect? Styles correctly noted that since this is so, and the Gospel does not specify who the elect are, the hymn is not true and cannot be sung in all good conscience. Other Particularists agree, while others do not see the inconsistency.

Why is this so important to the issue we are investigating? Simply this: the doctrine of Duty-Faith is seen as implying universal atonement. Since the latter is not true, say the Hyperists, neither is the former. Huntington summed up the position: "If it is the duty of all men to believe, they must believe that Jesus died for all men; that he will pardon all men, and save all men". That is, one cannot believe in the 'Bold Assurance' unless he first believes in universal atonement. But if he accepts this, then he must also accept that all men will be saved, for Christ certainly will save all those for whom He died. Since not all will be saved, Christ did not die for all; and if this is so, then it is not of the essence of saving faith, and therefore not a duty of the Gospel.

This is, in our opinion, to go against Calvin and Crisp. Just what is their view of the 'Bold Assurance' in relation to the atonement? Basically it is summed up in Zech. 12:10, "They shall look upon me whom they have pierced, and they shall mourn for him, as one mourneth for his own son". Strains on this motif crop up in various authors with whom we are concerned. Earlier we noted the stages of this theory of faith as follows: there is first regeneration, then illumination of the
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Cross, sight that Christ died for all, thus that Christ died for oneself, that one is responsible for crucifying Christ, that the atonement is God's guarantee of redemption, trust in the Saviour, repentence and mourning. The great incentive to faith and repentence is not the Law but the illumination that Christ died for oneself.

Where Particularists differ from Calvin here can be seen in two areas. Firstly, they cannot point men directly to a sight of the Cross, for they feel that only the Spirit can do that by spiritual illumination. The result is that they cannot invite men directly to Christ but only to the means of grace which the Spirit may use to illuminate sinners through. Secondly, they sometimes tell men to wait for spiritual illumination, for faith is mainly a passive thing.

But they are not even consistent in these areas, for they realize the importance of the atonement to faith and the Gospel. The result is that they must preach something concerning faith. In effect what they do is to preach that one must believe in Christ savingly to be reconciled to God. But, of course, they cannot tell all sinners to believe savingly, for this implies that Christ died for them. Some critics judge that this is to demand that they make bricks without straw. Others say that it makes faith blind, similar to the leap in the dark of Kierkegaard or Hobbes. This is what Kendall means by describing the Particularist notion of faith as 'Voluntarism'. Thus, faith is not assurance that Christ died for oneself but rather an act of the will.

Another illustration pictures the Particularist idea of faith in the atonement as follows. A blind man is told to sit in a chair without first touching it with his hands. Halfway down the blind man asks, "The chair is there, is it not?" To which the reply comes, "It is if you sit down in it, but if you do not sit down then that is evidence that it is not there". The blind man stops in mid-motion, perplexed between wondering whether he'll land on the ground or whether he should attempt to continue to stand up, tired though he may be. Not wishing to the thought a fool, he stands.

This is basically the criticism of John Bunyan. Bunyan maintained that the Gospel is to be preached to all because Christ died for all.33

The doctrine of limited atonement is an unnecessary stumbling-block to faith, for unbelievers will reason as follows:

I do not know I am elect, and therefore dare not come to Jesus Christ; for if the death of Jesus Christ, and so the general tender of the Gospel, concern the elect alone; I, not knowing myself to be of that number, am at a mighty plunge; nor know whether is the greater sin, to believe, or to despair: for I say again, if Christ died only for the elect, etc, then I not knowing myself to be of that number, dare not believe the Gospel, that holds forth his blood to save me; nay, I think with safety may not, until I first do know I am elect of God, and appointed thereunto.34

Particularists have held that the sinner must believe that Christ died for at least some sinners, but Luther asked what benefit this could have for the guilty sinner. Do not even the demons believe that the Saviour redeemed 'some sinners'?35 And if one must believe that Christ died for oneself, without founding this faith upon the Gospel, is this not requiring men to believe something that may not be true?36 Particularists agree and therefore deny the 'Bold Assurance', else men would be required to believe a lie.37 Gill explained:

Does it become true, that Christ died for me, only in consequence of my faith; then my faith changes immutable facts, and a false doctrine into truth. If it were true, that Christ died for me, before I believed it, then he died for all.38


37. Cause, pp.31-32; Engelsma, p.69; Owen, Works, vol.X, pp.297, 393, 404-405, 408; Spurgeon, in Thornton, p.136; Iain Murray, The Forgotten Spurgeon, pp.77-78. Ames: "Concerning Christ there is absolutely nothing presented, or which ought to be presented, in the calling of men to be believed as true which is not simply and absolutely true" (Narrow, p.158). Wayman: "The Law of God binds no creature to believe that which is not" (Enquiry, p.38). Cf. Philanthropos, Observations on Fuller, p.35; Whitby, pp.144, 162; Barclay, Apology, p.84. Wells said that to believe in a way of Duty-Faith is to believe and be "converted by and to a huge lie" (Letters to Theophilus, vol.II, p.219). Critics feel that Wells is grossly inconsistent here because, as in the Rahab Controversy (see Chapter X below), Wells 'accepted that faith can be justified by telling a lie!39

38. S & T', vol.II, p.155. Cf. Homer Hoeksena, Voice, p.59, who uses a similar argument. Depoyster contended that free offers require one to believe that Christ is our Saviour only ... Cont'd:
By reverse syllogizing it can be deduced that as Christ did not die for all, faith does not alter facts, and therefore cannot be a duty. Critics fail to see any logic in this, for they do not assert that faith makes something to be true but rather accepts something as true. How can you believe something that is not true until you believe it? On the contrary, they reply, it is the Particularists who present the difficulty by not providing an adequate basis for faith in revelation.

But Gill has an answer for this as well. No man is required to believe what is not revealed. If the Gospel revealed that the atonement is general, then all would be required to believe in 'Bold Assurance'. But the Gospel does not reveal whom the Saviour represented on the Cross, therefore no man will be condemned for not believing that Christ died for Him. As Crisp stated, "Christ will not speak more from heaven than he doth in his gospel".

What is the practical result of this kind of preaching? Critics charge that preaching in "the restrictive way" limits the effects of grace. Instead, it brings men only to legal repentance and despair and doubt. Experimentalist Hyper-Calvinists are quick to point out that this is not so. Rather, they suggest that it is the means which God has ordained through which He brings men to faith and then later to assurance.

The Hyperists often quote stories of their hearers going through the anguish of the grovelling of doubt that accompanies Experimentalist conversion. These poor souls often cry out, "Did the Lord Jesus, when He died, die for me?" Naturally the Hyper-Calvinist cannot answer the question until he determines whether the sinner is experiencing spiritual sensibility of sin or not. Popham asked, "Why sinner, you answer this if you can – for whom did Christ die? Was it for the righteous?" To some this smacks of the mockery which Twisse endorsed in refusing to

Cont'd:

after we believe: "If so, then, he is believing something which is not true in order to make it true" (Fragments, p.93).

39. Cause, pp.31-32, 64, 102, 164, 210; Body, p.468.
40. CAE, vol.I, p.47. See Chapters II and X.
41. Popham, Sermons, vol.III, p.96. So also Roe, pp.75, 97, 136, 155; Warburton, Gospel, p.10; Kershaw, Autobiography, p.56. Gosden said that saving faith has "at least a hope that He died for their sins" (Baptism, pp.13, 15).
make the 'Bold Proclamation'.

It is our opinion that the 'Bold Assurance' doctrine is the watershed between two extremes. Those who reject it thus must limit the atonement and eventually the Gospel. But these three limitations overlap several times. With some, the rejection of the 'Bold Assurance' comes first and the others follow. With others, holding limited atonement logically demands that they modify the 'Bold Assurance'. A few Hyper-Calvinists have begun with the rejection of free offers and have reasoned backwards to the rejection of the 'Bold Assurance', Duty-Faith, and universal atonement. Historically, however, the pattern seems to be rejection of universal atonement, then of the 'Bold Assurance', then of Duty-Faith and free offers.

This must not be construed as suggesting that all who reject any one of these four necessarily reject the others. That is certainly not the case, however inconsistent they may or may not be. For instance, there are some who believe in limited atonement but accept the 'Bold Assurance', Duty-Faith and free offers (thus Twisse, Crisp et al). There are others who hold to limited atonement but not this assurance, but still believe in Duty-Faith and free offers (thus Owen and most Particularists). But our impression is that those who hold to Particular Redemption place a higher premium upon that doctrine than upon the 'Bold Assurance'. If a choice must be made, they will usually opt for limited atonement. Some do not see the difficulty and call it a paradox.

It should be plain that the 'Bold Assurance' matches the 'Bold Proclamation'. If it is necessary to believe "Christ died for me", then the Gospel must proclaim "Christ died for you". Conversely, if the Gospel contains the message "Christ died for you", then all who hear should believe "Christ died for me". Rejection of the one logically demands rejection of the other. The question remains: what is the place of the atonement in the Gospel?

Particularists immediately name the work of Christ on the Cross as of the essence of the Gospel. Gill said that it is the principal, main, great and fundamental doctrine of the Gospel: "The first and grand article of it (is) that Christ died for our sins",43 for Gospel doctrines

"direct to the blood of Christ" and in the Gospel "he is evidently set forth crucified and slain for sinners". So much is agreed by all parties. And yet the Hyper-Calvinists have been accused of obscuring this central truth, at least in practice.

And yet Particularists deny that we can or must give the 'Bold Proclamation'. "We cannot say it", wrote Andrew Marshall, "because we do not believe it". It is argued that this expression is not found in Scripture, but their opponents point out Rom. 5:8, Eph. 5:2, I Peter 2:21, 3:18, and especially the words at the Last Supper in Luke 22:19-20. Those accepting limited atonement generally reply that these instances were written or spoken to those who already believed. When the critics point out that Judas was never a believer and was at the Last Supper, Particularists tend to take the opinion that Judas had already left. Thus, there is a stalemate.

Particularists further indicate that there are no examples in the apostolic preaching in the book of Acts, where one would expect it were it of the importance that Universalists and Dualists feel that it is. The reply from these last two is, that it is implied several times in the instances in which Peter accused his hearers of crucifying Jesus - an indiscriminate, universal accusation to the Jews. The Particularists answer is that this does not mean that Christ died for all those who put Him to death. Naturally, the counter-reply to this is that it was they, not Christ, who deserved to die and that Christ took their place - as indicated in His prayer that the Father forgive them. Again the Particularists reply that Christ did not pray for all.

Another Biblical passage has been disputed concerning the 'Bold
Proclamation' and that is I Cor. 15:3, "Christ died for our sins". The limited school deny that this was written to unbelievers, for the Corinthians were Christians. The non-limited school replies that Paul is reminding them of what he preached to them before they became believers, according to verses 1 and 2. How can Paul remind them of what he preached to them if he had never said those words? Surely there would be no worth in sinners believing that Christ died for believers, for that leaves them out and implies that Christ came to call only the righteous. Paul did not preach, "Christ died for believers, therefore believe", but "Christ died for us - you and I - therefore believe and be saved".

Particularists remain emphatic in their denial of the 'Bold Proclamation'. Pink was especially adamant about this. To him it was casting pearls before swine and preaching a lie:

But the Scriptures nowhere warrant us to tell any indifferent, impenitent sinner that Christ 'took his place on the cross': the substitutionary work of Christ is a truth for the comfort of believers and not a sop for unbelievers.

Therefore, wrote Pink, any person who experiences any difficulty in freely preaching the Gospel because he cannot make this announcement to everyone "does not clearly understand what the 'Gospel' is". Pink's energetic denials are echoed by Engelsma:

Reformed preaching will not approach the audience with the declaration: God loves you, and Christ died for all of you ... This message is a lie. Not only are these statements false, but they are also the bane of effective evangelism... (It) assures the sinner that all is well with him in his sin...

One then asks what the Particularists actually preach to all unbelievers regarding the atonement. One recent evangelistic book is

49. Calvin seems to favour this view in his Commentary. Cf. also Calvin's Sermons on Deuteronomy, p.676.
52. The Atonement, p.281.
consistently Particularist in stating, "He did not die for everyone". Usually, however, they are more subtle. Hoeksema frequently preached things like "He bore our sin" but this could be interpreted either way. Most often Particularists simply state that the atonement was for "sinners" or "men", though some felt that this implied universal atonement and thus disapproved of it. In the context of denying that the Gospel is an offer or invitation, Pink stated that it is a proclamation which is true whether sinners believe it or not:

No man is asked to believe that Christ died for him in particular. The Gospel, in brief, is this: Christ died for sinners, you are a sinner, believe in Christ and you shall be saved.

The same sentiment was expressed by C.H. Spurgeon in a way that is either inconsistent or confusing: "Christ died for sinners, therefore, if you are a sinner Christ died for you". But Spurgeon went on to qualify this by explaining that he was referring to "sensible sinners". Is this any different than the Hyperist practice of preaching certain things only to sensible sinners? And yet this style of preaching is easily misunderstood to be the 'Bold Proclamation'. Surely the hearer will reason, "The preacher said, 'Christ died for sinners and you are a sinner'. I am a sinner, therefore Christ died for me".

Indeed one gets the impression that the Particularists are sometimes

56. E.g., Commentary on Acts 24:24, 1 Peter 2:17.
57. Homer Hoeksema considered this vague sort of preaching to be "insipid Arminianism" (Voice, p.415).
59. Quoted in Thornton, p.137. Elsewhere Spurgeon was reported to have said, "If you trust Christ, that must be an evidence that He died for you", and the following anecdote which has some questionable points about its veracity: "I have been pleased in reading the works of Tobias Crisp. Dr. Gill made a few notes thereon. He somewhere says, that 'a drunken man, on seeing a drunkard saved, may have as much reason to believe that Christ died for him as for that other drunken man'. He may come to Christ on that warrant. I think he may come on the other warrant. He may come because God bids him" (Anecdotes and Stories, pp.140, 146). One wonders if the editor has not misplaced the second inverted comma within the quotation. It would make more sense for Gill to have said, 'a drunken man ... that warrant'. In any case, these words never appear in any of Gill's writings and the whole anecdote sounds spurious.
60. Compare Packer: "what does it mean to believe on the Lord Jesus Christ?... it means knowing oneself to be a sinner, and Christ to have died for sinners..." (Introduction to Owen, p.21).
caught up in their concern for souls when they inconsistently give the impression of such preaching. In fact, there are several instances in which some have actually even given straight-forward 'Bold Proclamations'. We remind the reader of Gill's own words to his daughter on her deathbed, words which Gill himself called "those appropriate words". Elsewhere he said, "behold the Son of God ... that has bore your sins", but this is probably spoken to believers. This would be similar to saying, "The Son of God bore your sins, if you believe" (remember the chair analogy above: The chair is there if you sit down). Davis wrote, "those Grand propositions of the Gospel, 'Christ died for all', viz. who live and have their lives given them". Gadsby: "Come poor, tired, burdened, cast-down, broken-hearted sinner, the dear Lord has accomplished a single-armed salvation, and it is done for thee", but Gadsby is clearly speaking of 'sensible sinners'. But can any other sinner be wrong for assuming on the face of them that these words at least sound indiscriminate? And of course, we regularly find the 'Bold Proclamation' in many of those who do not believe in limited atonement.

As we showed in Chapter VIII, the Hyper-Calvinists did not deny that we are to preach the Gospel to every person, and this applies to the difficulty in holding to limited atonement. "Particular redemption", said Pink, "must not prevent His servants from preaching the Gospel to every creature." Some Particularists would base the universal

61. Spurgeon: "He died for you" (in Thornton, pp.137-138). Keach: "he hath made your peace ... The Sinner is told his Debts are paid" (Display, pp.65, 154). Whitefield: "the Lord Jesus died for you" (Letters, p.179). Hazleton: "Guilty sinner ... The flowings of His precious blood on Calvary made atonement for thy sin" (Sermons, pp.18-19). Saltmarsh: "Christ was crucified for sins, and for your sins" (Free Grace, p.192. Compare his vague "for sinners" on p.138).


64. Sense of Sin, p.iv.

65. Works, vol. II, p.259. Compare Philpot's significant comments on preaching "to you" in a personal way in which the hearer need not doubt or act presumptuously, though this too falls short of the 'Bold Proclamation' (Sermons, vol. I, p.97). Gadsby asked, "Have you a hope, a spiritual hope, that Christ suffered for you?" (Sermons, p.121).

66. E.g., Bunyan, Works, vol.I, p.408; Luther, Works, vol.22, p.169. This kind of statement is found in The Narrow of Modern Divinity several times, leading us to believe that it did not accept Particularism. For instance: "whatever Christ did for the redemption of mankind, he did it for you ... he hath made him to be sin for you" (pp.118, 133. Cf. p.127). Cf. Douty, p.41; Denny, The Christian Doctrine of Reconciliation, p.263.
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preaching on the infinite value or universal sufficiency of the atonement, but some deny this and say that we preach only because we are told to do so. The warrant to preach matches the warrant to believe: the command, not the atonement. That is to say, "the question of the extent of the atonement ... has no bearing on the content of the evangelistic message". Naturally, opponents of Particularism charged this position with removing the Cross from the Gospel, for surely if one preaches that Christ died then it must say something about who He died for. If it was not for Himself, immediately something must be said about those whom He represented. To merely say it was "for sinners" is an indefinite statement which implies Universalism. The only other option is to state, "He did not do this for everyone, and perhaps not for you". What a far cry this is from the 'Bold Proclamation'.

Virtually all that has been said up to this point applies equally to the proclamation that usually precedes the 'Bold Proclamation', viz. "God loves you". Particularists and especially Hyperists rigidly deny that we can preach this statement indiscriminately to all, except only insofar as describing the bounties of Providence. These bounties, though, have nothing to do with salvation. To preach this short proclamation of grace is considered casting pearls before swine (Pink) or a just plain lie and deception (Engelsma). Even the usually moderate Spurgeon once burnt a tract which said "God loves you". He defended this by saying "I was afraid that somebody who had no right to it, might see it, and believe that it is true".

68. E.g., Symington, Atonement, p.287. Some later editions of the 1918 edition of Pink's important Sovereignty of God omit a passage in which he defended the infinite value of Christ's blood, which is sufficient for all mankind and opened a door whereby God could forgive all were all to believe. "It is in view of these two facts that a bona fide offer of salvation is to be made to 'every creature'" (pp.76-77). Whitefield: "let us offer salvation freely to all by the blood of Jesus" (Letters, p.156); "the offer of salvation, by the blood of Jesus, is now termed enthusiasm" (Works, vol.V, p.314).


70. Packer, Evangelism and the Sovereignty of God, pp.66, 68. So also Introduction to Owen, p.19; 'Puritan View', p.19. Packer often states that one is not to believe some thing but rather some one, though this is hard to reconcile with his other statements that the Gospel contains certain objective facts which need to be accepted. Cf. Engelsma, p.69; Pink, Holy Spirit, p.159.

71. Present Day Evangelism, p.7; Saving Faith, pp.6-7, 37.


73. Quoted in Thornton, pp.135-137.
This completely contradicts what the Universalists and Dualists preach. To them, no man will believe unless he is moved to by grace, which operates in his mind and heart by convincing him that God does indeed love him. The full display of this love is in the atonement made for him. To refuse the 'Bold Proclamation' is to stop the flow of grace in the heart of the hearer, who then must look either to the Law or within his own heart for warrants to believe. These same non-Particularists affirm that as there are two warrants to preach (the fear of judgement and the love of Christ for sinners), so there are the same two warrants to believe. And both of these have to do with Christ taking the wrath of God out of love for all sinners everywhere (II Cor. 5). Until a man is convinced that God loves him, argued Calvin, he will never come to Christ - and this knowledge comes to him through the atonement as preached in the Gospel. Or, as Crisp put it, "As long as men think that their sins are upon themselves, they cannot be at rest". At best, Particularists can only say "God loved some of us".

The necessary relationship between the 'Bold Assurance' and the conviction that one is savingly loved by God is brought out in Gal. 2:20, "the Son of God loved me and gave Himself for me". Non-Particularists argue that this conviction is of the essence of saving faith because the context is speaking of the very marrow of justification by faith. Granted, they say, justification is a legal transaction but it is also a loving relationship. To trust in Christ without realizing that Christ loves one is insufficient, for that would be based on fear which has selfish overtones. As one loves because he has been overwhelmed by love (I John 4:19), so one believes because of the conviction that he has been loved before he believes. That is, the very essence of grace is at stake. To assert that one can come to the conclusion that one is loved of God only after one has already believed can easily imply that it is actually only after one is converted that one is loved. In other words, the question is whether God loves us as sinners or as saints. Hyperists, because of the Supralapsarianism, must acknowledge that God only loves saints, not sinners.

This is not to say that these opponents contend that the persuasion

74. Cf. Comm on John 3:16; Institutes II, 16, 2; our appended excursus; and Chapter XI.
75. CAE, voL II, p.47. Cf. vol.1, pp.56, 343.
that one is loved comes before faith in such a way that implies that one can realize this truth without believing. If Particularists stress that this conviction follows faith, and most Universalists (especially Arminians) feel that it precedes faith and can be realized by one in an unconverted state, so there is a class between the two who feel that the realization of love comes at the exact point of faith. This is the Dualist position. The Dualists contend that their position prevents the errors of both extremes: the Particularist removal of grace as a warrant, and the Universalist tendency to give believers the impression that they are loved in spite of faith in such a way that means they will be saved without faith.

If, then, the Hyperist removes the proclamation "God loves you and Christ died for you" from the Gospel, and if in fact that proclamation is of the essence of the Gospel, then it could be said that Hyper-Calvinists do not preach the Gospel to everyone but only to believers (the elect). Does this mean that Engelsma is correct after all in asserting that Hyper-Calvinists do not believe in preaching the Gospel to all? No, it does not, for Engelsma himself does not accept that this proclamation is of the essence of the Gospel, nor that its corresponding conviction is essential to saving faith in the sense advocated by non-Particularists.

Without realizing it, Engelsma argues along classical Hyper-Calvinist lines in contending that to make these sorts of proclamations indiscriminately is akin to offering the Gospel. The 'Bold Proclamation' is viewed as much the same thing as the free offer; to reject the one is to reject the other. Now we agree with Engelsma and the school of Hoeksema on the way in which several important doctrines are related. We agree that one cannot consistently accept both limited atonement and an unlimited Gospel; one cannot reject the 'Bold Proclamation' and accept free offers. Our disagreement is mainly over whether or not original Calvinism held to Universalism, the 'Bold Proclamation' and free offers. Earlier we indicated that Calvin and the Reformers all accepted free offers. In Section A and in our appended excusus we show that Calvin was a Universalist regarding the atonement, as were most of the other Reformers (certainly the earlier ones). It follows that those same free offer Universalist Reformers also accepted the 'Bold

77. See Engelsma, pp. 1-2, 11, 17, 36, 53, 71, 102, 123.
Proclamation', which can hardly be doubted from the sources. The Hoeksemas and Engelsma contend the exact opposite, that the free offer, Universalism and the 'Bold Proclamation' are all Arminian intruders.

But this follows much of what Hyper-Calvinism has been saying for nearly 300 years. From the start Hyper-Calvinists have argued that free offers imply universal atonement.

Gill:

the universal offer cannot be supported without supposing universal redemption; which those, who are fond of, and yet profess particular redemption, would do well to consider.

More recently the same thing has been urged by Herman Hoeksema, who warned:

And those that preach a well-meaning offer of God to all men, must and will ultimately embrace the doctrine of universal atonement.

Gill admitted that if universal atonement could be proved from Scripture, then a free offer would be valid; but there is no universal atonement and therefore no free offer. This is especially the argument put forth by those who questioned the infinite worth and universal sufficiency of the atonement, such as William Palmer:

It includes the idea of a general atonement, or rather, that there is no atonement, or rather, that there is no proper atonement at all. A general proposal can only be made upon the ground of a general satisfaction.

It must be re-iterated that all of these Hyper-Calvinists still believed in preaching to all, even in spite of their holding to


Particular Redemption. As Palmer asked, "But what has the preaching the gospel to all, without exception, to do with the extent of the atonement?" 63

There is some marginal difference between High and Hyper-Calvinists here. 64 Neither believe in the 'Bold Proclamation' or the 'Bold Assurance' except in those unusual instances of inconsistency. Thus they stand together against Low Calvinists, whether Universalists or Dualists. All parties believe in preaching the Gospel to all men, but the Hyperists stand alone in rejecting that we are to offer the atonement to anyone. The High Calvinists sometimes defend their position by saying that it is a paradox how they can have an unlimited offer and a limited atonement. 65 Others deny that there is any paradox, for the two are easily reconciled by rejecting that any man need believe that Christ died for him. Some admit that at first sight free offers appear to contradict Particularism, 66 but they dismiss this and continue to give offers. Some contend that the infinite value or universal sufficiency of the atonement is a ground for offering to all, 67 an argument rejected even by those Hyperists who accept these two aspects of the atonement. Fuller said that 'Equivalentism' would indeed negate the idea of free offers, but the atonement is not to be considered as such. Fuller pointed out that no man is called upon to believe that the atonement was for him; he must, however, at least accept the infinite sufficiency of it to

Cont'd:...

82. Free Enquiry, p.15. See also pp.255-338.


save. Other Particularists prefer to root the offer in the all-sufficiency of the person of Christ rather than His work. Kuiper pointed out that the free offer belongs to the non-salvific benefits that accrue to all men.

The Hyper-Calvinists argued differently on several points. Gill was more generous than many in agreeing that the general revelation of the Gospel of the atonement did indeed lay "a general foundation for special and appropriating acts", but he adds that this requires only historical faith, not saving faith. The only real incentive concerns special grace producing special faith on the basis of a limited atonement. A universal atonement, he explained, offers no consolation to those who hear the Gospel, for it teaches that some of those for whom Christ died will perish - the hearer will ask whether that does not break the guarantee that those who trust Christ's atonement will not perish. After all, he reasons, the 'double payment' argument grants the assurance that those represented at Calvary will never perish, so one must discern whether he is one of those persons. But, one asks, does this not imply that the 'Bold Assurance' is of the essence of faith? No, says Gill. What he has said concerns those 'sensible sinners' who are concerned about perishing. High Calvinists argue something like this when they assert that the theory of definite atonement gives power to the Gospel, for it provides the guarantee that all those for whom the Saviour died will necessarily be saved. One, then, is to trust Christ and later discern if he is among that number. Some even add that the limited scheme must be preached, while others say that it is not so much the limitation as the perfection that must be proclaimed. In any case, High and Hyper-Calvinists agree together that preaching a universal atonement implies universal salvation, that all will be saved regardless of faith or even evangelism.

89. Cf. John Murray, Redemption, p.75.
90. For Whom Did Christ Die, p.36.
91. Cause, pp.31-32.
95. E.g., Packer, Evangelism and the Sovereignty of God.
Similarly, Gill argued that the fact the Gospel does not, nor ever will, reach all men is proof of limited atonement. It is inconceivable, he says, that God would make provision for salvation but not also provide adequate means by which it will necessarily be brought to all. Naturally, non-Particularists urge this as a major reason why we should evangelize as much as possible. Since it is a great tragedy for anyone to perish for whom the Saviour suffered, God obviously places a high value on the souls of men and so should we by evangelizing and offering.

Hyper-Calvinists present other arguments still why free offers are at variance with particular redemption. "God's well meant 'offer' of salvation cannot possibly be wider in scope than the objective satisfaction and justification of the cross of Christ." That is to say, one cannot have a limited atonement and an unlimited Gospel - and a free offer is an unlimited Gospel. This is to agree with Calvinistic Universalists such as Ralph Wardlaw. Both feel that free offer Particularists are inconsistent.

Further, "it is not an offer of pardon, that Christ, by his blood, has procured, and is exalted to give, but that (pardon) itself". Salvation is already definite; it merely needs to be applied, not offered (compare John Murray's Redemption Accomplished and Applied). To offer salvation implies that it is "precarious and uncertain", which insults the work of Christ. Salvation is already definite. But if this is so,
ask critics, why is it necessary even to preach? If the atonement is definite in this sense, why should men even believe? The reply is that in a sense the elect are saved before they believe; regeneration and justification are but the application of this. In other words, salvation is entirely outside of man and regardless of faith.

We mention only in passing the unusual argument used by Husseyt to the effect that to 'offer' Christ is to re-crucify Him, for in the Bible 'offer' always means 'sacrifice'. Offers are seen as an offence to the Cross. Moreover, as free offers imply, rest upon, and lead to the doctrine of universal atonement, so too do they open the door to Arminianism, for the Arminians themselves base their free offers on universal atonement.

How do non-Particularists respond to all this? In brief, they responded: "No universal atonement, no offer; no offer, no faith; no faith, no salvation". Watts:

we must cancel all these scriptures, and deny all offers of grace and salvation made to sinners in general, if Christ procured and provided nothing for them...

They charge Particularists of both varieties with removing the ground of faith. Though the Hyper-Calvinists are said to be more consistent, they are accused of being doubly dangerous - and the rejection of free offers and missions is one evidence of this. Some Universalists ask how we can preach "All things are now ready" if in fact nothing has been provided for the non-elect. This gets back to the chair analogy. If someone does not come to the Gospel feast, that is evidence that there


104. Operations, p.23. It is ironic that some Hyperists can speak of the atonement as a 'free offer' to God and deny it to sinners who need it. Hoeksema wrote, "His name and position He freely offers up to the righteousness of God", as if Christ were saying "Take my life, my name, my all. Freely I offer it in love to Thee" (IK, vol.I, p.660). Philpot speaks similarly of the eternal Covenant in which Christ was virtually slain: "In those solemn councils of heaven he freely offered himself to suffer, bleed, and die for guilty man's sake" (Sermons, vol.VI, p.56).

105. Cause, p.53.

was nothing there anyway; it is useless nonsense to suppose that there ever was, for he was not ordained to come. The Gospel according to Particularism cannot logically say "All things are ready for all", for this is tantamount to saying "Christ died for all". Similarly, a Particularist cannot preach, "All things are ready for you", for that is synonymous with the 'Bold Proclamation'. The warrant to invite and the warrant to believe is in the command (Highs) and internal calling (Hypers), not in the feast itself (Lows). The Low Calvinists point out that Hussey was inconsistent to repudiate his earlier book entitled *The Gospel-Feast*. They contend that Hyper-Calvinists are especially self-contradictory to say things like "He does not invite poor people to a feast and set nothing before them" (Raven). 107 But then, by 'poor people' Raven can only be speaking of 'sensible sinners', before whom alone the feast is set.

John Bunyan warned that limiting the atonement meant that there could not logically be any penalty for rejecting it. 108 Earlier we mentioned that Hyper-Calvinists are divided on this point, but the point is a good one. Universalists such as Bunyan contend that few will be saved through the Particularist Gospel and that those who will are saved in spite of the distinctive element, not because of it. To reject the ministry of offering the atonement is to make a mockery of the very ministry of being an ambassador of the Cross (II Cor. 5). It places undue hindrances on the salvation message. Particularists might respond that those who do not believe in the Gospel of limited atonement were obviously not ordained to believe in the first place; therefore the atonement was not made on their behalf anyway, so nothing is lost. 109

Other Calvinistic Universalists point out that the rejection of free offers because of definite redemption falls prey again to the error that there is only one stage of salvation. L.S. Chafer represents Low Calvinists here by re-iterating that "The cross is not the only saving instrumentality". 110 Redemption is not completed at Calvary any more than it was in the eternal Council. When Christ shouted "It is finished", He meant that that specific stage was finished. The next

stage was Resurrection, then the Gospel offer, then faith and repentance. We should have no more reservation about making the free offer than the 'Bold Proclamation', for they are much the same thing and are necessary stages to the chain of salvation. Consequently we find numerous examples of the free offer and the 'Bold Proclamation' in the writings of those who believe in Universalism, but progressively fewer in those who believe in Particularism.
D. CHRIST MADE SIN

A few words should be said here about another aspect of the atonement often associated with Hyper-Calvinism and Antinomianism. Some representatives of these two schools spoke in overly-literal terms about Christ being 'made sin', with the result that they were sometimes misunderstood and opposed by orthodox High Calvinists and others. Cave says that this way of describing the atonement is on the extreme side of Hyper-Calvinism and names four adherents of the theory (if it can be called a theory): Crisp, Gill, Chauncey and Saltmarsh. Buchanan says that the Antinomians differed from the Reformers on the nature of Christ's being made sin and implies that the Antinomians taught substitution by infusion while the Reformers taught substitution by imputation. That is, the former taught that Christ was literally made sin in the place of sinners, the latter that Christ was only figuratively made sin for sinners. Toon, on the other hand, is correct in showing that the Antinomians merely spoke "rather too literally" and thereby sounded as if they taught a literal exchange of persons rather than a legal non-literal "commutation of persons".

We are not too surprised to find Luther, in his characteristically bold style, speaking in similar terms:

All the prophets saw this, that Christ was to become the greatest thief, murderer, robber, desecrator, blasphemer, etc, there has ever been anywhere in the world ... He is a sinner ... If you want to deny that he is a sinner and a curse, then deny also that he suffered, was crucified and died ... (He is) a sinner of sinners.

1. Cave, p.354. Cave appears to have based his analysis upon the study by Alexander (Biblical Theology, vol.II, pp.102-112), who names the same four writers (p.102).
4. Works, vol.25, pp.277-278. Colyer: "The celebrated Reformer, Martin Luther... is 'very bold' on this subject of Christ made sin, preparatory to his being made a curse on account of Sin" (Good News, p.131). The words above by Luther were quoted approvingly by Cudworth in Letter to Henderson, p.5; and referred to by Wilks, pp.398, 423. On Luther's views, see Sweaton, The Doctrine of the Atonement According to the Apostles, p.527.
Calvin also used similar but much more guarded language. Occasional examples can be found among the Puritans, such as Bunyan: "(Christ) was made to be sin for thee, or stood sensibly guilty of all thy sins before God, and bare them in his own body upon the cross". As can be seen in these examples, what sparked off the controversy was the interpretation of Gal. 3:13 ("Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us") and 11 Cor. 5:21 ("For he hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin").

But it was Crisp who spoke boldest of all. A few examples will suffice:

God reckons Christ the very sinner.

Christ is all the sinners in the world by imputation.

God made him more than a transgressor ... no transgressor in the world was such a one as Christ was.

He makes Christ as very a sinner as the creature himself was.

5. Cf. Comm on Gal. 3:13; II Cor. 5:19; Sermons on Isaiah, p.111; Sermons on Ephesians, p.488; Institutes, II, 16, 6; Sermons on Deuteronomy, pp.550, 765-767, 940; and the sermons on Gal 3:13 in Sermons on Galations.

6. Works, vol.I, p.408. Note the 'Bold Proclamation' here. For other instances of the 'Christ made sin' motif in the Puritans, see Perkins, Works, vol.I, p.215; vol.II, pp.237-239; Chauncey, Neonomianism Unmasked, Part II, pp.13-82; and especially Goodwin, Works, vol.V, pp.180-195, 286-296. Goodwin detailed the difference between Christ being first made sin and then, as a result, being made a curse (see below). For discussions relevant to our study, see Fletcher, Works, vol. II, pp.224-225; Skeats, History, p.181; Toon, HC, pp.55-58. Williams represents the popular misunderstanding of the Antinomian position: "Antinomianism is the teaching that the sins of believers being imputed to Christ made Him personally a sinner in our place, while we, by accepting His righteousness, are made personally righteousness"; thus the work of the Holy Spirit is unnecessary because redemption is totally and absolutely complete in the Cross (Systematic Theology, vol.1, p.233).

7. CAE, vol.I, p.7. Tobias Crisp's son Samuel published his own Christ Made Sin in the 1690's, adding fuel to the Neonomian Controversy. He affirmed that the doctrine of 'Christ made sin' is the doctrine of the Church standing or falling (Christ Made Sin, p.99). William Young: "Crisp's doctrine of the laying of sin itself, not simply guilt, on Christ is paralleled by Luther's rhetorical expressions" (in The Encyclopaedia of Christianity, vol. I, p.277). Cf. Beverley, Discourse, p.9. The motif was not as prominent in the other Antinomians, though several of them touched upon it (e.g., Eaton, Honeycombe, p.38).

8. CAE, vol.I, p.10. Partly on the basis of this quotation Hoornbeek thought that Crisp taught universal atonement, but see Gill's footnote and Section A above.


Among the few works of Crisp that we have are two series of sermons on the atonement, one based on II Cor. 5:21 and the other on Isaiah 53:6 ("All we like sheep have gone astray ... and the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all"). That the atonement played a large part in Crisp's soteriology was shown earlier, and his comments on 'Christ made sin' must be interpreted in the light of our comments there. Now Crisp often made statements like the above but was quick to point out that he is speaking about imputation, not infusion. Sometimes he speaks of it happening by reckoning or accounting, which is the same thing. And he cautions the reader on the point about the sinlessness of Christ: "yet Christ is not an actual sinner". Crisp denies that Christ ever was, or ever could be, the actor or committer of transgression, for he never committed any; but the Lord laid iniquity upon him; and this act of God's laying it upon him, makes him as really a transgressor, as if he himself had actually committed it.

11. CAE, vol. I, pp. 287-289, 292. A few quotations from later Hyper-Calvinists will reveal much about how they viewed the exact manner of imputation of sin/curse to Christ. They usually employ contrasts; some are precise, some are bold. Popham: "God made Him sin, a sin-bearer, and actually imputed sin to Him" (Sermons, vol. IV, p.128). Warburton said that sin was "imputed to his charge" (Gospel, p.54). Roe stated that our sins were "literally, actually, legally" laid on Christ, thusly: "Literally - there is no fiction, no assumption here, no figure of speech, whether hyperbole or otherwise - all is solemn fact. Not by transfusion, but by transference" (pp.187, 250. Cf. p.173). Raven: "It is a real transaction! It is not a mere theory, it is a solemn and a sacred fact" (Sermons, pp.123-124). Sawyer: "by imputation, not by infection ... It was a law-charge" (p.141). Gadsby: "Christ was made sin for us - really made sin ... not by actual transgression, but by transfer" (Sermons, p.361). Palmer: "it was guilt transferred but not transfused, imputed but not imparted" (The Saviour and His People, p.19); "the actual transfer of human guilt to Christ, was not in the sense of transfusion and adhesion, but of accretion and oneration" (Epitome, p.17); "sin was really and truly imputed to Christ ... (but) it was not imputed as an inherent quality", for that would have meant "insertion as well as its imputation"; thus it was by 'imputation' rather than 'perpetration' (Free Enquiry, pp.275, 286). Stevens: "It is likewise ever needful to distinguish between sin's being imputed and its being infused. The former God can do, the latter he cannot; the latter would change our Lord's natural quality, the former would not" (Recollections, p.29). Silver: "when He was made sin by imputation for His people, He endured the curse of the law by infliction" (Sovereignty, p.150). Colyer is especially bold: "the Lord Christ was actually made sin ... it actually became Christ's by the real imputation of it to him; so that He was beheld as if He had committed all her sins ... He actually made Christ to be sin for His Church ... There was a complete transfer of our sins to Christ ... and that in reality, and not in figure" (Good News, pp.44-45). Thus, said Colyer, II Cor. 5:21 means 'sin' and not 'sin-offering', else it would mean "He hath made him to be a Sin-offering for us who know no Sin-offering" (p.126-127). John Gadsby was one of the few who took it to mean 'sin-offering', meaning that Christ is treated as if He were the sinner (Slavery, p.92). The 'as if' motif is vital, as Philpot explains: "its guilt and burden were laid on his sacred head, and so became by imputation his that it was as if he had committed the sins charged upon him" (Meditations, vol. I, p.116).


13. CAE, vol. I, p.269. See especially Stevens, The Sinlessness of Jesus. Virtually all Hyperists have held to the impeccability as well as the sinlessness of Jesus. There was some disagreement last century in Hyperist circles over the question of the mortality of Christ's body (that is, ... Cont'd.
For Crisp, being 'made sin' and being 'made a sinner' are two different things entirely. The first is by imputation and substitution; the second would be by infusion and would make Christ in His essence to be a sinner and sinful. Moreover, in pure Federalist tradition, men are 'made sinners' by inheriting the sinful nature of Adam (Rom. 5:19), but Christ did not inherit Adam's sin. Legally (Federally) Christ was made heir of Adam's sin but without actually committing sin himself. The second Adam died for the sin of the first Adam. Without getting into the intricacies of the Federalist view of Original Sin, we point out that difficulties necessarily arise when one says that this atonement is Particularist.

The use of the actual-virtual scheme can be seen here. Christ was virtually but not actually made to be sin. He was treated 'as if' He had sinned, though of course He had not. This is of the essence of Calvinistic substitutionary atonement (whether that of Calvin, Particularists, Universalists or Antinomians). Crisp pointed out another relevance of the actual-virtual scheme concerning the time of imputation:

... there is a twofold serving the execution upon Christ: it may be considered either virtual, or actual, and real. The execution is served upon Christ in the virtue of it, from the first instant that ever there was a transgression committed ... that before the actual payment that Christ made, there was the virtue of laying iniquity upon him; by which there was a discharge given before he had actually paid the debt.

Crisp here accounts for salvation under the Old Covenant. Ever since the Fall men have been sinners and needed salvation. The only possible way of salvation was through atonement. So, in accordance with the eternal Covenant of Grace, Christ had the sins of His people virtually
but not yet actually imputed to Him before He came to earth. That is, the pre-atonement imputation was one of promise. The future imputation would certainly (actually) happen, and believers in the Old Covenant dispensation were saved by faith in the future imputation of their sins to Christ. This is in keeping with the best Federalist tradition.

When we come to Gill we find the same motifs but more caution. Gill agrees that the substitutionary transaction occurred by transference and imputation, not by transfusion and infusion. Christ’s holy nature itself was not affected. Christ was "treated by the justice of God as if he had been not only a sinner, but a mass of sin", yet this does not mean that Christ "was really and actually a sinner, or in himself so". This parallels Gill’s view that Christ suffered only in His humanity, not in His deity, but it does not go to the extreme that asserts that His humanity was not real (i.e. Docetism). Nor does Gill accept that eternal humanity theory of Hussey and Watts.

Gill mentions here an important principle which relates the atonement to justification: "The same way that our sins became Christ’s, his righteousness becomes ours". This means that the same way that Christ’s righteousness becomes ours (imputation), our sins became His.

As we saw in Chapter VI, Gill followed orthodox Federalism in stressing

---

18. Body, p.480. Cf. Comm on Ex. 29:36, Gal. 3:13. John Gadsby: "Sin is in us, but it was not in Christ, but on Him" (Slavery, p.81). So too Stevens, The Sinlessness of Jesus, p.10. Bradbury: "He hath made Him sin for us; but never made Him commit sin" (Grove Chapel Pulpit, vol.1, p.14). Gadsby: "He was made sin, really made sin; not in his nature, for he was holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners; but he was made sin in covenant contract, as the Head and Representative of His people" (Sermons, p.133). Popham said that Christ was "made sin, covered with sin and immersed in it; not tainted with sin but covered with it" (Sermons, vol.IV, p.130). Comm on Gal. 5:21; Body, p.480. Cf. Comm on Gal. 3:13.


20. DJ, p.34; Body, p.515; Comm on Rom. 4:5. This is ‘the double imputation’, say Popham, Sermons, vol.IV, p.205; Windridge, p.223; Pink, Godhead, p.175. Cf. Styles, Manual, p.60; Brine, The Doctrines of the Imputation of Sin to Christ, and the Imputation of His Righteousness to His People; and The Imputation of Christ's Active Obedience to His People, and The Merit of It Demonstrated; Palmer, Epitome, p.19; Hazleton, Sermons, p.171; Hale, Catechism, pp.49-50; Stockell, Scripture and Reason, p.39; Pink, Beatitudes, p.33. Pink: "as the sin imputed to Christ is inherent in us, so the righteousness by which we are justified is inherent in Him" (Godhead, p.175). Barry noted that just as there was no way in which Christ could be made sin except by imputation, so there was no way in which a sinner could be made righteous but by the imputation of righteousness – and both receive that which belonged to the other (Only Refuge, p.75). Hence, just as only the elect were justified, so Christ died only for the elect. Hoeksema: "Indeed, does the Christ of God bear the curse of the world, yet not for all in that world" (Survey, p.374). Thus, Hyper-Calvinists are forced to reinterpret ‘all’ and ‘world’ in II Cor. 5 to mean the elect.
that justification is by imputed, not infused, righteousness. This can be related to Particularism as well. All those of whose sins were imputed to Christ, will be justified by the imputation of Christ's righteousness. The two acts of imputation match each other.

But, one may ask, does not the Christian also have the righteousness of Christ infused into him through sanctification? Would this not require that our sins were infused into Christ? Neither Gill nor Crisp comment on this. Their answer, we presume, would be that justification is a legal act and therefore required imputation and commutation, but sanctification is not a legal act. Sanctification is based upon justification, not directly upon atonement (though indirectly it is dependent upon it). Nor did either writer comment on any theory of 'vicarious' repentance. John MacLeod Campbell introduced that theory into Calvinism, though some suggest that this had antecedents in Calvin. The closest that Gill comes to commenting on this idea is the following:

... we may truly say, Christ was justified ... but not that he was pardoned; such an expression would sound harsh, and be very unwarrantable.


22. See Campbell's The Nature of the Atonement, based heavily upon his Universalism. A study of Campbell and the 'Christ made sin' idea would prove interesting. Campbell wrote shortly after Edward Irving caused no small controversy over the nature of Christ's humanity in relation to original sin. Maintaining the doctrine of the virgin birth, Irving wavered on the impeccability of Christ in an unorthodox manner. In a manner analogous to Irving in relation to Christ's humanity, some Hyperists of the same time went beyond the orthodox position in relation to the imputation of sin. Wilks best represents this trend. He held that Christ took a sinful human nature from Mary in order to atone for sin. Thusly, "he did not merely take our sins by imputation, but by derivation" (p.304). Sin was in Christ, for "in no other way could he have been made sin" (p.305). Christ's human nature was 'Fallen' but not 'sinful' per se (p.283). Christ bore "our sins", not just "the effects of them", else we are still in our sins (p.383). On Wilks's views, see especially, pp.283-348. Less extreme, Sawyer said that "He felt the guilt of imputed sin in his own precious holy soul" (p.143). On Christ bearing both the filth and the guilt of our sins, see Beart, Truth Defended, Part II, pp.96-102. Stevens stated: "Neither was he punished because he had taken the human nature, but because he represented sinful persons, who exist or shall exist apart from the divine" (The Sinlessness of Jesus, p.57). Cf. Memoirs, p.118. Note that Stevens accepted the Pre-Existerian idea that Christ took the human nature in eternity, therefore before Adam sinned. See Chapter V above. On the similarity of the Campbellite doctrine that Christ repented and believed for the elect, see Baxter, Works, vol.II, p.155; Catholick Theologie, Preface, p.A2; Flavel, Works, vol.III, pp.556-557; Philpot, Meditations, vol.I, p.39; and Chapters VI and VII above.

23. Body, p.503. See Chapter VI above.
Christ did not have to repent, for He was not actually a sinner. The imputation of sins to Him required Him to die, for that is the penalty for sin; but not to repent, for that is how atonement is applied with faith. But this does not mean that repentance is the foundation of justification. Quite the contrary, in fact. Repentance is based on faith which is based on justification which is based on atonement.

Gill parallels Crisp's use of the actual-virtual scheme on the two stages of the imputation of our sins to Christ. The first stage was in the Council of Peace, which underlay the Covenant of Grace; the second was at Calvary. In the first, our sins were virtually laid on Christ; in the second, they were actually imputed to Him. This differs from Crisp only in that Gill explained Old Covenant salvation more in terms of the eternal Covenant than in terms of looking forward to the atonement, though he does not entirely rule the latter out.

In sum, the 'Christ made sin' is but one aspect of the penal-substitution doctrine of atonement that has always been essential to Reformed theology. That doctrine teaches that the infinite wrath of God was laid on Christ, who thereby suffered what is deserved by those for whom He died — Hell. The atonement included Christ's sufferings

25. Gadsby, Works, vol. II, p. 90. On the definition of the 'curse', see Popham, Sermons, vol. I, p. 83; Gill, Comm on Deut. 29, Gal. 3:13, etc.; Pink, Reconciliation, p. 20. Hoeksema: "The curse of God is His word of wrath upon us. It is the opposite of His blessing and His favour" (Survey, p. 370). This presents difficulties for those Hypers who deny the universal sufficiency of the atonement. But even they tend to accept the infinite value of the atonement, not because of the infinite nature of sin nor its object but because of the worth of Christ.
26. Gadsby, Works, vol. II, p. 257; Popham, Sermons, vol. IV, p. 202. Perkins held that Christ's sufferings were greater than if all men in the world had suffered for ever and ever (Works, vol. I, p. 5). Note the progression: Christ made sin, then being made "a cursed one for those under a curse" (Tryon, Momento, p. 51). Thus, following Goodwin, being made a curse was worse than being made a sin (Oxenham, Riches of Free Grace, Part II, p. 81). Hoeksema explained: "There He became literally "a curse for us" (Survey, p. 292); therefore "He actually tasted the horror of God's curse upon the sinner" (IX, vol. I, p. 660). As Allen noted, "he bore the very identical curse that was due to us for our sins" (The Spiritual Magazine, vol. II, p. 164). This does not mean that Christ suffered after He died, though sinners indeed suffer eternally after they die (cf. Greenfield, A Letter to the Rev. Isaac Beman). Recently Arthur Custance, a High Calvinist, questions the eternality of the punishment of Hell in the traditionally accepted idea of duration. If, as is universally admitted, Christ did not suffer Hell's torments in infinite duration, but in infinite intensity, is it not possible for the reprobate to suffer the full intensity of suffering their sins deserve in a point of time rather than in the infinite duration of Hell? This admittedly has much in common with the un-Reformed notion of Annihilationism. See Custance, The Sovereignty of Grace. On eternity, see Chapter III above. But even those Hyper-Calvinists who rejected universal sufficiency accepted eternal sufferings of the reprobate in a manner including duration, though not entirely one of duration.
but especially His death. Our judgement is that there is no fundamental difference between the Hyperist-Antinomian doctrine and that of orthodox Calvinism. Moreover, the motif had been popular before the Reformation and has been found elsewhere since. What is apparent, though, is the special emphasis given by the schools represented by Crisp and Gill, leading to the extremes of Wilks and others. This emphasis might be explained in terms of their stress on sovereignty over responsibility.

27. Philpot implies that it was Christ's sufferings and not His death that constituted the atonement: "Sin was fully put away before Jesus bowed his sacred head and gave up the ghost, or he never could have said, 'It is finished'. Had he died under the load of imputed sin, he would have died under the curse and wrath of God", and therefore would be unable to be a Saviour (Meditations, vol.III, pp.124, 126).

28. The 'Christ made sin' motif was often touched upon in the Middle Ages by certain mystics who contemplated the Passion (e.g. Bernard, Thomas a Jesu, Bonaventura), sometimes in conjunction with the Sacred Heart notion. There were later similarities between these mystics and the 'Christ made sin' motif in the 'Blood and Wounds' teachings of the Moravians. However, it is not likely that Zinzendorf was familiar with Crisp, though Cudworth attempted to merge strains of both Moravianism and Antinomianism in his eclectic position. Even the vigorously anti-Antinomian Samuel Rutherford incorporated the 'Christ made sin' idea into his Christocentric theology, notably in his devotional writings on the Passion.

Before leaving the subject of limited atonement we will discuss some points mentioned earlier in relation to universal terms like 'world' and 'all'. This takes us back to Augustine once more. As we indicated in Section A, Augustine often spoke in clearly universalist language in reference to the atonement. For example, he used the argument that Christ is the judge of all the world because He died for all the world:

For with righteousness shall He judge the world: not a part of it, for he bought not a part: He will judge the whole, for it was the whole of which He paid the price.¹

Here Augustine clearly includes the reprobate in the 'world', for Christ judges all and especially the reprobate. Note especially that he speaks of it as 'the whole' and not merely 'a part of it'. On the other hand, Augustine uses 'world' in other ways. Of John 12:32 he says that the term 'world' is (sometimes) used "of the good, who in like manner are diffused over the whole earth", who are the ones also mentioned by Paul in II Cor. 5:21.² When Christ spoke of not losing 'all', He was referring to "all that is predestined" (i.e. His sheep). 'All' sometimes means all parts of an individual (body, soul and spirit), or "all things", "all kinds of men, be it in all tongues, or in all ages, or all degrees or honours, or all diversities of national abilities, or all professions of lawful and useful crafts, and whatever else may be said as touching the innumerable differences by which men differ one from another".³

Commenting on John 15:17-19 Augustine equates the 'world' with the Church and says that this is the 'world' of II Cor. 5:21, John 3:17 and I John 2:2. He says:

The church then is the whole world, and the whole world hates the church: so then, world hates world: the world at enmity, the world reconciled, the condemned the saved, the polluted the cleansed,... (He) elected a world out of a world.⁴

1. Homily on Psalms 96 (Latin 95), Section 15. On Augustine's use of 'all' and 'world', see Browne p.1240, and Browne's footnote to Augustine's Homilies on John, p.855.
3. Ibid.
4. Ibid.
This is a typical Augustinian paradox, similar to his paradox of grace (that God both loves and hates men at the same time). *'

We have mentioned elsewhere Calvin's uses of 'all' in the Timothy epistles (see appended excursus). Luther also spoke in a similar fashion. Soon after the Reformation we find some extreme examples of interpreting universalist language in a non-Universalist fashion. In the Amyraldian controversy Spanheim took the 'all' of such passages as 1 Tim. 2 to mean "generally and indiscriminately" many of all classes but not literally all of all classes, as held by Amyraut. Spanheim charged Amyraut with failure to distinguish between "an indefinite and a universal proposition". This was generally the tenor of High Calvinism. That is, they contended that statements such as "Christ died for sinners" are indefinite and are not to be interpreted as universal, such as "Christ died for all sinners".

Now Calvinistic Universalists and Dualists agree that 'all' and 'world' sometimes have the meaning of 'some of all sorts' and 'the world taken in a general but not inclusive sense'. They deny, for instance, that God will pour out His spirit upon each and every man on earth. Acts 2:17 ("I will pour out of my Spirit upon all flesh") simply means that God will pour out His Spirit upon some of all sorts, with no distinction of class, race, sex etc. The context, they say, clearly admits this. But Universalists and Dualists deny that this use of 'all' must always prevail. When Paul says that "all have sinned" (Rom. 3:23), he clearly means literally each and every individual, for context reverses it and says "There is none righteous". So they argue that context determines the definition and extent of these terms, and these terms are used in the latter sense in the relevant texts about the atonement (1 Tim. 2:4, 1 John 2:2, etc.). This is especially evident in the passage in 1 Tim. 2 and they sometimes claim Calvin for support, though others feel Calvin's interpretation was unique. Does not Paul say that Christ died for all those whom God wishes (wills) to be saved? If then this speaks of the revealed will, and all parties agree that in the

Cont'd: ... 4. Homilies on John, Number 87, Sections 2 and 3 (pp.855-856).
5. See Chapter XI.
7. E.g., Baxter, Universal Redemption of Mankind, p.3.
revealed will God does indeed desire the salvation of each and every individual on earth, does this not prove that Christ died for each and every person? Is not the Gospel to be preached to all those for whom the Saviour died, equating these two classes? Particularists, especially of the Hyper-Calvinist variety, deny that this is the meaning of these texts. The atonement, for all practical purposes, is really of a secondary nature in the Gospel, at least in the Universal sense. They generally contend that the I Tim. 2 passage concerns the secret will rather than the revealed will, even though both prayer and atonement are mentioned. Some solve the problem by agreeing that the passage speaks of the revealed will but redefine the 'all' to mean 'some of all sorts' or 'all the elect'. Similar expositions occur with the 'world' passages.

Saltmarsh rejected the equation of 'world' with 'the elect' in any instance. Crisp, however, takes the High Calvinist option. I John 2:2, he says, speaks of "all the sins of all his elect people at once, both Gentiles as well as Jews, even to the end of the world". The whole world' means "many of all sorts". He denies "the universality of redemption unto all particular persons in the world", for "universality is nothing else but a concurrence of all particulars met together". Titus 2:11 means "not every particular man in the world; (for it is manifest, that all shall not be saved) but some of all sorts of men". Of II Cor. 5:14, Crisp says:

he puts emphasis upon the word all; and that emphasis is not spoken simply, but relatively and comparatively; as much to say, It is not only the Jews (who) have part in the death of Christ, but all have a part in it ... that is, all his people have a part in that death.

This is no different from the High Calvinists. Owen, for one, often

8. Free Grace, p.200. It has always been popular amongst Federalists to make this equation - e.g. Witsius, Economy, vol.I, pp.229ff.
made 'all' mean 'some of all sorts' in relation to the atonement. Moreover, said Owen,

... the Scriptures do not hold out anywhere that Christ died for this or that particular man as such, but only for sinners indefinitely, specified oftimes antecedently by God's purpose and consequently by their own purchased obedience.¹⁴

Ness denied that 'all' in this disputed passages literally means 'all'. He spoke of "the world of Gentiles".¹⁵ And examples of this sort from the Puritans could be multiplied.

When we compare these comments with those of Calvin in our appended excursus, it becomes apparent that there is a difference between Calvin and Particularists on the universal terms in relation to the atonement, the revealed will of God, and the Gospel. Both agree that the Gospel does not say that God wills any certain (that is, particular, individual) man to be saved, or that Christ died for this man or for that. Calvin says that this is why the Gospel is universal. It says that God wills salvation for literally all. It says that Christ died for literally all. The Gospel is to be preached to literally all, for preachers do not know which individuals are elect and which are not. We call attention to Calvin's warning that if one limits the 'all' of the atonement, then one limits the revealed salvific will of God, which necessarily infringes on the preaching of the Gospel and diminishes the "hope of salvation" of those to whom the Gospel is preached. Both High and Hyper-Calvinists fell prey to Calvin's warning. The former limited the atonement and opened the door to limiting the revealed will that all be saved. Hyper-Calvinists went through that door and logically diminished the Gospel ministry and content.

Hussey took 'all' often as meaning "all who have their election of God".¹⁶ Though there is a 'general love' of God for literally all, John 3:16 does not teach universal atonement, for the second clause limits the whole verse to those who believe — namely, the elect.¹⁷

¹⁵ Ness, pp. 52-57.
¹⁷ Glory, p. 646.
Gill elaborated the limitations of 'all' even further and often at great length. While admitting that "There are several passages of scripture, which at first sight, may seem to countenance the universal scheme", he was forced by Particularist premisses and logic to abandon his usually literal hermeneutic and deny the plain sense of Scripture. Of 'world' he has several elaborate discussions, including the following:

In the writings of the apostle John, the word world admits of a variety of senses; and therefore the sense of it in one place cannot be the rule for the interpretation of it in another; which can only be fixed as the text or context determine: sometimes it signifies the whole universe of created beings, John i.10; sometimes the inhabitable earth, John xvi.28; sometimes the inhabitants of it, John i.10; sometimes unconverted persons, both elect and reprobate, John xv.19; sometimes the worser part of the world, the wicked, John xvii.9; sometimes the better part, the elect, John 1.29, and vi.33, 51; sometimes a number of persons, and that a small one in comparison of the rest of mankind, John xil.19 ... the word world is always used in the apostle John's writings in a restrictive and limited sense, for some only ... and that it is never used to signify every individual of mankind that has been, is, or shall be, in the world ..

For Gill, "The word 'world' is an ambiguous one". But he still insists on limiting it in the disputed passages to meanings like "the world of God's elect" or "all that believe". When Christ came, "a new world began". Gill places much importance on the rabbinic equation of 'world' and 'whole world' with 'Gentiles', though in one place he equates 'world' with 'the Jewish world'.

---

19. This is not to ignore his allegorizing, though. See Chapter II.
22. E.g., Body, p.191; S & T1, vol.III, p.115. So also Gadsby, Works, vol.I, p.151. H.A. Long: "the elect are the world, though the world are not the elect" (p.67).
24. Comm on II Kings 17:37. The early Hussey interpreted II Cor. 5:19 and I John 2:2 as meaning, "all ages, all times of the world" (Gospel-Feast, p.148).
Gill then interprets 1 John 2:2 in this limited fashion. Universalists contend that this goes against the context. I John, they argue, says nothing of the Jew-Gentile differences but speaks at length of the differences between believers and unbelievers (the 'world'). Some point out that 'the whole world' is used only once more in 1 John - in 5:19, which clearly means unbelievers ('the whole world lieth in the evil one'). They also compare Matt. 16:26, 26:13, Mark 16:15, and Rom. 1:8.27

Gill also interprets 'every' in this manner in some places. Sometimes it means "the greatest part of them".28 Such terms as 'every' and 'all', says Gill, are often "to be understood either hypobolically, or of the greater part thereof".29 This applies especially to 'all', which can be "taken in a limited and restrained sense, for some, or some of all sorts".30 "... by 'all the earth' is meant the inhabitants of it, and only them, and those the more principal."31 "All Christians are not all men, and all men are not Christians."32 Gill agrees with Whitby's statement that "all men certainly are many, yet many are not necessarily all."33 To Gill, 'many' sometimes means "a multitude, and sometimes only a part of a multitude".34 Curiously, Gill elsewhere admits that "Many can never design a few only",35 though the Particularist argument is that 'many' in Matt. 20:28 means 'a few, as opposed to all'. Gill would deny Calvin's equating 'many' with 'all' in several passages.36

32. Cause, p.160.
34. Comm on I Tim. 2:5; Cause, p.51.
35. The Resurrection (1814 ed.), p.369. Particularists contend that, though Christ died for a small proportion of mankind, yet that number is very large in itself. Sawyer (pp.143, 317) and Windridge (p.281), among others, explicitly state that Christ died for millions of persons.
36. See appended excursus. We will only mention in passing that Particularists usually take 'many' in certain soteriological passages to mean 'some' and not all, whereas Universalists and Dualists take it to mean 'all'. Stevens summed up the Particularist view: "He bore all the sins of many, but not the many sins of all" (The Sinlessness of Jesus, p.10). Thus, they take 'all' ... Cont'd.
As for I Tim. 2, Gill takes 'all' in the restricted sense to mean "the whole election of grace throughout the whole world". The passage speaks of the secret will of God, not the revealed will, "unless there be two contrary wills in God".

Universalists, as we said, agree with Gill's statement that "the word 'all' does not always design every individual of mankind". Yet they stringently deny that 'all' ever means 'a few' or 'the elect'. They say that in passages dealing with sin, atonement and the will of God, 'all' means 'literally all'.

Gill encountered difficulty on another matter. We mentioned earlier the problem of distinguishing between "an indefinite and a universal proposition" in the controversy between Amyraut and Spanheim. Gill admitted that

the word 'all' is not in the Hebrew text, in Deut. 27:26, but is manifestly implied, an indefinite proposition being equal to an universal one.

Gill fails to see how this hermeneutical axiom contradicts his interpretation of several indefinite propositions elsewhere in Scripture. He does not accept indefinite propositions such as "Christ died for sinners" in a universal way ("Christ died for all sinners"). On the other hand, he is quick to point out that many of the uses of 'all' are merely hyperbolical. Compare also his views on metonymy:

it is true of some among them, in a spiritual and evangelic sense, and so, by a figure, the whole is put for a part,

Cont'd... to mean 'many', and 'many' to mean 'some' or 'a few'. Some critics compare this with the manner in which Post-Millenialists take 'few' to mean 'many' with respect to the number of those who will be saved in relation to those who will be damned, according to Matt. 7:13-14, etc. Most Particularists feel that the number of the saved will be less than that of the damned, but is still quite large. Wells, therefore, concludes that Christ died for millions of persons (Vale, p.87).

38. Cf. Chapters III and VIII.
39. Cause, p.38. All schools concerned do admit, however, that in certain Scriptures, "All means all" (e.g. Popham, Sermons, vol.II, p.147).
as sometimes the part is for the whole."

Universalists agree that Scripture contains both hyperbole and metonymy but deny that the word 'all' is to be taken in either sense when speaking of the atonement. The burden of proof, they say, falls on the Particularists to show that the context demands that the literal sense be rejected.

Much of what is at stake is the governing Particularist principle that God deals with men as individuals and particular persons only after the double decree. This means that in the creation decree God deals with all men alike, but then particularism enters in. Sublapsarians say that God still deals with men universally in the decree of the Fall, but Particularists hold that the double decree of election and reprobation precedes that decree. In any case, after the double decree God deals with men either as elect or as reprobate. The logical conclusion is that all those in the decree of election necessarily receive the decrees of atonement, faith and glorification.

As for the Gospel, Gill agreed with Calvin that it is "general, and not particular" but means something much different by this. When Gill says it is 'general', he does not mean 'Universal'. His Gospel consists of vague propositions, many applying to literally all but many stated with such Particularist limitations that the hearer has no ground to believe that God loves him or that Christ died for him.

Later High and Hyper-Calvinists continued to employ similar restrictions when discussing the Scripture texts in question.

44. Cause, pp.31-32.
ANTINOMIANISM

A. BACKGROUND

To understand the charge that Hyper-Calvinism is — or finds its roots in — Antinomianism, we must first briefly survey the history of what has been termed 'Antinomianism', with special emphasis on the Calvinistic kind.

One writer has said that "Antinomianism ... is a possibility open only to the Christian". Indeed, John Gill commented that the first Christians (especially Paul) and even Christ Himself were accused of Antinomianism. The Hyper-Calvinists defended themselves as merely being in the same tradition. To them, being faithful to doctrine meant exposing oneself to the accusation of Antinomianism and libertinism. But they also recognized that church history has seen many examples of unbiblical Antinomianism. Gill and Skepp mention the early Gnostics.

The Reformation saw three Antinomian controversies: the teachings of Agricola, the Swiss Libertines, and the Munster uprising. Agricola is often cited as the first 'Antinomian', a term possibly coined by Luther.
Gill seems to have defended Agricola, but he had some reservations. On the other hand, Luther himself was labelled in this way by some of his opponents because of his doctrine of justification by faith alone. Calvin and subsequent Calvinists have been similarly characterised because of their emphasis on salvation by grace alone. Calvin differentiated his teaching from that of the Swiss Libertines, who lingered on the fringes of the Swiss Reformation and had some things in common with the more radical Anabaptists. Since then, Baptist Calvinists have often been associated with or accused of Antinomianism. As for the Munster uprising, it is curious that Gill places the blame on the paedo-baptists rather than on the Anabaptists.

There was also a controversy in New England in the 1630's involving John Cotton, Mrs. Anne Hutchinson, Thomas Hooker and others. This prepared the way for the controversy most relevant to our discussion. This one occurred in the 1640s in England. The first of these Antinomians was either Tobias Crisp or John Eaton. Eaton was older.

Cont'd:


8. Cf. Gill, Cause, p.200; Huehns, p.31; Fuhrman, p.6. Gadsby: "I have no doubt that if that eminent man of God, the great reformer Luther lived in our day, he would be stigmatised as a bitter-spirited Antinomian" (Works, vol.I, p.267. Cf. p.269).

9. E.g., Bourn, The Birmingham Dialogue, Part II, pp.83ff. Wilks called Calvin a 'high Calvinist' and an 'Antinomian' - terms which are equivalent to 'Hyper-Calvinist' and ones which Wilks applied to himself (p.113).

10. See Calvin's Treatises Against the Anabaptists and Against the Libertines; and Verhey and Wilkie, 'Calvin's Treatise "Against the Libertines"', in Calvin Theological Journal, vol.15, no.2 (Nov., 1980), pp.190-219. The controversy is discussed in most biographies of Calvin.


13. On this controversy, see Iain Murray, 'Antinomianism', pp.7-75; Campbell, 'Antinomian Controversies', pp.61-70; Stoever, The Covenant of Works in Puritan Theology: The Antinomian Crisis in New England; Pettit, The Heart Prepared; the several works of Perry Miller, and relevant sections in Kendall, Kevan, Mather, etc.

but Crisp's writings were more influential. The other leading persons were John Saltmarsh, Robert Towne and William Dell. Lesser names include Randall, Bath, Lancaster, Simpson, Haydon, Emerson, Erbury, Penn, Denne, Hobson, and Richardson. The most influential works were Christ Alone Exalted, being the collected works of Tobias Crisp; The Honeycombe of True Justification by Eaton; Free Grace by Saltmarsh; and The Assertion of Grace and A Re-Assertion of Grace by Towne. All of the aforementioned strongly denied the suggestions of libertinism. Their opponents included Samuel Rutherford, Richard Baxter, Stephen Geree, Thomas Gataker, Thomas Bedford, John Benbrigge, Thomas Bakewell, and the Westminster Assembly, which proposed to burn Crisp's Christ Alone Exalted.

These Antinomians were usually Independents and therefore had some influence in Cromwell's New Model Army. They never formed an organized church, says Huehns in her important study, but there were a few organized sects on the sidelines which were also labelled Antinomian. These included the Familists (the Family of Love), the Ranters, the Loists, the Levellers and the Quakers. Strictly speaking,

Cont'd:...
Crisp's sermons were published posthumously in CAE, while Eaton's Honeycombe was a more systematic treatment.

15. Lists are found in Kevan, p.25; Gill, S & T, vol.III, p.3; Rutherford, The Spiritual Anti-Christ, Part I, p.193; Baxter, Apology, Preface; Young, op. cit., pp.276-277. Other sources list Eyre, Cradock and Vavasor Powell. Most of them are mentioned in the standard works on the Puritans (Neal, Brook, etc.), but there is a great need for fresh and unbiased treatment of the Antinomians. Kevan's The Grace of Law is the most extensive recent effort, but in it he confines his discussion to the Antinomians in relation to mainstream Puritans regarding the Law. Hoeksema's brief comments are worth consulting, for though he is not in complete agreement with them he admits that they were greatly maligned and contained more truth than many of their critics have recognized (TK, vol.III, pp.27-29, 443-447).


17. See the entries in our bibliography, Copinger's extensive bibliography on Calvinism and Arminianism lists at least fifty-two books, tracts and articles written against Crisp alone. See also the entries for the Antinomians in the British Library Catalogue and those in the studies mentioned above. Some of the anti-Antinomian efforts were extremely polemical, often scurrilous in nature, sometimes based merely upon rumours. More temperate was the comment of the great William Twisse, Prolocutor of the Westminster Assembly, who said that he "had read Dr. Crisp's sermons, and could give no reason why they were opposed; but because so many were converted by his ministry, and so few by ours" (quoted in Brook, Lives, vol.II, p.473).

18. In addition to the excellent studies of Solt and Huehns, see also L.F. Brown, The Political Activities of the Baptists and Fifth Monarchy Men in England During the Interregnum.


20. See Kerr, Henry Nicholas and the Familists; Williams, The Radical Reformation, pp.351, 477-485; Rutherford, The Spiritual Antichrist; and the encyclopaedias.
however, the aforementioned writers should be classed with the Puritans rather than with these sects. They all considered themselves Calvinists. Saltmarsh, for instance, classed himself with Preston, Rogers, Sibbes, Perkins, Calvin, Gataker(!), Goodwin, Bolton and Palmer. The Antinomians were indeed Puritans. The mainstream Puritans, as represented by the Westminster Assembly and their later followers, however, placed themselves in the centre between the equally extreme errors of Antinomianism and Arminianism. But this was a distortion of the facts. Puritan Federalism (High Calvinism) had far more in common with doctrinal Antinomianism than it did with any form of Arminianism. By setting up this perspective, the Federalists sought to show that they were balanced and free from extremes, and that Antinomianism was a more serious threat than it actually was.

The correct positioning would be to place High Calvinism between Antinomianism on the one hand and Low Calvinism on the other (this is not, however, to evaluate which is most Biblical). Soon there would be two other theologies to add to this framework: Neo-Nomianism extended the borders of Low Calvinism even lower and Hyper-Calvinism took Antinomianism even higher. This took place at the end of the Puritan era in the 1690's. Baxter and Williams reacted against Antinomianism and were responsible for Neo-Nomianism. Three parties soon arose in


22. This has been admitted by a few: Kevan, p.22; Rutherford, op. cit., Part II, p.30; Samuel Crisp, in CAE, vol.I, p.xi. Contrarily, this has been denied by a number of Calvinists in the tradition of the Westminster Assembly. Gospel Standard Antinomians consider themselves in the tradition of the Puritans by and large, as Popham: "The old Puritans were wiser than we are" (Sermons, vol.II, p.197). Critics wryly agree with Popham's comment. See Chapter II.


24. On the 1690's Antinomian-Neo-Nomian Controversy, see Orme, in Baxter, Works, vol.I, pp.660-679; R.T. Jones, pp.114-119; Campbell, 'Antinomian Controversies', pp.76-77; Colligan, pp.9-18; Toon, PC, pp.85-106. See our bibliography under the names listed above, as well as Beverley, Thomas Edwards, and 'A Lover of Truth and Accommodation'. Though Richard Baxter and Samuel Crisp's names are well known, the real leaders were Daniel Williams on the one side and Isaac Chauncey on the other, for Baxter was quite old and died during the controversy and Samuel Crisp did not produce as scholarly works as Chauncey. Saltmarsh's Free Grace was also reprinted at this time, but it did not evoke as much controversy as the reprinting of Crisp's CAE. Traill said that the controversy began before the reprinting of Crisp, not as a result of it, though it certainly stirred up matters (Works, vol.I, p.252).
the controversy: the Neonomians, or Anti-Antinomians (Baxter, Williams et al); the Antinomians, or Anti-Neonomians (Davis, Hussey, Chauncey, Samuel Crisp, Traill, possibly Skepp, and others); and the Moderates, who were basically High Calvinists and who attempted to mediate in the dispute (Witsius was most prominent). Much confusion arose when twelve prominent High Calvinist divines signed a statement signifying that the reprint of Christ Alone Exalted was accurate. The statement was published in the reprint. Some of the Neonomians thought that it was an acceptance of Antinomianism whereas, in fact, it was merely a verification that the reprint was accurate and added no substantial variation from the original; it neither endorsed nor condemned Crisp. The twelve were: George Griffith, George Cokryn, Isaac Chauncey, John Howe, Vincent Alsop, Nathaniel Mather, Increase Mather, Hanserd Knollys, Thomas Powell, John Turner, Richard Bures and John Gammon. Soon Chauncey became a leading Anti-Neonomian, possibly even an Antinomian, but he does not appear to have become a Hyper-Calvinist. Benjamin Keach was a prominent divine at this time but took no major part in the controversy, though he was labelled Antinomian (possibly by Socinians) because of his views on justification. The issues in this second English Antinomian Controversy were much the same as in the earlier one: the Covenant of Grace, the imputation of the elect's sin to Christ and Christ's righteousness to the elect, assurance and faith, the use of the Law and so on. But a new issue arose which signalled the beginning of Hyper-Calvinism. That was the free offer question.

25. Hussey is but one of several who used the term 'Anti-Antinomian' (e.g., Glory, pp.232, 501, 647).
26. See Maurice, Firmin, Rehokosht and Glass.
27. See Preface to Operations, p.viii and pp.312-313; Glory, pp.504-505.
29. Gill, DJ, p.43. See bibliographical entries under Witsius. Traill sometimes appeared to take the conciliatory line placing the truth between the errors of Arminianism and Antinomianism, while admitting that the former is more dangerous and widespread. Traill even felt that Rutherford and Burgess, two of Crisp's most bitter opponents in the 1640's, fought Crisp wrongly and would have changed their minds and defended him against Neonomianism (Works, vol.I, pp.253, 261-262, 279).
30. Cf. Toon, PC, p.102; HC, pp.49-50, 66. Baxter called this list "a decoy, when some of them abhor the Error of the Book, and know not what is in it, but yielded by surprize only to declare that they believed him that told them that the additions were a true copy" (Title-page of The Scripture Gospel Defended).
31. Keach, Display, p.V.
The third English Antinomian Controversy came to a head in the 1750's. John Gill reprinted Crisp's works yet again, only this time with an introduction and occasional footnotes which sought to defend Crisp by showing that his doctrines could be harmonized with orthodox Reformed theology. Much of Gill's work here was merely showing the context of Crisp's more unguarded statements. The controversy had begun at the same time as Thomas Boston defended and annotated the controversial Marrow of Modern Divinity, which fueled the Marrow Controversy in Scotland. Both of these controversies should be interpreted in the light of each other. Though the persons involved in each controversy mostly ignored the other controversy, there are important parallels. They surrounded the reprinting and annotation of books originally published in the 1640's. The same doctrines were debated. As for Gill, he defended Crisp with few reservations. Crisp was "falsely charged with Antinomianism", he said, for Crisp was a man "of great piety and learning, of long standing and much usefulness in the church of Christ, whose name and memory will be dear and precious to the saints".

The result was that Gill was classed as an Antinomian, at least a doctrinal one. Others have defended Gill from the charge. Of course, Gill denied the allegations of libertinism. The accusation was "a wicked calumny". Gross Antinomianism, he affirmed, is "odious". Part of the basis for the charge was his view of justification: that it was by imputed righteousness, is eternal, and is received solely by faith.

33. Kevan misdates this 1832, when CAE was later reprinted. Brine also took part in the controversy at this time. See his Antidote Against a Spreading Antinomian Principle and Sin Reigns Not.
34. This is unfortunately ignored by Lachman in his otherwise excellent work on the Marrow Controversy. Toon also tends to overlook it, while Kevan devotes more space to it. The Marrow explicitly rejected the Antinomianism of Crisp and Eaton (e.g., pp.166, 168).
39. Preface to Davis, Hyams, p.IV.
42. Cause, p.200.
His kind of Calvinism, particularly the emphasis on free grace, were said to lead to licentiousness, but he also denied this in strongest terms. Others referred to his views about the Jewish Covenants and the ceremonial law. Gill often denied all charges in a controversial manner. For example:

If this is to be an Antinomian, I am quite content to be called one; such bug-bear names do not frighten me.

I am a Baptist, he may call me , if he pleases, a new Baptist, or an old Calvinistic one, or an Antinomian; it is a very trifle to me by what name I go.

[ I ] had chosen to suffer reproach, the loss of good name and reputation, to forego popularity, wealth and friends, yea to be traduced as an Antinomian, rather than to drop or conceal, any branch of truth respecting Christ and free grace.

From Gill's perspective, he was being persecuted because of his stand for the Gospel, which was the case with most other true preachers. His three main responses were sermons: 'The Doctrine of Grace Cleared from the Charge of Licentiousness'; 'The Law Established by the Gospel'; and 'The Law in the Hands of Christ'. One of his opponents (Mayo) claimed that Gill set aside the Law in his unprinted sermons, not in the printed ones. Another contemporary writer replied that Mayo had misrepresented and misquoted Gill's unpublished sermons.

Gill's main opponents were the Arminians. Coppedge contends that Wesley reacted against Calvinistic Antinomianism by formulating the doctrine of Christian Perfection. Gill, on the other hand, labelled as

43. E.g., Comm on Rev. 3:3; S & T¹, vol.II, p.25.
44. S & T¹, vol.II, p.413. See Section E below.
45. Ibid.
47. Quoted in Rippon, p.xxiii.
49. All of these are found in S & T¹, vol.I, S & T¹, vol.I.
52. Coppedge, p.317. There was also the Antinomianism of certain elements of Moravianism at this... Cont'd.
Antinomian the Neonomians, Arminians, Socinians and especially the Deists because they compromised the Biblical doctrine of justice and rejected the high doctrines of sovereignty and grace. Fuller and Brine said the same thing. Toplady claimed that Wesley's Perfectionism led to libertinism. Because there was so much libertinism among the Arminian Methodists, said Toplady, they felt that everyone else (especially the Calvinists) had the same plague.

It should be remembered that much of the debate between the Hyper-Calvinists and the Deists paralleled that between the Stoics and Epicureans. Gill felt that Deism was licentious: "Wherefore they are the libertines of the age, who in any period, as the followers of Epicurus, deny the providence of God". Deists such as Samuel Chandler thought that God Himself was subject to a higher law of 'moral fitness' inherent in all being, and Gill charged that this set aside God's Law as the true standard of morality and was therefore libertine. Consequently, Deists are notorious for riotous living and lack of real morality. Deists in turn replied that Calvinism led to Antinomianism through determinism, imputed righteousness and other doctrines. Such, for example, was the accusation of Samuel Bourn. Yet the record shows that the Stoic Calvinists lived far more moral lives (at least outwardly) than the Epicurean Deists.

Alverey Jackson claimed that the non-offer Calvinists had much in common with the Deists. Fuller made similar contentions, though like most Calvinists of the day he felt called upon to defend the Reformed faith from the charge of Antinomianism. The Particular (or

Cont'd:...

59. Jackson, Question, pp.52, 56.
Calvinistic) Baptists were especially open to the charge, for the majority of them were in the grip of Hyper-Calvinism. Brine, like Gill, was accused. And like Gill, he denied it. The Moderate Calvinists were sometimes accused but did much to expose what they thought was a revival of the Antinomianism in the form of Hyper-Calvinism. See, for instance, Fuller, Rippon, and the younger Ryland. All parties involved in the controversy, then, were both accusers and defendants.

The fourth Antinomian Controversy arose at the end of the eighteenth and the beginning of the nineteenth centuries. William Huntington reprinted Saltmarsh's Free Grace in 1792 with a recommendatory preface and otherwise taught similar doctrines. The controversy coalesced further with the Gospel Standard Baptists and the anti-missionary movement. Prominent at this time were Gadsby, Philpot, Rushton, Wilks, and Hawker. As others before them, they denied the charges of practical Antinomianism, though some of them admitted to being doctrinal or 'Modern' Antinomians. And it is no surprise that Crisp's

63. Motives, pp.46, 53.
66. See entries in our bibliography under each of these and all in the Gospel Standard circle. Hawker and Wilks were not, strictly speaking, of the same association but nevertheless represented a form of doctrinal Antinomianism. The school of Stevens, however, vigorously opposed doctrinal Antinomianism. See Palmer, Law and Gospel Considered; Stevens, Doctrinal Antinomianism Refuted, and The Review Reviewed. Other opponents included Maria De Fleury, Henry Hart, Gawthorn, and those listed in Chapter I above. Huntington was clearly the leader from 1780 until his death, when the role fell to Gadsby ("the king of the Antinomians" - John Gadsby, Memoir of Gadsby, p.64. Cf. pp.38, 49, 58, 64, 76, 77, 78, 83, 94, 108). The role then was assumed by Philpot and then Popham, but neither maintained the same vigour as either Huntington or Gadsby. It is curious that the Gospel Standard Baptists think so highly of Huntington in this regard, for the 'Coal-heaver' was not a Baptist, much less a Strict Baptist, and the Gospel Standard tradition has always been polemically Strict Baptist. This is not to say that all Strict Baptists have been doctrinal Antinomians. The peculiar views of James Wells will be discussed in Sections C and D below; in certain respects they were the most extreme of all.
68. Wilks, pp.11, 304, etc. See Section B below.
works were again reprinted (1832).

This covers the main controversies. But just what is 'Antinomianism'? How should it be defined? Has the term always been used in the same way? Is there a connection between the Antinomianism of Crisp and the Hyper-Calvinism of Gill and the others? To answer these questions we turn to the next section.
B. DEFINITION OF ANTINOMIANISM

Some writers have equated Hyper-Calvinism with Antinomianism.¹ Defendants sometimes claim that those who make this charge either have not tried to find out what Antinomianism is or have not read the works of those whom they accuse.² These claims are often true. Confusion and misunderstanding mar many of the discussions. Even so, a common thread can be discerned in the writings of the 'Antinomians' and most of their critics.

Our opinion is that there is considerable overlap between the Antinomianism of Crisp, the Federalism of Westminster and the Hyper-Calvinism of Gill. Each of them shared something in common with each of the other two against the third. For example, Westminster and Crisp accepted the 'free offer' doctrine. What Crisp taught is Antinomianism proper, but what he had in common with Gill can also be considered a form of Antinomianism. The overlap between these two is the subject of this section.

Torbert, the Baptist historian, calls Gill's theology an "Antinomian perversion of Calvinistic doctrine".³ Nuttall goes further:

---

1. Orme, in Baxter, Works, vol.I, p.676; McLintock and Strong, Cyclopaedia, vol.I, p.265; Cole, Preface to Calvin, Calvin's Calvinism, p.10; R.T. Jones, p.115; Underwood, p.133; Fern, Encyclopaedia of Religion, p.29; Wilks, pp.14, 113; Engelsma, pp.132-133, 135-137, 141; E.S. Williams, Systematic Theology, vol.I, p.233; Pink, Gleanings from the Scriptures, p.271-272; Election and Justification, p.237. Daniel Steele equated 'ultra-Calvinism' with 'Antinomianisol (Antinomianism Revived, pp.38-39). Commenting on the 1640's Antinomians, William Young notes: "They were not hyper-Calvinists, however, in the ordinary sense of the much-abused term, notwithstanding their influence on such writers as Gill and Huntington" (Encyclopaedia of Christianity, vol.I, p.276. Cf. p.272). So also Geoffrey Williams, Appendix to Warburton, Mercies, pp.247-248. Oliver follows up on this by observing that Huntington combined doctrinal Antinomianism with Hyper-Calvinist theology ('Survey', p.13). Our judgement is that not all doctrinal Antinomians have been Hyper-Calvinists, so not all Hyper-Calvinists have been doctrinal Antinomians. The most extreme representatives from both camps are the ones who are both. Hoeksema comments on the Antinomians as "high", "higher" and "so-called higher Calvinists" are notable, coming from his own form of Hyperism (IX, vol.III, pp.445-446).

2. E.g., Green, 'Biography', p.X.

3. Torbert, p.68. Gawthorn feels that Antinomianism constitutes that body of doctrine held by some Calvinists above that normally held by most other Calvinists (Coincidence of Antinomianism and Arminianism, pp.7-8). The Arminian John Fletcher charged, "speculative antinomianism, and barefaced Calvinism, are one and the same thing", but he was quick to point out that there are several varieties of Calvinism and Arminianism (Works, vol.II, p.88. Cf. pp.93, 94, 190; and Chapter XII). The present chapter is mostly concerned with Calvinistic Antinomianism, or Antinomian Calvinism. As much as the more moderate Calvinists would reject these terms as inherently self-contradictory, we hope to show that they are accurate descriptions of certain extreme varieties of Calvinism.
Antinomiansm is not Calvinism; but it is Calvinism's peril. Every religious system has its perils... So Calvinism can degenerate in antinomianism of a dry, doctrinal kind... The curious thing is that Calvinism's opposite, whether Arminianism, universalism or enthusiasm, can also degenerate into antinomianism, though of a more practical kind.

He is correct in asserting that Hyper-Calvinistic Antinomianism is often doctrinal and, we feel, dry. But Nuttall overlooks the enormous affinity that exists between this system and the High Calvinism of Westminster. His last point is significant, that Calvinistic Antinomianism is theoretical while Arminian Antinomianism tends to be practical. Some Arminians may dispute this. Nuttall also claims that the system arose from the emphasis on logic. Other critics contend that it arose from the stress laid on the 'high' doctrine of Federalism and that, in fact, there is no substantial difference between Westminster, Crisp and Gill. We share that conviction. Yet we add that the special emphasis merits investigation and should not be overlooked.

The special emphasis is evident in Crisp's bold literary style. His loose and unguarded statements in this area were easily misunderstood, especially when read out of context, as is often done by his antagonists (e.g. Rutherford and Gataker). Even Gill and Gadsby felt that Crisp's language was too unguarded. Some of the other Antinomians employed paradoxes which lend themselves easily to misunderstanding. One instance is Towne:

I am a sinner and no sinner. Daily I fall in myself and stand in Christ forever. My works fail, his never can, and

4. Nuttall, 'Calvinism in Free Church History', p.425. Cf. Candlish, Extent, p.132. Abraham Taylor: "they must be poor champions against the Arminians, who cannot keep from running into what directly tends to Antinomians" (Address, p.13). Robert Traill had written a similar evaluation during the Neonomian Controversy, adding that those who over-react against Arminianism through the heat of debate and hatred of the opposing scheme, are matched by Arminians who do the same in reverse (Works, vol.I, p.279). On the history of how these factions over-reacted in doctrine and in history, see Alan Sell's brief but excellent The Great Debate.


... Cont'd:
Some may suggest that 'Antinomian' is a derivation from 'antinomy' in the sense of paradox, but this is not entirely correct. The suggestion, however, does correctly point out that the Antinomian methodology was one of paradox and mystery, whereas that of Westminster was more of logic. But we would point out that Hyper-Calvinism employed logic probably more than Westminster.

The root meaning of 'Antinomian' is 'against law'. It comes from the Greek words 'anti' (against, or in place of) and 'nomos' (law). Fuller: "What is Antinomianism? Enmity or opposition to the law of God. Are not all men then by nature Antinomians? I believe they are". He applies this to the Calvinistic Antinomians and Hyper-Calvinists because they "profess to renounce the moral law as a rule of conduct, and maintain that as believers in Christ they are delivered from it". Other detailed definitions can be found in the many exposés. Wesley named three characteristics, Kevan lists five, Bedford six, Huehns seven, Flavel ten, the Marrow of Modern Divinity six ('Antinomian paradoxes'), Wilks eight, and William Young twenty. The definitions are quite similar.

Critics often differentiate doctrinal and practical Antinomianism.
Some feel that the former sometimes leads to the latter, but most agree that the leading Antinomians themselves were not practical Antinomians. Practical Antinomianism is usually defined as 'libertinism' and 'licentiousness'. The doctrinal Antinomians naturally denied that their system was either of these. Gill, for one, distinguished between 'liberty' and 'licence', though he accepted that practical Antinomianism is the same as 'libertinism'. 'Libertarian' is another similar term employed, but it is generally used to denote those who believed in free-will. It also had a political connotation with the Deists (see Section E). 'Libertine' was a difficult word. Usually it had a derogatory connotation, but note what Crisp said in his typically bold style:

To be called a libertine, is the most glorious title under heaven... I do not say, to be made a libertine in the corrupt sense of it, but to be one in the true and proper sense of it.

Fuller commented: "many people have been called Antinomians; yet very few call themselves so". Some examples are interesting and appropriate to quote. Wilks: "my theological tenets, are Antinomian in the extreme". Spurgeon: "I am rather fond of being called an

Cont'd:...

Antinomians (i.e. Hypers), and doctrinal Antinomians are not libertines. Therefore the division is misleading because it associates the two, overlooking the fact that one does as he believes. Cf. Wilks, pp.56-67.

16. Cf. Coppedge, pp.317-318; Cole, Preface to Calvin, Calvin's Calvinism, p.10; Robison, pp.iii-iv, 71-72; Kevan, pp.25, 28. John Fletcher, a vigorous opponent of both forms of Antinomianism, admitted that 'speculative' does not always equal or lead to 'practical Antinomianism' (Works, vol.II, p.278).


Antinomian ... the term is generally applied to those who hold truth pretty firm, and will not let it go".\textsuperscript{23} Hussey: "A Gospel-Antinomian (such a one as I profess to be) is against the Law put into (Christ's) place... Now in the sense of the Gospel-Antinomian, I am, through grace abounding, a strict Antinomian... There is some orthodox sense in which a man may, and in which he must be an Antinomian..."\textsuperscript{24} On the other hand, Wilks says that some of his contemporary 'Modern Antinomians' felt that the term is non-descript and without meaning, and he disagreed with them.\textsuperscript{25} Gadsby felt that "Antinomian' is a kind of bugbear word to frighten people from the truth".\textsuperscript{26}

The word has several forms. Antinomianism is sometimes called 'Antinomism' or even 'Autonomianism'.\textsuperscript{27} The Antinomians were sometimes referred to as 'Antinomists'.\textsuperscript{28} Hussey and others sometimes used 'Anti' as an abbreviation.\textsuperscript{29} He was also but one of many to equate Antinomianism with 'Anti-Neonomianism',\textsuperscript{30} though some critics disagree with this because not all those against Neonomianism were Antinomians.\textsuperscript{31} Hussey also spoke of the Neonomians as 'Anti-
Antinomians', but not all who opposed Antinomianism were Neonomians (e.g., the other Low Calvinists, the Arminians, and the Deists). Of the 1690's controversy Wilson observes that "By adherents of Dr. Crisp it was called the Neonomian, and by the friends of Mr. Williams the Antinomian Controversy". Kevan: "Antinomian' is such a relative term, that Richard Baxter used it of almost all the Puritans who did not echo his Neonomianism". Confusion has always surrounded the uses of the words under discussion.

The Antinomian system has sometimes been labelled in terms of the leading writers (especially Crispianism and Gillism), and the adherents are sometimes spoken of in this way (Crispians, Gillists, Eatonists, Huntingtonians, etc.) In a sense this is the best manner of description since it points the student to the writings of certain individuals and maintains historical control. On the other hand, both the leaders and adherents of the system deny that the system is centred around men. They contend that their theology is mere Christianity. The same problems surround Calvinism in general and Hyper-Calvinism in particular. (For further on this, see our conclusion in Chapter XII.)

What are the distinctive tenets of this system? What doctrines are involved in the special emphasis of Crisp and Gill? What differentiates it from High Calvinism? One finds that suggestions generally fall in with the themes determining the outline of this thesis and the doctrines we have investigated in each chapter. Some critics point to the deterministic, neo-fatalistic theory of divine sovereignty. Spurgeon: "if I should declare that God so over-rules all things that man is not free enough to be responsible, I should be driven at once into Antinomianism or fatalism". Fuller roots it in the prying into the

Cont'd...

p.146 say that mainstream Puritanism was anti-Neonomian but not Antinomian.
32. E.g., Glory, pp.232, 501. Hussey charged that Anti-Antinomians do not know the meaning of grace (p.531).
34. Kevan, p.237.
35. Ellis: "it might even be that some haphazard reader, catching under his eye this formidable word 'Antinomian', may have supposed that it had something to do with the drug called antimony" (quoted in Iain Murray, 'Antinomianism', pp.31-32).
secret counsels of God, particularly with reference to the origin of sin. "The doctrine of necessity, as embraced by them, reduces man to a machine, destroys his accountableness, and casts the blame of sin upon his Creator." This points to the Supralapsarian question. Wilks boldly asserted that "modern Antinomianism is neither more nor less than superlapsarianism, and that superlapsarianism is modern Antinomianism." But this fails to account for the fact that Perkins, Beza and others were Supralapsarians but are rarely styled Antinomians. Flavel and Greaves associated the system with a high view of the Covenant of Grace. That is, the Covenant is seen as being solely intertrinitarian and not between God and man, being unconditional to man. Spurgeon also mentions election in this context but in a personal judgement. Antinomians "held that, because they believed themselves to be elect, they might live as they liked." Now Gill admitted to a high view of sovereignty but denied that it produced fatalism or libertinism. He admitted to being somewhat Stoic and replied:
How far soever the stoics carried their doctrine of fate and destiny, it is certain that they never thought it had a tendency to looseness of life; nor does it appear to have had any such influence upon them; for of all the sects of the philosophers, none were more addicted both to the love and practice of moral virtue, than this sect.\(^1\)

The Epicureans, not the Stoics, were the libertines. And the Deists, who followed the Epicurean doctrines in denying deterministic providence, were also libertines.\(^2\) As for election, Gill held that "the doctrine of election is no licentious doctrine; for though holiness is not the cause of it, yet as a means fixed in it, and is certain by it, and an evidence of it."\(^3\)

Hussey, Brine and Gill were considered Antinomian because of their doctrine of eternal union, even though they themselves denied that this doctrine produced libertinism.\(^4\) On the contrary, they felt that knowing that one had been and will always be united to Christ was part of the only real incentive to holiness. Perry Miller feels that basic to all forms of Antinomianism is "a common belief that the union of the elect with the Holy Ghost is immediate and intimate".\(^5\) Related to this is the suggestion that libertinism can be the result of the doctrine of full assurance of salvation,\(^6\) which is of the essence of faith,\(^7\) is given by the Holy Spirit,\(^8\) and is superior to the syllogism of sanctification.\(^9\)

Gill's reply implies 'Crisp's Incentive', viz:

... the doctrine of assurance is no licentious doctrine; no

---

\(^1\) Cause, p.194. Cf. Clark, Thales to Dewey, p.167. Moreover, in agreement with Plato, Gill believed that "a licence to sin, is the greatest punishment of sin" (Body, p.303).

\(^2\) Body, p.281.

\(^3\) Comm on Jude 1.


\(^5\) New England Mind: The Seventeenth Century, p.370. "Christ's entering into the heart by faith", said John Vinall, a Hyper-Calvinist, "is by many in our day styled Antinomianism" (in Ebenezer Vinall, Memoir of Vinall, p.67).


\(^8\) Cf. Crisp, EAC, vol.II, p.89; Toon, HC, p.28.

persons are so holy as those who are truly possessed of that grace; and as for such who pretend unto it, and live in sin, it is a certain thing that they in reality know nothing of it. 50

Recalling the controversies of the Reformation, we are not surprised to see Antinomianism associated with the doctrine of justification by faith without works of the Law. 51 But this was not the sole property of those whom we are studying. This is also the case with justification by imputed rather than infused righteousness. 52 More relevant are the accusations that eternal justification or justification before faith are definitive tenets of Antinomianism. Brine replied that one need not reject the doctrine of eternal justification because some of those holding it were licentious in their lives. 53 This implies not only that there were libertines of that order but also that they justified their behaviour by appealing to this doctrine.

Hoornbeck defined the system in terms of a two-tiered justification. There was active justification at the time of Christ's atonement and


53. Cf. Flavel, Works, vol. III, pp. 555-556; vol. VI, p. 261; Goodwin, Works, vol. IV, p. 277; Brine, E.J., p. 15; Gill, S. T., vol. II, p. 179; Mayo, p. 14; Fuller, Works, p. 345; Ivey, vol. III, pp. 136, 449; Kaven, p. 43; Toon, H.C., p. 28; PC, pp. 99-100; Berkouwer, Faith and Justification, p. 146; Pink, Election and Justification, p. 237. This is denied by William Young, op. cit., p. 272 (but see also p. 271). E.S. Williams wrongly says that Antinomianism believed in justification from the eternal counsel and Resurrection of Christ rather than by faith (Systematic Theology, vol. I, p. 233). Bellamy differentiated 'Gross Antinomians' from 'Refined Antinomians': the former taught eternal justification before faith, with faith merely being the sight that one has already been justified: the latter taught that all men, even the elect, are under wrath until they are justified by faith. See Works, vol. III, p. 118. Similarly, Wilks thought that 'Modern Antinomians' such as himself held to eternal justification, while 'Modern Calvinists' accepted justification in time (pp. 23-24. Cf. pp. 349, 380).


55. E.J., pp. 73-74.
passive justification in the application of in foro conscientiae.\textsuperscript{44} The curious point is that Hoornbeck thought that Crisp held to justification in foro dei at the time of the atonement rather than in the eternal Covenant. As we saw in Chapters V and VI, this was not specifically the case. Crisp held to the orthodox three-tiered system: Covenant, Resurrection, application. Moreover, neither Crisp nor Gill associate justification with atonement in the way suggested by Hoornbeck. R.T. Jones makes the same error in analysing Richard Davis, even suggesting that Davis held to universal atonement ("Humanity has been justified since the moment when Christ died").\textsuperscript{47}

On the other hand, there is some truth in the contention of Hoornbeck. The Particularists sometimes spoke of the atonement's perfection in such a way as to imply that the elect were fully redeemed and reconciled before they believed or even existed. But not all Particularists were Antinomians, and 'Crisp's Incentive' presents special problems in this regard. Toplady, Reed, Berkouwer, and others say that the Antinomians so emphasized the perfection of the work of Christ in redemption that the believer must be thoroughly passive in both justification and sanctification, with the result that personal holiness is compromised.\textsuperscript{50} Berkhof agrees and adds that this might be associated with Pi\textperbaris'\textsuperscript{51} view that Christ obeyed in the stead of the elect.\textsuperscript{48} Note the emphasis on substitution, which has always been a hallmark of Federalism. The Socinians opposed the doctrine of substitutionary atonement. Gill's response implies 'Crisp's Incentive',\textsuperscript{55} but he does not not explain how the atonement is an incentive to holiness in those who do not yet have the assurance that Christ died for them. Other writers connect Antinomianism with Crisp's 'Christ made sin' motif, usually by misunderstanding the doctrine.\textsuperscript{50} Others, as we have said, associate it with Christ's substitution in the Covenant and in not only obeying but


\textsuperscript{55} R.T. Jones, p.115.


\textsuperscript{57} Berkhof, Systematic Theology, p.543.

\textsuperscript{58} S & T', vol.I, p.313. This passage, quoted in Section C below, is found nearly verbatim in Body, p.488. The charge was made by the Socinian Racovian Catechism. See Hussey, Glory, p.501.

\textsuperscript{59} See, for example, Toon, PC, pp.99-100; Flavel, Works, vol.III, pp.556-557.
also believing and even repenting in the stead of the elect. 62

Moving on, we find that some define the system in terms of the non-offer position. 63 This is misleading, for the Antinomians of the 1640's all believed in the doctrine of the free offer. Only with the advent of Hyper-Calvinism in the 1690's can this tenet be correctly linked with Antinomianism. In opposing Neonomianism, Hussey labelled the 'free offer' practice as legal preaching, though in the end it is libertine because it substitutes the Gospel for the Law and makes the Gospel a new Law, which it is not. Says Hussey, "the foolishness of preaching" rather than offering is "the Antinomian Gospel". 64 On the other hand, there is a connection between Crisp and Hussey here. Crisp did not stress the use of the Law in preparing sinners for conversion, though he did not entirely rule it out. 65 By the time of the nineteenth century this degenerated into the Gospel Standard doctrine, which substituted the Gospel for the Law. In a sense, this is Antinomian if one remembers that the root of the term means both 'in the place of' as well as 'against' the Law. Hence, there is much truth in Runes's definition that, from Agricola onwards, Antinomianism in general "held that the gospel rather than the law is determinative in man's repentance". 66

That which is cited more than anything else in defining Antinomianism, however, is the use of the Law in the life of believers. 67 Toplady: "Men are or are not, to be styled Antinomians, with relation to the moral law". 68 The Oxford English Dictionary defines

64. Hussey, Operations, pp.312-313; Glory, pp.245, 293, 435, 647.
'Antinomian' as follows: "Opposed to the obligatoriness of the moral law; of or pertaining to the antinomians ... one who maintains that the moral law is not binding upon Christians, under the 'law of grace'". Gill defended himself from the charge according to this popular view, admitting that the definition is accurate: "For my part, I have been traduced as an Antinomian ... [But] I abhor the thoughts of setting the law of God aside as the rule of walk and conversation..." He also defended Crisp in the same way: "the Doctor owns the law is a rule for conversation, consequently [is] no Antinomian". Most of the rest of this chapter will investigate this aspect of Antinomianism, but let us add a few other aspects sometimes given as definitive.

The doctrine of free grace is one such aspect. Saltmarsh asked: "And shall we call every one Antinomian that speaks [of] Free Grace, or a little more freely than we do?" Crisp defended himself in a similar fashion: "Free grace therefore, even to sinners, is no licentious doctrine, nor doth it a jot maintain continuance in sin". Gill denied that true grace can be turned into licentiousness, though the doctrine of free grace can and sometimes is abused in this way:

... they may be said to turn it into lasciviousness, either by asserting it to be a licentious doctrine, when it is not; or by treating it in a wanton and ludicrous manner, scoffing at it, and lampooning it; or by making the doctrine of grace universal, extending it equally alike to all mankind, and thereby harden and encourage men in sin."

Sometimes Antinomianism is connected with an anti-semitic view of the covenants, while Fuller draws a different conclusion. "The quarrels between Antinomianism and Pharisaism", he says, "arise, I think, more from misunderstanding than from any real antipathy between

---

70. S & T', vol.II, p.179.
71. CAE, vol.II, p.82 note.
74. Cons on Jude 4. Cf. S & T', vol.II, pp.307-308; Cause, p.45; Rippon, p.xxiii. This is basically a charge against Arminianism.
75. E.g., Hussey, Glory, p.647; Gill, S & T', vol.II, p.413. See Section E below.
them". That is, "The distinguishing feature of this species of religion is selfishness". Finally, some have associated Antinomianism with the ecclesiastical polity of the Independents or Baptists. This sometimes has political overtones, but that too will be mentioned below.

Said Rabbi Duncan, "There is only one heresy, and that is Antinomianism".

76. Fuller, Works, p.338. Pink said that every sinner has the heart of an Antinomian and a Pharisee, for these two equal but opposite errors meet at the extreme (The Law and the Saint, p.3; Sermon on the Mount, p.60). So, similarly, Fletcher, Works, vol.II, pp.352-353. Thornwell notes that most Antinomians were formerly legalists who rejected legalism and over-reacted against it (Works, vol.II, pp.383-386). Philpot: "Antinomian presumption is the hydra of our professing day, the damning sin of Calvinists, as self-righteousness is of the Arminians" (Letters, p.145. Cf. Gadsby, Works, vol.II, p.245). He refers to practical, not doctrinal, Antinomians.


78. Quoted in William Young, op. cit., p.270.
C. DOCTRINAL ANTINOMIANISM

What do the Hyper-Calvinists and Antinomians teach about the Moral Law of God? Do they entirely set it aside? Has it no use today? Gill: "The preaching of the law is of use both to saints and sinners". Brine: "The Law is to be preached". Gadsby: "We believe it right to preach both law and gospel in the hearing of all that hear us". Even Crisp felt the same but he placed more qualifications on the preaching of the Law than did the mainstream Puritans. It was these qualifications that constituted the special emphasis of Antinomianism and differentiated the two higher schools from ordinary Federalism. They concern 'Crisp's Incentive'. But let us begin at the beginning.

According to Gill, "the moral law (is) still in force, which is a transcript of the nature and will of God". Therefore this Law determines whether an action is morally good or bad. Fuller later said, "If the law of God is right and good, and arises from the very nature of God, Antinomianism cannot stand". This would be true, felt Gill, if one equated Antinomianism with libertinism. But the debate is deeper than this.

One must consider the relationship of Law and Gospel. Gill says that, salvifically speaking, one must not mix Law and Gospel, or grace and works together. Historically, however, they are mixed:

4. CAE, vol. II, pp. 175-176. So also Eaton, Honeycombe, p. 126; Hoeksema, IK, vol. III, pp. 442-450. Hoeksema, therefore is incorrect in claiming that Antinomians do not preach the Law (ibid., p. 443). His error, however, is understandable in the light of certain bold statements, such as "Our commission is not to preach the Law, but the Gospel" (Johnson, Evangelical Truths Vindicated pp. xxiii, 74). Johnson is merely saying that we do not preach the Law without the Gospel, that the Law is not to be preached as the means of justification.
7. Quoted in Kirkby, p. 70.
8. S & T, vol. II, p. 10. Crisp said that the Law is subservient to, and prepared the way for, the Gospel (CAE, vol. II, pp. 397-398). Eaton often stated that the Law and the Gospel must not be intermingled or confused (e.g. Honeycombe, pp. 83-84, 86, 124). On the difference and similarities of Law and Gospel, see Palmer, Law and Gospel, pp. 8-12; Huntington, Excommunication, p. 34.
... there was an intermixture of law and gospel under the former dispensation, as there also is in the present one; they are interspersed in both testaments; though the law was more largely held forth than the gospel, under the former dispensation; and therefore we commonly call it the legal dispensation; and there is more of the gospel than of the law under the present dispensation; for which reason we call it the gospel dispensation; yet there are of each in both. 9

... there is an entire harmony and agreement between the Gospel and the law... what is contrary to the one, is also to the other. 16

As we saw in Chapter VIII, Gill had difficulty in differentiating the concepts of 'Law' and 'duty' and 'obligation'. At times he sounds as if he felt that believers are free from duty. "All duty and good works belong to the law." 11 "Preaching duty is preaching the law." 12 Since duty and obligation are synonymous, and since the denial of either of these constitutes Antinomianism (according to the popular definition 13), it appears that the charge against Gill might be valid after all. But then Gill often accepts that believers have duty and obligation: 16 "... though God works all works of grace for us, and in us, yet there is a work of duty and obedience to him for us to do..." 18

'Law' sometimes means 'principle'. Therefore the Gospel, which is the principle of grace, can be called a law – the law of faith. 16 But the law of faith is not to be confused with the Moral Law; 17 nor, on the other hand, is the Gospel (in this sense) a lesser Law. 18 'Law'

18. Comm on Rom. 3.27.
also means 'doctrine', and this too applies to the Gospel. Gadsby agreed with this: "the gospel is a law... The law of Christ is the gospel of his grace... called the law of faith, the law of liberty, and the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus..." Yet Gadsby did not distinguish the Law as a Covenant of Works and as a rule of conduct. For Gadsby, to be under the Law meant to be under it as a Covenant of Works, which is antithetical to the Covenant of Grace and faith.

All are agreed that the Moral Law is summed up in the commands to love God and man, which are still in force. Yet Gill elsewhere refers to the love command as 'the law of Christ'. This does not mean that he equates the 'law of Christ', the Gospel, and the Moral Law. The law of Christ takes the form of the love command in working out the Gospel. As such it fulfils the Moral Law but is not the same as it. Believers are justified by the Covenant of Grace, the Gospel, and faith. As a result they obey the love command, but they are not justified by love for that would be justification according to the Covenant of Works, the Law and by man's works. The Law prepares the way for the Gospel, and the Gospel provides the only way of true obedience to the Law.

Gadsby was not alone in asserting that believers are not under the Moral Law as a Covenant of Works. Gill and Brine taught this as well. It is basic to Federal theology. For example, the Westminster Confession stated:

Although true believers be not under the law, as a covenant of works, to be thereby justified, or condemned; yet it is of great use to them, as well as to others; in that, as a rule of life informing them of the will of God

22. Comm on Mark 12:30, etc.
and their duty, it directs and binds them to walk accordingly...23

All agree that to be under the Moral Law as a Covenant of Works means condemnation. Believers are not under condemnation, therefore they are not under the Moral Law as a Covenant of Works. The curse of the Moral Law has been abrogated.24 Crisp agrees.25 Believers are under the forgiveness of grace rather than the curse of Law.26 The phrase 'under the Law' is important here. Seymour states that "Antinomianism may be defined as the belief that the moral law is not binding on Christians who are 'under grace'."27 This is a misleading definition. All Federalists, including Antinomians and Hyper-Calvinists, have accepted that a believer is under grace and under some law, though without being under the curse of the Law. Brine is clear on this point:

... the moral Law is to be considered as a Law merely, or Rule of Action; as such, regenerate persons are under it... I am most firmly persuaded, that they will be under that Law in Heaven.30

Reformation theology specified three uses of the Moral Law: (a) to restrain sinners; (b) to convict and lead sinners to Christ; (c) to guide

29. Seymour, p. 71. Seymour evidently takes this definition verbatim from Underwood (p. 133).
30. Motives, pp. 41-42. Cf. Vindication, p. 240; Ivison, vol. III, p. 449; Gill, s & T, vol. II, p. 116; Body, p. 892; H.A. Long, Calvinism, p. 183. Crisp: "we are under the law still, or else we are lawless" (CAE, vol. II, p. 401). Hyperist Antinomians vary here, but usually state that we are not under the Law of Works but the Law of Faith; under Christ and not Moses. Thus, being not under the first does not mean that we are 'without Law', for we are under the second. All sinners are under the former, all believers are under the second. To place sinners under the second is presumption, to place believers under the first is legalism and Arminianism. See Huntington, Works, vol. VIII, p. 69; vol. XV, pp. 54, 57, 60-61; Stockell, Redeemer's Glory, pp. 141-143; Martin, Sermons, vol. I, pp. 476-511; Wayman, Enquiry, p. 14; Philpot, Meditations, vol. II, p. 42; Wells, Surrey Tabernacle Witness, vol. I, pp. 111-112; Gadsby, Works, vol. I, pp. 18-19, 72, 103-104, 107, 118, 263-264; John Gadsby, Memoir of Gadsby, p. 29; Popham, Counsel, p. 66; Sermons, vol. III, p. 178; Gosden, Baptism, p. 3.
or rule believers. Berkhof is one of several who assert that the third use of the Law is rejected by Antinomians (and probably Hyper-Calvinists— he does not differentiate the two). Is he correct? We do not think so, but several points need to be made. Firstly, Gill listed three uses of the Law: (a) "to convince of sin"; (b) "to restrain from sin"; (c) "to condemn and punish for sin". We saw in Chapter VIII that both Antinomians and Hyper-Calvinists agreed that the Law has a place in preparing sinners for conversion. Nevertheless, they did accept that Christ is the end, or goal, of the Law. But they are quick to add that the Law itself is not enough, nor is the Law equal to the Gospel and grace as an incentive to conversion. 'Crisp's Incentive' is implied in Crisp's own words: "men are mistaken that think that the law makes them to see their own vileness; for a gracious sight of our vileness is the only work of Christ". Secondly, all parties are agreed that the Law has a place in restraining sin, though the Antinomians added that the Law without Gospel and grace does not adequately restrain sin. Without conversion, a sinner under the Law is liable to break out in gross sin at any time and for any length of time. The only really effective restraint is grace, which is revealed in the Gospel. But neither the Gospel nor grace operate in this way, (nor in any other way) divorced from the Law. And this also implies 'Crisp's Incentive'.

It is really the third use of the Law that is debated. Does not Gill leave this out of his list mentioned above? Not really, for that list concerned only sinners. Gill never denied the use of the Moral Law for believers. Nor, for that matter, did Brine or even Crisp. This is so repeatedly and clearly stated in their writings that we must question the extent to which some of their critics have studied them. One often gets the impression that some of the criticisms are based on hearsay or quotations out of context. When properly understood, these authors will


32. Berkhof, Systematic Theology, p.615.


be seen to have been in substantial agreement with orthodox Federalism, differing mainly in vocabulary and emphasis.

This is not to deny that some of their statements easily lend themselves to misinterpretation. This is especially true with Crisp, but the careful reader will usually find clarifying statements in the same context. One example of oft misunderstood language is the common statement that believers are not under the Law as in the hands of Moses but are rather under it as in the hands of Christ (or the Spirit). This merely means that they are not under the curse pronounced by Moses but are under the justification and guidance of Christ. They are under the Covenant of Grace, not the Covenant of Works.

The two higher schools very plainly assert that the Moral Law is 'binding' on believers. They are misunderstood when they say that believers are not under the cursing of the Law. 'Binding' sometimes means 'cursing'. A believer will not be bound hand and foot to be cast into Hell. The curse of the Law is not binding on believers, for they are justified and will never come under condemnation. The Moral Law continues as guidance, not as cursing. In this sense they are in agreement with the Westminster Confession (XIX:5): "The moral law doth forever bind all, as well justified persons as others, to the obedience

36. See Gill's sermon, 'The Law in the Hand of Christ' (S & T', vol.I, pp.268ff.; S & T', vol.I, pp.433ff.); Body, pp.371-372, 525; Comm on Deut. 10:2, 10:5, 27:8, 34:7; Rom. 3:21, 6:15, 12:2; John 8:36, Heb. 2:2; II Cor. 3:11; Skepp, p.23; Craner, Manual, p.77; Testimony, p.11; Pink, Law, p.9; Letters, p.81. The more Antinomian Hyper-Calvinists vary or deny this at times. Huntington denied that Christ rules His people with the Moral Law in his hand. The Gospel, he says, and not the Moral Law is His sceptre. Huntington appeals to Gill on this point. See Works, vol. XIV, pp.176-177; vol.XV, pp.53-54, 59; vol. XVII, p.111; vol.XX, pp.308-312. Gadsby thought that the Moral Law is a schoolmaster unto but not in the hands of Christ. Christ judges sinners with the Law in His hand, which is more serious than in the hand of Moses. See Works, vol.I, pp.70, 107, 240.

37. E.g., "the moral law may be called a yoke; it is binding upon all mankind" (S & T', vol.II, p.116); "the moral law ... is still in force and is binding upon Christians" (Body, p.892). Mayo (p.5) misquotes Gill here, probably slanderously, as follows: "the moral precepts were grievous ... and as they were not easy of observation, so they were not binding on Christ's disciples". Mayo may have thinking of Gill's views of the ceremonial law, but Gill does not call them 'moral precepts'. (See Section E below). Cf. Comm on Ex. 20:1; Pink, Law, p.11, etc. The Law is binding on believers, said Atkinson, for "by becoming Christians they do not cease to be men" (Faith, p.33). Speaking of the Law, even Popham could affirm that "its obligations are binding, though we have lost all ability to comply with it" (Sermons, vol.II, p.61), but he may have been thinking of unbelievers. Some have noted that the revealed will alone "is binding on us, and we have nothing to do with his secret will" (Tucker, p.220). So also Button, Remarks, p.58; Pink, The Atonement, p.283; Sovereignty, p.195. See Chapter III above.
thereof..." If the above definition of Seymour\textsuperscript{34} is valid (that Antinomianism denies that the Moral Law is binding on believers), then none of the subjects of our inquiry are Antinomians! Perhaps this definition is not appropriate, or at least needs clarification or qualification.

Another term is also controversial. That is the word 'rule'. Is the Moral Law a 'rule' for believers? Often Antinomianism is defined as that which denies that the Moral Law is a 'rule' of conduct and practice for believers.\textsuperscript{39} Even Gill accepted this as a definition, but he had 'libertinism' in mind.\textsuperscript{40} Gill himself was not an Antinomian by this definition,\textsuperscript{41} for he regularly stated that the Moral Law is a rule for believers.\textsuperscript{42} "I abhor the thoughts of setting the Law of God aside as the rule of walk and conversation..."\textsuperscript{43} He even admits that the Law is "a rule of faith and conversation",\textsuperscript{44} but this says the same thing. Faith is commanded in the Law, but this is not the same as saving faith. Being a rule, therefore, is one of the four uses of the Moral Law for believers.\textsuperscript{45} Moreover, as Seymour observes,\textsuperscript{46} Gill taught that the Moral Law of God is the rule for believers because there is no higher law in the universe – for God is the highest sovereign. There is no

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{38} See also Bedford, p.9; Mayo, pp.5-14.
  \item \textsuperscript{40} S & T\textsuperscript{1}, vol.II, p.179; CAF, vol.II, p.82 note.
  \item \textsuperscript{41} So also say Harrison, p.19, Ivimey, vol.III, p.367; Seymour, p.184; J.C. Ryland, Jr., The Work of Faith, p.10; William Young, op. cit., p.270; Pink, Joshua, p.230; Hooper, The Coalheaver, p.52; Clipsham, p.102; even Huntington, Works, vol.XV, pp.54, 57, 60-61. Huntington feels that the only difference between Gill and himself was in the words used. Some Hypers who accept the Law as our Rule add that this was the position of Edwards, Spurgeon, Ralph Erskine, Owen, Toplady, Booth, Blake, Romaine, and all the leading Puritans (Pink, Letters, p.93; Parks, Five Points, p.70). Philpot excused the Erskines and the Puritans for holding that the Law is our Rule of conduct (Reviews, vol.II, p.484).
  \item \textsuperscript{42} E.g., S & T\textsuperscript{1}, vol.I, pp.41, 357; S & T\textsuperscript{2}, vol.II, p.116; DJ, p.27; Body, pp.72, 371, 525; Cause, p.74; Comm on Deut. 10:5, 27:8, 34:7, John 8:36, II Peter 2:19, Rom. 3:31, 12:2, II Cor. 3:11, Gal. 3:19, 5:13, Job 6:25, Jer. 31:34, Pro. 20:19.
  \item \textsuperscript{43} S & T\textsuperscript{1}, vol.II, p.179.
  \item \textsuperscript{44} Comm on Deut. 10:2. The Law is "a rule of life and conversation to them; not a rule to obtain life by; but to live according to" (Body, p.371).
  \item \textsuperscript{45} Cf. Body, p.371.
  \item \textsuperscript{46} Pp.104-106.
\end{itemize}
higher law of 'moral fitness' or 'natural law'. Deists, Epicureans and Stoics are in error.

Other high writers have asserted that the Moral Law is a rule for believers.\(^7\) This includes even Crisp: the Law "serves for a rule of conduct, and a discerner of aberrations".\(^8\) Gill said of Crisp, "the Doctor owns the law is a rule for conversation, consequently [is] no Antinomian".\(^9\) To be sure, Crisp added a corollary truth: "I am confident of it, and affirm boldly, there is not one man made free by Christ, that makes it his rule, namely to be bold to commit sin with greediness..."\(^10\)

The Gospel Standard Baptists rejected much of this. According to their theory, it is the Gospel and not the Law that is the rule and standard for believers. Gadsby is the great exponent of this theory, but we find a few precursory statements in Towne, Dell, and Saltmarsh.\(^11\) We have not found the theory in its distinctive form to be stated in Gill in any of his works.\(^12\) Gill was in substantial agreement with Crisp on

---

47. See the following: Davis, Truth, p.90; Brine, Motives, pp.41-42; Vindication, pp.222, 228; Skepp, p.23; Stevens, The Words of Truth, p.170; Help, vol.II, p.6; Wayman, Enquiry, p.14; J.C. Ryland, Sr., Contemplations, vol.II, p.271; Craner, Manual, p.77; Hawker, Works, vol.I, Memoir, p.208; Tucker, p.220; Button, Remarks, p.88; Johnson, Riches, Vol.II, p.182; Palmer, Free Enquiry, p.351; Epitome, p.25; Hoeksema, TK, vol.I, pp.52-62; vol.III, p.447. So also several prominent Anti-Neo-Methodists (e.g., Traill, Works, vol.I, p.276) and Supralapsarians (e.g., Cornie, p.119) - neither of whom being Hyper-Calvinists. Some Hyperists said that the Moral Law is our 'guide' (e.g., H.A. Long, p.121). Pink often said that the Moral Law is the binding rule of conduct (e.g., Law, p.13; Ten Commandments, pp.10-11; Covenants, p.142). He even went so far as to contend that "the Law, and not the Gospel, is the rule of our sanctification" (Sanctification, p.175. Cf. pp.151-187). Elsewhere he wrote, "The standard of perfection is in Christ alone; he is the rule of every Christian's walk" (Godhead, p.220). His animosity to the Gospel Standard doctrine is evident in urging his friends to "avoid as you would a deadly snake any man who denies the law of God is the Christian's rule of life" (quoted in Iain Murray, Life of Pink, p.104).


51. E.g., Towne, Re-Assertion of Grace, p.138; Dell, Works, pp.493-494. Saltmarsh: "They that are under grace are no more under the Law ... The Gospel is both a perfect Law of Life and righteousness" (Free Grace, pp.128, 146).

52. Dix: "In denying the moral law as a rule of life Gadsby was departing from the position of the earlier Particular Baptists expressed in the confessions and the writings of Gill" (Dix, p.18, note 78). Many today, including some Gospel Standard Baptists, would disagree with our assertion, but having read the entirety of Gill's writings we stand by our assessment. This is not to say, however, that the difference between Gill and Gadsby was as great as some would suggest.
most points, as was Gadsby, but Gadsby felt compelled to use even bolder language. Note what he says about Gill:

... remember, that if the Doctor should, after this, in any place whatsoever, attempt to prove the law of works (to be) the believer's rule of life, you will not think it strange if I should not consider myself obliged to join him."  

Gill never denies that the Law is a rule or standard, but he never says that it is the only rule or standard. The Law and Gospel are both rules, each in their own place. The Gospel is not a subservient rule. As both have their place in justification, both have their place in sanctification. The Gospel Standard doctrine had difficulty with this, feeling that it could be taken to mean that one is justified and sanctified by both Law and Gospel, works and faith. Much of the problem is Gadsby's apparent difficulty in differentiating the Law as a Covenant of Works and as a rule of conduct.  

54. Martin explicitly states that the Moral Law is our Rule but not our only Rule (Thoughts, vol.I, pp.24-28). This raises a crucial point: all Hyperists follow mainstream Calvinism in confessing that the Scriptures as a whole are our 'Rule of Faith and Practice'. Sometimes the word 'standard' is used. See the following: Gill, Comm on Deut. 32:9; Body, pp.21-25, 29, 57; Wilks, p.76; Hazelton, Sermons, p.89; Bentley, Helper, p.15; Button, Remarks, p.vi; Brine, Vindication, p.103; Wayman, Enquiry, pp.2, 14; Cranker, Testimony, p.4; Hawker, Works, vol.I; Memoir, p.208; Stockell, Confession, p.5; Scripture and Reason, The Standards of all Religion; Pink, Election and Justification, p.35; Revelation, p.154; The Atonement, p.236. So also Traill, a leading Anti-Neonomian (Works, vol. I, p.276). It is, then, somewhat surprising to read the same confession from some of the staunchest Gospel Standard Baptists, such as Philpot: "Our first rule must be that the Scriptures shall be our only standard of appeal, and these taken in their plain, literal meaning..." (Sonship, p.18. Cf. Sermons, vol.I, p.28; vol.II, p.103). Gadsby: "It is the word of God I wish to make the rule of my faith ... the only certain rule of faith and obedience" (Works, vol.I, p.47; vol.II, p.82. Cf. vol.I, p.85). Compare Gill's declaration of Faith with Gadsby's Last Will, both containing the words "the only rule of faith and practice" (both are appended to the present work). See also Popham, Counsel, pp.38, 54. There is either a gross inconsistency among these Gospel Standard Baptists or there is not as great a distance between them and those such as Gill, or both.  
55. E.g., Works, vol.I, pp.7, 18. 167. Gadsby defines just what he means by the Gospel being our only Rule in vol.II, pp.68-69. He rejected the argument of Galus that not to be under the rule of the Law meant that we are under no rule at all. Gadsby replied that we are not under the rule of the Law but under the rule of the Gospel (vol.I, pp.19-20). See note 30 above. On the problem of differentiating the Law and Gospel as 'rule' and 'covenant', see also Huntington, Works, vol.III, pp.384ff.; De Fleury, Letter to Huntington, p.13; Morton, Daughter's Defence, pp.33-44. Most critics feel that neither Gadsby nor Huntington ever satisfactorily explained just what they meant. To some extent they were merely stressing the similarity to 'Crisp's Incentive' and their opposition to Neonomianism. Other summaries of the Gospel Standard doctrine concerning 'rule' can be found in Gospel Standard Article XVI; and, to some extent, Hale, Catechism, pp.53-54. That 'rule' means several things is evident. As concerns sinners, Popham said that the 'standard' by which God judges sin is his "character as revealed in the law" (Sermons, vol.I, p.35. Cf. Sawyer, p.206). Roe describes the person and work of Christ as the 'standard' ... Cont'd:
Gospel, said Gadsby, then he is not sanctified by another means. To make the Law a means of sanctification is legalism. However, when one sifts through all the difficult passages in Gadsby, one finds no substantial departure from Gill, nor Gill from Crisp, or Crisp from Federalism. It was just that Gadsby felt compelled to add a number of qualifications. In doing so, he chose to reject some of the terminology of his predecessors. As we said, the difference between these groups is mainly in vocabulary. Gill simply did not employ Gospel Standard vocabulary.

But remember that Crisp, Gill and Gadsby all felt that the Moral Law is to be preached. It has a place in sanctification, howbeit subservient to the Gospel, even as it does in justification. Even Gadsby must admit this, though he is reluctant to speak of the Law as even a lesser 'rule' for believers. The reader will immediately see that much of the problem is the literary styles of each of the writers. Gill is very logical and cogent and fairly easy to understand. He was a systematic theologian. Crisp, however, was a preacher and as such his works lend themselves to misunderstanding. One could compare Gill to Calvin and Crisp to Luther. Hussey and Huntington are extremely difficult to exegete in this context and Gadsby is hardly any better.

One might ask, "If the Gospel is a rule to believers, is this not the same as Neonomianism?" Did not even Gadsby hold that "the gospel is a law"? Did not Gill teach that "there is a commanding voice" in the Gospel and that "the Gospel ... is called a commandment"? Gadsby and Gill are not teaching that sinners are saved by obeying a new Law which is less than the Moral Law. Instead, sinners are saved by what the Gospel reveals. Properly speaking, it is not the Gospel but what the

Cont'd:...

(p.18). 'Rule' and 'standard' are usually taken as synonyms. As for believers, "The rule of Jesus Christ is the rule of love" (Popham, Sermons, vol.IV, p.142). The term 'Gospel standard' has been used by others, even by Whitefield (Works, vol.II, p.352) and John Allen (The Gospel Standard), both in a non-Antinomian way. Gadsby is recorded to have said "Christ is the Standard, and the Holy Ghost is the Standard-bearer" (John Gadsby, Memoir of Gadsby, p.131). Compare Hazelton: "the covenant (is) the Father's rule, the Son's rule, and the Holy Spirit's rule" (Sermons, p.93).

Gospel reveals that saves. The Gospel is a doctrine and in that sense is a law or principle. Also, the Gospel requires faith and it is through the Gospel that the Holy Spirit gives faith. All this is informally taken, for "in the Gospel, strictly taken, there is no command". The Gospel is in the indicative; it is all promise, nor commands. Neonomianism, on the other hand, allegedly makes the Gospel all commands. This makes the Gospel a lesser Law with lesser stipulations and conditions. Hence, it means justification by Law and works.

Neonomianism is opposed because it brings only the curse of the Law, while the true Gospel sets men free. The Gospel is the 'Law of Liberty', the principle of freedom, the doctrine that sets free. Since the Moral Law is subservient to the Gospel, when it is placed in the hands of Christ it is considered a Law of Liberty. (Gadsby seems to deny this, however.) The Gospel is also the Covenant of Grace revealed and brings 'the liberty of grace', which is freedom from the curse of the Covenant of Works. But the presence of sin remains. "It is a liberty not to sin, but from it." Saints are freed from the curse and power of sin; one day that will be freed even from the presence of sin.

Good works are the evidence, result and effect of justification, not the cause or ground. In bold style similar to Crisp's, Gill says, "Good works are in no sense necessary to salvation". Works are not the moving cause, the procuring cause, the co-efficient cause or any other sort of cause, condition or means. They are, however, necessary

---

64. Comm on Rom. 12:2.
65. Works, vol.I, p.101. Also: "The law of Christ is the gospel of his grace ... called the law of faith, the law of liberty, and the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus" (vol.II, p.58).
66. See Chapters V and VIII.
67. For the eight freedoms of the liberty of grace, see Body, pp.525-527.

... Cont'd:
evidences. Gill lists four uses of the Law for saints and fifteen reasons (five negative, ten positive) why works are necessary as evidence. 71

At this point we need to discuss 'Crisp's Incentive' in relation to sanctification. Earlier we saw that Calvin taught something analogous and that it was minimized by the High Calvinists. The theory teaches that a sinner comes to believe not so much because of the terrors of the Law and conviction of sin, as because of the wooings and charm of grace. Grace, not Law, is the greater warrant of faith. One is converted out of a sense of love and forgiveness rather than merely out of a sense of fear. He is persuaded to believe because he realises that God loves him. Faith is the grateful response to the display of mercy in the atonement and Gospel. It is related to faith as a gift. The elect believe through grace. This is 'Crisp's Incentive' in relation to justification by faith. The Law takes a decidedly secondary place to Gospel, whereas in High Calvinism the Law takes an equal or greater place so far as the moving incentive (warrant) is concerned.

But it does not end with justification. Most parties agree that sanctification flows from justification and that the means of the one are the same as, or similar to, the other. Since free grace is seen by Crisp as the great incentive to faith and justification, that same grace is the incentive to faith and sanctification. Free grace is the great incentive to obedience, not the detriment thereof. 72 Free grace speaks of forgiveness. That means that the only effective preventative against sin in believers is the knowledge that if one sins he will be forgiven. 73 One sins when one forgets grace and breaks the love relationship. And once in sin, the saint can be restored only by that same grace. Allison is correct in his analysis of Crisp on this point: "Crisp defends himself from the charge of antinomianism by insisting that there is no really effective way in getting people to forsake their sins except by telling them that they are forgiven and bought with a price". 74 Other

Cont'd:...

70. S & T', vol.III, pp.50-53. Crisp taught that good works are necessary "not casually, but consequently" (CAE, vol.II, p.328). This may be a typographical error for 'causally'.
74. Allison, p.213.
Antinomians taught the same principle.\textsuperscript{75}

Furthermore, says Crisp, it is legalism to preach "the terrors of the law, the wrath of God, damnation, and hell-fire" to saints in order to incite them to obey.\textsuperscript{76} However, this must be balanced by the following:

\ldots wrath and vengeance must be revealed to believers, and to restrain them from sin, but not in the way men ordinarily think \ldots wrath and vengeance must be revealed \ldots not for fear of coming under wrath, but out of love, because God hath been so gracious to them\ldots It proceeds from joy, in consideration of wrath already past, and not from fear of it to come\ldots\textsuperscript{77}

To preach the Law in any other way in order to ensure holiness is seen as Arminianism and brings in the Covenant of Works. Such implies that one may lose his justification, that his ultimate salvation is dependent upon sanctification and good works. All this is said by Crisp against the prevailing High Calvinist view of sanctification. When Neonomianism reacted against it, Hyper-Calvinism arose as yet another reason. We find the same incentive in Gill's works. A few examples:

\ldots the love of Christ, and not the terrors of the law, constrains them to yield a cheerful obedience to it.\textsuperscript{78}

\ldots a view of covenant-interest in God lays all good men under the strongest obligation in the strength of divine grace to attend to his will; nor can there be a greater motive to them than covenant-love, grace and mercy.\textsuperscript{79}

But, O! how impious, how profoundly base!
To talk of Sin as a Consequence of Grace!
That those who live by Faith may as they please,
Trample on Love, and live in carnal Ease;
As tho' the Grace of God does not constrain
The Hearts of those belove'd to love again.\textsuperscript{80}

\textsuperscript{75} Cf. Eaton, Honeycomb, pp.115, 460-462; Allison, p.211. Wayman taught something analogous in Enquiry, pp.83-84.
\textsuperscript{76} CAE, vol.II, p.173.
\textsuperscript{78} Comm on Rom. 7:4. Cf. Philalethes, p.8.
\textsuperscript{79} Comm on Deut. 26:17. The use of the word 'motive' here is significant, paralleling what we call 'Crisp's Incentive'.
\textsuperscript{80} Perseverance, p.8. This poem was penned in the controversy with Wesley (see Chapters I and ... Cont'd;
... the pardoning grace of God and cleansing blood of Christ, which, when savingly applied, sets men against sin, and makes them zealous of good works.\textsuperscript{81}

Gill even comes close to relating 'Crisp's Incentive' to the assurance that 'Christ died for me' as being of the essence of faith. Note the following:

... though God works all works of grace for us, and in us, yet there is a work of duty and obedience to him for us to do; nor should we be slothful and inactive, but be the rather animated to it by what he has done for us.\textsuperscript{82}

Once more it is said, that this doctrine of Christ's satisfaction for sin, weakens men's obligation and regard to duty, and opens a door to licentiousness; but this is so far from being true, that on the contrary it strengthens the obligation, and excites a greater regard to duty, and promotes holiness of life and conversation in those who have reason to believe that Christ has made satisfaction for their sins; for the love of Christ ... constrains them in the most pressing manner to live to him, according to his will and to his glory.\textsuperscript{83}

Nothing more effectually keeps ministers, or others believers, in the work and service of their Lord, or more strongly obliges and constrains them to a cheerful discharge of their duty to him, and one another, than his love displayed in his covenant-engage ments, in his assumption of human nature, and particularly in his dying for them...\textsuperscript{84}

This is not to say that the Antinomians and Hyper-Calvinists alone taught that grace and atonement are the great incentives for holiness. A number of non-Neonomian Low Calvinists have taught that the Gospel doctrine that Christ died for all is the great incentive (warrant) for both justifying faith and sanctifying faith resulting in good works. In a sense, they are stronger in this incentive than even Crisp and Gill,
for these two were still Particularists. In our opinion, Calvin was such a Low Calvinist. These Low Calvinists react against both the High Calvinists and Neonomians on the one hand because of their insistence upon the Law as an equal or greater incentive, and against the Antinomians and Hyper-Calvinists for teaching this great incentive yet effectively limiting it to those saints alone who have the full assurance of faith. The Antinomians, however, tended to speak of this assurance as being of the essence of faith and thus were quite close to the Low Calvinists. And, in our opinion, they were more similar to Calvin in this way than were any of the other groups, except the Lows.\

'Crisp's Incentive' underlies Gill's view of sanctification and Gadsby's Gospel Standard doctrine. If Gill's doctrine grew out of the opposition to Neonomianism, Gadsby's grew out of opposition to Fuller's Moderate Calvinism, which was only a modified form of High Calvinism. But it would be incorrect to suppose that Crisp, Gill and Gadsby are entirely in agreement in all the details. Nor, for that matter, are Westminster, Baxter and Fuller entirely alike. Nevertheless, we feel that the idea of incentive is the key to the whole Antinomian issue. With the Antinomians of the 1640's it took the form of 'Crisp's Incentive'. Later, it was expressed in similar terms by Hyper-Calvinists such as Gill, as outlined above. The Gospel Standard form of it was different from each of these in a few particulars, mainly vocabulary (rule, standard, binding, etc.), but the same thrust is there. Note what William Gadsby himself wrote:

\[
\text{the gospel contains not only a perfection of precepts, but a perfection of motives to induce the child of God to walk therein... A man who only lives what he calls a holy life, because he is afraid he shall be damned if he does not, is a stranger to holiness.}\]

This is not at all to say that this motif cannot be found in lower forms of Calvinism. As a matter of fact, it can be described in all varieties, especially in the moderate branches as they were involved in evangelism. George Whitefield expressed this sentiment, "Love, not fear, constrains him to obedience".\(^85\) It can even be found in the ambivalent

\[^{85}\text{This is Kendall's opinion as well.}\]
\[^{87}\text{Works, vol.I, p.101.}\]
A.W. Pink. But what is absolutely crucial to note is that while the Low Calvinists employ this great incentive in evangelism of unbelieving sinners and believing Christians alike, High and Hyper-Calvinists almost always limit it to Christians alone (with a few exceptions). This ties in with what we have elsewhere observed concerning the warrant of faith and grace.

It must not be forgotten that the Gospel Standard doctrine was formulated in conjunction with the rejection of free offers and Duty-Faith. This explains some of Hussey's comments, but specifically pertinent to our study here is how it took on distinctive form under Huntington and Gadsby. Note Huntington's rebuke to John Ryland, Jr., for giving free offer to unbelievers and making the Law the rule and standard for believers:

You set the law before the believer, as his only law of life and conduct and the gospel is set before the unconverted as their only rule of duty. The carnal man has got an evangelical law and the heir of promise has got a legal one; the life-giving commandment is palmed upon the congregation of the dead, and the ministration of death is saddled upon the children of the resurrection; the believers are all sent to Moses, and the unconverted are all sent to Jesus; Moses is to have the illegitimate sons and Christ is to have the bastards... This is at once removing all the distinctions that God has made between saint and sinner, believer and infidel, the children of God, and the children of the devil; for it all lies in the one being under the law and the curse, the other under Grace and blessing.*

Thus, there is a difference between 'Crisp's Incentive' and the Gospel Standard doctrine on one crucial point: the free offer. Crisp, it will be recalled, firmly believed in the free offer, though retaining limited atonement. Huntington rejected the free offer and attempted to rescue 'Crisp's Incentive'. To a certain extent he and Gadsby did just that, but by rejecting offers and the belief that assurance was of the essence of faith, they lost the vitality and warmth of Crisp and the earlier Antinomians. They directly paved the way for the excesses of Philpot's extreme Experimentalism.

This can also be observed in Gadsby. According to the founder of the Gospel Standard Baptists, the Gospel is not one's rule of life until he is a believer. Until then the sinner is under the rule of the Moral Law, which is sheer legal duty. Therefore, he argued, there is no Duty-faith, for that concerns salvation and is for believers only. Furthermore, he confessed:

I believe, in some senses the precepts of Christ demand less from believers than the law of works demands from unbelievers; and, in some senses, the precepts of Christ demand more from believers than the law of works demands from unbelievers. Thusly, unbelievers are not under the rule of the Gospel, therefore there is no free offer calling for Duty-faith. Believers are not under the Law as a rule, therefore they are under the Gospel alone as a rule. This principle can be found in the severe warnings against presumption that characterized Philpotism. If it is legalism for a believer again to be subject to the rule of the Law, it is licentious presumption for an unbeliever to act as though he were under the Gospel. As Israel Atkinson put it, "if an unbeliever practises those things that are specifically commanded to believers, he will add presumption to his unbelief".

This is not to say that all Hyper-Calvinists of the Gadsbian period followed this exact pattern. The school of Stevens did not. More recently, Pink has expressed disgruntlement with the relationship between the non-offer and the Gospel Standard theory. Representative of his usual theological perceptivity, Pink noted that the two were related:

The plain fact of the matter is that if the servant of God today has no Divine warrant to call upon the ungodly to forsake their sins and turn to Christ for pardon and peace, then he also has no authority to exhort believers to walk in the paths of righteousness, for they both rest upon the same foundation, namely, the precedents furnished by Holy

---

91. Ibid.
92. Faith, p.52.
93. Stevens: "Take heed also to distinguish between the law as a rule of justification by works, and the law as a rule of sanctification through faith in Christ. In the former sense, law belongs to all men by nature; in the latter sense, it belongs to spiritual men by grace" (A Pastoral Letter, pp.10-11).
Pink also denied that Christ's vicarious obedience frees believers from the obligation of obedience. This was to reject John Warburton's argument that since Christ obeyed the Law for believers, believers are justified and not under the Law.

In keeping with the main proposition of our present enterprise, we must point out that this state of affairs fits into the general pattern of Hyper-Calvinism's tendency of stressing divine sovereignty to the minimization of human responsibility. According to Hyperists, unbelievers do not have the responsibility to believe savingly in Christ, for that belongs to those who have been regenerated. One, then, must discern by Experimental introspection whether he is regenerate, then conclude that he is elect, and then assurance. The place of election here is significant because it concerns the secret will of God. By pointing men to the secret will of election rather than to the revealed will of Christ crucified in the Gospel, Hyperists thus tend to substitute the secret will for the revealed will. Thus, divine sovereignty replaces human responsibility.

There is another variant of Hyper-Calvinist doctrinal Antinomianism that merits our attention. It arose in competition with Philpot's Experimentalism and, while rejecting the distinctives of the Gospel Standard approach, was in certain respects the most extreme form of doctrinal Antinomianism hitherto known to Calvinism. We are speaking of the special theory of James Wells. Originally in more or less sympathy with the school of Stevens on a number of points, Wells caused no small controversy in mid-nineteenth century English Hyper-Calvinism.

94. Quoted in Iain Murray, Life of Pink, p. 232.
95. Salvation, p. 63. So also Bellamy, True Religion, p. 326. This was one of the main arguments of Baxter against Crisp, Saltmarsh and Eaton. Pittman, a leading Primitive Baptist, shows how Primitive Baptists have not tended to doctrinal Antinomianism in the Gospel Standard sense here: "What part of the old conditional Covenant belongs to the New? The fulfilled part, - that which Jesus brought over by his perfect obedience as examples for us" (Questions, p. 103).
97. Note Pink's words here: "God's secret will is no business of his; God's revealed will (in the Word) is the standard of human responsibility" (Sovereignty, p. 195). Thus, says Pink, no man can know that he is reprobate. Moreover, this verifies the fact that God commands all men to repent and believe in a saving sense.
when he preached and published his infamous sermon on Rahab the harlot. Almost nobody took his side except those in his own congregation, most of whom followed their pastor with the greatest enthusiasm, though a small contingent did not. This caused a division with William Palmer, John Foreman, J.C. Philpot and others, resulting in a heated exchange of tracts on the subject. Even W.J. Styles in a later generation felt the need to rebuke Wells, though on many other subjects the two were similar.

In sum the theory of Wells was as follows. According to Scripture, Rahab was justified in the incident with the spies. She was justified not in spite of her telling the lies but because she told the lie in faith and for a higher purpose than men usually tells lies. She lied to protect God's chosen people and thus to bring greater glory to God. Wells says

98. The sermon, entitled 'The Faith of Rahab the Harlot', was based on Hab. 11:31 and referred to passages in James and Joshua as well. It was preached on 18 June, 1865 and was published shortly thereafter. It is found in Surrey Tabernacle Pulpit, vol. VII (1865), pp. 193-200. He later defended it in three other sermons: 'The Faith of Rahab Defended' (in ibid., pp. 385-400. Cf. pp. iii-iv); 'Good to Come, and Another Word for Rahab the Harlot' (in ibid., vol. VIII (1866), pp. 73-80); and Last Sermon in the Old Surrey Tabernacle, p. 8. For his non-Gospel Standard, yet semi-Antinomian, doctrines in general, see also 'The True Gospel Standard', in Surrey Tabernacle Pulpit, vol. VI (1864), pp. 225-240; and The Moral Government of God. Oliver touches on the controversy in 'The Dangers of a Successful Ministry'.

99. Palmer answered Wells with three pieces: What Was Rahab? And What Was Her Faith? (1866); Moral Distinctions Founded in the Nature of God, Not in the Rights of Divine Sovereignty, or, The Immutability of God's Moral Law, and the Indispensable Nature of Human Obligation: In Reply to Mr. Well's Sermon on 'The Faith of Rahab the Harlot' (1866); and The 'Defence' Examined, and Mr. Wells Shown to be in a Worse Position than Before (1866). Among Palmer's charges was that Wells was teaching the views of Ockham and Socinianism (Moral Distinctions, pp. 6-8).

100. See the Rahab Controversy: Mr. John Foreman's Letter to Mr. James Wells, In Explanation of His Course of Action. Philpot notes that Wells and Foreman, both London pastors, were longtime friends until this controversy, when they divided (Reviews, vol. II, p. 547).


102. In addition to the above, see: Cozens, A Protest Against the Protestors and A Critique on W. Palmer's Pamphlet ... In Which is Included the Protest of Sixteen Baptist Ministers Against Some of the Sentences in Mr. James Wells' 'Rahab' Sermon (1865); 'Canturianensis', The Fenian Baptists: A Review of the Attack Upon the Rev. James Wells, and A Peep at the Company of Jubilee Trumpeters (1866); 'Cultor Veritatis' (pseud.), A Reply to Mr. John Foreman's Letter to Mr. James Wells, on the Rahab Controversy (1866); Omega, Doctrine, pp. 60-70. See also the earlier Fontinalia Arida: or, Wells Without Water (1837) by J. Scofield.

103. Guide, p. 118; Manual, pp. 11, 184. Styles argued, "The enactments of the moral law are not right merely because they are commanded; but they are commanded because they are right," and quoted Palmer in agreement, "Moral distinctions are founded in the nature of God, not on the rights of divine sovereignty" (Manual, pp. 16-17).
that he would do the same thing if he were in the same position.

But is not telling a lie a moral evil? Is it not contrary to the ninth commandment of God's Moral Law? How can God justify either the lie or the liar? Wells explains:

she was placed apparently between two evils ... therefore, between the two evils she chose the least. But were not the untruths she told sinful? No, I believe not ... But it is the peculiarity of the circumstances, in times past; and even now I could easily show you we may be placed in circumstances where such untruths, which untruths would do no one harm, would be commended.144

Thus, Rahab had to make a choice between telling a lie which would do good or telling a truth which would result in evil. There is some 'evil' in both of these, so something further must be appealed to in order to justify action. The deciding factor was the protection of God's people. This showed faith, for to recognize that the spies were God's people and to wish to protect them meant that she desired to be identified with God's cause. Thus, the end justified the means.

But this concerns more than just the place of the Moral Law in the life of a believer. It concerns the very essence of justification by faith in relation to sin on the one hand and divine Law on the other. The problem then arises that this implies that God sets aside His Moral Law in the Gospel that justifies. Wells further gives his defence here:

I hold this doctrine; that in the physical, in the moral, and in the spiritual world the great God can suspend for a time any law he chooses ... God here suspended the law of falsehood, and by suspending that law did hereby take away the criminality of Rahab's falsehood; that though she told two falsehoods, there was no sin in them, no crime in them; necessity demanded it; God suspended the usual law of truth, and made that morally true which was literally false; that is, Rahab did not choose to know whence the spies came, or whether they went, and in the exercise of this right she was justified; hereby suspended one law to make way for another.145

This is what justification is all about. Sinners are under the Moral

105. Ibid., p. 199.
Law and it would be a lie to say that they are righteous. But the Gospel transcends the Law, and in justification of a sinner God sets aside the Law in order to establish a higher law—the Law of Faith. Rahab realized this and submitted to it and was thereby justified, even if it meant going across the Moral Law. To have told a truth for the sake of maintaining the Law would have kept her from justification.

This necessarily means that God Himself is not bound by the Law. He applies the Law to all men but in some circumstances He chooses to suspend it by the Gospel. This not only justifies the sinner involved but also exonerates the sins concerned. To the weak mind this appears to be a legal fiction; in metaphysical terms it seems to be calling wrong right and right wrong. Does not, then, this reflect on the nature of God? Wells was aware of this objection and continued his explanation:

What cannot the great God do? There are some laws he will not suspend; the law of his love—never alter that; the law of salvation; not because he cannot—but careful how you attribute cannots to the great God. God cannot lie because he will not. There is a man, and a good man too he is, he says that the damnation of a soul is the will of God's nature, but that salvation is the nature of his will. That may do for logicians, but it is horrible divinity. What! is God so under the control of his nature that he is from necessity compelled to—damn to eternity a living soul?!

That is to say, God can and sometimes does suspend His Moral Law, but He never suspends the Law of Faith. The Covenant of Works can be set aside but not the Covenant of Grace. In the end, says Wells, it boils down to the question of God's nature and sovereign will. This is in keeping with the general tenor of our opinion that the tendency in Hyper-Calvinism is to exalt the sovereignty of God over divine holiness and love. Thus, sovereignty transcends human responsibility. Elsewhere Wells attempted to modify this position by stating that once a law has been firmly established it will never be abolished. Even God Himself would be unrighteous to go against it. This can apply to the law concerning truth as well. "Remember that sin is a lie against God; and he who would make God the author of sin, must make God a liar."  

108. Ibid., p.245.
It should be plain that this theory went contrary to the interpretation of the Rahab incident given by Calvin as well as High and Hyper-Calvinists. Most say that the lies were sins but were forgiven her in the act of justification. She was justified in spite of, not because of, her falsehoods. But recently another school of High Calvinism has advocated a theory which has distinct affinities with the position of Wells. That is the school of Theonomism. According to Rousas Rushdoony, the leading representative of this school, the usual Calvinist interpretation is faulty. Rushdoony offers another version. Truth is not ultimately determined by a concept in the mind of man and no higher; truth is not even determined by the natural fitness of things; it is determined by God alone. The same is the case with Law. We are to do something not because it is right in itself but because God says it is right. Thus, lying may appear to be wrong in all cases, but this is only because men tend to think of 'rightness' as a standard apart from God. Thus, in some circumstances God's Law contradicts what we think is right or true. Since the ultimate end of Law is the glory of God, we must do what we can to further that end - even contradict what appears to be an absolute standard. Thus, men are not under the Law as an entity in itself but as it is an expression of God's will. In fact, argues Rushdoony, to tell a truth regardless of the consequences is Antinomian; true obedience is more concerned with the end, the glory of God.

But critics sometimes feel that Rushdoony and Wells both taught that we can do evil that good may come, though this is denied by them both. Do the two positions go full circle after all? What is the relation between doctrinal and practical Antinomianism?

109. On the various Puritan opinion on the acceptability of lying, see Mosse, The Holy Pretence. The subject is covered in all the major Puritan works on cases of conscience (e.g., Ames and Baxter). The subject regarding Rahab has been discussed from standard Federalist perspectives by John Murray in Principles of Conduct.

110. See Gill's Com on the passages in question, especially Joshua 2:5. See also Pink, Gleanings in Joshua; and Hebrews.

111. See especially Institutes of Biblical Law, pp.542-549, 838-843; Law and Society, pp.20-27; Intellectual Schizophrenia, Culture Crisis and Education. What makes Rushdoony's comments particularly surprising is his vehement opposition to all forms of Antinomianism. Basically Rushdoony builds upon the Calvinistic foundation laid by Cornelius Van Til, but Van Til's views on the Rahab case would probably be more in agreement with those of his fellow professor John Murray than with Rushdoony.

D. PRACTICAL ANTINOMIANISM

Did doctrinal Antinomianism produce practical Antinomianism? It is generally agreed that the Antinomian and Hyper-Calvinist leaders themselves lived very holy and moral lives. This is significant. If any cases of libertinism in practice can be proven, the guilty parties were certainly not following their leaders' examples. The truth is that such instances of libertinism are extremely rare. When one examines the primary sources of the matter one is struck with the plethora of rumours and hearsay rather than eye-witness accounts or confessions. But there were some examples, probably more in New England than in England itself. The Westminster Confession (XX:3) seems to imply the existence of a form of libertinism at that time. It condemns those "who, upon pretence of Christian liberty, do practise" licentiousness and immoral lives. Baxter reported instances of libertinism among some of the soldiers in Cromwell's army. Crisp, who died in 1642, considered many of the reports of Calvinistic libertinism to be mere rumours, but he did not entirely rule them out. He himself saw no such instances but condemned anyone who should prove to be such a one.


2. Sells notes that if the doctrinal Antinomians were consistent with their worst beliefs, perhaps Locke would be correct in stating that they should have been practical Antinomians. But they were not consistent, and so practical instances are rare. (Debate, p.46). Cf. Chauncey, Neonomianism Unmasked, Part III, p.85; Robison, p.72; Clark, p.167.


5. Cf. Stoughton, vol.II, p.348. It may be recalled that several notable persons were chaplains in Cromwell's Army - Saltmarsh, Baxter and even Owen.

The same situation occurred in the controversy of the 1690's. Rehokosht contended that "many thousands" claimed forgiveness of sins but "live in open prophaneness, drunkenness, and all debaucherries". He is speaking of those of a Calvinist persuasion, not of the Deists. He cited numerous examples of Davis's followers but his documentation appears specious. He even charged Davis himself with being a Jesuit in disguise! Davis, of course, denied all these allegations about his followers and himself. Similar charges were made against Hussey and his people. Hussey responded by counter-charging his critics (usually Deists) with libertinism.

There does, however, seem to be one notorious example of Calvinistic libertinism about this time. That was David Crosley, the pastoral successor to Hanserd Knollys and predecessor to Skepp and Brine. It seems that he was expelled from the pastorate because of drunkenness and immorality. B.A. Ramsbottom (present editor of the Gospel Standard magazine) says that Crosley was later reinstated, and Underwood says that Whitefield later recommended him in a preface to one of his works. First-hand documentation is difficult in this case.

In the eighteenth century controversy we find a few more examples. Robison mentions one John Church who was convicted of sodomy. Brine said that there is no reason to reject the doctrine of eternal justification merely because some of its adherents were licentious. Since the only ones accepting that doctrine were Hyper-Calvinists, it is reasonable to infer that there were in fact accepted cases of Calvinistic libertinism. Often the Arminians (e.g., Fletcher) charged the Calvinists with examples of libertinism; the Calvinists (e.g., Toplady) usually retorted by accusing the Arminians.

---

Towards the end of the century William Huntington was often cited as an example of libertinism. Often his critics mentioned the fact that he had fathered an illegitimate child, but this overlooks the fact that this incident occurred in 1769 and therefore before his conversion. When he was converted he changed his name from Hunt to Huntington to avoid publicity over the scandal. Later critics felt that this was all too unethical, and they were not content with his explanation, even though they were hard pressed to cite other examples in what appeared to be a life above reproach. Incidentally, when he was converted he began appending the initials 'S.S.' to his new name, signifying 'Saved Sinner'.

In the nineteenth century Spurgeon cited numerous examples of practical Antinomianism within certain extreme Calvinistic circles, and they have the ring of truth to them. Even Gadsby admitted that there were such examples to be found, even among ministers. But he was quick to add that "these are not to be confined to men who deny the law of works to be the believer's rule of life". Gadsby's son recorded


14. Spurgeon, Autobiography, vol. I, pp. 224-228. If rumours abound, so do anecdotes - particularly from those such as the witty Spurgeon. His friend Williams recorded the following which we could hardly omit here: "When he [Spurgeon] first sought membership with a Christian Church the minister, having heard he was a rather high Calvinist, said to him, 'Do you believe it obligatory in Christians to observe the moral law? The youthful applicant looked at his with astonishment and replied, 'Whose umbrella have I stolen?'" (Williams, Reminiscences of Spurgeon, pp. 163-164).

15. Works, vol. I, p. 27. Cf. pp. 5-6, 28, 41. Speaking of the Neonomians, Traill wrote, "And both they and we know where to find such true Antinomians in great abundance, who yet are never called by that name" (Works, vol. I, p. 276). Palmer challenged his opponents to prove that there were proportionally more cases of practical Antinomianism among those against free offers than among those in favour of them (Free Enquiry, pp. 356-357). Gadsby gave a parallel to the Parable of the Good Samaritan in which two legalistic Anti-Antinomians see an Antinomian slip into sin. They dismiss all doctrinal Antinomians as licentious libertines, while defending one of their own number with the explanation that it was his besetting sin, a sudden temptation, an unwitting sin, or one into which he was led by others (Works, vol. II, p. 231). The Good Samaritan, of course, is a Gospel Standard Baptist. Styles cites examples of practical Antinomianism within Strict and Particular Baptist churches in Manual, p. 315. One of the reasons Philpot and Tiptaft seceded from the Church of England was the rampant licentiousness they found in the ordained priesthood there. And yet Philpot himself (1) was accused of licentious conduct in marrying a young teenage girl approximately half his age and of questionable spiritual profession. She just happened to be Tiptaft's niece and the wedding had the blessing of Warburton with full knowledge of the facts. Tryon was one who levelled the accusation against Philpot in his Present Tokens.
A Baptist minister was once conversing with him about the doctrines that he preached, telling him that they led to licentiousness. "Indeed", said Mr. G., "do they lead me to licentiousness?" "Why, no", replied the minister, "I don't mean you exactly." "Well," said Mr. G., "do they lead my church to licentiousness?" "No," replied the minister; "I don't say they do." "Well," continued Mr. G., "do they lead you to licentiousness?" "No," replied the minister, "for I don't believe in them." "Well, then," said Mr. G., "if they lead neither believers nor unbelievers to licentiousness, pray tell me who the characters are they do so lead?"16

As for Gill, he was certainly innocent of even the slightest hint of libertinism.17 For example, he condemned as 'criminal' such licentious activities as card-playing, stage-plays and other such entertainments.18 (Such practices were usually defended by the Deists.) One early source records the "He was a smoker until he heard of his mother's death, when he put down his pipe and never smoked again".19 He did not allow...

16. In John Gadsby, Memoir of Gadsby, p.64. Cf. Hassell, History, pp.617-618. For another anecdote in which Gadsby and an Arminian opponent compare which of them lived the holier life, see Memoir of Gadsby, pp.117-118.


19. W.W., 'Gospel Ministers and Places', XXVI, p.184. Gadsby evidently opposed the practice (John Gadsby, Memoir of Gadsby, p.124). On smoking tobacco, see Tryon, Present Tokens, pp.72-74, 78. Pink was known to have been a smoker. Herman Hoeksema not only smoked a pipe but once won a cigar-smoking contest sponsored by his church (Gertrude Hoeksema, Therefore, pp.80-81, 173, 175, 240). A small repository could be filled with the recorded anecdotes concerning the well-known 'big black cigars' of C.H. Spurgeon. Many are obviously apocryphal, but the consensus of historic research amongst Spurgeonic aficionados is that the Baptist preacher eventually followed the example of his eminent predecessor and ceased all use of tobacco. Smoking, of course, has been disdained in many conservative-minded churches, but the practice has not always been subject to such disapproval in all schools of Calvinism. Dr. Lachman, whose work has been alluded to in these pages, mentions that John Murray, his former Professor who has also been referred to herein, sometimes smoked "small bits of black rope that were alleged... Cont'd:
musical instruments to accompany congregational singing. Such would border on entertainment. On the other hand, Gill was no total abstainer from alcohol, but he did advocate moderation and great caution, especially among ministers.

Toon labels Gill a casuist. If that means that Gill applied doctrine to the realm of ethics, we agree. But if it means that his ethical system did not allow for 'things indifferent' — which are neither right nor wrong but depend upon the situation — then we disagree. Gill: "what things in one age, and in one nation, are reckoned immodest are not so accounted in another age, and in another nation". Freedom in Christ means liberty and "this liberty lies in the free use of things indifferent". To some this may appear like 'situation ethics' or a form of libertinism. But Gill also states that 'things indifferent' may be done only if not explicitly condemned in Scripture, if they are done in faith with the aim of glorifying God, and if they do not cause a weaker brother to stumble. It is a misuse of Christian liberty and therefore

20. Comment on Psa. 149:3, 150:5. So also Gadsby, according to John Gadsby, Memoir of Gadsby, p.111. Unaccompanied congregational singing has often been the standard with Hyper-Calvinists and more than a few Highs, while the Lower varieties appear to have been more open to musical accompaniment. Similarly, the higher forms have sometimes been given to exclusive Psalmody, while the revival of Hymnody in the eighteenth century came mostly through Low Calvinists and Arminians (e.g., Watts, Doddridge, and the Wesleys). On the other hand, one must not overlook Calvin's strict views in favour of exclusive Psalmody. See Gill's Comment on Eph. 5:19; Rippon, pp.xxiii-xxiv.

21. Comment on Lev. 10:9, I Tim. 3:3, 5:23, etc. Divergent views have also been expressed on this case of conscience. Hoeksema was definitely not a total abstainer (Gertrude Hoeksema, Therefore, pp.19, 240). Gadsby was, however, though he may have allowed alcoholic wine to be served at communion (see John Gadsby, Memoir of Gadsby, pp.123-124; Gadsby, Works, vol.II, p.70). Pink seems to have allowed for the latter. Virtually all have opposed taverns (e.g., Kershaw, Grace Alone, p.163). Teetotalism certainly was not the position of the Reformers. Why, even Luther was known to discuss theology over a stein of ale!

22. HC, pp.98, 127. Wilks speaks of Tucker as "that great casuist" (p.132). Hussey: "the design of preaching is to bring down general truths to particular cases" (Gospel-Feast, 1Epistle to the Reader!).

23. Comment on Ruth 3:4. In the context Gill is making a judgement about ethics, not merely an observation about comparative cultural mores.

24. Comment on Gal. 5:1. The phrase 'things indifferent' was employed by Calvin (e.g., Institutes, III, 19, 13) and Pink (Paul, pp.24-31; Practical Christianity, pp.169-182), but not very often in most Hyperists. It might surprise Hypers and non-Hypers alike to find the concept in Philpot (Answers, pp.107-110).

25. Comment on I Cor. 7:22, 10:23, Rom. 15:1.
libertine to use these things to the injury of the consciences of others. It is also licentious to class as neutral or indifferent something which Scripture forbids, even as it is legalistic to make something ethically necessary if it is not. Gill may have accepted Augustine's dictum: "Love God and do as you please". But we have not found where he explicitly says so.

Gill attempted to prevent libertinism in his church through discipline. He was a firm believer in church discipline, which might come as a surprise to some of his critics. Five sorts of persons are listed who must be disciplined: schismatics, those who fail regularly to attend corporate worship, those who walk disorderly, those who continue unrepentant in known sin, and heretics. The procedure of discipline includes admonition, barring from the Lord's Table and ultimately cessation of membership. The Church Record Book should be consulted for examples. It records the following: drunkenness, lying, covetousness, abusing one's wife, neglect of communion, contempt for the authority of church elders, absence from church attendance, idleness, indolence, embezzlement, forgery, "making ballads", "encouraging lewdness and debauchery", robbery, fraud, swearing, "occasional conformity to ye church of England", and neglect of the Lord's Day. There are records of admonitions and excommunications, as well as of repentance and reinstatement. Sometimes a person applied again several times for re-admission but was refused for lack of evidence of repentance.

Two points must be made here. The first is that Gill exercised

28. Cf. Comm on Lev. 14:45. See our comments in Chapter V, Section H, on Strict Communion. The Gospel Standard Rules (Article 6) states that one is to be disciplined if he knowingly participates in the Lord's Supper in any non-Gospel Standard Church. See also Articles 7-11 of the Rules.
29. There are few examples of discipline for offences relating to the Sabbath, though this was an area in which the Puritans were especially strict. Keach, one of Gill's predecessors, disciplined those who observed a seventh-day Sabbath (T.E. Dowley, pp.209-216. Cf. Manley, Rippon, p.101). The relative scarcity of discipline in this area during Gill's pastorate may be due to his distinctive non-Sabbatarianism, for which see Section E below.
discipline for those guilty of 'Enthusiasm' and denying that the internal work of the Holy Spirit in conversion necessarily produced a sanctified, holy life. Such persons denied that sanctification is a necessary corollary of justification. They may well have been practical as well as doctrinal Antinomians, but we do not know. Three members were disciplined on one occasion and there were probably a few others later. 31 Our point is that though Gill was a doctrinal Antinomian in some sense, he did not at all allow practical Antinomianism. Secondly, in the light of the many and varied examples of discipline recorded in the Church Record Book, one might question the true state of holiness in the church. 31 With so many cases and kinds of open sin, could not one say that libertinism was common? Does this not prove that doctrinal Antinomianism unwittingly produced libertinism? To some, the record shows that Gill attempted to keep it in check; to others it only shows that he was unconsciously encouraging it by the type of preaching he did. Now both his predecessor (Keach) and successor (Rippon) exercised discipline, and their records show little difference from Gill's in number and kinds of offences. 32 But nobody is accusing either of them of doctrinal Antinomianism per se. Moreover, had there been no records of discipline, one might have contended that Gill was lax in discipline, that holiness of life was not thought important to him.

The Church, says Gill, must discipline because God Himself disciplines and chastens His children and uses the Church as a means. Some critics of Hyper-Calvinism charge that Antinomians and their successors denied that the Lord chastens believers. This accusation is

30. See the extract from the Church Record Book quoted in Iviney, vol. III, pp. 442-443. This is probably the incident referred to by Harrison p. 19. A case of 'Enthusiasm' was recorded also on 3 July, 1732. Brine wrote that anyone who says that the Law is not our rule of conduct should be put out of the churches (Vindication, p. 84). Would he have excommunicated Gadsby and Philpot?

31. Having read the entire Church Record Book for the pastorates from Keach to Rippon, we estimate that there was one case of discipline approximately every three months. The size of the congregation, though, fluctuated during this period between a minimum of about 200 to a maximum of about 1000. See Chapter I above.

32. For Keach, see T. E. Dowley, pp. 207-216; for Rippon, see Manley, Rippon, pp. 95-102.

33. E.g., Huehns, p. 8; Harrow of Modern Divinity, p. 217; (anonymous) A Declaration Against the Antinomians, pp. 3-4; William Young, op. cit., p. 271. Thomas Dray, an obscure Antinomian of the last century, defended non-chastisement in Love, Wisdom, and Faithfulness of Jehovah. Philpot opposed this work in Reviews, vol. I, pp. 565-579. Huntington's views were more extreme than most. Sometimes he spoke of chastening as the Law-work that leads to conviction and conversion, in which case those already converted are not chastened. But he still accepted a non-penal form of chastening for believers. See Works, vol. I, p. 7; vol. VIII, pp. 31-43; vol. XIII, p. 251; vol. XIV, p. 161; vol. XVIII, p. 169; Last Fragments, p. 87; and often in his Letters. In a sense, the non-... Cont'd:
basically without foundation, but we can see whence the misunderstanding arose. Crisp taught that "God doth never punish any believer after he is a believer, for sin". But this simply means that believers will never suffer the wrath of Hell for their sins. Christ already took their wrath and God never punishes twice for the same offence. God does indeed chasten believers but this is not punishment. "Afflictions are unto believers from sin, but not for sin."3 Gill taught likewise. Chastening comes from a Father, from love, for their good; punishment is from a judge, from wrath, for detriment.34 Chastening is one means by which God works repentance in sinning believers.35 This, too, is

Cont’d:

elect are never chastened. Huntington even went so far as to say that "The Moral Law is a chastening rod in the hand of God the Father, which he uses upon all the elect children that he has given to Christ", but this refers to the Law-work preceding conversion; thus, there is no 'Law as a rule' to believers. This could be interpreted as a form of non-chastisement (Works, vol.XV, pp.33-37, 48, 59; vol.XX, pp.165-167). On Huntington, see Hacker, Believer’s Entanglement. Gadsby knew of but opposed an Antinomian who denied chastening (Memoir of Gadsby, pp.96-97). Gadsby accepted the chastening doctrine of Huntington to the extent of saying that since the Law curses and the Gospel chastens, believers are not under the Law as a rule. See Memoir of Gadsby, pp.89-90, 140; Works, vol.I, p.12; vol.II, pp.7, 70, 225, 283-285, 291. That some had rejected the chastening doctrine is also clear from the criticism levelled by Parks (Chastisement, especially pp.3-4, 11-13), Kershaw (A Protest, pp.21-28; Autobiography, p.283), and Pink (Gleanings from the Scriptures, p.296; Practical Christianity, pp.189-224).


36. Body, p.109. See the Comm on the relevant passages. Similarly, the death of a believer is not punishment for his sins, for Christ has already died for him (Hoeksema, IK, vol.I, pp.675, 673, 677-681; Dogmatics, p.755; Pink, Practical Christianity, p.217; Coarie, p.58). On chastening from a Father rather than a Judge, see H.A. Long, p.182; Allen, The Spiritual Magazine, vol.II, pp.159, 305-317. Gospel Standard Article XXII deals with this aspect, adding that the believer will be made to discern the reason for the chastening and that it is wise for others to attempt speculation thereof.

37. S & T, vol.II, p.127. Cf. vol.III, p.46; Gadsby, Works, vol.II, p.30. Thus, forgiveness of sins does not mean that one will not be chastened (Parks, Notes, p.281; Philpot, Reviews, ... Cont’d;
related to 'Crisp's Incentive'. When one is chastened, he is reminded that he is not getting all that he deserves, for that was placed upon Christ. This speaks of grace and forgiveness. It is a chastening of grace.

God loves the elect but hates their sins, "yet their sins do not hereby cease to be sins", "nor is sin itself a real good". Believers are not without sin, but they do not incur the same anger from God as do the reprobate. They are not the sons of wrath in the same sense, for they have not been appointed to wrath. This leads to the controversial statement which many critics feel is definitive of Antinomianism: "God sees no sin in a believer". Gill admits that this statement is true. It is, he confesses, "the sum and substance of the Gospel". "If this is a fancy, it is the glory of the Bible, and the marrow of the Gospel." But by this he means the doctrine of forgiveness:

Cont'd:

vol. I, pp.575-576; Answers, pp.7-10, in which Philpot says that chastening is in both testaments and that chastening of Heb.12 is not Law-work conviction). In addition to the citations listed above, we have found the basic doctrine of chastisement in the following Hyperists: Vinall, John Gadsby, Goulding, S. F. Paul, John Martin, Craner, Stockell, Bentley, Hale, Silver, Feist, Foreman, Raven, J.C. Ryland, Sr., Popham, Raven, Windridge, Sawyer and others, but listing the documentation would be unnecessarily tedious. The multitude of evidence overwhelming presents the viewpoint presented herein.

38. S & T1, vol. III, pp.42, 44; Comm on Rom. 8:28. So also Body, p.101; S & T1, vol. I, p.13; Song, p.154; Hoekema, Dogmatics, p.247; Philpot, Reviews, vol. I, p.569; Answers, p.8; Pink, Atonement, p.176. Antinomians used bold statements easily misunderstood, as Eaton: "there is no sin in the Church of God; for they which do believe in Christ are no sinners" (Honeycombe, pp.40-41. Cf. p.130). This, however, is merely hyperbole.


41. E.g., Narrow of Modern Divinity, p.217; Flavel, Works, vol. III, pp.555-557; Huehns, p.8; Crow, p.3; E.S. Williams, Systematic Theology, vol. I, p.233; (anonymous) A Declaration Against the Antinomians, p.5; William Young, op. cit., p.271; Steele, Antinomianism Revived, p.35. The Antinomians did indeed use bold language here, as Eaton: "God hath made his children so perfectly holy and righteous in his sight that he sees no sin in them, in and by their justification" (Honeycombe, p.56. Cf. pp.48-49, 117-118). The matter was discussed by the Anti-Neo-nomians along similar but more precise lines, as Chauncey, Neo-nomianism Unmasked, Part III, pp.1-24. Similar pronouncements can be found in the treatments in Philpot, Reviews, vol. I, pp.566-569, 578; Gadsby, Works, vol. I, p.254; Wilks, p.376; Feist, The Believer's Security, p.12; Bentley, Balak, pp.22-23; Kershaw, Protest, pp.21-22; and others. Much more moderate are J.A. Haldane, Atonement, pp.178-198; and Pink, Interpretation, p.11; Gleanings from the Scriptures, p.96. The motif is drawn from Num. 23:21., Hab 1:13, and Jer. 50:20. Stevens: "As he knew no sin in himself, so he could not bear to see it in his chosen people: he resolved to make them as sinless as himself" (Sinlessness, p.41).

though all sin is seen by him, in articulo providentiae, in the article of providence, and nothing escapes his all-seeing eye; yet, in articulo justificationis, in the article of justification, he sees no sin in his people, so as to reckon it to them, or condemn them for it."

God, therefore, is offended by the sins of the elect but not by their persons. " God loves the elect even when they sin. " Their sin has no effect whatsoever on divine love. This, too, is related to 'Crisp's Incentive'. Saltmarsh:

No sins can make God who loves for ever and unchangeably, love us less; and yet a believer will grieve for sin, because it grieves the Spirit of his God; and though he knows sin cannot now separate from God, yet because it once separated, he hates it; and because it separates still, though not from God, yet from Communion with God..."

One could say that God virtually but not actually sees no sin in believers. God always overrules sin in believers but this does not eliminate man's culpability. Even though God has allowed sin to enter, God is not to be blamed. The guilt lies with the sinner alone."

When believers sin, they must confess their sins. " Some opponents

43. Song, p.154. See also Body, p.518; S & T, vol.I, pp.13, 507; vol.II, p.129; Comm on Num 23:21, Hab. 1:13, Jer. 50:20. Philpot: "In one sense, God may see no sin in His people; but in another He may see a great deal" (Answers, p.8). Jonathan Edwards explained that when God forgives He is said to cover and bury sins so that they cannot be seen or found, neither will He remember them (Works, 1834 ed., vol.II, p.576). This is the orthodox Reformed interpretation with which the Hypers and Antinomians are in agreement, except for a few excesses of description with the Antinomians. It is quite surprising that Park confessed, "I do not know where it is said that God sees no sin in His people" (Chastisement, p.13).


45. Cf. Crisp, CAE, vol.II, p.172; Gadsby, Works, vol.II, pp.283ff.; Parks, Notes, p.266. Critics class this as a definitive error of Antinomianism, such as John Edwards, Crispianism Unmasked, pp.35-38; E.S. Williams, Systematic Theology, vol.I, p.233; (anonymous) A Declaration Against the Antinomians, pp.4-5. The school of Hoeksema differs in asserting that God is displeased with the sins of His people, but even these divines admit that according to the Supralapsarian scheme God is not angry with the persons themselves. See Hoeksema, TK, vol. I, p.677; Hoer Hoeksema, Voice, p.665. But do not the Antinomians also accept that God is displeased with the sins of Christians but not their persons?


think that Hyper-Calvinists and Antinomians denied this. But Crisp plainly wrote, "when a believer sins, he must confess these sins ... he that indeed confesses his sin, confesses he had perished if Christ had not died for him". This is 'Crisp's Incentive' in one of its clearest forms. Believers should confess and grieve for their sins. Indeed, said Crisp, "before a believer confesses his sin, he may be as certain of the pardon of it, as after confession". To some this is blatant libertinism — sinning with the excuse that one will be forgiven anyway, sinning that grace may abound. But this is not what Crisp is here saying. Instead, he is warning against that error. He is trying to preserve the doctrine of assurance by grounding it outside of man and the sanctification syllogism. And again we are brought to the 'Incentive': the only effective way for believers to avoid sin is the assurance that if they do sin they will be forgiven. Knowing that one's sin has no effect on the love of God convinces one of the wonder of that love, and grace operates through knowledge. When a believer sins, however, he should pray for a sight of that same grace and forgiveness. He is not

Cont'd...

the duty of Christians to pray or that it is useless to pray, in the light of predestination (e.g., Rice, Hell, p.81). But we saw in Chapter III that Hypers have their own way of praying. Furthermore, they accept that prayer is indeed a duty for Christians. See Hale, Catechism, pp.83-84; Irons, Jazer, pp.103-108; Button, Remarks, p.43; Pink, Sermon on the Mount, pp.152-171, 295-315; Profiting, pp.45-56; Philpot, Sermons, vol.I, p.72; vol.VIII, p.134. Hussey said that all men have the natural duty to pray, but added that there is a kind of prayer which only believers can pray — which proceeds from special grace and is prompted by the Spirit — and which they alone have the duty to pray (see Glory, p.254). This seems to be the position also of Gadsby, whom, as we noted in Chapter VIII, told his son "The Lord teach you to pray for yourself". In some places Gadsby taught that prayer is the duty for all and in this he encouraged children to pray, while elsewhere he noted that special prayer which believers alone can offer. See Works, vol.I, pp.146-147, 254-255; vol.II, pp.12-13, 77, 94, 208-212, 309-310. Part of the difficulty is the content of prayer. Obviously those such as Hussey and Gadsby did not feel that unbelievers had the duty to pray in saving faith; conversely, believers do not have the duty according to the Law of Works to pray.


50. CAE, vol.I, p.225. Hussey held that confession is wrong, or at least inadequate, if it is not combined with faith in Christ (Glory, p.343).

51. Saltmarsh, Free Grace, p.130 (contra Kevan, p.104); Davis, Truth, p.18 (contra Rehokosh, p.13); Eaton, Honeycombe, pp.147-158.

52. CAE, vol.I, p.225. See Chapter VII.


54. CAE, vol.II, pp.161-165. Popham: "The more we are blessed the more we hate sin; and the more certain we are that we shall never be punished for sin, the more we desire to live a godly life" (Sermons, vol.III, p.176).
to pray for justification, for he is already justified; nor should he pray for a new act of forgiveness, for God has already by one eternal act forgiven all his sins; nor should he pray for a sacrifice for his sin, for Christ is the only sacrifice and He has already atoned for the sin. After one sins he is to look to Calvary.

In the light of all this, a believer need not ever fear that he will ever perish. He need not fear sin's penalty. This attitude has also been rebuked by critics. If one does not fear the penalty of sin, they ask, what will keep him from sinning? Is not fear an important incentive to obedience? Not really, said Crisp, unless that fear arises out of love. The only effective restraint is love, which comes from grace, which is shown in the fact that sin will no longer incur condemnation. But these words are only for believers, not for the licentious hearts of unbelievers. This brings us to more of Crisp's bold language: "the people of God need not be afraid of their sins ... there is no sin that ever they commit, can possibly do them any hurt". Gill admits that Crisp spoke a little boldly here, though he agrees with the sentiments themselves. Curiously, Gill adds this comment:

As to the notion of sin's doing a believer no harm, Eaton, Saltmarsh, Simpson, and Town say nothing of it... (it) was never a received tenet of any body or society of Christians among us; no, not even those who have been called Antinomians. It is not the sentiment of those who are branded with the name in this day.

But he qualifies this. On the one hand, he rejects the implications,

---

58. CAE, vol.II, p.119. Cf. vol.I, p.5; vol.II, p.51. Similar but more moderate views are found in Chauncey, Neonominism Unmasked, Part III, pp.24-38; Stockell, Redeemer's Glory, p.154; Irons, Jazer, p.41. Others are stricter here, such as Oxenham, Caution, pp.10-12; and Palmer, Free Enquiry, p.352. Gadsby: "And if he atoned for your sins, then your sins are put away by the atonement. Therefore what will harm you? Not your sins; for they are put away" (Sermons, p.328). Yet Gadsby also said that he is not a saved man who says, "I fear no sin, sin can do me no harm" (p.267).
"for though it [sin] can't hinder the everlasting salvation of God's people, it does a great deal of hurt to their peace and comfort". But all parties are in agreement on that. On the other hand, even Gill uses some bold, Crispian language at times when speaking of sin. For example, "it can't hurt them" (i.e., condemn them). God always overrules sin and in this sense sin cannot harm a believer, nor should a believer fear sin. He should fear sinning, not the curse of sin.

At this juncture Mayo asked, if the elect are eternally justified why should they fear sin? If one knows that he is elect and eternally secure in grace, what will keep him from sinning? Gill has several answers. Firstly, true faith always persevere to the end and true faith produces good works. Therefore a believer will persevere in holiness rather than licentiousness. He will sin occasionally, yes, but as a rule he will be in a state of obedience much more than disobedience. Furthermore, those who persevere in sin as a way of life are not true believers at all. Once one has received grace, he can never live his old way of life again. Those who regularly sin do not know grace, even if they claim to be Christians or claim the liberty of grace. In this sense "Sanctification is absolutely necessary to salvation". This is the Reformed doctrine of the perseverance of the saints. The elect persevere

62. Comm on Rom. 8:2.
65. Cause, pp.134; S & T, vol.I, p.46; Crisp, CAE, vol.II, p.344. On the doctrine of perseverance, see the following: Body, pp.559-578; Cause, pp.131-149; Parks, Notes, pp.99-104; Feist, The Believer's Security; Pink, The Saint's Perseverance; Hoeksema, TK, vol.II, pp.231-236; Dogmatics, pp.547-560; Homer Hoeksema, Voice, pp.629-843; Van Baren, in Hanko et al, pp.85-95. Gadsby noted that if the fifth point of Calvinism were not true, then it would be better to kill a new convert rather than risk his losing his salvation through licentiousness (in Memoir of Gadsby, p.105).
67. Body, p.559. Crisp: "Sanctification of life is (an) inseparable companion, with the justification of a person by the free grace of Christ" (CAE, vol.I, pp.48-49). Cf. Fletcher's commendation of Crisp here in Works, vol.II, pp.277-278. Davis was charged by Rehokosht (p.6) with teaching "Sanctification is no evidence of justification", but by this he merely meant that works alone do not provide assurance (Truth, p.18). Philpot: "If there is justification, there is sanctification" (Sermons, vol.IV, p.29). Pink: "Holiness in this life is absolutely necessary to salvation; not only as a means to the end, but by a nobler kind of necessity - as part of the end itself" (Sanctification, p.28). Cf. Sermon on the Mount, pp.344-349; Traill, Works, vol.I p.276; Comrie, p.78.
(actively) as well as are preserved (passively). To posit a doctrine of preservation without perseverance is a form of libertinism. But neither the Antinomians nor Hyper-Calvinists taught that. Some Dispensation- alists, however, have taught that many (if not most) saints do not persevere in obedience even though they will be preserved in a state of salvation. 68

The doctrine of perseverance incites true holiness according to Crisp's Incentive, viz: "the doctrine of assurance is no licentious doctrine; no persons are so holy as those who are truly possessed of that grace". 69 When one knows he is elect, he will live more holily, not less so. Assurance flows from faith, faith from grace. Grace therefore produces holiness. This is not to say that believers never sin. All Calvinists have rejected this. Gill said that believers are capable of sinning all possible sins except the blasphemy against the Holy Spirit, which is unpardonable. 70 This sin "lies in the denial of the great and fundamental truth of the gospel, salvation by Jesus Christ, in all its branches". 71 A believer will never become doctrinally apostate.

This is Gill's doctrine of sanctification in relation to doctrinal Antinomianism. 72 Believers sin daily, 73 but not every minute of the day. "A believer is not an ungodly person." 74 Saints do not continue in sin ... gracious souls, when they sin, are [always] sorry for it.

69. Comm on Eph. 1:13. Cf. Popham, Sermons, vol.III, p.176; Homer Hoeksema, Voice, pp.209-217. Stevens: "He that can sin because he is safe and salvation is free, may expect to suffer because he is presumptuous and damnation is sure!" (Register, p.3).
72. See especially Body, pp.552-559. Robison ("Legacy", p.121) erroneously says that "In proportion to the total volume of his writings, he had very little to say about the holy life, a fact that his critics duly noted". Though Gill may not have been as specific on contemporary issues, nevertheless he wrote much about the general principles of sanctification and godliness. There are dozens of books, treatises and sermons on sanctification from the Hyperists, of which Pink's The Doctrine of Sanctification is the most popular.
74. DJ, pp.40-41.
repent of it..."73 As Toplady said, "no true believer can possibly be an Antinomian" in the sense of the libertine.76

But what about 'perfection'? Did not Saltmarsh hold that "a justified person is a perfect person"?77 This refers only to justification, which is already perfect and complete. With regard to justification, one is as perfect as those already in heaven." Saltmarsh, Crisp and Gill are in full harmony with orthodox Calvinism here, as well as in rejecting the Wesleyan notions of the possibility of perfection of sanctification in this life. For the Calvinists, justification is past and perfect; sanctification is gradual and imperfect. The Wesleyan Perfectionists posited that justification is progressive and imperfect; sanctification can be perfect in this life. (This, however, does not deny the Reformed doctrine of a three-tiered justification.) Moreover, said Gill, the elect are perfect with regard to imputed righteousness but imperfect as to infused righteousness." A believer has Christ's imputed righteousness in full but the infused righteousness only in part. He has the new nature and the principle of grace in him; but he also has Adam's infused sin, the old nature and the principle of sin at work in him. The result is a continual internal warfare. The old nature does nothing but sin; the new nature does nothing but obey.78 It would be libertinism of a sort to assert that a believer has only the old nature; it is Perfectionism to assert that he can have only the new nature.

Because of this view of internal warfare, some critics feel that Hyper-Calvinists often shift the blame for sin in believers onto Adam, Satan, or even God.81 After all, if the old nature only sins and is unable to

77. Free Grace, p.129. Similar statements can be found in Dell and Eaton.
... Cont'd
obey, is one really responsible? This argument is rejected by Gill. Depravity does not negate responsibility. But Fuller and other critics contend that Hyper-Calvinists often speak about 'the old nature' as if it were not them at all. Much of this discussion centres on the interpretation of Romans 7.

Several points should be touched upon briefly in closing. Firstly, some have felt that the doctrinal Antinomians rejected the notion of rewards for believers. But we have seen nothing substantiating this. Of course, Reformed theology has often been accused of libertinism by Socinians and others in this regard, for Calvinism teaches that salvation has nothing to do with rewards. But our subjects added that there are incidental rewards given to the saints in proportion to their sanctification here. However, they were slower to speak of this than were, say, the Neonomians.

Secondly, these Calvinists never asserted that the commission of sin ever glorifies God. Rather, as Gill stated, it is the forgiveness of sin that glorifies God in believers. Men sin through want of grace, for grace prevents sin. Grace also forgives sin, but this does not minimize the guilt of it. Grace always justifies the sinner but never justifies the sin. It is grace, not sin, which glorifies God. God is also glorified when grace leads one in the ways of obedience.

Cont'd:....
82. See Seymour, pp.131-135, and Chapter IV and VIII above.
83. E.g., Bedford, p.18; Kevan, p.190; Rice, Hell, p.81; Pittman, Questions, pp.37-38. Brine occasionally sounded as if he rejected the idea of rewards, but in fact he was only saving that we do not obey the Law in order to be saved by it (Vindication, p.248). Wells and Styles verged on the error by denying that there will be degrees of glory for the saints as there will be degrees of damnation for sinners, even though there will indeed be a judgement for the works of believers in heaven. See Wells, Moral Government, p.34; Styles, Guide, pp.99-105, 115-119. H.A. Long: "The true Calvinist thinks nothing of reward in the sublime to come" (p.198), but this has to do with the merit of salvation and the aim of moral endeavour, not an explicit denial of rewards. Atkinson: "Rewards of merit from God are beyond the reach of men in any state, but rewards of debt are not" (Faith, p.54). We know of no instance in which any doctrinal Antinomian or Hyper-Calvinist has explicitly denied the doctrine of rewards, though we do not entirely rule it out. The question seems to parallel the issue of chastening. For explicit affirmations of rewards, see the relevant passages in Gill's Comm; Pink, Perseverance, pp.99-100; Hoeksema, Dogmatics, pp.514-519; I.K. vol.II, pp.366-377; Stockell, Redeemer's Glory, p.176.
84. Comm on Rom. 6:1.
Thirdly, Abraham Taylor warned that the non-offer position led to a form of practical as well as doctrinal Antinomianism. He does not elaborate but we feel that the criticism is correct. If the command to evangelize the world is part of God's Moral Law – as is admitted by most Calvinists – then those who do not evangelize are not obeying God's Law. When they persistently do not evangelize and even oppose those who do, this can be seen only as a licentious abuse of one of God's commands. And that is a form of practical Antinomianism. Hyper-Calvinists, of course, reply that they do evangelize. If they took the extreme position of the elder Ryland and denied that believers should evangelize, then that would be different. Hyper-Calvinists at least say that they evangelize. But those who disagree with their concept of evangelism charge them with redefining evangelism in such a way as to excuse their disobedience. If this is practical Antinomianism, it is a lesser form. After all, it is not a libertinism extending to all of the other commands of Moral Law. Other critics contend that the non-offer view is but a disguise to cover their inner libertinism. The inner attitude of Hyper-Calvinists, it is suggested, is one of pride, selfishness and laziness. This lacks the compassion for sinners that compels one to evangelize. In the end it is a disobedience of the great command to love one's neighbour. Flagrantly to disobey that command is licentious in the extreme.

Lastly, we mention a small point of dispute amongst certain Hyper-Calvinists over whether sanctification is progressive as concerns the old sinful nature. Mainstream Hyperists have held that there are several stages of sanctification: eternal (decretive), in the Cross, infused through the Spirit, and then the daily growth in grace, culminating in perfection in heaven. The daily aspect is called progressive sanctification, but herein lies the dispute. All sides accept that there is a continual battle between the two natures in a believer, but some of the higher Hyper-Calvinists so stressed the fact that the 'old nature' never does anything virtuous that they tended to deny that the balance of the two natures is affected. Or, more to the point, they denied that

86. E.g., Packer, Evangelism and the Sovereignty of God, p.96.
the old nature is ever sanctified - spiritual growth in sanctification refers only to the new nature. The Christian, moreover, is always absolutely dependent upon grace. The old nature is mortified, not sanctified. In a sense, it could even be said that the new nature is already perfect in that it never sins. Sanctification is ultimately God's duty, not the Christian's. This is, in sum, the essence of the extreme theory." As is evident, it is in keeping with the thesis of our investigation that Hyper-Calvinism has the tendency to remove all responsibility from the Creature and give it all to the Creator.

In turn this raised two other disputes. The first was over whether a Christian can backslide. Some affirmed it, others denied it. Much of the controversy was semantical. That is, what is meant by 'backsliding'? If it meant that a Christian never sins, no Hyper ever accepts that. If it means that a Christian can live in perpetual sin, that too is denied by all. But, curiously, certain Hypers fell out with others by so stressing the divide between sovereignty and responsibility that they asserted that a Christian can indeed backslide. Indeed, any who said otherwise were disdained as proud persons who infringed upon the divine prerogative. In some quarters this implied that a Christian should be expected to backslide."

The other matter raised was over whether sanctification is infused or imputed. Historically, Calvinists have usually held that justification is imputed, not infused; and sanctification is infused, not imputed."

89. On the rejection of progressive sanctification see the following: Styles, Manual, pp.143-145; Philpot, Tiphtaft, p.29; Gospel Standard Article XIX. Hazelton: "I do not believe in progressive sanctification as to the experience of the believer, for where is the saint who feels that he becomes holier every day?" (Sermons, p.172). Wilks opined that Modern Calvinists held to progressive sanctification, while Modern Antinomians such as himself rejected it (Wilks, pp.24, 390-435). Philpot and Gadsby fell out with Tryon and Hazelrigg on the subject, the former tending to the rejection of the progressive view. See Philpot, Reviews, vol.I, pp.465, 527-535; Hazelrigg, Letter to Mr. Gadsby; Reply and Confessions; Indwelling Sin; Thoughts upon God's Word.

90. On the assertion that a Christian can backslide, or the denial that a Christian cannot backslide, see: Vinall, Sermons, pp.186, 451; Gadsby, Sermons, pp.142, 266; Works, vol.II, pp.215-217, 230-234, 283-292; John Gadsby, Memoir of Gadsby, p.96; Kershaw, Protest, pp.6-21; S.E. Pierce, Exposition of Hosea (milder than the others); and Gospel Standard Article XXII. Some of the controversy surrounded Philpot's work, The Heir of Heaven Walking in Darkness and the Heir of Hell Walking in Light; which was answered by 'Presbyter', Remarks on a Sermon. In this context Kershaw remarked on a similar issue by rejecting the notion that "sin in the thought of the heart is as offensive to God as sin in the outward act" (Protest, pp.28-31).

91. See Chapter VI above.
But certain extreme Hyperists felt that both were imputed.\footnote{92. On the one side see Stevens, \textit{Doctrinal Antinomianism Refuted}, pp.6-27; Popham, \textit{Sermons}, vol.II, pp.94, 163; vol.III, p.79. On the other side, see Beart, \textit{Truth Defended}, Part II, pp.102-110; J.C. Ryland, Jr., \textit{The Work of Faith}, pp.518-519.} Sanctification is not infused into the old nature. In effect, this ended up sounding as if they virtually identified the new nature of the Christian with the Holy Spirit. Fortunately, not much has been written explaining or defending this heterodox theory. We mention it because it is yet another instance in which Hyper-Calvinists shift as much as possible away from Man and onto God. In effect this suggested that men are not responsible for their sanctification or sin – God was responsible for both. And it is this which conforms to the popular notion of Antinomians.
E. THE THREEFOLD LAW

The Antinomians and Hyper-Calvinists followed the orthodox Calvinist division of the Law into three categories: Moral, ceremonial and judicial.\(^1\) But because some of them attached some distinctive qualifications or emphases, some misunderstanding arose. It is fitting that we take a brief look at the situation.

In sum the position was this: all of the ceremonial law is abrogated; some of the judicial is done away with; but none of the Moral Law has been lessened in any way.\(^2\) It is seen immediately that the judicial (civil) law forms a bridge or overlap between the other two. The Moral Law takes precedence over the others. Sometimes the term 'Moral Law' was rejected by some Hyper-Calvinists,\(^3\) but even then the basic idea was maintained. Now this Moral Law is revealed in Nature and conscience and as such is binding on all mankind.\(^4\) It is this part of the Law, not the other two, which is a "transcript of the nature and will of God".\(^5\) It is summed up in the Decalogue and even more so in the two love commands.\(^6\) It constitutes the stipulations of the Covenant.

---

1. Body, pp.367-369; Comm on Joshua 22:5, Acts 25:8, and often; Pink, Sermon on the Mount, pp.50-51. Wells spoke of the triad as natural (Moral), legal (civil) and dispensational (temporary or ceremonial). See Letters to Theophilus, vol.II pp.126-144. Palser preferred to divide the Law into natural and moral. The first is based on necessity (the divine nature) and the second on divine sovereignty (the divine will). The former is the matter, the latter is the mode. See Epitome, pp.23-25; Moral Distinctions; Law and Gospel, especially p.5. This was to reject the usual triad on the one hand and to oppose Well's views, which came to a head in the Rahab controversy.


4. E.g., Comm on Deut. 19:14, 22:15. See Chapter II.

5. Comm on Jer. 31:33. Gadsby wavered on this point. He agreed that the Law is a transcript of God's holiness and justice, but denied that it was a transcript of mercy, for the Law knows no mercy (Works, vol.I, pp.102-103; vol.II, p.67). On the place of mercy in the Moral Law in the theology of mainstream Puritanism, see Kevan's definitive study, The Grace of Law. Kevan points out that the usual Puritan view was that though the Moral Law did not itself contain mercy, it nevertheless pointed to mercy. Thus, the Law is not antithetical to the Gospel, nor is holiness against grace.

6. Comm on Ex. 20:1, etc.; Styles, Manual, p.17; Gadsby, Works, vol.I, p.72; Hoeksema, IK, vol.I, p.57; Hale, Catechism, pp.11-12; Stockell, Confession, p.33. Compare Westminster Confession XX: 2-3 and Catechisms. Unlike the Puritans, the Hyper-Calvinists have not produced many expositions of the Ten Commandments. Gill gives a very brief outline at the end of the Body (pp.991-994), and its brevity has caused Seymour to doubt Gill's interest in the details of ethics or casuistry. As a matter of fact, however, the brevity of Gill's treatment here can be explained. It was perhaps the very last thing which Gill wrote - and that only shortly before his death. Following a pattern rather in keeping with Puritan bodies of divinity, Gill was intent on a fuller exposition of the Ten Commandments as well as the Lord's Prayer (it would have been... Cont'd:
of Works, being thoroughly conditional. Some of the precepts are commands, others prohibitions.

Some of God's commands are all of the Moral Law but some are a mixture of any two or all three of the categories. It is very important therefore to determine the categorization of the commands in Scripture in order to know how or whether to obey any one in particular.

The Moral Law continues into the dispensation of grace but the ceremonial law does not. The ceremonial law was only given to the nation of Israel and has never been binding upon Gentiles. It consisted in ordinances and precepts such as circumcision and those surrounding the sacrificial system. It was entirely symbolical; it was the Gospel in types. Now that Christ has come, the shadows have passed away and the ceremonial law is no longer needed. Similarly, the Church replaces Israel, though in a very real sense the Church existed in the Old Covenant with Israel. But the ceremonial law no longer has immediate relevance to the Church. He is a weak Christian, says Gill, who still clings to the ceremonial law in part or in whole. And thus far all

Cont'd:

unlikely that he would have treated the Apostles' Creed, however. On the other hand, Gill's Commentary Ex. 20 is quite substantial, not to mention his exposition of other texts concerning individual Commandments. Yet Seymour was correct to point out that this sort of practical divinity was not the norm with the Hyperists. Pink gave what was for him an extremely cursory treatment in The Ten Commandments, while Hoeksema's exposition of the Decalogue fills the better part of vol. III of The Triple Knowledge. None of the seventeenth century Antinomians expounded the Decalogue as such, though at times they brought in the two love commandments in relationship to their discussions of divine grace. In the bulk of Hyperist sermons one can find sermons here and there on all of the Ten Commandments and the two love commands, but none of them to our knowledge form a notable series as such.

7. Commentary on II Cor. 3:11.

8. S & T', vol. I, p. 41; Commentary on John 8:36, Acts 13:14, Matt. 5:17, Psal. 19:9, Eccles. 9:10, Gal. 3:19, Heb. 2:2, Col. 2, etc. So also Westminster Confession XX:1; Gadsby, Works, vol. I, pp. 69-73. Gadsby concluded that the ceremonial law is not the believer's rule (vol. I, pp. 34, 38). Pink felt that the ceremonial law has not entirely been abolished. The Law of Moses, which is both ceremonial and judicial, "has not been repealed" for those under it. But it has always governed Jews, never Gentiles. Presumably this means that it is still in effect for non-Christian Jews, but what about Christian Jews? As for the Gentiles, what concerns them is the substance fore-shadowed by the ceremonial law. See Law and the Saint, p. 9; Sermon on the Mount, p. 53.


this is in agreement with orthodox Reformed theology. Says Toplady, the Antinomian question concerns the Moral not the ceremonial law.\textsuperscript{11}

Contrary to some opinions, the Antinomians and Hyper-Calvinists were Federalists. The Low Calvinists usually were also but some tended to reject certain distinctives of Federalism. For example, there has been debate whether Neonomianism can be considered Federalist. In the early nineteenth century there arose another theology which has usually been of a Low Calvinist variety and which has been a reaction against Federalism. That is Dispensationalism. Now some Federalists,\textsuperscript{12} especially those of the current Theonomy school,\textsuperscript{13} classify Dispensationalism as a form of Antinomianism. There is much confusion here. For one thing, they are not really suggesting that Dispensationalism arose out of Calvinistic Antinomianism. But there is sometimes the implication that Dispensationalism is yet another form of 'Antinomianism', and since it it usually Low Calvinist in doctrine, associations or comparisons of this nature often occur. Defining Dispensationalism is difficult but suffice it here to state that it stresses the differences between Israel and the

\textsuperscript{11} Works, vol. III, pp. 412-413.

\textsuperscript{12} Cf. Kevan, p. 261; Berkhof, Systematic Theology, p. 543; Blair, in The New International Dictionary of the Christian Church, p. 48; Steele, Antinomianism Revived, or, The Theology of the So-Called Plymouth Brethren Examined and Refuted. Hoeksema also opposed Dispensationalism (e.g., TK, vol. I, pp. 554-556; vol. II, pp. 166-175, 210-220, 262; and Good Pleasure). It may be recalled that A.W. Pink was originally Dispensational, as revealed in some of his earlier works (Genesis, Parables, Redeemer's Return, The Antichrist, etc.). Later he vigorously repudiated and opposed Dispensationalism, especially in The Sermon on the Mount. For example, in that work he rebuked those Dispensationalists who took the line that the Sermon on the Mount was spoken to national Israel at a specific time and therefore is not applicable to Christians, as its use will be resurrected for the Jews only in a yet future period (pp. 136-137). It must be admitted, however, that Dispensationalists have varied on this point. The more moderate ones see some uses of the Sermon on the Mount for Gentile Christians, while the more extreme ones (such as E.W. Bullinger) completely reject its use for today. We hasten to point out that evidence of Pink's Hyper-Calvinism can be found in the same period as his Dispensationalism (e.g., The Sovereignty of God). This is the only example, to our knowledge, of the merger of the two by any author at any time. J.W. Darby, usually credited with founding modern Dispensationalism, was certainly a Calvinist and often emphasized it, but he never ventured into Hyperism. The closest he came was in his distinctive views on the extent of the atonement, but our impression is that they were more Dualist than Particularist. Particularist Dispensationalism is rare.

\textsuperscript{13} Theonomism has already been mentioned in the present work. Its leading writers include Rushdoony, Bahnson, North and F.N. Lee. If Dispensationalism is always emphatic, if not extreme, Pre-Millenialism, Theonomism is always emphatic Post-Millenialism. This is not to say that all other Pre-Millenialists are Dispensational (e.g., G.E. Ladd, Robert Gundry), nor that all Post-Millenialists are Theonomist. Theonomism is a fairly recent school of High Calvinism and has its roots in 'The Philosophy of the Cosmic Idea' formulated by Dooyeweerd, Van Til and Vollenhoven. Amongst current Evangelicals, Theonomists are perhaps the most fervent opponents of Dispensationalism.
Church, while Federalism attempts to maintain the similarity or connection between them.

We mention this for this reason: Gill and Hussey were accused of Antinomianism because they differentiated Israel and the Church with reference to the Covenants in a way which, to some at least, appeared less than Federal. But this is not to say that they were Dispensationalists, though they employed the term 'dispensation' in their writings. On the other hand, Gill had a peculiar theology of the Millenium and some might see in this something of a quasi-Dispensationalism. That is, most High Calvinists were either Amillenial or Post-millennial, but Gill was a combination of Post-millenial and Premillenial. Another similarity was the way in which he indicated the differences between the Old and New Covenants. The Puritan Federalists tended to place them closer together, but the Antinomians placed more distance between them. The Hyper-Calvinists like Gill described them like this: there is a mixture of Law and grace in both dispensations; there is more Law than grace in the Old, more grace than Law in the New, but neither exclusively in either. Sins against the Moral Law are sins in both dispensations. The extreme Dispensationalists, however, sometimes speaks as if there were no grace in the Old and no Law in the New. It is the old problem of Law and grace that is debated.

Another question is over which commands are of the Moral Law and which are of the ceremonial law. Of special relevance is the Sabbath question. It is contained in the Decalogue and for that reason most High Calvinists place it entirely within the Moral Law. The only substantial difference, they add, is that in the New Covenant the day of the Sabbath has been changed from the last to the first. One need not read much Puritan theology to see that the Sabbath question was a perennial controversy. It is logical, then, for them to class as Antinomian anyone who felt that Christians are not bound to keep the Sabbath commandment. But most seventeenth century Antinomians were

15. Body, p. 367. See Chapters III and V.
17. This is the contention of Theonomists like F.N. Lee, The Covenantal Sabbath, pp. 29, 195, 202, 219, 231, 235, 254-255; but also non-Theonomists such as John MacLeod, Scottish Theology, p. 301. "Evangelical Antinomians today", wrote William Young fairly recently, "are apt to exempt the Christian Sabbath-keeping" (in Encyclopedia of Christianity, vol. I, p. 278). Pink... Cont'd:
Sabbatarians, as have been most Hyper-Calvinists. John Gill, though, was not a Sabbatarian in the strict sense of the term. And that created controversy.

The Church Record Book shows the Sabbatarianism was predominant in the church during the pastorates of Keach and Rippon but not during Gill's ministry, except at the beginning. But Gill did discipline for offences relating to the Lord's Day. Is this a contradiction? The situation was as follows. According to Gill there is no 'Creation Sabbath'. Genesis 2:3 is merely in anticipation of the Sabbath given to Israel. The Sabbath is not a command of the Moral Law written in Nature nor in conscience. The Sabbath commandment began with Israel

Cont'd:... condemned "Dispensationalists (who repudiate one of the greatest of all God's commands: the Sabbath-Statute)" (Sermon on the Mount, p.59).

18. See the following: Crisp, CAE, vol.I, p.126; vol.II, pp.170, 333; Eaton, Honeycombs, p.13; Hussey, Glory, pp.255, 697-698, 870-871; Wells, Experience, p.46; Johnson, Confession, pp.104-113; Vinall, Memoir, pp.33, 113; Bentley, Mark, pp.38-42; H.A. Long, Calvinism, p.104; Pink, Ten Commandments, pp.32-36; Hoeksema, TJK, vol.III, pp.298-271; The Sojourners Sabbath; Popham, Sermons, vol.II, pp.55; vol.III, p.117; vol.IV, p.169; Cousel, pp.88-89; Kershaw, Autobiography, p.166. Philpot was a Sabbatarian, but allowed the sale of sermons, tea, etc., on Sundays (Answers, pp.127-128. See also Sermons, vol.III, p.55). Gadsby was Sabbatarian, as evidenced by his enthusiastic support for Sunday (Sabbath) Schools. He alleged that certain Anti-Antinomians who opposed him broke the Sabbath or kept none at all. Like most High, Antinomian and Hyper-Calvinists, he did not accept holy days such as Christmas or Easter. Moreover, he argued that the change from Saturday to Sunday is proof of the Gospel Standard doctrine. "You should recollect that the law says 'The seventh day is the Sabbath', not the first. You Must not go to the law of works, sir, to prove that the first day in the week is set apart for the worship of God." If one, therefore, holds that the Law is the rule and standard for Christians, then consistency demands that he become a seventh-day Sabbatarian. See Works, vol.I, pp.12-13, 41-42, 74; vol.II, pp.85-89, 305-310. These remarks must be understood in the context of his theory that the Law of Faith (the Gospel) completely replaces the Law of Works. Gadsby feels that the former contains some, but not all, precepts of the latter. Thus, Gadsby's doctrine of the Sabbath illustrates his Gospel Standard doctrine in a way which is not in the orthodox tradition of the usual triad in relationship to the Gospel. The Puritans were almost always Sabbatarians and literature on the subject is enormous. The mainstream position was presented in the Westminster Confession (XX:7), the Larger Catechism (Questions 115-121), and the Shorter Catechism (Questions 57-82).


20. Comm on Gen. 2:3, 4:3, Ex. 20:8; Body, p.965. On Gill's view of the Sabbath, see especially Body, pp.964-972, and the Comm on the relevant passages. Other non-Sabbatarian Hyper-Calvinists include Stevens, Register, p.3; Primitive Baptists such as Hassell, History, pp.45-46; and probably Palmer, Law and Gospel, p.4; and Bradbury, Grove Chapel Pulpit, vol.I, p.283. Gill's non- (or, at best, semi-) Sabbatarianism would come as a great shock to many later and current Hyper-Calvinists. More shattering to the foundations of Calvinistic Sabbatarianism is the fact little known to thePopular Calvinist but long evident to those who have researched the matter, that John Calvin himself was not a Sabbatarian. For instance, see Tracts and Treatises, vol.II, pp.61-63; Sermons on Deuteronomy, pp.200-212; and Comm on the relevant passages. In a recent monograph on the history of the development and deviations of Calvinism, Alan Sell has noted the incident in which the strict Sabbatarian John Knox was dismayed to find Calvin playing bowls... Cont'd
at Sinai in order to differentiate Israel from the Gentiles. Therefore no Gentile has ever been under obligation to keep the Sabbath. It was thus part of the ceremonial law and was a type of Christ. Now that Christ has come and has rested in the grave, the Sabbath is unnecessary and is abolished. Christ is the 'sum and substance' of the Sabbath. He has the authority to abolish it and He did just that, together with the rest of the ceremonial law. Only weak Christians keep the Sabbath. Keeping the Sabbath insults Christ, for it insinuates that Christ is not the antitype.

But there is another side to the Sabbath according to Gill. The Fourth Commandment, he says is a mixed commandment – partly Moral, partly ceremonial. In the New Covenant dispensation, there is a correspondence between the Sabbath and the Lord's Day. The latter is sometimes, but not strictly, called the Sabbath. The Jews were also in more or less the same locality and could keep the same Sabbath, but Christians are scattered worldwide and cannot keep the same day. But Christians can keep the Lord's Day in their own locality. Gill's regulations for the Lord's Day are rigid but less strict than those of the Puritans. His regulations mostly concern corporate worship, which is the main purpose of the Lord's Day, whereas for the Puritans rest from labour was as important as the assembly, if not more so. Gill also allows far greater liberty with respect to the Lord's Day than the Puritans did. For instance, he feels that it is given by permission rather than by express commandment, therefore one should not judge others who differ in their views of it. It is highly unlikely that Gill

Cont'd:...

on Sunday. "The making of this trite point blunts the edge of some caricatures of Calvin – and may surprise some latter day sabbatarian Calvinists" (Debate, pp.2,103). Sabbatarian Calvinists have usually been fairly uniform, though with a few deviations. Whitefield once believed in keeping a sundown-to-sundown Sabbath (Dallimore, vol.II, p.486), but we know of no seventh-day Calvinistic Sabbatarians. W. McLoughlin is certainly in error to aver that "Gill (was) a Seventh Day Baptist" (in Backus, State and Calvinism, p.499).

22. Comm on Matt. 12:8, Ex. 26:31, Rom. 14:5-6, Jer. 17:22; Body, p.413;
23. Comm on Ezek. 20:12, II Cor. 3:11.
27. Body, p.970; Comm on Col. 2:15.
would have favoured civil legislation governing the keeping of the Lord's Day, as was the case with the Puritans.

Several observations can be made here. Firstly, Gill felt that the Lord's Day was similar to but not entirely identical with the Sabbath. Or, one could say, they were virtually but not actually the same. Secondly, Gill did not entirely reject the Sabbath. He was not a full anti-Sabbatarian. In that sense he could not be classed an Antinomian, from the perspective of the Sabbatarians. Thirdly, he was noticeably less strict in his regulations than were the Puritans. This was enough for him to incur the accusation or at least the suspicion of being licentious with the Law. But as we saw, his differences with the Puritans were often merely those of emphasis or vocabulary. This example shows much of the relationship between the schools studied in this thesis. Lastly, this illustrates that Gill was in basic agreement with the High Calvinists as to the relationship and differences between the Moral and ceremonial laws. Their only differences concerned the application of those legal principles to specific examples, such as the Sabbath.

Another problem area in our discussion is that of the judicial, or civil, law. Some of it was of the Moral Law and thus is still binding; governments should legislate accordingly. But other parts of it were ceremonial and were only for Israel; these are abrogated and should not be legislated today. This is the position of mainstream High Calvinism as well. Some Federalists, however, tend to make most if not all of the judicial law to be moral and binding. (This is especially the case with the theocrats and Theonomists.) In asserting that Christians are freed from the ceremonial aspects of the judicial law, some of the Puritans urged a political system which supported Cromwell and left themselves open to the charge of civil Antinomianism or anarchy. This was especially true with the Independents. The reader will recall also that the Antinomians were all Independents and had a rather large influence in the New Model Army (though this influence has sometimes been overrated). The Baptists, being a sort of Independents, also tended to

28. See especially the studies of Solt and Huehns (especially pp.80, 85, 88-89), and Campbell, 'Controversies', p.76. We do not find many comments from the works of Crisp, Eaton, or Towne, while Saltmarsh and Dell commented more on the situation. Dell was against having a theocracy, for he felt that compelling outward holiness without inner reformation only made sinners hypocrites with false confidence. At times Dell even sounded politically anarchist, saying that Christians are only under Christ's spiritual laws. Nevertheless, he accepted that the Magistrate is bound to punish those who are outwardly wicked. See Works, pp.105-143.
support Cromwell, though many were apolitical. Cromwell, an Independent himself, sought the support of such minority groups who had formerly been persecuted by the Established Church and were looked upon with scorn by the Presbyterians. Some of these minority groups were of a Post-millenial persuasion attempting to legislate the Kingdom of God in the political sphere. Others were more Pre-millenial. Generally they were not royalists and therefore were viewed as anarchic. We mention again the condemnation of the Westminster Confession (XX:4) of those who oppose the established government in the name of spiritual liberty. Note, however, that this clause was omitted in the parallel clauses of the (Independent) Savoy Confession (Chapter XXI; cf. XXIV) and the Baptist Confession of 1689 (Chapter XXI; cf. XXIV). But all this changed with the Restoration, though it eased somewhat with the Acts of Toleration in 1689. Even so, throughout the golden age of Hyper-Calvinism (1707-1771) there was great political pressure in England and laid upon the Baptists and Independents – especially those of an Antinomian persuasion. They were also treated with suspicion by the Church of England, and the feelings were reciprocal.

Baptists at that time, such as John Gill, recognized the Monarch as "our rightful sovereign", but this is not to say that they were royalists. Sometimes Gill sounded royalist, but at other times he sounded much more in favour of the old Commonwealth of Cromwell and the Puritans. In any case, he did not feel that spiritual liberty freed a Christian from obedience to the State. Christians are to obey the civil magistrate in all instances except where they infringe upon 'religion


30. Solt, p.73.


and conscience'. These rulers, especially the Monarchs, should not infringe upon spiritual liberty. They are to be "fathers of their people", leading them along Biblical lines, especially in imitation of the Commonwealth of Israel. Says Gill:

I cannot but be of the opinion, that a digest of civil laws might be made out of the Bible ... either as lying in express words in it, or to be deduced by the analogy of things and cases, and by just consequences, as would be sufficient for the government of any nation.

Agreeing to a large extent with the 'Social Contract' theory of Locke and Hobbes, Gill felt that the governing and governed agree with mutual fear to rule and be ruled. This in one reason why Christians should obey the State. And since the British government allowed its subjects the liberty to worship according to conscience, Christians should obey in cheerfulness. The ideal, of course, was that all of society would worship correctly and that all rulers would be Christians in the highest sense. But, says Gill, since the perfect society will never arrive until the Millenium when Christ returns, Christians are not encouraged to enter politics. Gill was not as concerned with politics as were most of the Puritans. It is unlikely that he would have supported a revolution in his day, whether led by a Cromwell or a Washington. But such a possibility was rather unlikely, especially from the Baptist point of view.

We also add that though he supported the 'Social Contract' theory, he strongly opposed the Deists. The Deists, it was felt, sought political 'liberty' in order to indulge their sinful desires. This was libertinism in the political sphere. We question whether he would have supported the Americal Revolution, for example. Though it occurred shortly after his death in 1771, Gill would have opposed the Deism of Washington, Franklin, Jefferson and the others. He would have preferred the quasi-theocracy of the Puritan experiment there in the seventeenth-century, but that was long gone.

35. Body, pp.368, 527; Comm on Gen. 20:2.
37. Body, p.984. See Chapters II and V above.
39. Body, p.985. This is the exact opposite of Theonomism.
Gill also rejected the idea of a state church, but one wonders what he would have felt if there had been any possibility of establishing a state Baptist Church. Other areas of the political sphere receive little or no treatment by Gill. He evades the question of slavery, except to comment that spiritual liberty did not give slaves a licence to rebel against their master. Wesley, on the other hand, was active in the first stages of the movement to abolish slavery in Britain. Gill also said that spiritual liberty did not absolve the marriage bond or other binding obligations. As for military obligations, Hyper-Calvinists have taken different positions. Some, such as Pink, were pacifists; while others, such as Hoeksema, were ambivalent on supporting the military.

40. Seymour (p. 225) incorrectly says that Gill says almost nothing about the relationship between the Dissenting Churches and the Established Church. In fact, however, Gill often commented on the subject. See especially his sermon 'The Dissenters' Reasons for Separating from the Church of England'. Philpot and Tiptaft were notable seceders from the Established Church and both defended their actions in print. See especially Philpot's widely-read Secession from the Church of England Defended. Cf. also Gadsby, Works, vol. II, pp. 145-152. William Palmer was especially adamant against the Established Church. See the following items: What is Meant by Separation of Church and State?; How Livings are Bought or Bartered in the State Church; Would the Separation of Church and State be the Overthrow of the Protestant Cause?; Pietas Ecclesia, or The Dissenter's Textbook, Being a Review of England's Hierarchy in Its Principles and Practice; A Letter to Lord John Russell, on the Ecclesiastical Title Bill; A Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury; Apostolical Succession; An Examination of Ten Reasons in Favour of Church and State. On the Antinomian view of Uniformity, see Dell, pp. 57-70.

41. Compare Eph. 6:5, Col. 3:22, I Cor. 7:19-24. Dabney, Thornwell and some Theonomists have actually approved of slavery, while other Calvinists have accepted it reluctantly (e.g., Whitefield - cf. Dallimore, vol. I, pp. 494-509; vol. II, pp. 219, 367-368). John Gadsby's small book, Slavery, barely touches on the subject, being a spiritual treatise.

42. Compare on I Cor. 7:12, etc. See also Pittman, Questions, p. 84; Philpot, Answers, pp. 4-21, 65-67; Gadsby, Works, vol. II, pp. 179-198.

43. See Letters, p. 107.

44. See Gertrude Hoeksema, Therefore, pp. 81-90, 265-268.
For my own part, I should not greatly care to be reckoned ignorant, and especially enthusiastic...

Thus wrote Dr. John Gill in showing his aversion to what was known as 'Enthusiasm'. Others had charged him with this error and later Hyper-Calvinists have been subject to the accusation as well. Since the term is generally equated with mysticism, it is meet that we investigate this aspect of Hyper-Calvinism and doctrinal Antinomianism.

The term 'Enthusiasm' is not used very much any more, but in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries it was a ready term to describe persons, groups or theologies which were of a rather fanatical nature. As such it described extreme emotionalism, religious delusions, unorthodox experiences, and any unusual mystical behaviour or belief. Thus, it was often a term of abuse. In any case, it is as difficult to define as mysticism.

The Antinomians of the 1640's were particularly subjected to this charge, often in connection with the accusation of licentiousness. The sum of our present section is that these Antinomians set forth a distinctive theology which could accurately be described as 'Mystic

2. E.g., Comm on Rev. 3:3.
4. Fletcher speaks for many in noting that the two terms are similar and can both be used in a good or a bad sense (Works, vol.II, p.54).
5. In addition to the standard dictionaries, see: Hodge, Systematic Theology, vol.I, p.60; Kevan, p.34; Toon, HC, p.31; Colyer, Good News, pp.91-93; Hawker, Works, vol.I, p.212; Helm, 'Enthusiasm', pp.1-7. R.A. Knox's Enthusiasm in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries (1950) is the standard work, but it should be used with caution and critical judgement. Other historical and theological works on mysticism should also be consulted.
Calvinism', but the Hyper-Calvinists did not entirely follow in their train. We caution, however, that we do not mean 'Calvinistic Mysticism'. Our impression is that the Antinomians were Calvinists first and mystics second, howbeit of a slightly different nature than others of each of these schools.  

It must be remembered that during the Commonwealth many mystical groups flourished which had been either suppressed beforehand or which had existed only in precursory form. The Quakers got started at this time and were the most well-known, but not the most extreme by any means. Other groups of similar persuasion included the Ranters, the Familists (or Family of Love), the Levellers and the Loists. These were all more extreme than the Calvinistic Antinomians, a fact often obscured in historical theology. For example, the others were more Arminian or semi-pantheistic.

When we come to the end of the century we see a revival of Antinomianism in a different form, and then the birth of Hyper-Calvinism. Consequently one should not be surprised to read that the accusation of Enthusiasm was given at this time. Joseph Hussey, for example, was labelled in this way and he did not entirely deny the description, though he did call for understanding. Unlike most Calvinists, he admitted that there was much truth in the Quaker theology, but he also rebuffed many of its special tenets. When we come to Gill, Brine, and Wayman, again we find the accusation, except that these Hyperists firmly denied it. As we showed earlier, this classic Hyper-Calvinism was much more Stoic than mystic – and it is not our impression that Stoicism can accurately be described as mysticism, with its suppression of emotion, even if its pantheising paralleled certain mystical motifs.  

7. Likewise, there are different emphases in each of the Antinomians themselves. Crisp was the most well-known but, in spite of his bold language, was probably the most moderate of the group. Eaton, Towne, Lancaster, Simpson and Richardson were more extreme in a few points, and Saltmarsh and Dell even more so. Crisp's distinctive was the 'Incentive', the Zech. 12:10 motif, and the testimony of the Spirit. Eaton and Saltmarsh brought in new ideas in the realm of grace and justification; Towne was fond of paradoxes; Dell was most mystical concerning the outer versus the inner life.  

8. See Glory, pp.10, 216, 228, 232-233, 283, 299, 306, and the indices. Davis had been rebuked in a Quaker tract, An Account of the Doctrines and Discipline of Mr. R. Davis, 'With the Canons of George Fox, Appointed to be Read in All Quaker Meetings'.

9. It may be recalled that Gill exercised discipline on a church member for 'Enthusiasm' (Church ... Cont'd;
On the other hand, there was a degree of truth in the description with regard to John Gill. The Song of Solomon was the favourite Biblical book of the medieval mystics and it is no coincidence that Gill's exposition of this book is one of his first productions. And then we mentioned earlier how Gill believed in a degree of allegorical hermeneutics, in which the deepest meaning is called 'the mystical meaning'. Furthermore, there was his high view of the Zohar, his doctrine of the internal testimony of the Holy Spirit, and his opposition to Deistic rationalism. And yet he does not usually quote the mystics, his doctrine of the Spirit was more Puritan than Antinomian, and his anti-Deism was more Stoic than mystic.¹⁰

At the end of the century, a new development in Hyperism began with William Huntington. As we have seen, Huntington revived the Antinomian idea of grace over Law in a revised fashion. Consequently, the new doctrinal Antinomianism assumed a new form of mysticism. It was called Experimentalism. This branch has prospered mainly in the Gospel Standard tradition. More recently, the Hyperism of Pink and the school of Hoeksema have basically rejected this Experimentalism and have more or less returned to the position of Gill and the Puritans.

This is but an abbreviated summary of the subject at hand. From here on we will chart the different ideas, strains and emphases of them all with regard to specific points.

The first idea which needs to be investigated is that of Holy Scripture. As far as we have been able to discern, Gill's view of revelation is at one with orthodox Calvinism. According to his position, there are several stages of divine revelation: natural (through Nature and conscience), special (Scripture), and personal (in the God-Man, Christ). The Reformed position has also stressed the work of the Holy

Cont'd:...

Record Book, 3 July, 1732). See Brine's comments in Vindication, pp.9-11, 159-173. Wayman: "This is not enthusiasm, whatever men are pleased to think and say of it" (Enquiry, p.156). Contemporary with these three, Whitefield was regularly accused of Enthusiasm (cf. Works, vol.IV, pp.171-199, 229-249, 285-302; Dallimore, vol.I, pp.23, 115, 249). Whitefield may have been opposed by the Hypers here as well: "the offer of salvation, by the blood of Jesus Christ, is now termed enthusiasm" (Works, vol.V, p.314). One recalls J.C. Ryland, Sr., allegedly calling William Carey 'an Enthusiast'.

¹⁰ Most of these points are discussed in Chapter II above.
Spirit in the middle stage. The Spirit inspired the Bible and now illumines the elect to receive the revelation already given in the Bible. That special activity of the Spirit is part of the new birth and is related to faith and assurance, but the divine Comforter adds nothing to the revelation of Scripture. Rather, He enlightens the minds of the elect spiritually to understand Scripture and shows them its truth. Further, the Spirit speaks in and through Scripture to the elect in a special way, which is, as it were, echoed within them by the internal testimony of faith and assurance.

In keeping with mainstream Puritan Calvinism, Gill, Pink and a number of moderate Hyperists denied that assurance of salvation was of the essence of faith in the manner explained by Calvin (i.e., the 'Bold Assurance'). If they went beyond Calvin, and perhaps marginally beyond the High Puritans, they did not accept the views of the Antinomians on the one hand nor the extreme views of Experimentalism on the other.

We disagree with the interpretation of the Antinomians put forth by some critics, that Crisp and the others either disregarded Scripture in favour of the sole sufficiency of the internal testimony or that they so stressed the latter as to threaten the former. In our opinion, Dell is the only one who approaches such a position. The true explanation, as we see it, is that there was certainly a difference in emphasis between the Antinomians and the High Calvinists. The former stressed that the internal testimony is the ultimate authority for assurance, which it is essential to faith, and though this does not supersede Scripture it is superior to (but not divorced from) the 'Syllogism of Sanctification'. The High Calvinists, on the other hand, placed the Spirit's internal testimony on the same level as (or even on a lower level than) the 'Syllogism of Sanctification'. Neither of them degraded Scripture, but the former stressed the personal aspect of the 'Bold Proclamation' in the Gospel by the Spirit that went beyond the latter. On some of these points the Antinomians were closer to Calvin than were the High Puritans, as Kendall and others have shown. Yet this is not to deny

11. Berkhof shows an ignorance of the works of the Antinomians in his criticism: "Antinomianism ... does not regard the external Word as necessary at all, and displays a Mysticism which expects everything from the inner word or inner light, or from the immediate operation of the Holy Spirit" (Systematic Theology, p.611). So, more or less, Kevan, p.34; Campbell, 'Controversies', p.73.
that on other points the Antinomians were further from Calvin than were the Puritans.12

This brings us to what has been called Experimentalism. The term has been used similarly to 'Enthusiasm' and 'mysticism', but in our context it has to do with certain tendencies in the higher form of Calvinism. Kendall has recently labelled Puritan Calvinism 'Experimental Predestinarianism',13 and the views of the Gospel Standard branch of Hyperism have definite affinities with the Puritans' views of the experience of the believer in the light of predestination. The position has been advocated in definitive form by Huntington, Gadsby, the Gospel Standard Baptists, and especially J.C. Philpot. Actually, it is much the same as what has been known as 'Philpotism'.14

This view goes beyond that described above in several areas. First there is the internal testimony of the Spirit. Said Gadsby, "This is a blessed part of what I call heart religion".15 The Spirit leads into the true Experimental life, but this is not to say that there is no Experimental life until there is the assurance of the Spirit. Quite the contrary, for much of this life has to do with the search for assurance. But first, just what is 'Experimentalism', or 'the religion of experience' as such? Palmer:

By experimental religion is meant the sensations and impressions caused by an inrooted principle of grace, the

---


13. E.g., Calvin and English Calvinism to 1649, p.8.

14. See Chapter VII, Section B, and Chapter XII below.

15. Works, vol.I, p.310. Cf. p.140; Philpot, Sonship, p.52; Meditations, vol.I, p.50. The contrast between head and heart religion is a favourite one (e.g., Gadsby, Works, vol.I, pp.180-181; and even Pink, Beatitudes, p.46). "Head-knowledge is nothing without experience" (John Gadsby, Memoir of Gadsby, p.66. Cf. pp.82, 103). For alternative views of experience, see Edwards, Religious Affections; Bellamy, True Religion Delineated; Hulse, The Believer's Experience. Philpot admits that Skepp, Topладy and Gill were more doctrinal than Experimental (Reviews, vol.I, p.148). Similarly, Pink feels that Experimentalism arose as a reaction against the dryness of the doctrinalists (Serving Faith, p.106). Stevens noted that some Christians are too interested in doctrine over experience and practice, while others go to the opposite extreme (Recollections, p.31). It may be recalled that contemporary with the rise of Hyper-Calvinist Experimentalism was another reaction against formality and strict rationalism – for instance, note the positions of Schleiermacher and Kierkegaard.
operations of the Holy Spirit, and the action of divine truth on the soul; which are not a whit less incomprehensible or a whit more mystical, than our intellectual operations or corporeal sensations. 16

Philpot listed four essential qualities of true Experimental knowledge:

1. Divine light in the understanding; 2. Spiritual faith in the heart; 3. Godly fear in the conscience; 4. Heavenly love in the affections. 17

Experimental religion, then, is in the heart, 18 is spiritual and true religion, 19 is 'experiential' 20 and is illustrated by Biblical history and prophecy. 21 It is summed up in godliness 22 and the words "conviction, conviction, conviction." 23 Sorrow for sin is more indicative of a truly Experimental life than is joy. 24 On this the Experimentalists are in

---

16. The Saviour and His People, p.42. Palmer was a rather low Experimentalist. Others have said that the experience of faith and love is so mysterious that, perhaps, those who have attained the greatest degrees in them are least able to describe it to others (Button, Remarks, p.9). True experience is "virtually or actually" mocked, ignored, or at least unknown to those who do not possess it (Philpot, Sermons, vol.V, p.14). Cf. Sonship, pp.14, 62; Popham, Sermons, vol. IV, p.7. Philpot encourages believers to ask professors what their experience is concerning religion (Tiptaft, p.62). "An experimental man", said Gadsby, "can state his own experience" (Works, vol.II, p.244).


18. Philpot, Tiptaft, p.95.

19. Hazleton, Sermons, pp.78, 79, 97; Philpot, Sermons, vol.I, pp.92, 120, 125, etc.

20. 'Experimental' and 'experiential' are sometimes used as synonyms (e.g., J.H. Philpot, Seceders, p.37). We know of no instance in which any of the writers in question used 'existential' as a synonym.

21. "As it was dispensationally, so it is experimentally" (Pink, Godhead, p.135). "What is true prophetically is true experimentally" (Philpot, Meditations, vol.III, p.101). Thus, as the Law preceded the Gospel in history, so the Law-work precedes and prepares for the work of the Gospel in justification.


23. Sawyer, p.54.

24. Warburton: "Then woe be to those professors of religion who are all joy, and never know any sorrow ... all faith, but never any doubts; always full of peace, but never groaning under guilt ... Some of them will talk wonderfully about the doctrines of grace, but have never known what it is to water the Throne of Grace with their tears ... they know nothing about these things by soul experience" (Mercies, p.137). Some quote Eccl. 7:2. "It is better to go to the house of mourning, than to go to the house of feasting". Consequently, 'Experimentalist' churches tend to be centered around mourning for sin rather than rejoicing in the forgiveness already received. This is not to deny, however, that there are expressions of joy in their writings. By and large, however, they describe, encourage and emphasize mourning more than joy. Some critics ask, "When will your mourning turn to joy?"
marked contrast to the Antinomianism of Crisp. Crisp stressed the positive – faith, joy, love – but the Gospel Standard divines stressed mourning for sin and the negative. The former tended to place the positive before the negative; the latter tended to place the negative before the positive. Thus, there is a difference between 'Crisp's Incentive' and Gospel Standard Experimentalism.

This is illustrated in the numerous recorded experiences of Huntington, Warburton, Kershaw, Gadsby, and others. In these accounts the soul undergoes conviction of sin for lengthy periods of time, crying out for forgiveness, seeking assurance, and so on. Crisp, on the other hand, pointed men directly to Christ in the free offer, calling upon men to look, believe, and then they will mourn. Some would even posit that extreme Experimentalism is a form of Preparationism. This is inseparably related to the Hyper-Calvinist notion of the warrant of faith. Calvin had seen a double warrant – the atonement and the command. High Calvinists accepted only the command, while Hyperists reject Duty-faith and replace the command with internal marks of regeneration.

This bred an extreme introspection which urged sinners to look first within themselves before they could look to Christ. Their experience became the warrant of faith, or, as Philpot put it, "Your rule is not some experience that you have not had, but some experience that you have had". The danger was that Hyperists tended to place experience on the same level as Scripture – or even higher, as Scripture gives no personal warrant. Some critics, such as Robert Sheehan, suggest that this creates a false dichotomy between the Word and the Spirit, resulting in a deficient view of Scripture. This is also the case

---

25. They often charted the thoughts and stages of experimental knowledge, such as in John Gadsby, *Memoir of Gadsby*, p.102 (cf. pp.108-109).


27. Hoeksema often made pronouncements such as, "All Scripture teaches this. The entire history of the church teaches this. Experience teaches this again and again" (*Believers*, p.135).

28. "There is an incipient Barthianism in Hyper-Calvinism. The prominent Hyper-Calvinist preacher, J.C. Philpot, explicitly rejected that religion which required men to do something because the Bible told them to. He affirmed that only when the Spirit told him to do something would he do it" ('Critique', pp.45-46). Sheehan refers the reader to Philpot, *Letters*, p.120.
respecting ethics. The experience of conscience relates to Scripture in making decisions, as Pittman explained in a modification of Experimentalism:

The Bible and our conscience, when these two agree, rightly answer all questions pertaining to right and wrong; and when they do not agree, or the conscience is silent or seared, take the Bible answer, for its answer is always right. 17

If some Hyper-Calvinists too closely approached to a Stoic suppression of emotion, others went too far in the prominence given to the importance of feelings. Cold, dry Calvinists are rebuked. 34 Experimentalism and "feeling religion" are equated, 31 but "True experience is not mere feeling, as feeling, but an experience of the power, presence, grace, and teaching of God in the soul". 32 Philpot appears to contradict himself here in stating that "in the things of God natural feelings are not to be our rule and guide, but the unerring Word of truth". 33 In effect, however, truly spiritual feelings are always in agreement with Scripture. If experience and feeling are at variance with Scripture, then "it is evident that he is not taught by the blessed Spirit". 39 Thus, neither feeling alone (which is natural) nor Scripture alone (which is dry doctrine) are the rule and warrant, but both together. Arminian emotionalism is mere natural feeling, while Experimental feeling is the spiritual manifestation of the Spirit of the Word in the soul.

29. Questions, p.83. Presumably this means that one can follow his conscience when Scripture is silent on a matter. This is not entirely to reject Philpotism. Rather, Philpot argued that Scripture is silent on the individual warrant to believe; it merely says that only those who experience regeneration have the warrant to believe. Compare Gadsby: "But when our experience and God's Word agree - the testimony of God in the conscience and the testimony of God in his Word, then we are fit to come forth to measure the spirits of men" (Sermons, p.31. Cf. Works, vol. II, pp.273-276).


... Cont'd:
Experimentalists have written a fair amount of poetry describing their Experimental feelings, often dwelling upon the experience of mourning for sin. Experimentalists also accept spiritual 'manifestations', dreams and visions, though not "of a mystical or enthusiastic nature".

The Experimentalists also have a distinctive form of preaching. Doctrinal and expository preaching is usually disdained. Experimental preaching illustrates doctrine from the preacher's own experience and tends to stress the agonies of conviction of sin, for which it was sometimes criticized by opponents. Some opponents even charged it with glorifying in the flesh or placing undue temptation before the congregation. Gadsby was often criticized in this manner, sometimes with the additional criticism that many unconverted persons went to hear him describe the glories of sin better than the degenerate stage-players could. Another criticism was that it bred doubt and fatalism. But the Experimentalists defended the practice. "Authentic religious experience, to those who have known it, is the most absorbing of topics, to those who have not, the most wearisome and meaningless, like love-poems set before a child." In other words, Experimental preaching to those who do not appreciate it is like casting pearls before swine. The solution is to change the listeners, not the message.

Experimentalism is not to be confused with practical preaching or

Cont'd...

33. Answers, p.16.

34. Warburton, Gospel, p.72.


40. "The common preaching of what is called 'experience' is not healthy", wrote Frederick Tryon. "It more tends to settle people down in a powerless hope and a fatalist spirit. We need a revealed Christ according to the Word" (Memento, p.302). Cf. Hoeksema, IK, vol.II, p.231.

or life. Rather, experience is seen as lying between doctrine in the mind and practice in the life. Listeners are exhorted to be still and wait for the divine manifestation of one's experience. One is to be completely passive, for it would be presumptuous to act in faith. Thus, Experimentalism is contrary to Duty-faith. In this the Experimentalists have been compared with Stoicism, Quietism, and passivistic mysticism.

In sum, criticisms fall into two categories. The first is that the Experimentalists tend to put their experience in the place of Scripture, the Holy Spirit, true faith, and even in the place of Christ. The other is more searing. It charges Experimentalism with hypocrisy because it does not proceed from faith. The Experimentalists claim to speak highly of the experience of faith, but they deny its foundation by rejecting the doctrine of Duty-faith and free offers. They speak about conviction of sin, but they deny that the Law is a rule to believers. They speak about the experience of grace, but they virtually deny universal grace. It all gets back to the concept of God. They speak about experience and feeling, but in the end they still accept that God is impassible. This is one point which differentiates Experimentalism from historic mysticism.

44. Roe: "It is what Christ has been through, friend, for you, that matters. Not that I would say a word against a feeling religion - a thousand times no - but do not put a feeling religion in the place of the Lord Jesus Christ. That is what many are doing and do not know they are doing it" (Roe, p. 183).
CHAPTER XI

GRACE

A. DEFINITION OF GRACE

In a eulogy on the occasion of the death of John Gill, his friend Samuel Stennett remarked that the central doctrine of Gill's whole theology was the glorious truth of free grace. How did Gill himself define this 'amazing grace'? 'Grace', said Gill, sometimes means 'the gospel of grace', signifying that the Gospel reveals grace. The grace of God is several things. It is God's beauty and especially his goodness, for "The grace of God arises from the goodness of his


2. Gill used the phrase 'amazing grace' at least three times in his writings: § 6, vol.I, p.509; Come on John 6:38, 14:22. Anne Dutton used it in 1734 (Narration, p.18). It became immortalized in John Newton's famous hymn of the same name, though it is unlikely that he got its use from the Hyper-Calvinists.


5. Gill often speaks of grace and goodness as synonyms (e.g., Come on Ge. 22:17, 24:27, 28:17, 32:9, 43:29, Ex. 20:5, 23:15, 33:20-23, Psa. 77:3, 101:1, etc.). His penchant for alliteration is evident here (see Chapter II). In addition to 'the gospel of grace' and 'grace and goodness', compare the following: 'the glory of his grace' and 'the goodness and glory of God' (both in Come on Ex. 33:19, etc.), 'glory, grace and goodness' (e.g., on Ex. 33:23), and 'grace and gracefulness' (e.g., on Psa. 45:2). See below for 'grace and gifts' and 'grace and glory'. Bradbury spoke of 'grace, godliness, and glory' (Grove Chapel Pulpit, vol.IV, pp.252-264). On grace as goodness, see Hoeksema, IK, vol.II, pp.393-394; vol.III, pp.197-202.
nature". This is because "he is Grace itself". God is love. This is part of His very nature.

But here we see an important difficulty arise. If God is love and grace in His very nature, then surely God essentially loves all men. But Gill denies this, as we shall see, though he allows that there is a lesser sense in which divine love can be said to be universal. The problem is to be found in Gill's theory about the relationship between God's nature and will (see Chapter III). Divine nature governs the divine will. If the divine nature is love, then the divine will would be that of love. But Gill, in effect, prefers to locate divine love in the will rather than in nature. Grace is first of all sovereign; sovereignty takes precedence over grace. Because God does not have to love all men, He does not love all men, if only to show that He is free so not to do. This, in a nutshell, is the Hyper-Calvinist concept of grace.

Now what we have said mainly concerns divine love in its internal essence. In its external manifestation grace "is always to be understood of the unmerited favour and sovereign will and good pleasure of God" toward whom ever God chooses to give it. Men do not deserve grace for two reasons: they are men and God is God, and they are sinners and God is holy. However, when we understand Gill's view of grace in the

---

6. Body, p.82.
8. Cf. Come on I John 4:8, 16, Ex. 33, etc. Philpot: "Love is another revealed attribute of God, and is therefore included in the name of God; for 'God is love'" (Sermons, vol.X, pp.42, 56). Hussey: "The Act of his will to love us, awakened and called up the Mercy of his Nature to appear for us; and from hence where he sets his love" (Gospel-Feast, p.195). Wells: "Some tell us that God in His nature is love, and the He must love; so, according to this definition, He does not love from choice but of necessity. That 'God is love' to His people, I can and do believe; and that He is love to them from choice and not from necessity I firmly hold. But the doctrine that God must love is what I cannot exactly receive" (Letters to Theophilus, vol.II, p.237). According to the Supralapsarian scheme, God chooses to love some and hate others, completely irrespective of faith or sin in either. But even Sublapsarians who place election before atonement in the decrees are open to the charge that they make election and not atonement the greatest display of grace, and that their scheme roots atonement in the will rather than the nature of God (in sovereignty rather than love). Others point out that this affects divine holiness in that the Law is a revelation of God's character: the fulfilment of the Law is love to God and all men indiscriminately; if God does not love all men indiscriminately, then He is inconsistent with His own Law and therefore with His holiness.
light of the Supralapsarian scheme, there is really only one reason — the first.

Are there different kinds of grace? Augustine, says Fuhrman, talked about five kinds of grace: prevenient, preparing, operating, co-operating and conserving grace. Roman Catholic theology expanded these categories in the Middle Ages, especially under the influence of Thomas Aquinas. Gill, of course, would see the influence of Thomas as a semi-Pelagian corruption.

Now Gill speaks of justifying, pardoning, adopting and sanctifying grace, but these are really all one in essence and object. They are but different aspects of the same thing, grace in its several actions. This is 'special grace'. The main distinction Gill employs is that of special and common grace (see Section D below). Even so, this distinction and all others are to be understood "after the manner of men"; they are not real and actual. They "only concern the effects of the grace of God" and not grace itself, for grace "itself is but one in God". The lesser distinctions include that of imputed grace ("the holiness, obedience, and righteousness of Christ imputed to justification") and inherent grace ("what is wrought in the heart, by the Spirit ... in regeneration"). Gill also allows "grace preparing, preventing, operating, and co-operating, and subsequent" but only "if rightly explained and understood" — in the strictly Augustinian-Calvinist tradition.

Properly speaking, then, there are no distinctions in grace itself. This pertains especially to the Romanist-Arminian distinction of grace as antecedent and subsequent. The former, it is alleged, is pity and benevolence and concerns men before their conversions. The latter is complacency and delight and concerns men as converted. In the same

12. Body, p.82.
13. Body, pp.82-83.
14. Body, p.82.
15. Body, p.84.
vein, Gill rejected the distinction of "love in ordination, purpose and design" (that God plans to love men when they are converted) and "a love in gift, which is actually bestowed". Gill explains:

All the differences between God's love before, and after conversion, lies in the manifestation of it. It is manifested at, and after conversion; and that sometimes more, and sometimes less; but was not at all manifested before. But the change is in us, and not in God's love.

... it is needless to ask whether it is the same love before as after conversion, since there were as great, if not greater, gifts of love, bestowed on the object loved, before conversion, as after.

The love of God, therefore, knows no degrees, though the manifestations themselves vary in degree. Another difficulty arises here. On the one hand, Gill asserts that "some ... receive more grace from him" than do others. On the other hand, "where there is one grace, there is every grace, though none perfect". That is, "though all grace is seminally implanted at once in regeneration, it opens and increases gradually". It is the same grace that is given to all the elect but in different amounts and in varying manifestations. To some,
this implies that God loves some of the elect more than others, but Gill would deny this. When grace is finally and perfectly manifested it will be discovered that God has loved all the elect with the same love. They are all eternally in Christ and receive their grace in and through Him.

Grace, of course, is irresistible.23 Gill never tires of speaking in this manner and often the reader gets the impression that Gill's basic concept of grace is that of power rather than love. In this Gill is solidly in the Dortian tradition.

This concerns the giving of grace. What are the 'means of grace' through which grace is given? Gill names several, including prayer, the Word and the ordinances.24 Yet he is quick to explain what he means.

25. A succinct comment: "their evil works don't hinder his grace when he's resolved to work, and their good works don't merit it" (Camm on Ezek. 20:44). Some preferred to speak of 'invincible' rather than 'irresistible' grace (Philpot, Meditations, vol. II, pp. 38-39). On grace as power, see Hoeksema, Dogmatics, p. 632; TK, vol. II, p. 398. The Antinomians emphasized the loving aspect of irresistible grace more than many other Calvinists. Dill, for example, spoke of it as a persuasive, not coercive, power. It is influence, not violence. See Works, pp. 202, 350. This is associated with 'Crisp's Incentive': the incentive to believe is the awareness that one is loved of God. Thus, the gift of faith comes by special grace drawing one in love to the crucified Christ (Jer. 31:3, Song 1:4), rather than the brute force of a Law-work conviction. Occasionally the Gospel Standard Baptists show the influence of the Antinomians at this juncture. Even Philpot (I) admitted that one receives Christ out of affection and not merely because he is driven by necessity or fear. If no affection is involved, it is not true faith and one is not converted (Sermons, vol. III, p. 39). The key to understanding Philpot here in the light of his extreme Experimentalism, both concerning the Law-work and inner warrant (see Chapters VII, VIII, and X), is that he is here speaking of conscious faith. This conscious faith has already followed regeneration, which has come through the Law-work. In a very real sense, then, Philpot's words concern the reflex assurance of faith, not the pith and marrow of saving faith itself. Contrariwise, Low Calvinists accept Crisp's incentive without the extremities of Philpot's Law-work. Low Calvinists add that this comes through the universal atonement (John 12:32). Toon comments on the Hypers: "Excessive emphasis was also placed on the doctrine of irresistible grace with the tendency to state that an elect man is not only passive in regeneration but also in conversion as well" (HC, p. 145). Critics of the higher Calvinist views of irresistible grace sometimes point out that "the term 'irresistible' is never used as a modifier of 'grace' in the Bible" (Rice, Well, p. 25), while those accepting the term reply that the word for 'draw' in several New Testament passages means 'drag'. On the irresistibility of grace, see discussions of the 'fourth point of Calvinism' in the classic treatments of the Dortian points (e.g., Gill, Parks, Hoeksema, et al).

26. E.g., Cess on II Peter 3:18; Cause, p. 211; Song, p. 274. Cf. Philpot, Sermons, vol. II, p. 74; Hoeksema, Dogmatics, pp. 631-634; TK, vol. II, pp. 389-419. "In a sense", wrote Hoeksema, "we can say, of course, that all things are a means of grace for the elect" (TK, vol. II, p. 401). Hyperists, like most other Calvinists, see the preaching of the Word as the most important of the means of grace (e.g., Hoeksema, TK, vol. II, pp. 399-400. See Chapter VIII). The Baptist Hyper-Calvinists (Gill, Brine, Wells, Gadsby, Philpot, Styles, Pink, et al.) preferred to speak of 'ordinances', whereas the paedo-baptist Hyper-Calvinists accepted the term 'sacraments' (Hoeksema, Hussey, Huntington, Irons, Parks, Hawker, et al). The former followed in the Anabaptist tradition of separating spiritual grace from tangible symbols.
When men pray, they do not make God love them, nor does God give grace because men pray. As we saw in Chapter III, the High and Hyper-Calvinist theory is that prayer itself is a blessing of grace and as such is a means by which God gives further grace. If a believer is aware of the fact that he is praying, he can reason that God has stirred him up to pray. Since God never stirs a man to pray unless He intends to answer his prayers, one can deduce that God will answer his prayers. Prayer is the forerunner of mercy. Even so, one cannot have full assurance in the matter, for God is still sovereign and may choose not to answer our prayers. This does not just mean the safety valve of suffixing prayers with "if it be thy will" (viz, if it isn't answered, then it obviously was not God's will to do such and such; the cause is not so much in man's lack of faith as in God's intent). There is an added feature. Faith is a gift of grace. Faith is necessary to some prayers - 'some' because God often answers some prayers without faith, just to show that He is not bound. Since faith is a gift, one is to look for marks of it when one prays. He can wait for it, ask for it, but in the end he must remember that God may not give it to him. This is the way in which prayer is a means of grace. It is a means by which God gives, not a means by which the independent man may apply for grace.

As for the ordinances, Gill obviously rejected an ex opere operato theory. This is particularly evident in his Baptist principles. Grace is not something tangible. It is not at the disposal of ministers to distribute. Similarly, biological heredity is not a means of grace, and certainly not so in a literal fashion: "sin, and not grace, is conveyed by natural generation". Some Hyper-Calvinists of paedo-baptist persuasion, such as Hoeksema, seem to say that grace is biologically transmitted because of family covenants. If sin can be transmitted, why not the opposite of sin? This has some parallel with the peculiar Hyper-Calvinist deviation, the 'Two-Seeds-in-the-Spirit' theory. This arose in the early nineteenth century but Gill would have rejected it, as most Hyper-Calvinists have done. Gill admitted that "There never were but two sorts of persons in the world; the seed of the woman, and the seed

---

27. E.g., Comm on Isa. 57:9. The Baptist Hyper-Calvinists sometimes charge paedo-baptists with this error, though it is clear that the paedo-baptist Hyper-Calvinists also rejected the error. For example, see Hoeksema's views on presumptive regeneration. Even so, there were elements in the latter's theology which have disturbed Baptist Hyperists.

of the serpent", but this refers to spiritual natures and has no biological overtones.

Furthermore, our author denies that providential blessings or general revelation are means of grace. Rather, they are the fruit of common grace. The Gospel and the ordinances are the "common and ordinary means of grace". Being sovereign God may choose to use 'extraordinary means' such as angels or even "some other secret method unknown to us". Finally, as concerns the 'means of grace', Gill rejected Whitby's Arminian theory that election was merely to the "enjoyment of the means of grace" rather than "to a certainty of being saved by those means".

When God gives grace, He gives it irresistibly and without regard to faith. Indeed, as we said, faith is a gift of grace. If then grace cannot be obtained by faith, grace cannot be lost by sin. To many critics this is pure Antinomianism. But Gill clearly states that when God loves men He is not condoning their sin. Rather, God chastens the sinning believer. But it is vital to note that Gill sees faith and obedience as gifts of grace, even from before the Fall. That is, when grace is given a person necessarily believes and obeys and is in a state of grace; when grace is withheld a man always and necessarily sins. This is the sovereignty of grace.

29. Comment on Jer. 24:3. Cf. Comment on Gen. 3:15; and Chapters I, IV and VIII above. Huntington was not teaching the 'Two-Seed' doctrine as such when he said, "A principle of grace is God's seed produced by the operation of the Spirit" (Works, vol. VI, p. 57).

30. Cause, p. 213.

31. Cause, p. 211. See Chapter VIII, Section E.

32. Cause, pp. 78-79. See Chapter V, Section D.

Gill often mentions two realms of existence in the universe, namely Nature and Grace.\(^1\) Sometimes he adds Creation, Providence and Glory. Nature has two parts: Creation and Providence.\(^2\) Creation is the aspect of Nature which points back to its origin in the Creator; Providence points to its present state in the hand of the Preserver. This is all in the Puritan tradition, especially the idea of discerning Providence: "the things of nature and Providence, which are plain and manifest, are for our use and instruction".\(^3\) But neither Nature nor extraordinary Providence reveal Grace: "the works of nature are to be sought and found in the book of nature, the works of providence in the book of experience, and the works of grace in the book of God".\(^4\) This contradicts Deism, which denies the special realm of Grace as miraculous. For Deists, there is only Nature.

For Gill, the State of Nature is Creation, but the State of Grace is Redemption.\(^7\) The one is temporal, the other is spiritual.\(^6\) The first is natural, the second is supernatural.\(^9\) Providence is the higher of the two aspects of Nature and as such touches on the supernatural through the intervention of miracles. But not all miracles are Grace. Grace is


\[3. \text{Coom on Deut. 29:29. Nature often Illustrates Grace, or as Philpot described it, "It is in grace as in nature" (Sermons, vol.IX, p.90). For Natural Revelation, see Chapter II.}\]

\[4. \text{On Providence, see Chapter III.}\]

\[5. \text{Coom on Job 11:17, Psa. 19:1.}\]

\[6. \text{Coom on Psa. 111:2.}\]

\[7. \text{Coom on Psa. 104:31.}\]

\[8. \text{Song, p.144.}\]

\[9. \text{Body, p.82.}\]
always supernatural but not all that is supernatural is Grace. There is a 'common grace' in Providence, but Gill prefers to speak of this as pity, mercy and goodness rather than grace. This is the "general way of providence". Only in an improper, or lesser, sense can the natural gifts of Providence be called 'gifts of grace' or 'gifts and graces'. These are not the fruit of special grace: "Gifts are not grace; a man may have all gifts ... and not have grace". These are 'external gifts' and include "a rational knowledge of the gospel, historical faith, and even gifts for the public ministry, which persons may have, and yet be unknown by Christ, and be cast-aways". And these gifts are much different in nature than the supernatural 'grace and greater gifts'.

"The way of Grace" is different from and much greater than "the way of Providence". The former brings men into "the State of Grace" by implanting the seeds of grace in the hearts of the elect. This is "the work of grace" done by the Holy Spirit in regeneration. The result is that the believer has "the principle of grace" within himself. The Spirit brings the elect "out of the horrible pit of nature into the state of grace", even "an open state of grace and favour with God". As a

14. Body, p.84.
17. Body, p.532; Comm on Isa. 40:11, Hosea 10:12. This is the spiritual seed and has no reference to the 'Two-Seed' heresy. See Chapter IV.
18. E.g., Comm on Psa. 45:13; Body, p.539. Being a Baptist, Gill required every member to have had a 'work of grace'. The Church Record Book records numerous instances of the testimonies of members. One example: "Hannah Monk gave a satisfactory account of the work of Grace upon her soul and it was agreed yt: she be received into communion with ye Church..." (Church Record Book for 10 August, 1725).
19. E.g., Comm on Isa. 40:11, Rom. 14:17, and often. So too Brine, Grace at Sovereign Disposal, pp.88. 'The Principle of Grace' is also called "inward experiential knowledge" (e.g., S & T I', vol.III, p.71). Cf. S & T I', vol.III, pp.211ff; Body, pp.537-538. Also "the principle of grace in the soul ... has the force of a law; is a reigning, governing principle". (Comm on Jer. 31:33). Philpot refers to this as "a divine standard set up in his soul by which he measures others as well as himself..." (Sermons, vol.II, p.46, cf. vol.VII, p.4). Popham refers to it as "a holy principle" (Sermons, vol.I, p.106). On 'nature'as a 'principle', see Pink, Salvation, pp.23-24.
20. Comm on I Sam. 2:1, 7; Job 36:22.
result, the 'gracious soul' is 'in grace' (or 'in religion', but this is not to be understood in the Romanist-mystical sense) and in 'the kingdom of grace': "The kingdom of grace (is) the governing principle in the soul". Once a person is in the State of Grace, he will always be in it. It is irreversible. The gracious soul is still on earth and in that sense is still in Creation. He still has his old sinful nature within him and in this sense he is in Nature, but he has taken the first step into the higher realm of Grace. The first step into the State of Grace is indicated when the higher realm is called 'the state of justification' and 'the state of regeneration'.

To be sure, Gill reminds the reader that this all concerns the manifestation of grace. By representation in Christ, the elect must have always been in a State of Grace. Nor is the change in the States themselves; the change is in the elect.

The State of Grace opens into the State of Glory. Gill says much about 'grace and glory'. The two States are inseparable. Whoever has 'grace here' will have 'glory hereafter'. Grace concerns time, glory concerns eternity. (Grace has an eternal aspect in that grace was given to the elect in Christ in the Covenant by representation, but here we speak of the State of Grace in its temporal aspect.) Both grace and glory are founded in the Covenant of Grace. God chose the elect to enjoy both grace and glory. Therefore, whoever can gain assurance of present grace can know that he will receive eternal glory, for the two are inseparable. "Grace is his first gift, and glory is his...

25. This is another favourite phrase of Dr. Gill's. See, for example, Comm on Ex. 15:11, 33:23, Deut. 7:17, Psa. 145:16. Hussey used it profusely in Glory. It was employed by the Puritan Federalists (e.g., Sibbes, Works, vol.IV, p.280) and Antinomians (e.g., Crisp, CAE, vol.I, p.23), and has been a favourite among Hyper-Calvinists (e.g., Hazelrigg, Serm., vol.I, pp.17-24; Bradbury, Our Gospel, pp.161-170).
26. E.g., Comm on Deut. 21:17, 26:17, Job 7:17, John 4:14. So too Owen, Works, vol.X, p.159; Skepp, p.74; and many others. "The change from grace to glory", observed Pink, "will be as the change from nature to grace" (Godhead, p.211).
27. S & T, vol.III, p.107. ... Cont'd:
Both are freely given. Both are given by the Father to Christ and are found fully and only in Christ. And the elect are given to Christ in the Covenant and, being united with Him by eternal union, they receive both grace and glory in Christ. These gracious souls have now received 'grace for grace'; later they will receive 'glory for glory'. Even in glory the elect will remember grace.

Cont'd...

30. Ibid.
C. SPECIAL GRACE

Here we look at Gill's idea of grace in the context of the 'doctrines of grace'. As we saw in Chapter VIII, this was a favourite phrase with Gill and is emphatically Calvinistic. It refers to the five points of Dort. Robert Hall, no admirer of John Gill, commented here:

the Calvinistic doctrines have often been denominated, the doctrines of grace; implying, not merely in their truth, but that they constitute the very essence and marrow of the gospel. Hence persons of little reflection have been tempted to conclude that the zealous inculcation of these comprehends nearly the whole system of revealed truths, or as much of it, at least, as is of vital importance; and that no danger whatever can result from giving them the greatest possible prominence.

It is a bitterly polemical phrase and, to Arminians (at whom it is aimed), it has an arrogant edge to it. It implies that this system is the one and only system of grace, that the Calvinist system alone teaches the true doctrine of grace. All other systems are seen as mixing grace with works and are more or less Pelagian, Pharisaic and fleshy. Grace cannot be properly understood except in the context of 'the doctrines of grace'. These doctrines define just what grace is.

Thus it is necessary to go back to the deterministic view of sovereignty in order to understand grace. This means we start with the Covenant of Grace. 'Covenant of Grace' is 'predestinating grace'. This grace is also Trinitarian in the Covenant. Grace finds its origin particularly in the Father; it is given to the Son; the Spirit then gives

1. E.g., Comm on I Peter 4:10, I Cor. 2:9, John 6:37. Also, "grace may intend both the doctrine of grace, the Gospel of the grace of God preached by Christ, and the blessings of grace which come through him" (Comm on Psa. 138:2). Hence, 'the doctrine(s) of grace' is synonymous with 'the Gospel'. Hyperists often point out that, formally speaking, there is only one 'doctrine of grace', though it has several facets like a diamond (e.g., Hazelton, Sermons, p.7; Pink, Election and Justification, p.116). Philpot: "We who hold the doctrines of grace are often called Antinomians" (Secession, p.10), for the 'doctrines of grace', Calvinism and doctrinal Antinomianism are all virtually the same. Wells: "to make light of the great doctrines of grace is to make light of Christ" (Experience, p.46). On the identification of 'the doctrines of grace' with Dortian, 'Five Point' Calvinism, see Warburton, Mercies, p.115; Gadsby, Works, vol.I, p.271; Hewlett, Defence of the Doctrines of Grace Commonly Called Calvinism.


3. 5 & T', vol.I, pp.120, 268.

4. 5 & T', vol.III, p.34. Compare Crisp: "The covenant is nothing but God's love to man" (CAE, vol.I, p.89). This is in keeping with the Antinomian preference of speaking of 'covenant' as... Cont'd:
what is the Son's to those who belong to the Son. Grace, then, is to be found by us in Christ alone. Grace is given to the elect 'in Christ' in that they are eternally united to Him by representation. And this grace is the love of complacency and delight before the decree of their Fall and before their conversions in time, for Christ was the object of the complacency and delight of the Father from all eternity. It is irrespective of sin because Christ was eternally without sin.

'Electing grace' is also 'redeeming grace' in most cases. The elect angels receive the former but not the latter, for they never sinned and therefore needed no redemption. Electing grace is that which concerns election; redeeming grace is that which concerns redemption. Since the former governs and precedes the latter, the atonement is limited to the elect alone.

The 'special grace' is essentially one and has several aspects but has the same objects among mankind. In a word, God gives grace only to some because He has elected only some. Saving grace is not universal. It is special, discriminating and distinguishing. Grace preceded and produced election, for "Election presupposed love". Election is of grace, not mercy. Mercy is more or less universal but grace is particular. This refers to the Supralapsarian scheme. Mercy deals with men as sinners, grace as the 'pure mass'. Since the decree

Cont'd...
'the promise and relationship' over 'contract'.
5. S & T, p.149, 261.
9. Body, p.82.
10. E.g., S & T, vol.I, p.57; S & T, vol.II, p.301; Body, p.79. Favourite adjectives modifying grace are 'distinguishing' (e.g., Wayman, Enquiry, p.41; Button, Remarks, p.41; and especially in Philpot) and 'discriminating' (e.g., Gadsby, Works, vol.I, p.158; vol.II, pp.201, 231, 240, 281, 291). Hence, Gadsby extolled "the discriminating doctrines of grace" (vol.I, p.274) and "the discriminating power of God's matchless grace" (vol.II, p.278).
of election precedes that of sin, election is of grace.\textsuperscript{12} Mercy and grace are related but not equated: "mercy is no other than grace to objects in misery";\textsuperscript{13} "though all mercy is grace ... yet all grace is not mercy".\textsuperscript{14} But does not the entire Supralapsarian scheme rely upon interpreting the mercy of Romans 9 as electing grace? Gill says that this is 'special mercy', which is special grace, and treats the elect as elect, not as sinners.\textsuperscript{15}

Special grace is sovereign grace. 'Sovereign grace' and 'free grace' are two terms which often imply the High and Hyper-Calvinist emphasis on the deterministic view of divine sovereignty. They concern the origin of grace. The origin and sole cause is God Himself. Nothing outside of God is the cause for anything that He does, and that includes the bestowal of His grace. If anything external caused God to give grace, that other thing would be higher than God and therefore be another God.\textsuperscript{16} Gill is especially fond of Augustine's dictum: "Grace is not grace unless it is altogether free".\textsuperscript{17} Man does not buy it, earn it, deserve it or procure it. It is simply and sovereignly given. Men merely receive it passively.\textsuperscript{18} This means that free grace is opposed to free will, even with respect to the 'pure mass' and man's innocence.\textsuperscript{19} Moreover, Gill says that

\begin{quote}
The grace of God is magnified, not so much by the number of persons on whom it is conferred, as by the sovereignty of it, the circumstances of the persons interested in it, and the manner in which it is bestowed.\textsuperscript{20}
\end{quote}

What is the manner in which grace is given? First, it is Supralapsarian. It is given to the elect irrespective of their sin. In the

\begin{enumerate}
\item\textsuperscript{12} Cf. \textit{S & T'}, vol.II, pp.70-71; \textit{Body}, p.88.
\item\textsuperscript{13} \textit{Comm} on Psa. 77:8.
\item\textsuperscript{14} \textit{Body}, p.85.
\item\textsuperscript{15} Cf. \textit{Body}, pp.86-87; \textit{Comm} on Rom. 9, Psa. 147:11; \textit{Cause}, p.151; Hoeksema, \textit{Good Pleasure}.
\item\textsuperscript{16} Cf. \textit{S & T'}, vol.II, p.300; \textit{S & T'}, vol.I, p.43. See Chapter III.
\item\textsuperscript{17} E.g., \textit{S & T'}, vol.I, p.588; \textit{Body}, pp.458, 509; \textit{Cause}, p.168.
\item\textsuperscript{18} Cf. \textit{Comm} on Pro. 8:35.
\item\textsuperscript{19} \textit{S & T'}, vol.I, p.243. See Section E below.
\item\textsuperscript{20} \textit{Cause}, p.55. So also Parks, \textit{Five Points}. Cf. Pink, \textit{Sovereignty}, p.29; Brine, \textit{Grace, Proved to Be at the Sovereign Disposal of God}.
\end{enumerate}
decree of election they were viewed as neither innocent nor guilty (critics suggest that this views them as irresponsible beings, perhaps suggesting that this is the root of Antinomianism). The elect are therefore forgiven not as sinners, nor even as those for whom Christ died, but as elect. The decree of election precedes those of atonement and sin; the latter two are but means to an end. This is free grace. The system implies that anything other than Supralapsarianism makes grace less than free.

The important point we are making is that Gill holds that grace is completely irrespective of sin and any other condition in man.²¹ This means that God loves the elect as much before they sin as after, and as much before their conversions as after.²² When grace is actually given, it makes a change in the elect but not in either God or His grace, for God is immutable.²³ God loved the elect with this grace while they were in a state of Nature.²⁶ God hates the sins of the elect but has never hated the elect.²⁸ Hate refers not only to wrath but to

25. S & T¹, vol.III, p.42; Body, p.101; Raven, Sermons, p.3; Hussey, Glory, p.118. S.E. Pierce: "he Lord God never hates his people for sin; yet, we may surely say he is angry with his professing people for it" (Hosea, p.75). Hoeksema entitled a sermon 'Hated Yet Beloved' (Good Pleasure, p.342); much of it, however, concerned Israel. Pink said, "God does hate His elect in some senses before their actual reconciliation", but denied that it was true that "God loved and hated His elect at the same time and in the same respect" (Reconciliation, pp.8, 10, 86). Pink calls it a "meaningless distinction" that "God loves the sinner, though He hates the sin" (Sovereignty, p.246; Objections, p.4). He asserts this in the context of denying that God loves everybody. Conversely, God only loves and loves only the elect. See Section D below. J.C. Ryland, Sr., felt that God can hate the act but not the persons of the elect when they sin (Contemplations, vol.II, p.404). H.A. Long explicitly affirmed, "God does not love sinners, but saints" (Calvinism, p.64), which must be understood according to the Supralapsarian system. Thus, God hates the sin and the sinner; God does not differentiate the two (p.63). Others relate it to divine holiness: "God does not, nor ever did, nor ever can love sinners. As sinners he may pity them, but cannot love them as such. He loves them only as they are sanctified in Christ" (Johnson, Faith, p.73). Critics charge that these Hyper-Calvinist sentiments go completely contrary to Romans 5:8, "God commendeth His love towards us in that while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us". Hyperists contend that this concerns only the elect, for Christ died only for the elect. And because God loved only the elect, Christ died only for the elect (see Chapter IX, Section B). Calvinistic Universalists point out that universal grace sent Christ to atone for the sins of the world according to Rom. 5:8, John 3:16, I John 4:9-10, etc. Hence, they say, to deny universal atonement necessitates denying universal grace, and vice-versa - the two are inseparable. Dualists point out that Arminians go to the opposite error by denying special grace and a special aspect of the atonement. The views of the two aspects of the atonement, then, are...
reprobation, therefore God has never hated the elect. The elect have never been in a state of Nature and under God's wrath in the same way that other men have been. The elect have not been sons of wrath; they have been destined for grace and not wrath. Gill cannot accept Augustine's view that God both loves and hates all men (for He loves all men by Creation and hates all men because of their sin, and election and atonement are on this foundation). For Gill, God loves the elect and hates the reprobate; there is no overlap; there is no neutrality.

Gill, however, tries to balance all this with his comments about the good of God redounding to the elect. God needs nobody. He created the elect to give them grace, not so that they could add anything to Him. This is the glory of grace.

Gill admits that all this has a Platonic tendency. For example:

All that God does in time, or will do in eternity, is only telling his people, how much he loved them from everlasting; all is but, as it were, a comment upon that ancient love of his."

Cont'd...

associated with the two graces of God and whether he loves men 'as sinners' or 'as saints'. Hyperists, indeed all Particularists, are logically bound to say that Christ died for saints, not sinners. And yet even further difficulties arise when the differences between Supras and Subs concerning the atonement and invitations to sinners 'as sinners'.

26. See Body, p.97; Comm on Eph. 2:3, I Thess. 5:9; Hussey, Glory, p.172; Stockell, Care, p.10. William Young classed as a mark of doctrinal Antinomianism the notion that "they were never children of wrath or under condemnation" (Encyclopedia of Christianity, vol.I, p.271). Opponents contend that Supralapsarianism destroys the Biblical doctrine of grace, for grace is love for those under wrath - but Supras say that the elect have never really been under wrath.

27. Calvin, referring to Augustine, stated that "in a marvelous and divine way he loved us even when he hated us" (Institutes, II, 16, 4; 17, 2). See Augustine, Homily on John 17:23. Engelsma appears to reject this idea: "For God to love and to hate the same man, to desire to save and to reprobate the same man, to be gracious in the preaching of the gospel towards and to harden the same man, is sheer contradiction. The reality of the twofold will of God is quite different. It has to do with the fact that God at the same time decrees that a man shall not be saved (the will of God's decree) and commands that man to repent and believe (the will of God's precept)" (Engelsma, p.47). Thus, the tendency (and with some, the actuality) of Hyper-Calvinism is to deny that God loves and hates all men. They tend to think that God loves and never hates the elect; conversely, God hates and never loves the reprobate. But can this really be thought to be Calvin's doctrine of grace?

It also relates to Stoicism:

Hence the Stoic philosophers denied mercy to belong to good men, and so not to God; and, indeed, it does not, in such sense, unless by an anthropopathy, or speaking after the manner of men; since he is free from all passion and perturbation of mind.\textsuperscript{29}

This latter statement is vital to an understanding of the Hyper-Calvinist doctrine of grace and mercy. As we saw in Chapter III, Gill basically denied that God has emotions, for these are to be equated with passions and therefore weaknesses. God loves the elect but this love is considerably different from human love in several ways. God loves men as lesser beings, as Creator to creatures, while men love one another as equals and as fellow creatures. God's love is also infinite, eternal, unchangeable, and bears the marks of all the other divine attributes; while human love is still human — finite, imperfect, and so on. Human love includes the emotions but divine love is more of the divine mind and will (cf. our comments on grace in the divine will and nature). Humans are commanded to love all men equally, but God does not love all men alike. Human love is commanded to be unselfish, while divine love is both selfish and unselfish at the same time. That is, God created all men for His own glory. In a sense, then, God is selfish. Men are forbidden to be selfish precisely because they are not God — doing something for one's own glory is the divine prerogative.

But there are two important stipulations, says Gill. First, men are allowed a limited amount of selfishness (if it can be called such) in so far as they are allowed to care for their basic needs of food, clothing, life, etc., but not at the expense of other men. Secondly, as we said earlier, though God created all men for His own glory, the goodness of God redounds to men. God is not served by men. He receives no benefit from their obedience, faith or even love. This may imply that Gill felt that God created the elect mainly to give them His love, not to receive their love to Him. Love to God is the chief commandment, yes, but the Gospel of election takes precedence over Law and says that God gives grace to the elect. However, in all this we remember that Gill relates this to the elect alone. God did not create the reprobate for the purpose of giving them love or even receiving their love, for He will never give

\textsuperscript{29} Body, p.305.
them His love nor will they ever love God. This might suggest either that the decree of creation follows that of election-reprobation—which most would count as absurd—or that the creation decree counted men as neither loved nor commanded to love. The problems are acute.

But we return to Gill's comment that the nature of God is not merciful or gracious except by anthropopathy. This says more than merely that God is not served by man's love or injured by his lack of love. It implies that God does not ultimately care about the condition of men. That God loves the elect and hates the reprobate is the anthropopathic description of this. The reality behind this anthropopathic expression is that God is essentially above all emotions. To some, this means that Gill felt that God is basically static and stagnant. This may be inherent in his views of God as actus purus and is certainly seen in his emphasis on divine transcendence. The resulting application of this may be that men are not really to be merciful to other men (hence the non-offer) but this contradicts the second great commandment. Or it may mean that men's whole idea of love must be radically re-interpreted to harmonize with divine love. This may mean that Christians are to imitate the Stoics' suppression of emotion. Since emotion is seen as a weakness, this may be the solution. Critics may reply that love without emotion is a contradiction.
In the light of what we have said, it would appear that Gill denied that God loved the non-elect in any form or fashion. For example, Gill asked two rhetorical questions:

... where is the general love of God to men, so much talked of? There is none at all to any.  

... how can grace be said to be given universally to men, when multitudes of men have not so much as the means of it?

Similar bold rejections can be found in the Gospel Standard Baptists, paedo-baptist Hypers, the school of Hoeksema, A.W. Pink, and many others.

1. Body, p.76.
2. Cause, p.179.
3. Gadsby rejected 'universal charity' (or 'unlimited charity'), thought by some to be the very essence of Christianity. See Works, vol.I, pp.44, 47, 51, 53, 62, 65, etc. Other Gospel Standard Baptists followed Gadsby's lead (e.g., Philpot, Answer, p.7).
4. Hussey opposed the doctrine of 'universal philanthropy' and common grace (Glory, pp.549, 685-694). Huntington opposed 'universal charity' especially in Works, vol.II, pp.1-253. He considered the notion to be Arminian (p.30). Cf. Thomas King, A Check to Uncharitableness, written against Huntington. 'Universal charity', another term for common grace, was also rejected by Thomas Bradbury (Grove Chapel Pulpit, vol.I, p.303), who explicitly denied that God loves everyone (Wholesome Words, pp.93-95).
5. The rejection of common grace was one of the reasons for the expulsion of Herman Hoeksema from the Christian Reformed Church in 1924, and this rejection figured prominently in most of his writings (e.g., IX, vol.I, pp.153-167). See De Jong, pp.63ff.; Gertrude Hoeksema, Therefore, pp.102-104. "Grace is never general, but always particular" (Dogmatics, p.470). The senior Hoeksema has been followed in his views by his son Homer Hoeksema, notably in Voice. The latter deals with whether common grace was taught by the Synod of Dort. As he denies both free offers and common grace, he denies that these were taught by Dort. Engelsma also follows the Hoeksemas here: "God's grace is particular; it is for the elect alone" (p.72).
6. Pink explicitly states, "God does not love everybody" (Sovereignty, p.30; Objections, p.4). This false notion, he contends, is "quite a modern belief. The writings of the church-fathers, the Reformers or the Puritans will (we believe) be searched in vain for any such concept" (Sovereignty, p.246; Objections, p.2). Cf. Douty, p.14. The utter ridiculousness of this assertion is evident to any student of historical theology. Rather, there would be more truth in the suggestion that it is a new theory that God does not love everybody. Pink was a well-read writer, especially in his eccentric and near-hermit latter days, but we find it incredible that he would make such an assertion. But then, Pink also asserted that limited atonement was almost unanimously accepted by the Reformers and Puritans (see Chapter IX, Section A). Pink also denied that God loved all men on the basis of the doctrine of divine sovereignty. If God loved all men, He did so because of the rule of love; but God is not under any rule, therefore He does not have to love everyone and does not do so (Sovereignty, p.30).
On the other hand, Gill clarifies what he means. Though God has a
special love for the elect, He also has a lesser and secondary concern
for the non-elect. He prefers to term this 'general mercy', 'general
love' or 'general goodness' rather than 'common grace', though he does
not entirely rule out the latter term. General mercy is universal and
concerns men as sinners. This includes the elect as well as reprobate.
Since it deals with men as sinners, God is not unjust when He chooses
not to give special mercy upon all men. God does not give general
mercy to all men equally. In general love, God loves all men as
creatures and even loves Satan and the demons as creatures in this
respect. This general love operates especially through providence. God's
general goodness is similar to general mercy and is also universal,
though there is also a special goodness for the elect alone. These
three make up common grace and give to all men such gifts as "the
light of nature and reason ... temporal blessings of life, the bounties
of providence ... and the continuance and preservation of life". But
common grace does not give salvation, faith or repentance. For this
reason Wesley sarcastically caricatured Gill's view of common grace as
'damning grace'.

7. Representing the school of Stevens, Foreman wrote, "grace is sovereign and particular only" (Remarks on Duty Faith, p.34). Contemporary with this assertion, James Haldane in Scotland denied that God loved everyone: "all His love is special" (The Atonement, p.143). Haldane wrote this against Wardlaw and the Low Calvinists of the day, who posited that there are two kinds of love and grace, one special and one universal. They sometimes noted that this duality is reflected in the atonement (see below).


11. Body, p.79; Comm on I John 4:8. So also Silver, Sovereignty, p.58. Owen: "God loves our persons as we are His creatures, is angry with us as we are sinners" (Works, vol.XII, p.534. But cf. vol.X, pp.227, 321-327). Perkins: "God doth love all his creatures, yet not all equally, but every one in their own place" (Works, vol.I, p.108). Contrarily, Pink affirmed, "God does not love everybody; if He did, He would love the Devil" (Sovereignty, p.30).

12. S & T, vol.II, p.301; Comm on I John 4:9, Hosea 9:15. Hyperists sometimes say that while God loves only the elect, the non-elect benefit from the 'bounties of Providence' - and only Providence (e.g., Huntington, Works, vol.XVI, p.298; Pink, Sovereignty, p.124; Haldane, The Atonement, pp.134-144.)


14. Body, p.82.

15. Wesley, Answer, p.7.
If it is properly understood, this common grace can be spoken of as 'sufficient grace' in so far as it sustains men in their existence, co-operates with the Moral Law in Nature, and helps render men inexcusable. But since Arminians also employ the term 'sufficient grace' in a much different manner, Gill prefers not to use it. "This external revelation of the mind of Christ ought not to be called sufficient grace". The Arminian concept alleges that sufficient grace is given either universally through Nature or to all those who hear the Gospel. It supposedly enables its recipients to repent and believe "if they will". Gill rejects this viewpoint on several counts, notably because of the Calvinistic doctrine of total depravity. 'Sufficient grace' in the Arminian sense is a non-entity, a myth, a chimera, for "no grace is sufficient but what is effectual". God never condescends to deal with men as equals. The final decisions – indeed, the only decisions – belong to God. God determines who will and who will not exercise their wills either for good or for evil. It is not a question of 'if they will' but of 'if God will'.

It is true, however, that common grace restrains men from being worse than they are. This is 'restraining grace' and is a corollary of the doctrine of total depravity. When restraining grace is given, men either sin less or not at all; when it is withheld men sin more. But, as we saw in Chapter IV, Gill denies that this pictures God as either the author or condoner of evil. Furthermore, says Gill, restraining grace has a general and special aspect. The general aspect is universal but in varying amounts. If men were as sinful in their outward acts as they would want to be, they would all murder each other. Therefore through providence God restrains men. God also uses government, the

17. Cause, p.15.
19. Comm on II Cor. 12:9. Hussey rejected the idea of a concept of grace as "sufficient for all but efficient only for the elect", for such would be a foundation for universal atonement (Glory, pp.645, 661). See Chapter IX. The Gospel Standard Articles spoke to the question as well "We deny that the Holy Spirit ever enlightens the non-elect, to make them capable at all of receiving grace ... We reject the doctrine called 'Baxterianism'; that is to say, that while all the elect shall assuredly be saved, there is a residuum of grace in Christ for the rest, or any of the rest, if they will only accept it" (Articles XXVII and XXVIII).
preaching of the Gospel and the Law to restrain human sin. And, of course, God is under no compulsion to give it to anyone. He is just when he withholds it and glorified when He bestows it. In the special aspect of restraining grace, God restrains the elect both before and after their conversions, again in varying amounts. Some of the elect are notorious sinners before their conversions, others are not; after their conversions some grow in grace more and sin less, while others grow less and sin more.²¹

Since there is a sense, then, in which grace and mercy can be spoken of as universal, does this not mean that there is a sense in which it can be said that the atonement is universal? After all, is not the atonement a picture and fruit of divine love and grace? Gill strenuously denies that the atonement is universal, except in the sense that the reprobate benefit from the existence and salvation of the elect. But that is a by-product of the atonement, not a direct benefit. Dualists such as Baxter, Amyraut and Davenant held to the two-tiered view of grace and therefore acknowledged that there are two aspects of the atonement: one universal and one particular. They were cautious to maintain the doctrine of common grace and warned that Particularists virtually denied common grace. Some Low Calvinists suggest that Particularists view election and not atonement as the greatest display of grace. Calvinistic Universalists sometimes argue that the universal atonement arises from the universal grace of God, while election arises out of the special grace of God. They strive to protect the universality of grace even more than do the Dualists.²²

Even when certain Hyperists spoke of 'common grace', they did not accept it in the sense advocated by Low Calvinists. For the Hyperists, 'common grace' or 'general mercy' is but the bounties of Providence.

22. The Dualists attempted to maintain a balance between both sides in the various dichotomies in a way which has led to much confusion, often because those who criticize Dualism are not usually given to accepting the principle of paradox. Hence, Particularists sometimes feel that Dualists denied special grace, while strict Calvinistic Universalists and Arminians considered Dualists to be virtual Particularists because they allowed for special grace. High Calvinists admitted a duality of special and common grace, but where the Dualists differ from them is that the Dualists admit salvific aspects of common grace which the Particularists deny (foremost of these aspects is the atonement). Similarly, the Dualists accepted common grace in a way that differentiated them from the Universalists, viz., that common grace was not entirely to be confused with 'sufficient grace' in the Arminian sense.
They are not in the least salvific bounties either. One could compare these 'bounties' to the slop that is given to pigs to fatten them up for the slaughter, for according to the Supralapsarian scheme the reprobate have never really been loved. They have been created solely for the purpose of displaying God's wrath. As reprobation is subordinate to election, so the reprobate serve the elect. Low Calvinists, on the other hand, maintain that there are elements of salvific benefits from common grace for the reprobate, for atonement flows from grace and the atonement was decreed before the division of election and reprobation.

One further comment may be appropriate here. Critics of Hyperism take special note of the Hyper-Calvinist system's virtual (and sometimes actual) rejection of the concept of God's universal favour. All Hypers deny that God truly loves all men; most accept that there is a general mercy. What is really in dispute is the phrase 'common grace'. Some accept it (such as Gill), some do not (such as Hoeksema). Does this substantiate Engelsma's contention that the school of Hoeksema are not Hyper-Calvinist? We do not think so. It should be obvious that, if anything, the disciples of Hoeksema go beyond mainstream Hyperists on this point. However, our opinion is that the difference is only one of vocabulary. In effect, all Hyperists deny common grace in the soteriological sense.

But if this is so, then there must certainly be severe ramifications for the doctrine of the free offer. And there are.
E. GRACE AND THE FREE OFFER

The Reformed doctrine of grace is inextricably associated with the free offer controversy. Iain Murray feels that what underlies the true free offer is the distinction between the two wills of God in relation to grace. Some suggest that Hyper-Calvinism arose as a logical deduction from this distinction; others say that it arose from seeing that the secret will/special grace takes precedence over the revealed will/common grace. Some Calvinists feel that the Gospel offers common grace; others feel that it offers special grace.

Hussey denied that any kind of grace is offered. All grace is given, not offered. Common grace (general mercy) is universally given through providence and special grace is particularly given through the Gospel. Common grace is not sufficient to move a depraved sinner to accept special grace. If it were, then special grace itself would not be needed; common grace would be special grace. Gill followed Hussey here. In one place he related the question to election and reprobation:

Hyper-Calvinists contend that free offers imply that God really does love all men. Since God does not love all men in the actual sense, free offers are misleading. High Calvinists say that "Sinners to whom the claims of the gospel come are not asked to believe that God or Christ

---

2. 'Free Offer and the Narrow', p. 13.
5. E.g., *Glory*, p. 545. This is the main thesis of Hussey's *Operations*.
loves them with this differentiating love". 7 There is, in fact, no
difference between the two schools here. Neither preach that God really
loves all men, nor that God has elected all men (which is the same
thing), nor that one must believe that God really loves him personally.
Assurance that God loves oneself does not belong to the essence of
saving faith. Consequently, one need not believe in a personal
atonement (i.e., that Christ died for oneself), nor that the cross is the
fullest display of divine love to oneself. Low Calvinists argue that what
is questioned is of the very essence of the Gospel. They say that no
man will believe unless he knows that God loves him personally and
nobody will know that unless he knows that Christ died for him
personally, for the atonement is the fullest and only effective display
of grace.

We would remind the reader of our earlier comments concerning the
place of the declaration "God loves you" in the 'Bold Proclamation'.
Hyperists reject such a concept of evangelism. But there are other
reasons associated with the doctrine of grace which call for the
rejection of free offers. Free offers presuppose more than just
salvifically universal grace. 8 They imply that grace is resistible. But
grace is irresistible, therefore there are no free offers. The two are
incompatible. A choice must be made, and so free offers are rejected. 9

Free offers are also seen as implying that sinners have a right to
what is offered. But grace is undeserved favour, therefore there are no
offers. 10 Further, "can it be said that salvation is ever offered at all,
when that special grace which bringeth salvation, is withheld and
unooffered?" 11 Grace by its very nature is a free gift, sovereignly given.
Therefore, "the doctrine of the offer denies the sovereignty of grace". 12
And what has been said about free offers applies equally to Duty-

being persuaded more or less of Christ's love" (Free Grace, p. 64). See Chapter IX, Section C.
8. Hoeksema: "this offer of the gospel is common grace" (in Engelsma, p. 27. Cf. p. 31).
9. See Engelsma, pp. 2, 15, 34, 37, 71, 136; Stockell, Redeemer's Glory, pp. 229, 242; Homer
Hoeksema, Voice, pp. 617-618.
Contrary to the sentiments of Low Calvinism, "The love that sends forth the gospel ... is the love of God for the elect church" alone. This gets back to the reason why we should preach to all. According to the Hyperist system, we are to preach to all because the elect are scattered in the world and we know not which persons are which. But we know that God has a love for these elect, and our job is to go to them by preaching to all. But under no circumstances should we preach so as to imply that God sincerely wishes all who hear to be saved. That just is not so, say the Hyper-Calvinists.

This brings up the question of the 'well-meant' offer, as the Hoeksema branch prefer to call it. Murray and Stonehouse were of the mind that "It would appear that the real point in dispute with the free offer of the gospel is whether it can properly be said that God desires the salvation of all men". Does the Gospel state that God intends to save all? If not, how can it be said to be sincere, well-meant or serious? Hyperists generally answer by stating that the Gospel, by simply stating the facts (including deterministic sovereignty and unconditional election), does not specify that God intends to save all. On the contrary, they hold, a free offer cannot be supported without doing damage to the doctrine of unconditional intent regarding salvation.

The Hyper-Calvinists also reply that there can be no hypocrisy in the revealed will. It must be subject to the secret will. In the revealed will, the most that one can say is that if the hearer believed, that would be pleasing to God. Note the hypothetical 'if'. God would be pleased if sinners repented, but God has not ordained all men to repent. Hence, it cannot be said that God intends all men to repent. The secret will, it will be recalled, is the will of intention. The revealed will is that of precept and obligation. In a non-Amyraldian sense, then, the revealed will is basically hypothetical. Gill explains

13. "Duty-Faith (is) an insolent slander upon the grace of God and the saving competence of Christ" (Styles, Guide, p.38).
15. See Chapter VIII, Section E.
the situation according to the acceptance of anthropopathy:

whenever God calls men to repent, he not only seems to be, but he really is serious and in good earnest ... (But) these things are only to be ascribed to God, after the manner of men, in a figurative, and improper sense.17

Thus, according to our comprehension God is sincere in calling men. But this is the external call, and that must give way to the internal call which matches the secret will. And in the secret will God does not intend all to be saved. Does this mean that there is a contradiction in the two wills here? No, says Gill, for our preaching must indicate that God does not intend to save all. The revealed will is conditional. It is not intentional,

nor is he to be charged for it with dissimulation and insincerity; since by it he declares what is his good, perfect, and acceptable will, and what would be grateful and well-pleasing to him was it complied with and done.18

In the preaching of the Gospel, God does not passionately wish the spiritual and eternal welfare of all mankind. When, therefore, the Scriptures speak of "a wish and desire of God for the spiritual welfare and conversion of men, such a wish can only be ascribed to him in a figurative sense".19

This also relates to the question of divine sovereignty and human responsibility, for the matter of intent concerns divine sovereignty. Now to the Hyper-Calvinists, human responsibility means free will, and free will means free offer. But these concepts go against that of sovereign grace. Pink opposed free offers as proposed by Arminians:

It is the view of these men that God makes an offer of His saving grace through the gospel message, makes it to the freewill of all who hear it, and that they can either accept or refuse it. But that is not 'grace' at all... If grace is merely something which is offered to me, something which I must improve if it is to do me any good, then my acceptance thereof is a meritorious act, and I have ground

The choice, then, is between free grace or free will, for the two are incompatible. Now we have already shown how Hyper-Calvinists reject free offers because of the doctrine of total depravity. Here we merely point out that total depravity nullifies free will, and if so then also free offers. Free offers are seen as being based upon free will, while free grace is based upon divine sovereignty. If a choice must be made, as the Hyperists feel is the case, then free grace and divine sovereignty must win out over free will, free offers, and human responsibility.

This is in line with the popular definitions of 'Calvinism' and 'Arminianism'. The one is said to be the system of free grace, the other of free will. But is this really accurate? Those who make this sort of equation usually also equate Augustinianism with Calvinism and Pelagianism with Arminianism. But they overlook a very important historical fact. Augustine himself warned against rejecting either free grace or free will. It would come as a great surprise for many 'Calvinists' to read Augustine's treatise entitled On Grace and Free Will. The African Doctor specifically warns of holding to such a rigidly deterministic concept of grace as to threaten free will or human responsibility.

Similar warnings can be found in the writings of theologians after Augustine, or even among the Reformers. Calvin and Luther, for all their attacks on 'free will', were merely opposing the Pelagian and semi-Pelagian views of responsibility. In no way were they going to the opposite extreme - the very extreme opened up by the development of High, Antinomian, and finally Hyper-Calvinism.

This historical departure from the proper balance can be traced step by step by noting where representative theologians of each school began.

20. Election and Justification, p. 171.
21. For examples, see the following: Tiptaft, Salvation by Grace, p. 12; Philpot, Letters, p. 260; John Gadsby, Memoir of Gadsby, pp. 55, 58; Bradbury, Grove Chapel Pulpit, vol. I, p. 33; Parks, Five Points, p. 38. Atherton: "If our opponents, or even ourselves, wish to be correct in designation of terms, Free-will versus Free Grace would be more correct; or what is commonly called Calvinism..." (The Church and Calvinism, p. 74).
22. E.g., Atherton, op. cit.; Ben Warburton, Calvinism, p. 19.
to over-emphasize divine sovereignty over human responsibility. Specifically pertinent to our allegation here is how they applied this to the question of choosing free grace over free will. It appears that these two imbalances match each other historically as well as theologically.

It is well known that the Federal Puritans stressed special grace, perhaps even to the detriment of a doctrine of common grace with soteriological aspects. What concerns us here, though, is how they drew the contrast between sovereign grace and human freedom. They did not usually state that a choice had to be made per se. But the stage was being set by the stress on the importance of sovereign grace, as when John Flavel wrote:

For my own part, he that searches my heart and reins, is witness, I would rather choose to have my right hand wither, and my tongue rot within my mouth, than to speak one word, or write one line to cloud and diminish the free grace of God. 23

Note that this was written in connection with the Antinomian Controversy. Flavel represented mainstream High Calvinism in opposing Crisp and Saltmarsh for going too far in minimizing human responsibility. These Antinomians, it was felt, thought that where a choice needed to be made, then we should choose divine grace rather than human freedom. In opposing this Flavel did not take the other option, that of protecting human freedom at the expense of divine grace. Rather, those such as Flavel felt that this last choice was made by the Arminians. As for the Antinomians, it would appear that they considered that a choice may have to be made. Note the words of John Saltmarsh:

I shall allow you your sanctification so far as the scriptures do, as a lower motive, and more carnally mixed and uncertain way of persuasion and assurance of justification. But a little to note to you two sides sadly mistaking one another in points of this nature: The one cries out against the other, as if they held we were justified partly from our being sanctified, or from our works; the other on the contrary, cry out, that such would cast out all sanctification: Now such opinions are in neither of them; justly in them, I mean in those of both that can spiritually judge: But there are some expressions on both parts, which make the one pass for legal Teachers, and the other for

Antinomians; the one giving too much in their Sermons and Books to Faith and Works, in an unwarrantable jealousy, lest holiness should be slighted; some other less than is fit, lest free-grace should lose her due; and both in an unwarrantable jealousy. And indeed, the latter I must prefer before the former: For if I must err, I had rather cry down men to exalt Christ, than Christ to exalt men, though I would do neither; but let both have their place and order.

These sentiments were aimed at opposing Low Calvinism in particular, but there were implications that certain forms of High Calvinism were not immune from rebuke. Saltmarsh preferred to maintain the balance, but if a choice had to be made then it would be better to err on the side of exalting Christ's grace to the detriment of human freedom than vice-versa. But this choice was still an error, howbeit a lesser one than exalting human freedom at the neglect to Christ's grace. One wonders how High Calvinists such as Flavel would have dealt with the question of a necessary choice. Or more importantly, how the Supralapsarians would have considered the matter.

The choice cropped up again in the Neonomian Controversy. High Calvinism was situated between the Neonomians on the one side and anti-Neonomians (or Antinomians) on the other. The latter class were slow to accept the classification as 'Antinomians' for fear of appearing to fall prey to the excesses of Crisp. And yet they felt that this would be a far less serious error than Baxterianism, as confessed by Benjamin Keach:

Brethren, 'tis a hard case that any of those who maintain the Old Doctrine of Justification, should be branded with the black name of 'Antinomians'. As for my part, if Dr. Crisp be not mis-represented by his opposers, I am not of his opinion in several respects; but I had rather erre on their side, who strive to exalt wholly the Free Grace of God, than on theirs, who seek to darken it and magnifie the power of the Creature, though we feel the Design is to wound the Truth and us, though that good Man's sides,

24. Free Grace, pp.81-82. The Arminian John Fletcher said that the more rigid Calvinists overplay free grace to the expense of free will, even as extreme Arminians do the opposite. This gave way to Antinomianism, which is the error of such rigid Calvinists as exalt free grace in soinjudicious a manner, and make so little account of free will, and its startings aside out of the way of duty, as to represent sin, at times, like a mere bugbear, which can no more hurt the believer (Works, vol.IV, pp.81, 185). See Chapters X and XII.
who, I doubt not, is gone to Heaven.\textsuperscript{38}

Keach's position sounds reminiscent of that of Saltmarsh and yet he was more in agreement with Flavel. Our opinion is that he extended the views of Flavel to accommodate new developments against Neonomianism. That is to say, Flavel and other High Calvinists would have been able to agree with Keach. For all that the High Calvinists said earlier about their position being equally placed between Arminianism and Antinomianism, the drift was in the direction of the latter.

When the Hyper-Calvinist controversy came along, sentiments similar to Saltmarsh were again expressed. This school of theology, as we have shown, was the outgrowth of an amalgamation of Antinomianism and High Calvinism. Gill exemplified this stage in admitting that he

\begin{quote}
had chosen to suffer reproof the loss of good name and reputation, to forgo popularity, wealth, and friends, yea to be traduced as an Antinomian, rather than drop or conceal, any branch of truth, respecting Christ and free grace.\textsuperscript{39}
\end{quote}

All along these Calvinists were attempting to show that the choice need not be made, though they were quick to point out that if such a choice need to be made then divine grace took the highest priority. This is just another way of rejecting free will in favour of free grace, or to be more precise, choosing free grace instead of free offers.

These sentiments continued throughout the history of Hyperism in the eighteenth century.\textsuperscript{27} In Chapter III we produced several examples of how the school of Hoeksema felt the need for the choice of sovereignty over responsibility, a choice which Engelsma traces back to Abraham Kuyper. Kuyper was a Supralapsarian who believed in the free offer, and his views in some respects parallel those of Keach above, if not

\begin{itemize}
\item[25.] Narrow, pp.1-11. Toon traced this position through the Savoy Conference (PC, pp.80, 83; HC, pp.52-53). Toon gives part of the same quotation as above but gives Narrow, p.8, as the source (HC, p.87).
\item[26.] Quoted in Rippon, p.xxi.
\item[27.] Against non-Calvinists, John Warburton said, "I do not indeed feel the least ill-will against any of their persons as the creatures of God, nor do I desire to do them the least injury, but those principles that debase free and sovereign grace, and exalt the creature, I hate and abhor" (Neclees, p.115).
\end{itemize}
higher still.28 But what about A.W. Pink? Earlier we showed that he wavered on the question of balance, finally coming down on the side of sovereignty over responsibility. In the context of free grace or free will, the same pattern is seen. Sometimes he calls for balance of grace and responsibility,29 and sometimes he even castigates other Hyper-Calvinists for over-emphasizing grace to the minimization of duty.30 But Pink was no friend of the doctrine of free will, and in the end he too chooses free grace over free will.31

More moderate Calvinists, including some High Calvinists, call for balance and attempt to maintain that balance by seeing that free grace is not entirely incompatible with a Biblical doctrine of free will. Low Calvinists, especially the Dualists, are most strenuous in trying to maintain the balance. To them, free grace and free will are complementary, not contradictory. Therefore, they preach a free offer based upon a dual redemption and upon the dichotomy of universal and special grace.

In a recent and helpful study, D.A. Carson points out the temptation to reject the Biblical balance by going on two equally opposite errors: common grace alone (God loves all equally) or special grace alone (God loves only the elect).32 We are in agreement with his analysis at this point. But one must choose which school best maintains the middle course. It would be difficult to prove that the High Calvinists keep the balance, due to their emphasis on limited atonement based on special grace alone. On the other hand, the Universalists tend to give too much to the idea of sufficient grace and a purely universal atonement. If we may be allowed to speculate, we would be easily persuaded to choose the Dualist conception of grace and atonement.

30. "They jettison the law of God under the pretence of magnifying His grace" (I John, p.179).
31. E.g., The Sovereignty of God and Gleanings from the Scriptures.
32. Divine Sovereignty and Human Responsibility, p.197. In the last century, Dale gave this analysis: "Of the two extremes, the suppression of man which was the offence of Calvinism, and the suppression of God which was the offence against which Calvinism so fiercely protested, the fault and error of Calvinism was the nobler and grander" (The Epistle to the Ephesians, p.52). Cf. A.H. Strong, Systematic Theology, p.369. This is an interesting comment, coming as it does from one who could hardly be considered a High or Hyper-Calvinist!
But the choice is not merely between free grace and free will, nor sovereignty and responsibility, but between one aspect of God and another. It is deciding between special grace and common grace, which is related to the choice between sovereignty and holiness (or sovereignty and love). It could even be traced further back into the question of the being (sovereignty) and will of God. In the end, then, the question of grace and the free offer reflects one's own view of the nature of God.\[33\] The Hyperists feel that all those lower than themselves have an imbalanced idea which does not give adequate attention to the sovereignty of grace. Conversely, Arminians feel that the other side does not give enough attention to universal grace. Those in the middle echo Carson's words above, that there is truth and error in both extremes.

The reader may wonder why we chose to place this chapter at this place in our work. Would it not have been more appropriate to deal with it in conjunction with, say, our treatment of divine sovereignty? Actually, we feel that this chapter could have been placed at any stage in the work for the simple reason that it relates to them all probably more than any of the others do. It ties in all the motifs and conclusions of all the others. For example, in Chapter I we traced the historical progression of Hyper-Calvinism, noting the diversity within the unity of a definite tendency. This has been exemplified in the present chapter: the Hyperists differ on several small points but are in agreement in their main thrust, which is the rejection of common grace as understood by lower Calvinists. This points to the actual-virtual scheme, mentioned in Chapter II, together with the ideas of dichotomy, paradox, Stoicism and Arminianism. The present chapter clearly builds upon the discussion in Chapter III concerning the being and will of God on the one hand, and the choice of sovereignty over responsibility on the other. Further, the rejection of soteriological aspects of common grace relates to the Supralapsarian scheme (Chapter IV), and the stress on special grace can only be understood in the light of the Hyperist understanding of the Covenant of Grace (Chapter V). The rejection of the view that the 'Bold Assurance' that one is loved of God explains much concerning justification by faith (VI) and assurance (VII). The rejection of free offers because of free grace underlies much of our work in Chapter VIII, and this is linked with the rejection of universal

\[33\] Cf. Hulse, Free Offer, p.4.
atonement through denial of salvific universal grace (Chapter IX). That Hyperists say much about free grace in a way which can be traced to the Antinomians was brought out in Chapter X. That brings us to the present chapter. All that remains for us is to give a few concluding remarks about the system as a whole in relation to other systems. Up until now we have discussed the definitions of specific vital doctrines. Now we must reach a definition of Hyper-Calvinism itself.
CHAPTER XII

CONCLUSION

A. THE VARIETIES OF REFORMED THEOLOGY

Every journalist knows that the report of a story must answer five vital questions to make his composition complete: Who, What, Where, When and Why. The reader who has read through our study will have noticed that we have attempted to answer each of these five questions in our attempt to define the school of theology commonly known as Hyper-Calvinism. In this concluding chapter we will summarize our findings, present our definitions and offer a few closing comments by way of overview. Heretofore we have investigated the trees, the branches and even the twigs, but now it is time to step back and look at the forest itself.

It is one thing to define something by analysis and another thing to define it by distinction. The first dissects, investigates and labels each part of the whole. The second compares, contrasts and classifies the whole in relation to other entities. We have sought to do both by looking at the constituent parts of Hyperism in relation to other parts of the whole, and comparing and contrasting the whole and its parts to other systems. The student of historical theology will realize that to understand a school of thought best one must compare and contrast it with its nearest neighbours, and this we have done.

Unfortunately, many writers over-generalize in their statements about what has come to be known as 'Calvinism'. Many, if not most, tend to speak of it as a single monolithic structure in which the present representatives are in the pure line of heredity to John Calvin himself. Sometimes this is coupled with the erroneous conclusion that there are only two types of theology, namely Calvinism and Arminianism. We will

1. On the Hyper-Calvinist understanding of what is involved in the process of definition, see Styles, Manual, pp.163-165. The Hyperists have occasionally produced Biblical-theological dictionaries, usually with short definitions which centre on the special emphases of the Hyper-ist system. See, for example, Parks, A Sunday-School Dictionary; Hawker, Works, vol.VI; J.C. Ryland, Sr., Contemplations. The pattern is sometimes employed in the various Hyper-ist catechisms (e.g., Gadsby, Hawker, Hale).
comment on this exaggeration in due time, but first we must take a look at the various strains of theology which came directly or indirectly from the Reformation. If it is not already obvious, we are in complete agreement with the analysis of the translator of Calvin's Calvinism when he wrote, "There are, in the religious world, almost as many different shades, kinds and degrees, of Calvinism as there are Calvinists".2

To use an idiom currently making the rounds of Biblical theology, there is both unity and diversity within the structure, doctrines and development of Calvinism. By the same standard, many of these strains can be traced to specific individuals, usually ecclesiastical leaders or important writers. To that extent it has become popular and relatively accurate to speak of 'Calvinism', 'Lutheranism', 'Gillism', 'Philpotism', 'Arminianism', and so forth. On the one hand, this has the advantage of specifying what one means when he uses the term - literally speaking, 'Calvinism' is the theology of John Calvin alone, and so with the others. The student should then have little difficulty in checking out the comments made about the system described.

On the other hand, these terms generally have been applied to the followers of the men named in the title, and this is where the problems arise. And then there is the problem of dogmatics. When representatives of these systems assert, as they often do, that their system is the best representative of the doctrines of the Bible, one wonders why they bother using the terms of mere men rather than the terms of Scripture. This is often coupled with the problem of following men rather than God.

In our cursory survey of the different systems we will mention the most common strands of theology related to the Hyper-Calvinist dilemma together with a list of some of the leading names. We are aware of the problems this raises, such as the criticism that it stereotypes theologies, uses over-simplification, or even sounds infallible. However, we have not been alone in discussing these schools of theology in this way. Indeed, one can hardly use the names of these schools (as all do) without having some idea what they mean, how they relate to others, and to whom they apply. We merely give our own understanding of them as employed in our investigation.

What we will do, then, is to chart the spectrum of the relevant theologies which arose directly or indirectly out of the Reformation, listing the leading representatives "from hyper-Calvinists to ultra-Arminians", to use A.W. Pink's phrase. We will, however, reverse that order so that we may give progressively more attention to the higher forms, culminating in Hyper-Calvinism.

Lowest down on the scale must surely be DEISM, if for no other reason than that the most extreme varieties tended to become atheistic. Such was the situation in France with Voltaire and Rousseau, but in Britain mainstream Deism centered on a view of transcendance which denied certain orthodox fundamentals, such as special revelation, miracles, the Trinity and justification by faith. As we saw in Chapter II, Deism arose contemporaneously with Hyper-Calvinism but did not last as long. In a word, Deism is reason - the sufficiency of human reason for all philosophic, religious and social purposes. Leading Deists included the following:


As Hyperism was the outcome of High Calvinism, so Deism had certain movements as important ancestors. Certain precursors can be found in the realm of philosophy, such as T. Hobbes and R. Descartes, and in the moral or religious views of Lord Herbert of Cherbury, P. Charron, J. Bodin and C. Blount. Deism was the immediate outgrowth of LATITUDINARIANISM, which in turn was associated with CAMBRIDGE

4. Cf. Hoeksema, TK, vol.III, pp.11-15. Earlier we showed that Deism was a modern form of Epicureanism, opposed by Hyper-Calvinism, which has been a modern form of Stoicism.
5. The two most important works from the Deist perspective are Locke's Reasonableness of Christianity, and Toland's Christianity Not Mysterious. The political aspect of Deism has always been strong and is generally dated from the publication of Locke's Two Treatises on Government. Among its many opponents, those who have figured highly have included Bishop Butler, W. Paley, A. Fuller, J. Gill, and T. Erskine.
6. There has been debate over when Deism actually began, and Hobbes and Herbert are sometimes classed as Deists. We prefer to think of them as pre-Deists. The most influential works from this stage include Hobbes' Leviathan, and Herbert's De Veritate.
PLATONISM. This latter movement prospered in the Oxbridge area of southern England and centered on the Platonic notion of the transcendent Ideal. Since God was out there and Man is down here, Man should strive to bring himself into conformity with that Ideal, which is possible without special divine intervention but rather by applying human reason and will to the area of ethics. It was more religious than Deism and, like Latitudinarianism, called for tolerance concerning religious liberty of thought. Leading representatives include:


The reader may wonder what is the relevance of these schools of thought to Reformation theology. The connection can be seen in what was in many ways the father of this progression: SOCINIANISM. Closer to orthodoxy than the others, this viewpoint did not rule out special revelation. Its distinctive was akin to ARIANISM, the rejection of the Trinity and the full deity of Jesus Christ. Salvifically it usually rejected the doctrine of eternal torments in Hell, either by denying the natural immortality of the soul (tending to annihilationism) or by accepting the salvation of every human soul because of the supremacy of the love of God (tending to strict UNIVERSALISM). There are distinct similarities with later movements, such as LIBERALISM (which stressed the divine immanence, the religion of feeling, and love as the essence of religion), MODERNISM (the rejection of traditional views of Biblical inspiration and interpretation, both within the Church of Rome and in Protestantism), and UNITARIANISM (more extreme than Arianism).

7. It would be difficult to say which is the most important or representative of the works by this school. More's Mystery of Godliness was as important as any and has special relevance to the subject of Pre-Existerianism, for which see Chapter V, Section E above.

8. The views of Socinianism are best summed up in the Racovian Confession.

9. Liberalism is generally considered to have begun in the early nineteenth century Germany with the writings of Schleiermacher. The classic statement is Adolf Von Harnack's What Is Christianity? Liberal theologians include F. Baur, A. Ritschl, W.M. De Wette, D. Strauss, W.R. Smith, J. Wellhausen, and others. Earlier precursors include Michaelis, Leibnitz, Sermius, and, more philosophically speaking, Kant and Hegel. That which is called 'Liberalism' is exceeding broad, but a common thread can be seen. Often that common denominator is summed up in the 'Four Points', of Liberalism, viz: the Fatherhood of God, the universal brotherhood of Man, the infinite value of the human soul, and that the sum of religion is in the practice of love.

10. Modernism proper was a movement within the Roman Church, represented by A. Loisy and others, and was eventually censured. In Protestantism it is popularly synonymous with Liberalism. Modernism proper, however, is usually the description given to certain progressive trends in...
denying Christ's deity above that possible by mankind in general, often stated in conjunction with progressive views of comparative religion).

Socinianism had its roots in the views of Faustus Socinus in the latter stages of the Reformation. His views had found their source in the earlier HUMANISM of the Renaissance, which culminated in the hesitant but important questions of the Roman Catholic, Desiderius Erasmus. To a certain extent Erasmus represented a semi-orthodoxy within the Church of Rome: at variance with the Papacy and much of traditional teaching, but raising more questions than providing answers. Thus positioned, Erasmus could not entirely agree with the Reformation and chose to stay in Rome. Similarly, Socinus disagreed more with traditional Roman theology than with the Reformation, but could not properly be considered a Reformer. And Erasmus was no Socinian.

One could posit that the bridge between Socinus and the Reformers lay in the anti-trinitarianism of Michael Servetus and certain Anabaptists. Anabaptism was fairly diverse at the beginning stretching from the tendency to SEMI-PELAGINIANISM of certain persons to the SEMI-LUTHERANISM of individuals such as Menno Simons, Balthasar Hubmeier and Jacob Hutter.

In the immediate post-Reformation generation there arose a reaction against the views of mainstream Reformation theology (mainly the High Calvinism of Beza). This was spear-headed by Jacob Arminius and the theology came to be known as ARMINIANISM. Strictly speaking, this term applies to the theology of Arminius alone and the student of Protestant theology must realize that there have been as many variations of 'Arminianism' as of 'Calvinism'. Arminius himself was much closer to Calvin than many others called Arminians. Moreover, we would be reluctant to accept that all of the schools mentioned above could accurately be described as forms of Arminianism. Fletcher correctly notes the differences between 'Rigid Arminians' and 'Candid Arminians'.

Cont'd...

the field of Biblical studies, notably the 'Higher Criticism' and non-traditional views of the authorship and dating of the Pentateuch.

11. A prolific writer and editor in many fields, Erasmus carried on a literary debate with Luther in his Diatribe de Libro Arbitrio, which is that most pertinent to our discussion.

12. Fletcher felt that the former reacted too much against Calvinism and made "more of free will than of free grace". A 'Candid Arminian' himself, Fletcher was more generous than many in... Cont'd:
Unfortunately, the terms 'High' and 'Low' when applied to Arminianism can be confusing. In any case, the system was originally a modification of Calvinism, not Lutheranism, but eventually the animosity grew and hence one often hears of 'The Calvinist-Arminian Debate'. Leading Arminian theologians include the following, including all variations and ages:


Historically speaking, Arminianism is summed up in the five articles of the Remonstrance, which were rejected by the Synod of Dort. Some Arminians have ventured into PERFECTIONISM (e.g., Law and Wesley), including the Nazarene doctrine of entire sanctification (e.g., Miley). Others have been more mystically oriented – the more orthodox exponents of QUAKERISM (e.g., R. Barclay)¹⁵ could be accommodated in this category. Ecclesiastically, there have been Arminians among Anglicans, Methodists, Baptists, Congregationalists, Pentecostals and other bodies.

Perhaps the most moderate form of this system is that which accepts the final preservation of the saints but is in more agreement with the other points of Arminianism than with Calvinism in any form. This has more often than not been the case with much of what has been called FUNDAMENTALISM, particularly in America. The term, however, is not usually applied to the Calvinist-Arminian debate and we need not expand on it here.¹⁶

Cont'd:

writing, "Bible Calvinism and Bible Arminianism are two essential, opposite parts of the gospel, which agree ... perfectly together" (Works, vol. IV, pp.184-185). Gadsby differentiated 'Low' Arminianism from other kinds (Sermons, p.185). That 'Arminians' generally went beyond Arminius is noted by Proctor, p.93; and Harrison, Arminianism, p.37. Wesley himself has been quoted to the same effect as Fletcher, in Coppedge, pp.314-315.

¹³ See especially Sell, The Great Debate, in which he shows that both Arminians and Calvinists have usually gone beyond their founders by over-reacting against each other and those within their respective traditions.

¹⁴ The most substantial systematic theologies are those by Pope and Watson. Most Arminians would accept the concise interpretations given in Wesley's compact New Testament Commentary, often reprinted. Fuller Biblical exegesis can be found in the commentaries of Grotius, Hammond, Clarke, Whitby and Bengel.

¹⁵ The standard statement of Quaker theology is Barclay's Apology for the True Christian Religion.

... Cont'd:
Those who posit that there is no middle ground between Arminianism and Calvinism ignore the plain facts of church history. If, for the sake of argument, these two systems are defined in terms of the 'Five Points of Calvinism' and of 'Arminianism', one does not have to look far to find several systems and individuals who are a mixture of the two or who present alternatives to the points which neither accept nor reject them as they stand. Take, for example, the variations of **LUTHERANISM**. The lower forms were represented by Melanchthon, and the school had affinities with the theologies of Zwingli, Oecolampadius, Carlstadt and Bucer. Luther's own theology cannot be considered as being in agreement with the Dortian points except by a gross ignoring of the evidence.\(^7\) Using Dort as a hypothetical standard, the position of Lutheran would more or less be in agreement with total depravity, unconditional election, and final perseverance, but it can hardly be true that Luther would have agreed with the doctrine of limited atonement (and probably irresistible grace). Moreover, to suggest that Luther was a 'Three Point Calvinist' gives an unnecessary authority to Dort and ignores the prominent place of Luther in the Reformation. It would be as appropriate to speak of Dort as 'Three Point Lutheranism'. In addition to Luther and Melanchthon, others of orthodox Lutheranism would include the following:


**Lutheranism has, of course, had its variations. PIETISM was a**
mystical strain which sought to bring back the spiritual side to counteract the deadening trend in seventeenth century Lutheranism. This in turn produced **MORAVIANISM** in the next century. And there have been other variations.

A more recent theological trend of Protestant theology began as a reaction against Liberalism but rather than returning to Lutheranism or High Calvinism, it broke new ground and thereby figures in the spectrum discussed herein. It would be difficult to place what has been known as **NEO-ORTHODOXY** in the traditional categories. To a large extent it shares affinities with the lower strands of Calvinism, but its views of Biblical inspiration and interpretation are often more in agreement with those of Modernism and even Liberalism. The movement found precursors in the theologies of S. Kierkegaard and the Scottish theology of MacLeod Campbell, but in the present century it is usually associated with Karl Barth and Emil Brunner.  

18. This is the Swiss variety and sought to regain the truth of divine transcendence lost by German Liberalism. In Scotland this has been paralleled by a trend which received much impetus from H.R. MacKintosh. Other representatives of this school would include the following: J. Baillie, P.T. Forsyth, T.F. Torrance, J.B. Torrance, and J.K.S. Reid.

In America there have been further variations of Neo-Orthodoxy, as seen in the theologies of Richard and Reinhold Niebuhr and Paul Tillich. The Dutch version has been represented more closely along traditional lines through H. Berkhof, G.C. Berkouwer, and in America by James Daane. Each of these has affinities with what is popularly called **EVANGELICALISM**. Once synonymous with Fundamentalism, it is now recognized that there are variations within this school and that the tendency is to be more in agreement with Calvinism than Arminianism. A broad movement regarding the specifics relevant to our discussion, its leading representatives have included C.F.H. Henry, E.J. Carnell, and H.J. Ockenga in theology, and F.F. Bruce in Biblical studies.  

19. The best presentation of current Evangelical theology is the series of collections of essays similar to The Fundamentals of a previous generation. These include the following: Fundamentals ...

---

18. Both have written dogmatics, of which Barth's enormous Church Dogmatics is the larger, more well-known and more popular. Concise statements can be found in Barth's Dogmatics in Outline and Credo, and Brunner's Our Faith.

19. The best presentation of current Evangelical theology is the series of collections of essays similar to The Fundamentals of a previous generation. These include the following: Fundamentals ... Cont'd:
Evangelicalism often approached what we have referred to as **Low Calvinism**. It would not be entirely precise to include Neo-Orthodoxy in this category, several similarities notwithstanding, for Low Calvinists have been more apt to speak in the classical categories of traditional Calvinism. Since we have often referred to this variety of Calvinism in the present work, a few words of clarification are in order.

The division of High and Low Calvinism is not a new one. Unfortunately, the terms have been used in several different ways. Some equate High with Hyper-Calvinism and Low with everything else. According to this division, the differences between those differing over the extent of the atonement are either ignored or those holding to universal atonement are not considered Calvinists. The other way of employing the terms considers Low Calvinists to be those accepting universal atonement and High Calvinists to be those who do not. This division, which is closest to the one we have chosen, either classes Hypers as Highs and thus ignores the differences on the offer question or creates a separate category for non-offer Calvinism, viz., Hyper-Calvinism.

The division we have chosen is basically that described by Peter Toon and others: Low, High and Hyper-Calvinism. But even this triad is susceptible to misunderstanding. The two higher schools stress limited atonement and tend to dismiss the Lows as semi-Arminian. But that is an incorrect evaluation, for Low Calvinists certainly are not Arminians, James Morison: "I am not an Arminian; call me a low-Calvinist, or a no-Calvinist, if you like, but I am not an Arminian."

---


21. Quoted in Oliphant Smeaton, Principal James Morison, p.114. Wells associated Low Calvinism with Wesleyanism, except that it was inconsistent and nonsensical (Letters to Theophilus, vol.II, p.157; Experience, pp.18, 22, 36, 52). For this reason, Hyper-Calvinists tend to castigate Low Calvinists in stronger terms than Arminians. See Chapter II, Section I. James Wilson spoke ...

---

Cont'd:...
The division is basically over the extent of the atonement. If, as we hold, Calvin did not believe in limited atonement, then he cannot be considered a High Calvinist. And since he accepted the doctrine of the free offer, he certainly was no Hyper-Calvinist. In the light of these easily documented facts we find it difficult to escape the conclusion that Calvin has great affinity with what has often been described as Low Calvinism, i.e. theology which more or less accepts the other four points of Dort but not that of particular redemption. For this reason, we would tentatively accept that this school can be called 'Four Point Calvinism', as it often has been.  

There have been many of this persuasion. In addition to Calvin and nearly all of the Reformers, the following fall into this category:


Many more could be added to this list. We have listed these because each of them have made a specific point of emphasizing their rejection of limited atonement. This is, however, not to say that these are in agreement on all other issues. Some were Anglicans (Ussher, Davenant), others Prebyterians (Baxter, Campbell), some Independents (Doddridge, Watts), some Baptists (Bunyan, Strong). More important differences concern such things are the use of the Law in justification. NEONOMIANISM tended to employ language which sounds like there is a place for works in the ground of justification. This is an erroneous interpretation, however. The Neonomians were merely opposing the Antinomians and thereby stressed the place of conviction of sin and the necessity of sanctification as evidence of justification. The real difficulty concerns the Neomanian theory that the Gospel is a 'New Law',

Cont'd... disparingly of the theology of Ralph Wardlaw as 'Arminio-Calvinism' and 'semi-Arminianism' (The Gospel and the Atonement, pp.6, 60).

22. See Good, Are Baptists Calvinists.
of which the condition is faith and repentance. There were not many of
this persuasion: R. Baxter, D. Williams, W. Lorrimer, V. Alsop, J.
Humphrey, S. Clark, John Edwards, E. Stillingfleet, and others.23

Unlike many of those listed in the longer list above, the Neonomians
were not, strictly speaking, Calvinistic Universalists. Basically they
adhered to CALVINISTIC DUALISM. This position asserts that there is a
special as well as a universal aspect of the atonement: "for all,
especially the elect; not equally for all". Yet the universal aspect was
quite real and salvific.

While Ussher and Davenant presented Dualism before Baxter came on
the scene, a similar form of Low Calvinism was developing in France,
namely AMYRALDIANISM (or Amyraldism). Sometimes called HYPOTHETICAL
UNIVERSALISM, this branch spoke of a conditional decree concerning the
relation between election and atonement preceding the unconditional one.
Members of this school include: M. Amyraut, J. Cameron, P. Testard,
D. Blondel, J. Daille, L. Cappel, J. Claude, M. Le Faucheur, J.
Mestrezat, N. Vignier, and to some extent P. Du Moulin.24

Low Calvinism has been described under several other names, not
always accurately: MIDDLE-WAY THEOLOGY,25 NEW METHODISM,26 THE
DOUBLE REFERENCE THEORY, and MODERATE CALVINISM. The last of these,
as we shall see, has also been used to describe an aspect of what we

23. Neonomianism is sometimes referred to as 'Anti-Antinomianism' and 'Baxterianism'. In his
Catholick Theology (Second Book) Baxter placed the truth between the Calvinist and the Arminian.
The 'Reconciler' represented Baxter's attempt to mediate between (High) Calvinism and a growing
extreme Arminianism. Packer: "Arminianism, Baxter held, represented an extreme of reaction
against Calvinism; and the doctrine of limited atonement represented an extreme of reaction
against Arminianism" (Redemption and Restoration, p.261). If there was one quality which char-
acterized Baxter in all aspects of his theology in this context, with the exception of his
bitter opposition to Antinomianism, it was the attitude which called for tolerance over the non-
essential doctrines of the faith. This attitude was generally not shared by the High Calvinists
and Arminians with who's he had to do.

24. Sell: "Among the factors which motivated Amyraut was the hope that his position might make
Reformed teaching more acceptable to the Lutherans" (Debate, p.31). Thus, like most Low
Calvinists, the Amyraldians were intent on maintaining unity within orthodox Protestantism.

25. E.g., Hussey, Glory, p.570.

26. E.g., Hussey, ibid.; Traill, Works, vol.1, p.273. Thus, when Wesley and Whitefield came along
the Evangelical Awakening was seen by some as being a resurgence of Amyraldianism. To an extent
that was true, for before either of them developed their distinctive views, both saw a relative
harmony of Calvinism and Arminianism.
call High Calvinism.

What underlies Low Calvinism is the emphasis on balance. This is particularly the case with the Dualists. They posit that there are special and universal aspects of divine grace and the atonement. Moreover, the 'Bold Assurance' that "Christ died for me" is of the essence of saving faith, and that the free offer necessarily includes the 'Bold Proclamation' that says "God loves you and Christ died for you". As concerns the divine decrees, if there is an order in them, that of atonement preceded that of election.

The term MODERATE CALVINISM has sometimes been applied to what we describe as Low Calvinism. This is especially the practice of Hyper-Calvinists. Philip Schaff described the division of Calvinists in this manner:

There are two types of Calvinism, as there are of Lutheranism: the strict, scholastic Calvinism of the Canons of Dort and the Westminster Confession; and the moderate Calvinism of the Heidelberg Catechism, the Second Helvetic Confession, and the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England. Moderate and progressive Calvinism omits or softens the five knotty points of Dort and seeks to reconcile divine sovereignty and human liberty, divine justice and divine love. It is in sympathy with the Melancthonian type of Lutheranism...

Schaff correctly notes that the lower Calvinists attempted to maintain the balance of divine sovereignty and human liberty, while the higher Calvinists put this balance in jeopardy. That much of the problem hinges on the extent of the atonement is recognized by L.S. Chafer, who puts forth four categories relevant to the question:

1. The Extreme Limited Redemptionists,
2. The Moderate Calvinists who are Limited Redemptionists,
3. The Moderate Calvinists who are Unlimited Redemptionists,
4. The Arminians.

27. Theological Propaedeutic, p.342. Schaff goes on to class the Westminster Confession as High Calvinism (p.343). He erroneously labels A.H. Strong as 'High'.
28. Systematic Theology, vol.III, pp.184-185. Chafer places himself in the third category, as do many other Dispensationalists. Chafer's Systematic Theology, in eight volumes, is the most extensive dogmatic theology from that perspective. Fundamentalists have often been Dispensational, but not always; but all Dispensationalists have been Fundamentalists. Some Dispensationalists have been Arminian.
Chafer thus correctly observes that the term 'Moderate' has historically been applied to the lower advocates of limited atonement and the higher advocates of universal atonement. However, this ignores the Dualist position. Others, such as Toon, speak of 'Moderate' or 'Moderated' Calvinism which is "a combination of Calvinism and Arminianism, which had little to say about predestination and limited atonement or irresistible grace. Rather it emphasized the experience of Christ". Toon gives Doddridge as an example of this classification.

Moderate Calvinism was considered by the Hyperists to be universalist regarding the atonement and therefore it was staunchly opposed. "The epithet in which its advocates rejoice, means moderate Calvinists, which being interpreted, is, modified Arminianism", wrote James Haldane. Fullerism was Moderate Calvinism, and vice-versa. This raises the question of Fuller's exact position relevant to the atonement. Our judgement is that Fuller was a very low advocate of the limited position, so low that he was easily mistaken for being Dualist or Universalist.

By the same standard, the label 'Moderate Calvinism' has also been applied to non-Hyperist advocates of particular redemption. The antagonism of the Hyperists here is matched only by their confusion regarding the difference between those for and against the limited scheme while accepting the free offer. Styles:

Moderate Calvinism [is] a theological system which, while it embraces (the Five Points), incorporates with them many of the errors of Arminianism, as that while Redemption is particular, the Atonement is of infinite or universal extent, and avails for the original sin of all men; that unbelief alone excludes sinners from participation in the grace of God; that the gospel is an effective offer of grace to all

29. HC, p.41. Andrew Marshall, an advocate of the limited scheme, spoke of 'Moderatism' in a similar manner (The Atonement, p.205).

30. The Atonement, p.40. Palmer: "Moderate Calvinists consider the atonement to be general in its nature, but specific in its application" (Erroneous Views, p.1). Compare Wells in the same context: "To me, moderate power, moderate mercy, and a moderate gospel were of no use" (Experience, p.32). Cf. Huntington, Works, vol.VIII, p.181, 218.


32. Pink: "Posing as an angel of light, Satan succeeded in Arminianizing many places of truth; and even when this was not accomplished, high Calvinism was whittled down to moderate Calvinism" (Godhead, p.201).
men: that Spiritual Faith is a legal duty; and that the rejection of the gospel will augment the torments of the finally lost. Often styled 'Baxterianism' or 'Fullerism' from the names of two great and good men who adopted it; sometimes also styled the 'yea and nay' Gospel, on account of the contradictions it contains.33

The truth is that there have been some accepting limited atonement who have been more moderate in their views than have others who have accepted it limited view without rejecting the free offer. Hyper-Calvinists see the latter as inconsistent concerning the offer and the former as inconsistent regarding the extent of the atonement. But that there is a difference between pro- and anti-offer particularists is plain. Hence, one often finds the limited advocates divided as 'Moderate' and 'Ultra' Calvinists, and similar labels.33

We prefer to speak of pro-offer Particularists as 'High' and anti-offer Particularists as 'Hyper'.34 By 'High' we mean that this variety stresses divine sovereignty more than human responsibility.35 High Calvinism, then, is the theology of Dort and Westminster. It is basically synonymous with PURITAN FEDERALISM.37 While recognizing the many variations in this system through the ages, the common denominator is evident. Representatives of this variety include the following:


34. E.g., Cunningham, Reformers, p.393. Rice often fails to differentiate pro- and anti-offer Calvinism, though he does note the difference between what he calls 'Moderate Calvinism' and the higher forms (Hyper-Calvinism, p.6; and often in Predestined for Hell). Sarre11s speaks of 'Moderate or Non-Fatalist Calvinists' and 'Fatalist, or Hyper-Calvinists' (Systematic Theology, pp.109-110). Cave (p.356) speaks of 'Modified Hyper-Calvinists', but his examples all accept the doctrine of the free offer.
35. This is also Toon's division. We have often employed the term 'Particularism' to refer to those accepting the doctrine of limited atonement (particular redemption), regardless of the free offer doctrine. 'Particular Baptists' thus refers to those who hold to the limited scheme, as opposed to 'General Baptists' many of whom are Arminian. They had formerly been referred to as 'Calvinistic Baptists'. See Seymour, p.26.
36. Our division of High and Low should not be compared too closely with the ecclesiastical views (e.g. High Church) or doctrines of Biblical inspiration (e.g., the High doctrine) or interpretation (e.g., Higher Criticism) of those mentioned in this section.
37. On the difficulty of defining the term 'Puritan', see Kendall, Calvin and English Calvinism to 1649, pp.5-6.

Essentially, then, what we have called High Calvinism is Five Point Sublapsarian Calvinism which accepts free offers and Duty-Faith. This differentiates it from the varieties of Low Calvinism and the three yet higher forms. The next highest variety is SUPRALAPSARIANISM. This can be traced at least as far back as Theodore Beza. Earlier in the present effort we have discussed the subject of the order of the decrees at length. There are obviously different kinds of Supralapsarianism, as there are of the others, such as differences over the place of Creation decree, the decree of Christ, and whether the decrees of election and reprobation are co-ordinate or subordinate. The Supralapsarianism of Abraham Kuyper, sometimes referred to as HYPER-COVENANTISM, KUYPER-CALVINISM, or NEO-CALVINISM, tended to be more generous with common grace than some other forms were. As there was a link between the Supralapsarianism of the Puritans (especially Twisse and Goodwin) and the Hyper-Calvinists, so there was a link between Kuyper and Hoeksema. Nevertheless, they err who contend that Supralapsarianism itself constitutes Hyper-Calvinism in the precise sense of the term.

Most of the higher Anti-Neonomians were Supralapsarian – Chauncey

---

38. We could also add a few who have researched the varieties of Calvinism and who have been mentioned frequently in our work: I. Murray, E. Hulse, O. Lachman, K. Stebbins, J. Thornton, G. Harrison, E. Kevan, P. Helm, K. Good, but evidently not P. Toon, R. Seymour, or A. De Jong. Strange as it may be, there has been some dispute over whether Spurgeon held to limited atonement. Contra Rice and Fisk, we agree with I. Murray, Thornton and Colquitt that Spurgeon indeed was a Particularist.

39. This school has been variously named: 'the higher view', 'high Supralapsarianism', and so on (cf. Homer Hoeksema, Voice, p.19; Cunningham, Reformers, p.427). Pugh, who opposed Cozens, wrote: "We have in Calvinism what are called High Calvinists and Moderate Calvinists – sublapsarian and supralapsarian" (Pugh, p.106). Homer Hoeksema divided 'supersupralapsarianism' from 'modified supralapsarianism' (Voice, pp.238, 249).

definitely was, Traill probably was, and Witsius possibly. The school of THEONOMISM gives every indication of being Supra, especially given its association with the views of Kuyper and Van Til. Ignoring for the moment the 'Modified Supralapsarianism' of Karl Barth (which was not historic Supralapsarianism by any means), we feel assured in classing the following as exponents of the Supra scheme as commonly accepted, while still accepting the doctrine of the free offer:


There are yet higher forms of Calvinism than these, all of which are distinctly Supralapsarian. But because of other special tenets which they held, they are more appropriately classified otherwise. The first of these is ANTINOMIANISM, that is doctrinal Antinomianism of the Calvinist variety. Also spoken of as CRISPIANITY, HIGHER CALVINISM and other terms (often of a derogatory nature), this school is properly limited to the mid-seventeenth century English divines, of which Tobias Crisp was the most well-known. While on the one hand, they did not stress their Supralapsarianism, they did speak much of eternal justification and other distinctively Supra views. On the other hand, each of them held to the doctrine of the free offer. Thus, they opened the door to Hyper-Calvinism. The leading Antinomians were:


The distinctive emphasis of this school was that sanctification was of secondary importance to the internal testimony of the Spirit in

41. Theonomists include R. Rushdoony, G. Bahnsen, F.N. Lee, G. North.
42. We are reluctant to place Zanchius in this list but do not entirely dismiss the possibility that he was Supra. We cannot accept that Calvin or Ursinus were Supras, for they held to universal atonement. In our opinion, any view other than the strictest Particularism is incompatible with historic Supralapsarianism. Upon further research some of those listed as Highs may in fact be Supra.
43. E.g., Pugh, p.127; Wilks, p.380; Fletcher, Works, vol.II, p.29; and often in the many works against Antinomianism.
44. E.g., Hoeksema, TK, vol.III, p.446.
conjunction with assurance (which is of the essence of saving faith),
even as the greatest incentive to holiness, faith and love is the
consciousness of grace, not Law.

Before we define Hyperism and list its exponents, a passing mention
of other classifications of Calvinism might be appropriate. MODERN
CALVINISM was the name given, usually by Hyper-Calvinists, to that
form of Calvinism which answered the Modern Question in the
affirmative. Thus, in contrast to 'Modern Antinomianism' it believed in
free offers and Duty-Faith, but it could include both Low and High
Calvinists (the Hypers did not always differentiate these two, for to
their way of thinking free offers and Duty-faith was based on or led to
universal atonement). Pink spoke of Modern Calvinists in a way which
implied that he was not such a one. Often equated with Moderate
Calvinism, the term arose in the eighteenth century when many
Calvinists felt the need to bring their Calvinism into line with what
they saw God accomplishing in the Evangelical Awakening. The term
sometimes has been used to describe the form of Calvinism which sought
to preserve the balance of sovereignty and responsibility.

SPURGEONISM and FULLERISM were equivalent to the DUTY-
FAITHISM espoused by those in agreement with Spurgeon and Fuller. The
terms have been used almost exclusively by Hyperists and almost always
in a vilifying manner. Hulse correctly differentiates Hyper-Calvinism
from EVANGELICAL CALVINISM and Hyperists must agree with this, as

45. Palmer: "By modern Calvinists, I therefore mean such as hold forth general invitations and
offered mercy, without laying before their hearers those points on which Calvin chiefly insisted"
(Free Enquiry, p.10). Wilks popularized the differences between Modern Calvinism and Modern
Antinomianism (e.g., pp.20-23), as mentioned often in these pages. He readily admitted, "Modern
Calvinists ... are in fact my bitterest, if not my only enemies" (p.75). It is not clear whether
Wilks meant that he opposed them more than he opposed any others, or that they opposed him more
than any others did, or (which is probable) both.

46. Union, p.50.
49. Edward Williams defined Modern Calvinism: "That system of religion which represents the
sovereignty of Divine grace, without encroaching on the equity of Divine government". Similarly,
he defined 'Modern Arminianism' as "That system of religion which represents the equity of Divine
government in such manner as to encroach on the sovereignty of Divine Grace" (quoted in Sell,
Debate, p.89). R.T. Jones: "It sought to reconcile the indeterminacy of man's responsibility
with the certainty that was guaranteed by predestination" (p.169).
50. E.g., Dix, p.13; Shaw, Spurgeonism Examined. Hulse has spoken of 'Spurgeonic Calvinism'
... Cont'd:
many have in the past. In rejecting this term, Parks defined it as "employed to designate those who preach the gospel instead of law. Very often applied to such as preach a 'yea-and-nay' gospel". Gadsby also disclaimed the term 'Evangelical' for himself, as have some High Calvinists. James Wilson, such a High Calvinist, felt that the term referred to Arminians, Arminio-Calvinists and those whom we refer to as Low Calvinists. During the latter part of the nineteenth century many High and Hyper-Calvinists opposed the so-called HYPER-EVANGELISM of D.L. Moody, which was of a very Low Calvinism or the sort which we earlier spoke of as 'One Point Calvinism'.

Fletcher differentiated RIGID CALVINISM from Moderate Calvinism, the former being what we describe as High and Hyper-Calvinism. J. MacLeod Campbell often spoke of the MODIFIED CALVINISM which he shared with Wardlaw, Payne and Pye Smith. This conforms to what we describe as Low Calvinism, or the lower side of Moderate Calvinism. Alan Sell recently speaks of his position as an AMELIORATED CALVINISM, but unfortunately he does not elaborate except to imply that he is in agreement with the Calvinistic theology of H.R. MacKintosh and 'Rabbi' John Duncan. Styles differentiated his own Hyperism from ORDINARY CALVINISM, i.e., pro-offer Calvinism.

Cont'd:...

(Free Offer, p.12).

51. Cf. John Gadsby, Memoir of Gadsby, pp.31-34, 46,49, 55, 65, 82, 103, etc.; and often in Stevens, Help, Rushton, Defence; and other anti-Fullerites.


55. The Gospel and the Atonement.

56. Moody was opposed thusly by Popham, Errors, p.6; and John Kennedy, Hyper-Evangelism, 'Another Gospel'. Though a Mighty Power. Moody was defended against Kennedy's insinuations by several notable High Calvinists, such as Robert Young, Hyper-Criticism: An Answer to Dr. Kennedy's 'Hyper-Evangelism' (2 Parts); and Horatius Bonar, The Old Gospel: Not 'Another Gospel', But The Power of God Unto Salvation. To the latter Kennedy responded with A Reply to Dr. Bonar's Defence of Hyper-Evangelism. Bonar: "I confess that I do not understand what 'hyper-evangelism' is. I know what 'hyper-Calvinism', or even 'hyper-hyper-Calvinism' is..." (The Old Gospel, p.27). This is not to say that Kennedy was what we have spoken of as Hyper-Calvinist. That is rather unlikely, though of course quite possible.

57. Works, vol.IV, p.185. The former holds to deterministic necessity, while the latter rejects it. Fletcher contrasts this with 'Rigid Arminianism' and 'Candid Arminianism' (see above).

58. The Great Debate, p.98.

The school of Hoeksema derides OFFER-MEN and DOUBLE-TRACK THEOLOGIANS, viz, Calvinists who accept the doctrine of the free offer. Other Hyperists have anathematized these as FASHIONABLE CALVINISTS, SEMI-CALVINISTS, BAXTERIANS, HALFWAY CALVINISTS, and HALF-HEARTED CALVINISTS. Often terms applied by Hyperists have been extremely polemical when opposing free offer Calvinists: BALAAMITE CALVINISTS, MONGREL CALVINISTS, CAMOUFLAGED ARMINIANS, and BASTARD CALVINISTS. This should give the reader an indication of the intensity that has characterized the controversy.

We could hardly conclude this section without mentioning the threefold division given by Andrew Fuller, which underlies much of the categorization employed by others such as Toon and the present author.

60. Engelsma, p. 67; Homer Hoeksema, Voice, p. 354.
63. The term has been applied by several Hyper-Calvinists to any whom they do not feel adequately oppose Arminianism. High and other Calvinists have been known to employ the term, often used synonymously with 'Semi-Calvinism' (e.g., Copinger, p. 400). Technically it refers to Neonomianism, but fortunately many who have used it have understood neither Neonomianism nor Antinomianism. We have heard one High Calvinist accuse a Low Calvinist of being a Baxterian and an Antinomian (i.e., Crispian) at the same time, overlooking the fact that Baxter was one of Crisp's bitterest opponents. 'Baxterian' was rarely used by those to whom it was applied by others — usually with considerable fervour.
64. Similar to Middle Way Theology, which shares several affinities with the theology of Baxter and Amyraut, this variety was attacked by Wells as even worse than the Arminian doctrine of free will, for at least the Arminians are self-consistent and unhypocritical (Letters to Theophilus, vol. II, p. 204).
65. Toon: "To Hussey any minister who claimed to believe in the sovereign grace of God but yet offered Christ to all was a 'half-hearted Calvinist'" (HC, p. 82).
66. Wells uses this term synonymously with Moderate and Low Calvinists (e.g., Letters to Theophilus, vol. II, pp. 98-99).
67. E.g., Bradbury, I Don't Like Calvinism, p. 8; Philpot, Answers, p. 74. Gadsby identified these with Low as opposed to High Calvinists (John Gadsby, Memoir of Gadsby, p. 31). Spurgeon: "It is the custom of a certain body of Ultra-Calvinists, to call those of us who teach that it is the duty of man to repent and believe, 'Mongrel Calvinists' ... We are true Calvinists, however" (Metropolitan Tabernacle Pulpit, vol. IV, p. 341).
68. Hoeksema applies this label to those who profess to believe in unconditional election and limited atonement but persist in the free offer doctrine (IK, vol. I, p. 542).
J.C. Ryland, Jr., recorded the following conversation between a Church of England Clergyman and Fuller:

First C. 'there are different shades of Calvinism I suppose among you'. F. 'Yes, there are three by which we commonly describe, namely the high, the moderate, and the strict Calvinists. The first are, if I may so speak, more Calvinistic than Calvin himself; in other words, bordering on Antinomianism.' IC. 'Have you many of these?' F. 'Too many.' IC. 'Do they not reckon you a legal preacher?' F. 'Yes, at this very time, I am represented through the religious circles of London, as an Arminian.' IC. 'On what ground?' F. 'What I have written in a note in The Gospel Its Own Witness.' IC. 'I remember that note. I and my friends approve of it, and think it agrees with the doctrine held by our church. But what do you call a moderate Calvinist?' F. 'One that is a half Arminian, or, as they are called with us, Baxterians.' IC. 'And what (is) a strict Calvinist?' F. 'One that really holds the system of Calvin. I do not believe every thing that Calvin taught, nor any thing because he taught it; but I reckon strict Calvinism to be my own system.'

Elsewhere Fuller used the term 'Hyper-Calvinist' for what he describes here as High Calvinist. But what exactly is Hyper-Calvinism?

B. THE DEFINITION OF HYPER-CALVINISM

In describing Hyper-Calvinism, different writers have employed various terms and descriptions which indicate their views in a concise way. One of these is 'High Calvinism', which we have seen to have been used with reference to those who actually accepted the free offer doctrine. Generally the term denoted non-offer Calvinism up until the late nineteenth century. Originally even Fuller used this word, but ere long he came to choose 'Hyper' as a more descriptive term. Since that time it has not been unusual to make this differentiation between High and Hyper-Calvinism, but others have continued to use 'High' in the old manner.

Those whom we have described in this study are often content with the description 'High', or more often 'High Doctrine men', etc. They readily admit their zeal for 'high doctrine'. Hazelton: 'I do not know a low one. All the doctrines of grace are high.' To one who complained, 'I am afraid this is too high', Irons replied, 'Is it in the Bible? Do not tell me about high or low. Is it in the Word of God?' (Even so, Irons accepted the description 'High' in doctrine.) "Now, who in his senses, can, under these circumstances, blame me for becoming high in doctrine?" asked Wells. Primary among these doctrines is "the

2. Cf. D.E. Edwards, pp.199-203. Nuttall: "I prefer the term High Calvinism, which was in use in Fuller's time ... to the now more usual Hyper-Calvinism as less prejudicial and question-begging. One does not speak of a Hyper-Churchman" ('Northamptonshire', p.101).
3. This is Toon's division and the one we have chosen. Pink spoke of "high and hyper-Calvinists", but it is not certain whether he equated or differentiated them (quoted in Iain Murray, Life of Pink, p.147).
5. E.g., Parks, Chastisement, p.14. Parks admits to being a 'high doctrinist', but warns against the fatalism and blasphemy of others of that genre who make God the author of sin.
9. E.g., ibid., vol.II, p.445. Also, "we high-doctrine folks - and I never wish to disown that title" (vol.III, p.146).
high sovereignty of God" (Pink). Their opponents spoke of these persons as 'high brethren' (Spurgeon) or even 'the high-and-dry type' (Underwood). That this variety of Calvinism has gone beyond other forms, especially Calvin's is also noted in the popular term, 'Ultra-Calvinism', (sometimes 'Ultraism' or even 'ultra-hyper-Calvinism', and often 'Ultra' for short). Because certain persons taught limited atonement, which Calvin did not, "is there not reason to suspect that they are not Calvinists, but ultra-Calvinists?" (Payne). We feel that Payne has a point, as we show in our excursus on Calvin and the extent of the atonement. If Calvin was not a Particularist regarding the atonement, then certainly those Calvinists who limit the atonement go beyond the one whose name they attach to their system of theology. However, this applies to many who accept the free offer and who therefore technically are not 'Hyper-Calvinists' in the sense of the word as popularly understood.

Other critics have chosen terms which indicate that this form of theology emphatically goes beyond mainstream Calvinism in its overall approach. Hence, we find the terms 'Extreme', 'Extravagant' and

12. Spurgeon applied this to those who reject the truth concerning human responsibility (quoted in Palmer, Letter to Spurgeon, pp.2-5).
13. Underwood, p.135. We have heard the adage applied to such Calvinists: "They go down deep, stay down long, come up dry; but they never go out to bring anyone in".
15. E.g., Spurgeon, Commenting, p.8.
16. Good, p.126. Oliphant: "So now, how much better is this scheme and view than the most ultra 'Hyper-Calvinism' (Will, p.69).
17. E.g., Iain Murray, The Forgotten Spurgeon, p.51.
18. G. Payne, Lectures, p.223. In our excursus we produce several parallel criticisms.
19. E.g., Zens, 'Confusion', p.21; Rice, Hell, pp.6, 10-11, and often; Underwood, p.133. Cave contrasts 'Extreme Hyper-Calvinists' such as Gill, Crisp, Saltmarsh and Chauncey, with 'Modified Hyper-Calvinists' like Candlish, Sneadon, Edwards, and the Hodges (pp.354-356). Hulse implies that Hyperists are 'Extremists' (Graham, p.30), which is a phrase Iain Murray may also be using in Forgotten, p.51. Styles spoke of 'extreme - or consistent - Calvinists', such as himself ... Cont'd
'Extra Calvinism'. Still other scholars wish to bring out the fact that this school not only goes beyond Calvin and mainstream Calvinism but actually distorts it on vital issues. In this context one comes across terms such as 'False' or 'Pseudo-Calvinism'.

In America, the Primitive Baptists have often been called 'Hard-Shell', which they dislike, but do not object to the description 'Old School'. Some critics describe Hyperism as 'Hard Calvinism', which Hulse takes to mean 'Non-offer Calvinism'. The centrality of the free offer to the question thus figures in many of the phrases describing the school in question. In the later eighteenth century and early nineteenth century, pro-offer Calvinism was called 'Fullerism' and the anti-offer kind was confessedly called 'Anti-Fullerite Calvinism'.

There have been yet other terms employed by all sides in the controversy. Fletcher castigated 'Undisguised' and 'Barefaced Calvinism' which tends too much to speculation and Antinomianism, but at least its exponents were straightforward. Similarly, others speak of this as 'Thorough-going', 'Rigid' and 'Strict Calvinism' (with no reference to Strict Communion). More polemic have been the descriptions 'Unbalanced Calvinism', 'Calvinism-run-mad', and... (Guide, p.24).

Cont'd:...


21. Spurgeon spoke of "our extra-calvinistic friends" who admired S.E. Pierce (Commenting, p.89).

22. E.g., J.C. Ryland, Jr., The Work of Faith, pp.10-11, and often; Fuller, Works, often; Kirkby, pp.39, 82; Toon, HC, p.144; Coppedge, p.12; Clipsham, 'Fullerism', p.100.


24. Pittman, Questions, pp.19, 52, 94. "All denominations of the present day, except the Old School or Primitive Baptists, advocate Arminianism in some of its alluring and plausible forms" (p.19).


28. Spurgeon, The Metropolitan Tabernacle, Its History and Work, p.61; Seymour: "Gill was a thorough-going Calvinist of the most extreme variety, one who drove home his theology with uncompromising dogmatism" (p.44).

29. E.g., Rooy, p.12; Wilson, vol.IV, p.416; Fletcher, Works, vol.IV, pp.81, 84.

30 E.g., Rice, Hell, p.9.


'Illegitimate Calvinists'. Cole, translator of Calvin's Calvinism, uses this last term to describe "the graceless imitators of Calvin (who) know nothing of the spirit or religion of Calvin... They are frequently Antinomians in doctrine, if not in practice".33

This brings us to the oft-heard sentiment that the species of Reformed theology we have investigated is in some form 'Doctrinal Antinomianism'. We have seen that there is a measure of truth in this suggestion but that it is laced with many misunderstandings about the English Antinomianism of the seventeenth century. Not all doctrinal Antinomians have been Hyper-Calvinists; not all Hyper-Calvinists have been doctrinal Antinomians. Some, of course, have been both. This middle class sometimes went by the title 'Modern Antinomianism', often preferring it to 'Hyper-Calvinism'. Wilks said, "modern Antinomians (do not) subject themselves to the reproachful stigma of Hyper-Calvinists, by which it is insinuated, that they exaggerate the sentiments of the worthy Geneva reformer".34 Wilks considered Crisp "the great champion of Hyper-Calvinism",35 and Fuller stated, "what is now called Calvinism is not Calvinism... The sentiment which I oppose does not appear to me to be Calvinism, but Crispism".36 Contrary to these and other opinions,37 we do not consider Crisp to be an actual Hyper-Calvinist. It must be recalled that Crisp was a firm believer in the free offer of the Gospel, denied by all Hyperists be they doctrinal Antinomians or not. It would, however, be fair to contend that 'Crispianity' was virtual but not actual Hyper-Calvinism. One could posit that Crisp opened a door through which Hussey and the others passed, even as doctrinal Antinomianism sometimes but not always opened the door to practical Antinomianism.

In the same manner it is not completely accurate to identify Hyper-Calvinism with Supralapsarianism as such. All Hyperists have been Supralapsarians – indeed, the very system depends upon a Supra view of the decrees – but not all Supralapsarians have been Hyper-Calvinists. Behind this commonly held misconception is the similar suggestion that

33. Preface to Calvin's Calvinism, p.10.
34. Wilks, p.20.
35. Wilks, p.43.
36. Works, p.323.
37. Among those who have considered Crisp a Hyper-Calvinist is A.H. Strong, Systematic Theology, p.867.
what we have presented in these pages can be defined as 'Absolutism', 'Fatalism' (or 'Christianized fatalism'), 'Necessitarianism' (or 'Stoic Calvinism') (or 'the stoicism of Christianity').

In addition to the term 'Crispianity', this school has received other terms drawn from the file of its leading representatives. Hussey equated and accepted the descriptions 'Crispianism' and 'Davisism' Later 'Gillism' and 'Brinism' became popular expressions, especially the former. 'Gillism', or 'the school of Gill', was contrasted with 'Fullerism', and the latter equated 'Gillism' and 'Hyper-Calvinism'. One minister has been recorded as confessing, "Respecting myself, with the solitary exception of Dr. Gill's views on a disputed point [Eternal Sonship], I am an out-and-out Gillite". W.R. Ward criticized the Gospel Standard variety of Gillism: "the comic of Manchester radicalism, William Gadsby, the pioneer of Gillism in an industrial context and the greatest of the hypersons".

One gets a fairly accurate idea of what Hyper-Calvinism is when he compares the common denominator held by 'Gillism', 'Huntingtonianism', (the theology of Huntington and the 'Huntingtonians'), and

38. This is the term used specially by Primitive Baptists like Hassell and Pittman to describe the higher forms of Hyper-Calvinism, especially those who emphasize Supralapsarian reprobation and the Supra view of the origin of evil.
39. E.g., Pink, Perseverance, p.66; Sarrells, p.128.
40. Good, p.76.
41. Primitive Baptists (e.g., Sarrells, p.128) often use this synonymously with 'Absolutism'.
42. N. Ward, 'Stoic Calvinism'.
43. Pugh, p.128.
45. E.g., Button, Remarks, p.v.
46. E.g., Robison, PB, pp.116-117; Sell, Debate, p.83.
47. Laws, Andrew Fuller, p.41.
52. Philpot: "my heart has always been much with the real Huntingtonians. I say 'real' because I have no union with the mere nominal followers of Mr. H." (Letters, p.294). Philpot also quoted ... Cont'd:
'Philpotism'.53 One can draw a line through these three points alone and reach a fairly accurate view of Hyper-Calvinism. Huntington was not a Baptist, so this means that Hyperism has not been limited to Baptists. Philpot and Huntington were doctrinal Antinomians in a way which Gill was not, thus negating the theory that Hyper-Calvinism is synonymous with Antinomianism in every respect. But all three rejected free offers and Duty-faith and that rejection is the vital ingredient of the Hyperist system. The same pattern follows when applied to all those we shall list later in this section, but it manifestly fails when used with all Antinomians and Supralapsarians.

Those persons in question generally have preferred to speak of themselves as 'Calvinists' rather than 'Reformed'. Indeed, in recent years in Britain, the 'Reformed Baptists' are noticeably more moderate than the 'Strict Baptists' and 'Gospel Standard Baptists'.55 One often hears the name 'Hyper-Calvinist', but only rarely 'Hyper-Reformed'.

This brings us to the term itself. Andrew Fuller was probably the first to use the term 'Hyper-Calvinism' in the context indicated in our researches.56 Granted, 'Hyper-Calvinian' was used as early as 1674, according to the Oxford English Dictionary,57 but that instance is rare. In fact, 'Hyper-Calvinian' has not been the accepted form of the term in the theological circles with which we are concerned. Other variants, however, have been found. 'Hyperism'57 has often been used. Sometimes

Cont'd:...

Thomas Hardy as follows: "The best Christians I meet with are generally Huntingtonians" (Reviews, vol.II, p.32). The term occurs often in early nineteenth century literature, e.g., Morton, Daughter's Defence, p.39; John Gadsby, Memoir of Gadsby, pp.36-37, 72, 77; 'The Prodigal', Huntington Unmasked, pp.25, 73, etc.

53. E.g., Palmer, Plain Statement, p.16.

54. For example, Erroll Hulse is a prominent Reformed Baptist, and one could hardly classify him as Hyper-Calvinist in the light of his trenchant criticisms of the system. The present author has been a member of a Reformed Baptist Church for the six years during which these pages have been written.

55. Cf. Kirkby, p.1; Toon, HC, p.144; J.C. Ryland, Jr., The Work of Faith, p.57. Other than the OED entry, we have not found a single instance of the term before Fuller.

56. The OED quotes Hickman in 1674 thusly: "Thomas Aquinas ... is rather an Hypercalvinian than not a Calvinist in this matter of the absolute Decree" (vol.VIII, p.501).

'Hyper-Calvinism' is capitalized, sometimes not; it is nearly always hyphenated. Occasionally one reads of the word 'Hyper' being used as an adjective by itself, but more often a 'Hyper' is a 'Hyper-Calvinist' or a 'Hyperist'. We have found a unique occurrence of 'Hyper-Hyper-Calvinism'; unfortunately, it is unexplained (the author probably meant what we would call Hyper-Calvinist, and his term 'Hyper-Calvinist' means what we call 'High Calvinist'). There has also been a solitary use of 'thy-per-Calvinistic'. Needless to say, the term describing the theology of Gill and the others has absolutely nothing to do with the Lutheran Reformer by the name of Andreas Hyperius.

The word 'Hyper' is usually defined by lexicographers as meaning 'above' or 'beyond', from the Greek word HUPER. The English word 'super' is related to it, though we have yet to find anyone use the phrase 'super-Calvinism'. Those who contend that the word has no meaning must acknowledge that linguistically the word is valid if it can be proven that there is a form of Calvinism that goes beyond the 'Calvinism' of John Calvin (the proper sense of the term) or those styled 'Calvinists'. And the object of the pages which the reader has been reading is that there has indeed been such a theology deserving of the title.

We have often had recourse to interact with David Engelsma and his small but controversial book entitled Hyper-Calvinism and the Call of the Gospel. Engelsma has made many serious mistakes in this recent effort, among them concerning the term 'Hyper-Calvinism', viz:

Our denial of the offer of the gospel is in no sense of the word hyper-Calvinism. On the contrary, the theory of the

---

58. E.g., Pink, Practical Christianity, p.215; Iain Murray, Life of Pink, p.138; Forgotten, p.51; Thornton, pp.70, 134, 249, 250; Pugh, pp.92, 155; Zens, 'Confusion', p.21; Palmer, Moral Distinctions, p.2; Hulse, Free Offer, pp.11, 23; John MacLeod, Scottish Theology, p.140; W.R. Ward, 'Transformation', pp.168, 176; Wells, Letters to Theophilus, vol.II, pp.220-221; Surrey Tabernacle Pulpit, 1866, p.149; 1869, p.135; Spurgeon, Pulpit, vol.IV, p.341; Anecdotes and Stories, p.148; and in Iain Murray, Forgotten, pp.46, 59. This compares with other abbreviations mentioned above (Ultra, Anti, Supra, etc.).

59. Bonar, The Old Gospel, p.27, quoted in Section A above. Bonar says that he knows what the term means, but he has not told us what that meaning is!

60. Wilks quoted Fletcher speaking of "thy-per-calvinistic writers and preachers" (Wilks, p.19). This may well be a typographical error, as there are many such mistakes in the printing of this scarce volume.
Engelsma has evidently not done his homework or else he would have realized that he was not 'coining' the term 'hypo-Calvinism' for the first time, though he thinks he is. Within the last hundred years James Wilson wrote an important work entitled *The Gospel and the Atonement*. While not agreeing with all of Wilson's conclusions, we do accept that he has several important observations to offer. One of them deserves quotation here:

It is hardly necessary to repeat that from neither of these, hypo-Calvinistic, Calvinistic, or hyper-Calvinistic theologians, do we obtain any clear or definite outline of the Gospel, properly so-called. They merely furnish us with certain general statements connected with the Gospel, all in a sense more or less true, but throwing no light upon the special subject of our present inquiry. 62

Wilson does not deal extensively with the question of the free offer, but he does discuss the matter of the extent of the atonement in relationship to the content of the Gospel, which we have discoursed upon in Chapters VIII and IX.

In his futile attempt to exonerate Herman Hoeksema and his followers from the charge of Hyper-Calvinism, Engelsma reveals from the outset several of his fundamental flaws. We have mentioned already his misunderstanding of historic Hyper-Calvinism, and we will interact with him again on this later, but note particularly his words at the beginning of his monograph:

'Hyper-Calvinism' is a term of reproach and condemnation. It is the charge that a theological teaching which claims to be Calvinism has, in fact, so exaggerated and distorted Calvinism that it is not genuine Calvinism at all.

With these words Engelsma unwittingly condemns the theology of Hoeksema, for it can quite easily be shown that whatever else Hoeksema's theology may be, it most certainly is not the theology of John Calvin. Without entering into the details of Supralapsarianism, the

61. Engelsma, p. 2.
Covenant or assurance, we can indicate three areas in which Hoeksema (and Engelsma) differ from Calvin: the extent of the atonement, the free offer of the Gospel, and the question of common grace. This being so, we can accept the second sentence as it stands in the above quotation.

Our point of difference with Engelsma is that he feels that Hoeksema did not distort Calvin and therefore is not deserving of the epithet 'Hyper-Calvinist'. He grants that some persons, such as Gill and Hussey, are in fact guilty of this error and therefore merit the title in question. But Engelsma wrongly contends that Hoeksema was at fundamental variance with these. We have shown that their theology is one, with the exception of a few small details which are relatively insignificant so far as the marrow of Hyperism is concerned. They are at one in their theology and that theology is Hyper-Calvinism.

Observe also that Engelsma considers the term one of "reproach and condemnation". Elsewhere he says that the charge is "nothing but a theological bugbear". If by that he means that there is no such thing as a Hyper-Calvinist, he contradicts his statements elsewhere in his book. If he means that the term is a reproach, we can only suggest that it is a reproach which the Hyper-Calvinists have brought upon themselves by exaggerating and distorting the theology of Calvin while claiming to be basically in the correct tradition of the Reformer.

Engelsma has not been the only person to air his opinions on this manner. Similar statements can be found in Washington Wilks:

modern Antinomians (do not) subject themselves to the reproachful stigma of Hyper-Calvinists, by which it is insinuated, that they exaggerate the sentiments of the worthy Geneva reformer... what then becomes of the acrimony of modern divines against the faith of saints, indigantly referred to as 'Ultra Calvinism, Hyper Calvinism, Antinomianism?' by which it is meanly insinuated that these Ultra, these Hyper-Calvinistic Antinomians, preach higher doctrines than the Bible reveals, which is an assumption the most unfounded...  

63. Wilks, pp.20, 78.
What is unfounded in the remarks of Wilks is his presupposition that his theology is to be identified with the theology of Calvin and the Bible. Even if one were to grant that Calvin followed the Bible right down the line on what has historically been denominated 'Calvinism' (whatever that means), Wilks still had to prove that his own theology is equivalent with this Calvin-Bible theology. And he has not done that, for Calvin is rarely even mentioned in his book. At least Engelsma makes an attempt to deal with Calvin. In any event, it requires a minimum of expertise to demonstrate that the theology of Wilks is certainly not the theology of Calvin, much less the Bible, on those issues in question.

This is not to say that the Hyperism of Hoeksema and Engelsma is to be identified on all points with the Hyperism of Wilks. This would be impossible to do, for the former disclaim being Antinomians in the sense advocated by Wilks. Nevertheless, they are fundamentally at one regarding the rejection of the free offer and Duty-faith, even if Hoeksema is closer to Calvin on the question of assurance than Wilks and many Hypers are.

A similar defence has been offered by Mr. Jay Green, an American publisher who has reprinted several of Gill's writings in recent years. We are not aware of what Mr. Green's ecclesiastical associations are (they appear to be Baptist), nor are we entirely sure where he stands respecting the free offer. He has reprinted Gill's Cause, Body, and Song, but he has also reprinted Fuller's Gospel Worthy of All Acceptation, and a number of Puritan classics. Our impression is that his publishing firm has paralleled the Banner of Truth in Britain, with which it had something of a working agreement at one time (both were formed in the later 1950's). Be that as it may, Green inserted the following defence in his reprint of Gill's Body:

64. Green published under several company names, such as Sovereign Grace, Associated Publishers and Authors (A.P.& A.), and The National Foundation for Christian Education (N.F.C.E.). Having gone bankrupt on at least one occasion, Green has reprinted - or attempted to reprint - several notable volumes, usually from the Calvinist perspective including the following authors: Calvin (the entire Commentary and Institutes), Gill, Fuller, Spurgeon, Goodwin, Edwards, Luther, Augustine, Bunyan, Baxter, S.E. Pierce, Pink, Flavel, Ness, Elisha Coles, Zanchius, Alleine, Kuyper, Charles Hodge and Owen. In addition to his publishing, he has produced a revised translation of the Bible (The King James II Version) written a few small pieces, supervised the ill-fated but excellent Encyclopedia of Christianity (4 volumes), and has been involved in various and sundry projects.
One may admit to the name of Arminian, Unitarian, even thief, but was there ever a man who willingly admitted to the name of hyper-Calvinist? That name smacks of excess, of filthy excess so condemnatory that no one dare admit to it. One must despise wholeheartedly before he would even think of penning this denigrating name of a fellow human being... Actually, it is senseless to defend anyone, even a John Gill, against the charge of being a hyper-Calvinist. For in fact Hyper-Calvinism is a mythological name for something that does not really exist. Think about it. The word isn't even in the dictionary. Who is it that calls another a hyper-Calvinist? Isn't a 'hyper-Calvinist' usually one who is just a bit more Calvinistic than the one who calls him the name? To an atheist, anyone who believes God rules the world is a hyper-Calvinist. To an Arminian, anyone who believes one of the five points of Calvinism is a 'hyper-Calvinist'. To one who, because he likes the pose, bills himself as a 'Calvinist'; anyone who is more exact and precise in giving God all the glory is a 'hyper-Calvinist'. To a sublapsarian, one needs only to be a supralapsarian in order to be called a 'hyper-Calvinist'... the name 'hyper-Calvinist' is hypothetical, without meaning or context - it is degrading, but it is not meaningful.

It would not be difficult to enumerate the many mistakes in Green's defence. To deny that there is such a thing as Hyper-Calvinism grossly ignores the facts, contrary to Green's own rebuke elsewhere of those who attach the title on one such as Gill "without any personal investigation at all, merely on the say-so of someone else". The reader will also know that our present work takes the position that the term is indeed meaningful and definable. Green's defence is similar to those given by Hyper-Calvinists themselves. Even some High Calvinists have spoken in similar terms.

Surely Engelsma, Wilks, Green and anyone else who studies the history of Calvinism must be aware that there are varieties of Calvinism. That most of those who deny the doctrine of the free offer also reject the label 'Hyper-Calvinist' is obvious, for to accept it is

66. Compare Harrison: "As currently used, 'hyper-Calvinist' seems to be a term of polite theological vilification that enables you to condemn anyone who does not happen to go along with the latest methods and techniques of high-pressure evangelism. Or sometimes it refers to anyone who is the slightest degree more emphatic in his assertion of the sovereignty of God than you are. It has even been used of men like Whitefield and Spurgeon who, possessed of the most impeccable Calvinist credentials, found that these compelled them to apply themselves to a vigorous, passionate and urgent evangelism" (p.15).
virtually tantamount to admitting that one is either in error or that he has gone beyond Calvin, or something else. Nevertheless, as they have been those who have admitted to a right use of the word 'Antinomian', so there have been a few who have used the term 'Hyper' with respect to their high doctrines, if only satirically. For example, James Wells penned these words:

... we few poor hypers, do not deny human accountability; nor find an excuse for any one wrong of man; nor do we put the duty of the creature into the place of God ... Nor do we hypers hold out two ways of eternal salvation, one by duty-faith, and another by the faith of God's elect. 47

Wells was one of the very few to speak in such terms, but then Wells was often giving to making bold statements. Whether the 'poor hypers' deny the accountability of men is another thing, for his remarks must be interpreted in the light of his denial of free offers and Duty-faith in the same context because of his rejection of 'human responsibility' relevant to salvation.

We have often stated in the present inquiry that the best way to define a theology is to investigate the individual writings of those represented by that general theology, specifically those writers categorized by others as belonging to the class associated with that theology. This we have done in our research thus far, but should the student wonder just which persons can be accurately classed as Hyperist, we feel that we should give an indication of those whom we have researched to reach the conclusions given herein.

Most of those listed below fall within the perimeters of Hyper-Calvinism either by their own express statements which are in keeping with the accepted definition of that system, or who by logical deduction from their writings (or the reputable statements of other) have been found to be Hyper-Calvinists. We know of no other such list of Hyperists, 64 and this may serve as a helpful guide to others who may

---

68. Toon gives a short list in HC, pp. 148-150, but that will be seen to be far less extensive than our own. The various histories of Strict and Gospel Standard Baptists provide a number of names, but many in those lists have not been writers, as most of those in our list have been, and inclusion of preachers who have not written would not serve any special purpose. We have, however, listed a few such as Crossley and Church for, though they are not known to have written anything, they are notorious in their own right.
wish to study the field. Most of them have written books which are
listed in our bibliography. Our list, then, is as follows:

J. Gill, W. Gadsby, J.C. Philpot, Herman Hoeksema, A.W.
Pink, J. Hussey, W. Huntington, J. Stevens, J. Wells,
W.J. Styles, J. Brine, J. Gadsby, Homer Hoeksema,
D. Englombsa, R. Davis, W. Palmer, J. Irons, T. Bradbury,
L. Wayman, W. Button, J.C. Ryland, Sr., S. Stockell,
J. Warburton, J. Kershaw, J. Skepp, W. Wilks, R. Hawker,
J.K. Popham, W. Parks, W. Rushton, S.E. Pierce,
J. Foreman, S. Hassell, C. Hassell, R.H. Pittman, S. Cozens,
I. Atkinson, W. Bentley, T. Craner, W. Tucker,
J. Hazelton, Sr., J. Hazelton, Jr., J. Allen, G. Hazlerigg,
A. Triggs, F. Tryon, J. Johnson, F. Windridge, J. Barry,
J.A. Haldane, D. Burn, T. Tiptaft, H.A. Long, A. Atherton,
S.F. Paul, J.Q. Depoyster, W.H. Colyer, V. M'Culla,
J. Grace, E. Omega, D. Doudney, C. Sawyer, E. Roe,
J. Raven, G. Hoeksema, H. Hano, G. Ophoff, R. Hale,
C. Hemington, J. Warburton, Jr., F. Silver, J. Kent,
T. Burgess, J. Tanner, J. Vinall, E. Vinall, J. Eedes,
P. Feist, J. Martin, J.A. Jones, C. Goulding, J. Chamberlain,
T. Oxenham, S. Turner, J. Rusk, J. M'Kenzie, A. Hewitt,
J.H. Philpot, A. Dutton, J. Oliphant, S. Craig, B.A.
Ramsbottom, W.J. Berry, J. Leland, J. Rogers, W. Sykes,
J. Jay, J.A. Wallinger, J. MacGowan, J. Babt, T. Blonfield,
J. Jenkins, S. Collins, E.Morton, J. Church, D. Crosley,
H. Watmuff, J.M. Daniell, T. Packer, H.W. Shakespear,
W. Brown, E. Greenfield, J. Jacks, D. Denham, G. Denham,
W. Hopwood, G. Wright, J. Fellows, E. Samuel, C.H. Marston,
T. Davies, J. Branch, J. Cooper, A. Ramsay, J. Hupton,
J.H. Alexander, G.M. Alexander, R.G. Martin, J.L. Garrett,
G. Bayfield, I. Beeman, G. Van Baren, R. Hoddy, O.S.
Dolby, and J. Hupton.**

This list is by no means exhaustive or infallible, nor does it ignore
the differences between Hypers on various points as discussed in these

---

69. The reader will note the inclusion of the name of Pink here, and doubtless this will meet
with disagreement in some quarters. But we think that we have substantiated our contention that
Pink was more Hyper than High. Though Pink often opposed the other Hypers, it must be recalled
that many other Hypers have done the same thing - it has been a movement marred by divisions.
And though Pink said, "I am not a hyper-Calvinist ... but I am a strict and staunch Calvinist"
(in Murray, Life of Pink, p.44), he also confessed, "For our part we had rather be railed at
as a narrow-minded, out-of-date, hyper-Calvinist, than be found repudiating God's truth by reduc-
ing the Divinely-efficacious atonement to a mere fiction" (Sovereignty, p.320). These closing
words of the fourth (1949) and sixth (1959) edition of Pink's most important volume were expunged
by Iain Murray's Banner of Truth abridgement. Furthermore, Pink himself often rejected the
doctrine of free offers. That he also accepted the free offer in other places has been taken
into consideration. As we have explained in Chapter I and elsewhere, this is not the case of
Pink changing his mind, as he did with the question of Dispensationalism. We will concede,
though, that Pink's position is unique, except for some slight parallels in James Haldane, H.A.
Long and Dixon Burn. We know of no other writer who has accepted and rejected this definitive
tenet of Hyper-Calvinism so fiercely at the same time. In the light of Pink's eccentricities
mentioned by Murray, this may be explained as a paradox, a contradiction or a warp in his
otherwise lucid and consistent theology.
chapters. We have omitted certain names which some have considered as belonging to such a catalogue, names such as Toplady, Beza, Perkins or Kuyper. Properly speaking, these Supralapsarians all accepted the doctrine of the free offer. So also have we left off the names of the Antinomians of certain High Calvinists who have greatly influenced the spread of Federalism in recent years (such as Warfield, Boettner and Berkhof).

It will be noted that very few of those listed are still living at the present time. This is because Hyper-Calvinism is basically a thing of the past. The heyday of the Gospel Standard Baptists is past; the school of Stevens, Wells and Styles has almost completely disappeared. The Primitive Baptists do not maintain the same vigour as under the leadership of the Hassells and Pittman; and though the Systematic Theology of Sarrells is a notable achievement from this school, it is not in keeping with the non-offer tradition of the movement. The Protestant Reformed Church, on the other hand, has continued to grow and prosper, and many publications issue from their press. Homer Hoeksema and Herman Hanko have written well-read and helpful books, and it is hoped that their school will continue to grow and moderate some of the extremes of their non-offer position. It is feared in some quarters that unless their position on the matter is brought into line with more mainstream Reformed teaching, their school will suffer the same fate as the other branches of Hyper-Calvinism.

It may be wondered what criterion was used in the formulation of such a catalogue of persons. If this is a list of Hyper-Calvinists, then surely our grid has been a defensible definition of Hyper-Calvinism as such. This brings us to defining what is meant by the much-debated term. But to define Hyper-Calvinism one not only needs to compare and contrast it with other schools of Calvinism, as we have done, but also to set it against the backdrop of a definition of Calvin’s Calvinism. And that is not as easy a task as is thought in some quarters.  

70. "Ironically the Gospel Standard Strict Baptists, who defended orthodox Christology against errors (which may be traced back to Hussey), became, and still are, the chief defenders of Hussey’s ‘no offer’ doctrine in England. On the other hand, those churches which supported the views of Stevens are now, in general, advocates of the free offer of Christ, in the preaching of the gospel, to all men" (Toon, 'Supralapsarian Christology', p.29).

71. One hundred years ago the German historical theologian Hagenbach wrote, "Theologians are still divided on the question as to what constitutes the peculiarity of the Reformed Church" (History of Christian Doctrines, vol.II, p.434). Hagenbach then lists several possibilities.
Several doctrines have been put forth as the central tenet of Calvin's theology. Some suggest the doctrine of grace, others election, still others absolute predestination. It would be difficult to specify any single doctrine which took such precedence in Calvin's theology and our opinion is that it is rather a general trend or connection of doctrines which distinguishes Calvin's thought.

In a similar way, it has long been popular to define 'Calvinism' in terms of the 'Five Points of Calvinism'. Without arguing the point that Calvin himself does not speak of 'Five Points', it must be acknowledged that these Points were formulated at Dort and are historically and technically more appropriate to defining 'Calvinism' than 'Calvin's

72. Pink: "The great center of all Calvin's preaching was the grace of God. It has been the custom ever since to designate as 'Calvinists' those who emphasize what he emphasized. We do not accept the title without qualifications, but we certainly are not ashamed of it" (Godhead, p.125).

73. Sarrells makes a curious division of Reformed and Calvinist respecting the doctrine of election as taught by Calvin: "By Reformed Theology we mean that system of thought which, while still holding the doctrine of eternal election, either repudiates or tries to modify the older Calvinism which teaches that God by divine decree has separated the human race into two portions and ordained one to everlasting life and the other to everlasting death" (Systematic Theology, p.345). Earlier he had written, "By Calvinism here we mean those views expressed in the Westminster Confession, and later in the London Confession" (p.112). It has always been popular to describe Calvinism in terms of the theology common to the various Confessions and Catechisms generally denominated as Reformed or Calvinistic. To a large extent this is a helpful method. Comparative symbolics will reveal the same conclusions as we present in these pages, viz, that the early Reformation symbols set forth a 'lower' theology than the seventeenth century ones. Unfortunately, most collections of Reformed symbols omit the Hyperist statements of faith. Granting that the Hypers have produced few of these, it is important to the study of Hyperism to compare the confessions and catechisms of those such as Gill, Gadsby, Pierce, Hale, and the Gospel Standard Trust. For this reason we have inclined a few in our appendices.

74. E.g., Cunningham, Reformers, pp.431-433; Cave, Estimate, p.152. These writers, however, are addressing themselves more especially to 'Calvinism' as such, though of course Cunningham does not feel that there is any real difference to be made. That absolute predestination was the governing doctrine of Calvin is probably the most common suggestion we have met. Some point out that Calvin wrote a treatise specifically on the subject whereas Luther wrote a work concerning human responsibility (Bondage of the Will). Historically speaking, there is much truth in the view that Calvin stressed predestination more than most theologians. But more to the point is the question of how Calvin thought of predestination.

75. Many of the introductions to Calvinism are but expositions of these points (e.g., Parks, Boettner, Custance, Steele and Thomas, B. Warburton). The identification of Calvinism with 'TULIP' doctrines is common (Pittman, Questions, p.19; B. Warburton, Calvinism, p.83; Parks, Dictionary, p.19). These generally do not differentiate Calvin and later Calvinism. Good, however, feels that the following are not essential to true Calvinism: Covenant Theology (as concerns the Church and sacraments), limited atonement in the Supralapsarian sense, double predestination, and restriction of the Gospel (Are Baptists Calvinists, p.81). Good also notes that though there are varieties of Calvinism, there is a common strain to them all (p.109).
theology'. Whether there is a difference between the two is another matter.

Did Calvin himself ever sum up his theology? In a way, yes, he did. The Geneva Catechism sets forth the fundamentals in a clear fashion, as do several of the statements (or oaths) to which communicants or civil magistrates should assent. These latter, however, tend to centre on specific doctrines in dispute, as do his several statements on the Lord's Table. Calvin accepted the Apostles' Creed, but as this was the commonly accepted sum of Christianity in most branches of Christendom at the time, it cannot be considered his own doctrinal summary, except insofar as he interpreted it in a distinctive manner.

Then there is his magnum opus, the well-known Institutes. Calvin himself considered this to be the sum and culmination of his theology; and even though it went through numerous editions and revisions, a common theology can be discerned throughout. That same theology permeates the rest of his diverse writings. But this raises the problem of how to summarize the Institutes or analyse it and detect wherein its distinctiveness lay.

In defining Calvin's theology one should not consider so much the later interpretations or modifications of it by later Calvinists. Rather, it must be read in the light of its contemporary scene against the historical backdrop of the progress of Christian doctrine up until that time. And, of course, by seeking a 'definition' we are looking not so much for the doctrines which are to be considered essential or primary to his thoughts, as those which differentiate his theology from those of others.

76. There have been several abridgements and collections of excerpts from this, such as Instruction in Christianity.

77. The recent translation of the 1536 edition will doubtless inspire research along the lines of comparing the development of various thoughts in Calvin in the context of the development of Reformation theology. There have been various editions of the Institutes, which note some of these differences and parallels (e.g., Peter Barth, McNeill, etc.) but a full scale commentary on the Institutes is a desideratum in Calvin research. Such an effort would not only compare the different editions, as well as the French, but also refer to Calvin's treatment of the subject matter elsewhere in his works.
The general impression we receive from reading the Institutes and other works is that the distinctive features of Calvin's thought lie not so much in specific doctrines which he held in contrast to others, but rather in the way in which he held them. This is more than just saying that his theology is that special emphasis he placed upon the doctrines he held in common with, say, Luther or Bucer. It involves that, but even more is it the special way in which he relates his doctrines to each other and to the whole. Thus, much of the problem is discerning his theological methodology.

Without entering into all the exigencies of the matter, a basic pattern in Calvin's method can be discerned and this is borne out by a perusal of the Institutes. Luther never produced such a work. Melancthon's Loci Communes is something similar, and other organized efforts were produced by Zwingli, Martyr, Muscullus and Bullinger. There appears to be a more decided tendency in the direction of organization and structure of theology in the Swiss divines.

This is not to posit that Calvin ushered in a new Scholasticism. The Institutes is neither a Summa nor a commentary on Lombard's Sentences. For Calvin, theology had meaning and structure, but not in the speculative fashion of the Schoolmen. His Institutes were complemented by his many commentaries and sermons and special treatises, and Calvin felt that this was the way to do theology.

One cannot overlook the first few lines of the Institutes. For Calvin, the chief end of man is to know God and be known by Him. Life is a reflection of truth, and vice-versa, and theology is both theoretical and practical. That is, theology can be written and lived. The idea of knowing God means the necessity of divine revelation of God personally, which is grace. This revelation is given through Scripture, realized by the illumination of the Spirit, and known fully in and through the Son.

78. The organization of the main dogmatic works of these and others reveals much about their theological methodology, which in turn tells us something about their theology in general, as with Calvin. Bullinger, for example, produced the Decades in sermon form. Martyr's massive Loci Communes is more structured, but still less so than Beza or later Calvinists. Ursinus's Summe is in the form of a commentary on the Heidelberg Catechism. We should like to see a study on the organization of Reformed dogmatics since the early Reformation. Curiously, there were proportionately fewer systematic theologies in the Puritan era. Ames's Marrow rather resembles Lombard's Sentences. Other important Puritan systematics include those by Perkins, Ussher, Baxter and Watson.
It is this relationship which lies as close to the centre of Calvin's thought as any other. But where does this differ from that of others?

The key may lie in Calvin's tendency to see these things according to the sovereignty of divine transcendence in all things. It should be apparent that Calvin speaks 'higher' than Luther when speaking of the balance between God and Man, between sovereignty and responsibility. From the Lutheran perspective, Calvin was over-emphasizing sovereignty; from Calvin's view, the Lutheran view was over-emphasizing responsibility. At the beginning the views of Calvin and Luther were very similar. Indeed, we may even go so far as to say that they were complementary. But this relationship eventually gave rise to a dichotomy in Reformation theology which eventually produced extremes. The Lutheran theology modified through Melancthon and had the tendency to become synergistic, and at the time of Dort the Arminian theology took this tendency further – even if Arminianism originally arose within Calvinistic circles. Arminianism was an over-reaction against the monistic tendencies of that which developed out of Calvin's theology, namely the 'Calvinistic' developments of men such as Beza and Perkins.⁷⁹

This is not to make a pronouncement on the rights or wrongs of the positions involved. Our point is merely that what was originally a slight difference has ballooned into extremes hardly conceived of by Luther and Calvin themselves. To claim Calvin for the cause of Hyper-Calvinism is as without foundation as to claim Luther for the excesses of nineteenth century German liberalism. And yet the Liberals often felt that they were in the 'true spirit' of Luther, the supposed rebel against all traditional doctrine and the advocate of the supremacy of the individual conscience. Similarly, as we have seen, Hyper-Calvinists have claimed that Calvin not only taught limited atonement but also rejected free offers. Wilks goes so far as to call Calvin a 'high Calvinist' and an 'Antinomian', which to Wilks is what others have called Hyper-Calvinist.⁸⁰

---

⁷⁹. That there was a difference between Calvin and his immediate successors is crucial to our argument and is at the fore of the current debate in Calvin research (e.g., Kendall, Letham, Sell, Bell and so on). Pertinent to the Hyperist question, see Rice, Hell, pp.13, 20; Pink, Gleanings from the Scriptures, p.271, 295; Sovereignty, p.130; Strong, Systematic Theology, p.778; Toon, HC, p.144; Spurgeon, Commenting, p.4; Good, p.265.

⁸⁰. Wilks, p.113.
One need not read much Reformed literature to get the impression that the Hyperists consider themselves in the pure line of descent, sometimes even positing that some are more extreme than they themselves are. Some, as we have seen, even deny that there is such a thing as Hyper-Calvinism.

Having said all this, we must turn to the definition of this system which has gone beyond Calvin while claiming to develop Calvin's theology along lines which the Reformer would have approved.

There have been numerous attempts to define Hyper-Calvinism and we need concern ourselves only with those put forth by persons displaying a degree of first-hand knowledge of at least some of the sources. Several definitions define the system in terms of a going beyond Calvin on specific points, such as Supralapsarianism, limited atonement, and so on. Wilks listed eight points of difference between Modern Calvinists and Modern Antinomianism, and this substantially constitutes a definition. In dialogue with Spurgeon, a High Calvinist, Palmer noted that the main difference lay in points of application and emphasis on three specific doctrines:

The three differences between you and us, shall I say, are these: 1st, The nature and extent of moral obligation; 2nd, The nature and extent of the atonement; 3rd, The nature and extent of gospel invitations. These are cardinal points of difference, tangible, and easily understood. Considered as facts or doctrines, there is no difference of opinion between you and us; but when nature, mode, extent, application, and other particulars come under critical examination, differences spring up and we are divided.

81. E.g., Pink and Engelsma often make this contention.

82. S.M. Jackson, "Hyper-Calvinists is the name of that wing of Calvin's following which carries his views to the last logical consequences, holding the doctrines of a double predestination, of limited atonement, etc., in contradistinction to the Strict Calvinists, who cling to his personal views, and the Moderate Calvinists, who modify them by mitigating them" (Concise Dictionary of Religious Knowledge, p.395). Gawthorn said that the doctrinal Antinomianism of Gadsby is essentially that form of Calvinism which goes beyond that held by most Calvinists, especially concerning the separation of Law and Gospel (Gawthorn, pp.7-8. But see also pp.15, 17, 19). OED simply states that Hyper-Calvinism is "Calvinistic doctrine which goes beyond that of Calvin himself" (vol.V, p.501).

83. They are: divine sovereignty, election, reprobation, limited atonement, eternal justification, progressive sanctification, conditional salvation, and the free offer. (Wilks, pp.15-34).

84. Palmer, Letter to Spurgeon, p.5.
That Hyper-Calvinism is always and emphatically based upon the 'Five Points' has been recognized by several. This was admitted by W.J. Styles, himself an important Hyperist, in his definition:

Hyper (or 'extreme') Calvinism, the creed of those who embrace the five points of Calvin, but repudiate some of his views; and regard salvation as a Divine work wrought in the hearts of the elect only, and in no sense contingent on the will of man for its commencement, continuance, and consummation. **

Hulse tersely comments, "The essence of hyper-Calvinism is to minimize the moral and spiritual responsibility of sinners", ** and Styles could hardly disagree with that were he alive today. Hulse and others specifically relate this minimization of human responsibility to the rejection of the free offer doctrine, an element contained in almost every definition of Hyper-Calvinism. **

Toon gives an excellent and elaborate definition of the system in his important work, The Emergence of Hyper-Calvinism, ** which we need not quote here, and we differ from him only in a few small particulars. There have been other excellent definitions given in work cited in our research, and the common element in them all generally matches the common element in all who have been considered exponents of the theology itself. **

---


86. Free Offer, p.15.

87. This was evident from the very beginning of the use of the term 'Hyper-Calvinist' as formulated by Fuller, except that Fuller usually tied it as much or more to the rejection of Duty-faith and universal salvific responsibility. In addition to Ryland, Jr.'s The Work of Faith, see the excerpt quoted in D.E. Edwards, pp.199-203. On the non-offer as definitive, see W. Young, 'Historic Calvinism', p.64; Oliver, 'Survey', p.8; Hindson, Introduction, p.24.

88. HC, pp.144-145. In brief, Toon 'brings in these ideas: divine sovereignty over human responsibility, eternal justification and adoption, the Covenant of Grace, obscuration of the atonement in the Gospel, the secret and revealed wills, irresistible grace, the free offer, assurance, and introspection.

89. See especially definitions in Coppedge, p.13; Clipsham, 'Fullerism', pp.102-105; and Manley, p.44. Like others, Coppedge and Manley stress the use of logic from the premises of limited atonement and diminished human responsibility due to divine sovereignty and total depravity. Toon's definition bears a close resemblance to Coppedge's on several salient points, probably indicating the influence of the one on the other. They not only specify most of the same points, but they even use some of the exact same language in their definitions, though there are a few differences worth noting. Clipsham gives eight distinctive emphases of Hyperism, all mentioned in the respective chapters in our work and all but the first basically true. The first is that... Cont'd:
doctrinal Antinomianism, particularly in relation to the non-offer.

Engelsma is ambivalent in his definitions of Hyper-Calvinism, for in defining it according to what he has read in Gill, Hussey and Toon (he shows little knowledge of any others, except of course Hoeksema), he specifies the non-offer, rejection of Duty-faith, and Antinomianism, but interjects the false notion that Hyperists do not feel that the Gospel is to be preached to all men indiscriminately, but only to the elect. When this erroneous addition is removed, most of Engelsma's definitions are basically true. But what Engelsma fails to see is that this very definition can be applied to Hoeksema and himself. Perhaps upon further study Rev. Engelsma will recognize this, though we cannot predict what his future course would then be.

Returning to the guidelines laid down at the beginning of this chapter, we suggest that a workable definition must answer five questions (who, what, where, when and why). The definitions of those mentioned immediately above are fine as they stand, but with the exception of Toon in the larger context of his book, none of the others goes far enough in answering all five questions. We have already given a fairly extensive catalogue of who the leading Hyper-Calvinists have been, but here we re-iterate the special place of the leaders and most important writers. The lesser Hyperists have mainly followed in the trail of the greater lights, often uncritically so. The leading Hyper-Calvinists are listed at the beginning of the list given above, namely Gill, Gadsby, Philpot, Hoeksema, Pink, Hussey, Huntington, Stevens, Wells, and Styles. Irons and Hawker and the two Hassells were leaders in their respective church circles, but their overall influence was less than these others. Our historical introduction to Chapter I and occasional references in individual chapters also gives the answers to the where and when: England and the United States (with a few traces elsewhere), from 1707 to the present.

Cont'd:...

"it is wrong for Christians to pray for the salvation of their neighbours".


91. See Engelsma, pp.10-11, 14, 71, 136. Among other remarkable things is that Engelsma relies so heavily upon Toon, with whom we are in basic agreement. To our knowledge, Toon does not suggest that Gill or Hussey felt that ministers should preach the Gospel only to the elect.

92. Compare Manley: "Under the influence of John Skepp, John Brine and John Gill, High Calvinism ... Cont'd:
As to the what, we offer the following definition. Hyper-Calvinism is that school of Supralapsarian 'Five Point' Calvinism which so stresses the sovereignty of God by over-emphasizing the secret over the revealed will and eternity over time, that it minimizes the responsibility of Man, notably with respect to the denial of the word 'offer' in relation to the preaching of the Gospel of a finished and limited atonement, thus undermining the universal duty of sinners to believe savingly with the assurance that the Lord Jesus Christ died for them, with the result that presumption is overly warned of, introspection is over-encouraged, and a view of sanctification akin to doctrinal Antinomianism is often approached.

This could be summarized even further: it is the rejection of the word 'offer' in connection with evangelism for supposedly Calvinistic reasons. In all our researches, the only real tangible thing which differentiates the Hyper from the High Calvinists is the word 'offer'. The Supralapsarians were brought to the very door of Hyper-Calvinism but those who accepted free offers failed to enter into the realm of the most extreme variety of Calvinism that the history of Reformed theology has yet seen.

This, briefly, is our definition according to the first four questions. To answer the why requires a few additional observations that conclude our study.

Cont'd:...[i.e., what we call Hyper-Calvinism] was widely adopted by many who did not always understand the theological issues involved" (Rippon, p.44).
C. THE HYPER-CALVINIST TENDENCY

The all-consuming passion of the Hyper-Calvinist is to do justice to the sovereignty of God in all things. We have seen how this is effected in the various doctrines concerned with systematic theology, but one wonders how it is that the Hyper-Calvinist phenomenon came to assume its distinctive position. After all, most Christians would claim to respect the sovereignty of God. Why is it that the Hyperists differ in their approach?

One reason is that historically they have opposed movements which directly led to an explicit denial of divine sovereignty. The early Hyper-Calvinists had to deal with Deism; later ones opposed Liberalism. Throughout the history of Hyper-Calvinism there has always been some form of a threat to what they felt to be the correct theology of sovereignty. Arminianism was generally seen as the culprit at work in the spread of the compromise from a Biblical position to a mixed, synergistic one. Arminianism is the doctrine of Man; Calvinism is the doctrine of God. If one must choose, then it is better to choose God and reject Man. So argued the Hyper-Calvinists.

According to this perspective, there are really only two theologies possible: Arminianism and Calvinism. Often High and Hyper-Calvinists have said that there is no middle ground between these two systems. Consequently, when alternatives such as Fullerism or Low Calvinism presented themselves, they were rejected as being Arminianism in disguise. It rarely occurred to them that either of these may be the true Scriptural position. Without debating which position is the real Biblical one, we must point out a fatal flaw in the logic presented by the Hyperists. In arguing that there are really only two schemes possible, they ignore the many middle schools such as Lutheranism and Low Calvinism — both of which, we may add, preceded, not followed,

1. Atherton: "All systems of Theology are reduced to two outstanding principles, called 'Calvinistic' and 'Arminianism'. 'Arminianism' is man's religion, which can be accomplished by man ... 'Calvinism' is the Divine revelation" (in Parks, Five Points, p.iii). Pink: "the radical difference between Arminianism and Calvinism is that the system of the former revolves around the creature, whereas the system of the latter has the Creator for the center of its orbit" (Salvation, p.10).

2. Thornwell: "There is no medium in principle between Pelagianism and Calvinism" (Works, vol.II, p.394). And Arminianism is Pelagianism. Cf. Good, pp.70, 121. Cunningham implied that one is either a Calvinist or an Arminian; it is impossible to be both or neither (Reformers, pp.412-470).
Hyper-Calvinism. The Free Offer/ universal atonement position is not a new innovation in Reformed theology which threatens the doctrine of sovereignty. Quite the opposite is the case. Hyperism is the intruder into Reformed theology and by over-emphasizing divine sovereignty it has effectively threatened the doctrine of human responsibility as taught by the original Reformers.

We have shown that High Calvinists often picture their position between the equally opposite errors of Arminianism and the extremes of Hyper-Calvinism or Antinomianism. But we have also showed that this is a faulty picture. That High Calvinism is between them is correct, but it is not equally between them. Surely the middle position is that occupied by Dualism or Low Calvinism. Upon a closer investigation of Hyper-Calvinism, the High Calvinist must admit that the system of Gill and Hoeksema bears a striking resemblance on many points to that of the Westminster Assembly and the Synod of Dort.

We re-iterate our contention that the main difference between the High and Hyper systems is one of emphasis and terminology. 'Offer' was the most important difference of language, but underlying the respective theologies were premisses accepted by both of them as opposed to the lower schools. Even the differences concerning Supralapsarianism should not be unduly pressed, for Gill and Hoeksema admitted that theirs was the minority view and one that in effect complemented the Sublapsarian view. That is to say, they considered their theology to basically be at one with Westminster and Dort, only that it extended and developed Calvinism along lines not antithetical to the Reformed symbols.

A good case might be made defending the proposition that post-Reformational 'Calvinism' would be better described as 'Anti-Arminianism', for it over-reacted against that system and thus over-

3. Rice: "Calvinism especially appeals to those who think that hyper-Calvinism is the only answer to Arminianism" (Hell, p.6). Harrison: "It is, I say, only a biblical Calvinist who is in danger of taking this extra step into hyper-Calvinism. The Arminian of whatever intensity his shade of belief ... has no such problem" (p.16).


emphasized divine sovereignty. Originally Reformed theology strove to maintain the balance of sovereignty and responsibility, but with the development of Arminianism and later Deism, the High and Hyper-Calvinists came to prefer a system of going to one extreme and rejecting the opposite. Hussey, for example, was not concerned with maintaining balance. He sought no happy medium but rather "an absolute extreme" and this meant rejection of the offer doctrine.

We reject David Engelsma's contention that "The Reformed faith has always been characterized by a refusal to become reactionary". Quite the opposite has often been the case. Unfortunately, the Hyperists cannot see this. To them, it is not reactionism but a desire to defend the sovereignty of God. Moreover, they often looked upon this trend as the essence of spirituality. Growth in theology meant progressing higher and higher in doctrine, stressing sovereignty to new heights. Consequently, they looked down upon lesser Calvinists and tended to despise Arminians. He is a weak Christian, wrote Gill, who "can't digest the greater and more sublime doctrines of grace".

This means that it is weak theology that speaks of the balance of sovereignty and responsibility as pictured by Low Calvinists. This sort of balance was seen as synergistic. Indeed, Neonomianism was seen as perfect proof of this—did it not mingle faith and works in the same way as the Galatian judaizers? Hyperists and more than a few Federalists would have difficulty accepting the words of 'Rabbi' Duncan:

Antinomianism says that we (to use the words of Towne) are Christ-ed and God-ed. Arminianism says that half the work is God's and half is man's. Calvinism asserts that the whole is God's and the whole man's also.

To the Hyperist, there is no way in which it could be said that "the

---

6. Operations, p. 386. Hoeksma argued in a similar manner: "our danger does not lie in the direction of becoming too narrowly Reformed and Calvinistic ... The danger lies in the opposite direction ... What we must emphasize is not a would-be-broadminded Christianity, colorless and tasteless, but the specific principle of our Reformed faith" (in G. Hoeksema, Therefore, p. 121).
whole is man's also", for that is synergism.

The relationship between High and Hyper-Calvinism is an interesting one. On the one hand, it is often true that High Calvinism leads to Hyperism. And yet it is equally true than in many cases it has been the means by which some Hyperists have come to reject the non-offer position and appreciate a theology more in keeping with that of Calvin's. The case of Fuller is the classic example of the latter.

There are two errors which must be guarded against. The first is to equate High and Hyper-Calvinism and to ignore the differences they have with each other. The second is to so differentiate them as to make the High position "the main opposition to the Hyperist system". There is a measure of truth in both interpretations and the right estimation of the situation is keeping both of these truths in balance.

We are endeavouring to explain why it is that the Hyper-Calvinists see things as they do with respect to other systems and the sovereignty/responsibility balance. Part of the key lies in their failure to think in terms of paradox and balance. This in turn is related to their insistence that the decrees be seen in a logical and subordinate fashion. This also applies to their difficulty in maintaining the balance of the being and attributes of God, especially in the way in which they subordinate holiness and love to bare sovereignty. It is also seen in their placing the secret will over the revealed will, and eternity over time. From their point of view, theirs is the only logical system. From the point of view of many of their critics, however, it is one which displays a mindset unable or unwilling to accept the idea of divine paradox.

11. This is often put forth by those Highs who see themselves between the equal and opposite errors of Hyperism and Arminianism. Good, for example, says that Hyperism is "an entirely different thing" from Calvinism (p.77. Cf. p.108). See Iain Murray, Forgotten, p.51.

12. One could also apply the actual-virtual scheme, of which the two schools are so fond. One could say that High Calvinism is virtually but not actually the same as Hyper-Calvinism. To use an analogy, the difference between the two is like the difference between crimson and scarlet. Technically the two are marginally different when compared with each other. But when they are compared together with blue or yellow, they are seen as having far more in common with each other than with the others. Thusly, High and Hyper-Calvinism differ on the word 'offer', but are virtually the same when compared with Arminianism or Deism.

13. Nuttall observes that the Presbyterian Puritans were better educated than the Calvinistic Baptists and this is one reason why they were the first to abandon Federal Calvinism ('Calvinism in Free Church History', p.425). We do not necessarily agree with all the implications of ... Cont'd:
It could also be posited that the Hyperists are ignorant of certain facts of historical theology, such as that there have been many strains of theology between Calvinism and Arminianism. The ignorance is probably not wilful, though, but merely the result of the attempt to protect the tradition to which they belong. Unfortunately, many are either not aware of other valid varieties of Calvinism or they misinterpret those varieties in the light of their limited understanding of historical theology.

Sometimes it appears that the Hyperists are intent upon defending their tradition at all costs. Spurgeon commented; "Calvinism to some, by the way, is of more importance than Scripture". To many critics, the Hyperist system gives too much prominence to individuals such as the Reformers and Puritans, and to ecclesiastical gatherings such as the Synod of Dort and the Westminster Assembly. Some would even remark that this approaches the Roman Catholic veneration of the saints, submission to the Councils, and acceptance of authoritative tradition.

It is surprising that some of the most ardent Hyper-Calvinists have been Baptists. One wonders that they appeal so highly to Calvin and the Puritans when these were certainly no friends of the Anabaptists. Furthermore, there is a noticeable contradiction in dealing with High Calvinists. On the one hand, Hyperists claim that all so-called Calvinists who teach the doctrine of the free offer are 'bastard

---

Cont'd:

Nuttall's statement, but he does have a point in noting that Hyper-Calvinism has not been known for a plethora of intellectuals. We must also take issue with Rice, who says that Hyper-Calvinism "appeals to the scholarly intellect, the self-sufficient and proud mind" (Hell, p.6). However, Rice states this in the context of his evident failure to differentiate High and Hyper-Calvinism, and we would be more inclined to accept his criticism if it were applied to the tendency towards a Reformed scholasticism that has often appeared in High Calvinism.

14. A good example of this would be the blatant error of Henry Atherton: "It is well known that all our Reformers were Calvinists ... and not only our English Reformers, but the great Continental Reformers likewise, were unanimous in doctrine until Arminianism came into vogue" (Testimony, p.2) Any student of the Reformation will realize that though there was substantial unity on the essentials, there was considerable difference on the non-essentials. One need only study the Eucharistic Controversies or church-state relations to see many differences. This error is akin to the one which would identify Calvinism with Augustinianism in all things. While admitting that the two are similar, we point out that there were notable differences.

Calvinists' and 'Arminians in disguise', while on the other they turn around and praise pro-offer Calvinists in highest terms. Sometimes this inconsistency is seen with reference to the acceptance of the Law as a 'rule', or Sublapsarianism.

Others have sought to maintain the purity of their tradition by reading back into church history things that really did not occur. A prominent place here is the attempt to make Calvin teach limited atonement and reject free offers. The reaction of many High and Hyperists to the suggestion that Calvin was a free offer Universalist is tantamount to calling into question the purity of their ancestry. It would be more noble for them to admit that Calvin did not teach certain things they wish he would have taught, than to reinterpret the writings of the Reformer just to protect their tradition. This is similar to Hoeksema's treatment of Dort and Heidelberg.

There is more to it than this. We need to ask why it is that the Hyperists give such prominence to 'the doctrines of grace', i.e., the Five Points of Dort. Why did Thomas Bradbury admit that these points are in his 'shibboleth'? Why have both High and Hyper-Calvinists often stated that the Five Points stand and fall together? Why do they ceaselessly emphasize these doctrines? The answer is simply that they equate the Five Points of Calvinism with the essence of the Gospel. "For me the truth of the gospel and the Reformed faith are synonyms", wrote Homer Hoeksema. This applies to even a moderate Particularist such as R.B. Kuiper, who said, "Next to the Bible itself the clearest and purest expression of this doctrine is found in the five points of Calvinism". Is this not the reason why such Calvinists so strenuously defend limited atonement and the other points? There have been, we grant, a few who have denied that these points are essential to the Gospel, but our impression is that they have been in the minority. But we will add the comment that to a large extent the question of limited atonement is the watershed doctrine. Once it is accepted, the tendency becomes to limit

17. E.g., Ben Warburton, Calvinism, pp. 107-109, 149.
18. "C.H. Spurgeon speaks of some who have only a barrel organ with five keys, and these they grind over all the year round" (Ebenezer Hooper, in T.R. Hooper, Memoirs of Ebenezer and Emma Hooper, p. 116).
20. For Whom Did Christ Die, p. 70.
the Gospel (e.g., free offer) and faith (e.g., assurance and Duty-faith). The Highs have not gone as far as the Hyperists have in this, but there are reasons for that.

The main reason is the temperament of the Hyper-Calvinists. They tend to be fairly similar in personality and background; usually they were raised in the Hyperist system and have had minimal contact with other branches of Christendom. Their outlook is one in which the emphasis on the sovereignty of God is the pinnacle of spirituality. Unfortunately, this aspect of truth is not usually tempered with the healthy appreciation of other Biblical truths realized by other Calvinists.21

But lest our comments be misconstrued as implying a full condemnation of Hyper-Calvinism, we hasten to add the comment that the differences which those such as Fuller, Spurgeon and the present author have with the Hyperists are small in comparison to the truths held in common against many other theological systems. To a large extent, the controversy among Low, High and Hyper-Calvinists has been a family dispute. The Hyper-Calvinists may not have always seen it in this way, but the lower schools have not usually responded as fiercely to the errors of their brothers as have the Hyperists.

While many Hyper-Calvinists have come right out and stated that any who teach the free offer or limited atonement are not Christians, this condemnation has not been given by Low and High Calvinists to the Hyperist rejection of free offers and Duty-faith. "Orthodox Baptists under the spell of Gill's hyper-Calvinism did not expand", comments Good, "but they did not apostatize".22 Even Spurgeon was of this mind: "Gill is the Corphaeus of hyper-Calvinism, but if his followers never went beyond their master, they would not go very far astray".23 We have yet to find rebukes in Fuller's treatises against Hyperism as condemnatory

21. "Glorying in the name of Calvin, whose works they never read, or they would have branded him with the epithet of an Arminian, these zealots proclaimed the sovereignty of God, not in the spirit of Jesus or his apostles, with humble awful adoration, but with the temper of fiends who wished to render it odious and repulsive" (Bogue and Bennett, quoted in Sell, Debate, p.52). Similar to the first part of this quote, Fuller stated, "The writings of Calvin himself would now be deemed Arminian by a great number of our opponents" (Works, p.168).


as those in his opponents. For all his hatred of the distinctives of the Hyperist system, Fuller still accepted the Hyper-Calvinists as Christians. A similar state of affairs existed concerning the spiritual state of Arminians, for the higher one ascended on the ladder of High and Hyper-Calvinism, the lower he thought of Arminians. More than a few higher Calvinists have utterly denied that Arminians are true Christians any more than Romanists, Deists or Moslems.

In this light we feel that the weakness of Hyper-Calvinists has arisen indirectly because of their strengths. Their strengths are in the realm of appreciating the majesty and dominion of God in stark contrast to the Man-centred theology that has often permeated the theology of their opponents. Hyperists have rightly opposed the trivialization of the divine Lord of the universe and flippancy of worship often seen and encouraged by certain strains of Arminianism. One is forced to give the Hypers their due. They cannot be accused of the errors of those on the other side of the spectrum.

But one's strength easily becomes his area of weakness, as every Christian knows by experience. The weakness of Gill and Gadsby and the others was so to protect divine sovereignty against all onslaughts that a deadening effect set in. Their theology became staid and dry, and their attempts at spirituality soon turned to the legalistic Experimentalism of those such as Philpot rather than the rich spirituality and life of joyful love experienced by lower Calvinists. The remarkable thing is that this trend gets back to the appreciation of sovereign grace. One wonders if Gill himself was aware of this in his treatment of the Song of Solomon. There he explains why it was that the Bride of Christ's love for the Saviour led her into unexpected problems:

24. John Gadsby recorded that his father, William Gadsby, "always considered, and often stated publicly, that Andrew Fuller was the greatest enemy the church of God ever had, as his sentiments were so much cloaked with the sheep's clothing" (Memoir of Gadsby, p. 33). See the several quotations given in Chapter II, Section I above. That Fuller, Fullerites and free offer Calvinists have been described as wolves in sheep's clothing does not sound like an admission that these were brothers in Christ. Indeed, as we have seen, Parks bluntly stated that he did not feel that those who offered Christ were saved men at all. Gadsby opposed Fullerites, it is recorded, as he would Satan himself. Others have called pro-offer Calvinists emissaries of the Devil and other strong terms of abuse.
the jealousy she had of Christ's love to her ... was her weakness; and yet it was very torturing and afflicting, though at the same time it showed the greatness of her love to Christ."

We commend our Hyper-Calvinist brothers for their great love of the sovereign Christ. That love has moved them to great accomplishments. Who can read Gill's massive *Commentary* and not be amazed at his scholarship and industriousness? Who can read Pink's popular theology without admiring his masterful command of expressing profound theology in a way understandable to the average Christian? Who can read the works of Hoeksema, Gadsby or Wells and not commend them for their stand for doctrinal integrity and uncompromising truth?

Great as their jealousy for the love of Christ is, however, these have not always been generous enough with that same grace for others. Hyper-Calvinists are not the only persons whom Christ loves. Nor are they the only ones whom God has elected. If the Hyper-Calvinists would recognize this and temper their strengths with the appreciation of the truths surrounding the true Reformed doctrine of responsibility, then their theology would be a valuable contribution to Christ's Church and a powerful force in glorifying the Saviour Whose they are and Whom they serve.

And sovereign grace shall have all the praise and honour.

25. *Comm. on Song of Solomon 8:6.*
APPENDIX A

DID JOHN CALVIN TEACH LIMITED ATONEMENT?

It has long been debated whether the father of Calvinism taught limited atonement. Many subsequent Calvinists of all schools have claimed Calvin for support for their views on the extent of the work of Christ, and often this smacks of appealing to Calvin as a sort of Reformed Pope.\(^1\) The Genevan Reformer was an extremely prolific writer and we do not claim to have read all that he wrote. We question whether anyone ever has, especially given the fact that many of his works have not been translated and a large amount have not even been transcribed from the manuscripts. Nevertheless, we have culled from this large corpus what we hope is a representative selection of pertinent quotations. This is to verify and record the passages often cited by those who have previously written on the subject from both sides, but most are the fruit of our own effort. Far from this being the final word on the subject, we trust that this present excursus will clarify the issues, set forth a workable selection of materials, comment on the present state of the debate, and interact with previous treatments in the context of the usual patterns involved in historical theology dealing with Calvin. It is hoped that this will serve as an impetus for further research into the field.

We have continually been made aware of the intricacy and importance of the subject, and the vast amount of instances in which Calvin dealt with the subject compels us to call for a re-assessment of Calvin's position in the light of the evidence itself apart from the temptation to make hasty assessments which would reinforce one's own particular theological persuasion. A full-scale treatment of the subject has not yet appeared, but perhaps such an enterprise may yet be produced.

There are two equal but opposite errors of which one must be warned here. The first is to read back into Calvin the later embellishments of

---

1. This is denied by several writers. See Cunningham, Reformers, p.400; Richards, Theology, p.311; Watts, Works, vol.VI, p.287; F.F. Bruce, Answers to Questions, p.197.
later Calvinists who may or may not have followed in the master's footsteps. The other is to ignore or over-emphasize the historical setting in which Calvin wrote on the subject, specifically the Scholastic debates highlighted in Chapter IX of the present work. Calvin must be interpreted in the light of what preceded and followed, especially the former, but the greatest attention must be given to what Calvin himself wrote in the context of what he had to say elsewhere. That is, his views on the subject at hand bear an important relationship to other doctrines he taught (faith, Incarnation, election, the work of the Holy Spirit, and so on).

In the light of the many instances in which Calvin touched on the subject, whether explicitly or implicitly, we are rather surprised that some of those who have commented on the subject have asserted that Calvin did not address himself to the subject. Three writers in particular take more or less the same position here: William Cunningham, Robert Letham, and Paul Helm. All three contend that Calvin did not speak to the subject of the extent of the atonement because that debate did not arise until a later generation, culminating in the Synod of Dort. Helm explains:

Calvin, not being a universalist, could be said to be committed to definite atonement, even though he does not commit himself to definite atonement... There was no occasion for Calvin to enter into argument about the matter, for before the Arminian controversy the extent of the atonement had not been debated expressly within the Reformed churches.  

2. Calvin, p. 18. In our discussion that follows we will refer to Helm's book as Calvin and his article as 'Calvin'. Both were written in reply to Kendall's monograph. Helm's pieces are meant mainly as reviews of Kendall and thus do not deal with all the evidence put forth by others. At first this gives the impression that the burden of proof lies with those such as Kendall who attempt to prove that Calvin was Universalist regarding the atonement. In fact, however, neither side has any special right to be considered right until proven so. The debate began neither with Kendall and Helm, nor Cunningham and Morison. There were those in the seventeenth century who debated it from the sources. But Helm tends to discount these researches with the disparaging remark, "In Calvin research the same few references in Calvin which appear to teach general atonement are appealed to time and again" (Calvin, p. 39). This overlooks the fact that these references are not as few as Helm thinks they are. Helm also overlooks them except as they appear in Kendall. Moreover, Helm feels that they only "appear to teach general atonement", whereas they are quite explicit affirmations, as we shall see. Furthermore, Helm accuses Kendall of mangling and distorting the evidence, "as if Kendall has begun with a view of what the relationship between Calvin and the Puritans must have been and has secured the literature for evidence to support this view!" (p. 80). While this may or may not be true - and we do not feel that it is - the same could easily be said of Helm's own deductive method and Cunningham's rather crass dismissal of Daille's evidence (see below). But though Cunningham basically ignores the evidence... Cont'd.
By 'universalist', Helm presumably means one who believed in universal atonement. If this is so, then Helm reveals that in his mind the matter is resolved even before inquiry. That is, since Calvin did not teach universal atonement, he can be said to teach limited atonement, even though he himself does not explicitly say that he taught the limited position. This appears to beg the question at best or show a bias against the evidence before the evidence is produced. One wonders just what Helm is saying here. If Calvin does not commit himself, how can he be said to be committed? Perhaps Helm is suggesting that Calvin implicitly held to Particularism without explicitly saying so. This would be in line with what Helm says elsewhere, to the effect that Calvin did indeed teach limited atonement. It is evident that Helm's methodology is suspect from the start, for instead of objectively dealing with the explicit evidence, he basically appeals to special pleading to dismiss or ignore the evidence produced by others. This should be obvious from his discussions of the material, as we hope to show below.

It should also be obvious from what we sketched out in Section A of Chapter IX that the debate preceded the Synod of Dort. Indeed, it was an issue with the Church Fathers, notably Augustine and Prosper, not to mention the heated debates of the medieval Schoolmen. Even if Calvin or the other Reformers did not comment on the subject, this must be immediately recognized. In fact, though, Calvin and the others did mention the Schoolmen. Far from there being a silent, implicit consensus among the Reformers in favour of Particularism, the opposite was the case. From Luther onwards, we can find numerous discussions in the writings of the leading Reformers. The pattern was that the earlier ones tended to take the Universalist position, the later ones gradually shifting to the Particularist line.

Furthermore, it can hardly be debated that Calvin accepted the doctrine of substitutionary atonement. Surely, then, Calvin had some idea whom the Saviour represented in the atonement. According to Helm...
and Cunningham, Calvin does not say who these persons are. And yet upon closer investigation, Helm and Cunningham use this only as a stepping-stone to showing that Calvin did not advocate Universalism, but rather Particularism. One way in which Helm does this is by attempting to show that Calvin's views are not at variance with Particularism as advocated by, say, John Owen. The two theologians may not be identical in all things, says Helm, but they are not at variance and can be said to agree. Owen explicitly taught what Calvin implicitly held. This is in keeping with the High Calvinist theory that the Federalist Puritans as a body built upon Calvin's foundation without making any substantial re-adjustments. In popular terms this means that the Westminster Assembly and those represented in it developed Calvin's theology in a way in which Calvin himself would have done had he lived longer. Some would even suggest that Calvin was the virtual author of the Westminster Confession.

Letham presents another discussion similar to that of Cunningham and Helm. Like the others, he deals with some of the evidence while admitting that the debate did not really arise until Dort. Hence, says Letham, Calvin emphasized the efficacy of the atonement without addressing himself to the question of extent: "Calvin does not commit himself on the question of the extent of the atonement". Calvin was adverse to such speculation. Consequently, says Letham, there are in Calvin apparently contradictory and ambiguous statements, some of which seem to teach Universalism, others Particularism. In the end, though, Letham basically comes down on the side of Helm and Cunningham: Calvin taught limited atonement. The ambiguous and

3. Latham, vol. I, pp. 125-126, 143; vol. II, pp. 62, 66-67. Like Helm's effort, Latham's handling of Calvin is not entirely original. Helm gets almost all of his evidence from Kendall and Cunningham, and Latham produces virtually no references which cannot be found in others on both sides of the debate. It must be said on his behalf, as it was of Helm, that his treatment was not meant to be comprehensive. Helm's efforts were but reviews, and Latham's helpful but short treatment comes in the midst of the greater discussion of assurance. By and large Latham reveals a mastery of the sources contemporary with Calvin. As mentioned in Chapter IX, Latham posits that Universalism was the original Reformation view (Luther, Zwingli), but Particularism was introduced by those who wavered (Calvin, Bullinger), and explicitly taught by others (Beza, Martyr, Bucer, Zanchius). To a certain measure we agree with this analysis; our difference mainly concerns the persons involved and the stage in the Reformation at which Particularism began to challenge Universalism. Latham is thus in disagreement with those such as Pink and probably Kuiper who would suggest that all, or nearly all, of the Reformers were Particularists from the beginning. This is vital to the understanding of Latham's highly detailed study, one that is most helpful to the study of the Reformation and deserving of important consideration.
contradictory 'unlimited' passages are governed by the explicit 'limited' passages. It is curious that Letham would suggest that there was not much debate until Dort, for he himself shows that the earlier Reformers were Universalists and the later ones tended to become Particularist.

These are but three who have basically taken the line that Calvin either was not a Universalist or was a Particularist, which is to say much the same in the end. In this claim they are joined by a host of others, most of whom have been advocates of the limited scheme. It is interesting that we have found very few who have not believed in this scheme claiming that Calvin taught it. By and large they argue in the manner mentioned above, more of deduction than induction. They produce a few references, of course, but ignore many more mentioned by their antagonists. In the same way, their critics have sometimes ignored the evidence produced by those such as Cunningham.

We emphasize at the outset the utter importance of dealing with Calvin's own explicit statements. As in most areas of theology, the explicit statements must outweigh the implicit, the clear must govern the unclear. This is especially the case when the explicit far outnumber the implicit, as we feel is the case with Calvin. This does not mean that one should ignore the implicit evidence put forth by the opposition. Rather, as much of the evidence as possible must be examined and interpreted accordingly. Unfortunately, many of those with whose

4. In addition to Cunningham, and Helm, and Letham, see the following: A.A. Hodge, The Atonement, pp.357-360; E.T. Vaughan, The Calvinistic Clergy Defended, pp.51-55; Buck, p.124; Thornton, p.128; Cairns, pp.336-337; John Warburton, Mercies, p.203; Henry Atherton, in Parks, Five Points, p.iii; Leroy Nixon, footnote to his translation of Calvin's The Deity of Christ and Other Sermons (hereafter Deity), p.89; Owen Chadwick, The Reformation, p.95; Pittman, Biographical History, p.351; Questions, p.19; Hyslop, Ralph Wardlaw, pp.260-263; Blunt, Dictionary of Sects, p.97; Faber, The Primitive Doctrine of Election, p.36; Turretin, The Atonement of Christ, pp.170-171; Parks, A Sunday-School Dictionary, p.19; Wileman, Calvin, pp.76-81; Kirsch, James Morison, p.243; Kupfer, For Whom Did Christ Die?, pp.33, 62, 65, 69; Oxenham, The Atonement, pp.239-242; Sawton, The Doctrine of the Atonement as Taught By the Apostles, pp.520-530; Calkins, 'John Calvin's Calvinism', p.675; HILL, Lectures in Divinity, pp.386-391; John Murray, Works, vol.IV, pp.311-313. This is probably the position of Godfrey, 'Reformed Thought on The Extent of the Atonement to 1618', pp.137-138; W.S. Reid, 'Review of R.T. Kendall', pp.159-160; Huntington, Substance, p.46. Palmer takes this position, but with reservations that in some aspects Calvin is more in agreement with Arminius and Wesley (Free Enquiry, p.10). Hanko feels that Calvin's view was upheld at Dort (in Hanko et al, p.10) and Warfield thought that all that is in the Westminster Standards can be found in Calvin (Studies in Theology, p.148). Hunt says that Calvin held to 'particular redemption', but Hunt seems to define this more in terms of special grace rather than the extent of the atonement (Calvin, pp.120, 125). Arminians often say that Calvin taught limited atonement, e.g.: Pearlman, Doctrines, p.269; Shank, pp.350-354; and Rice, Hall, pp.9-10 (Rice leans much further into Arminianism than into any school of Calvinism, contrary to his assertions, except on the eternal security of believers).
conclusions we are in agreement have not always done this. They have concentrated on the passages which are plain and have often ignored the difficult passages. On the other hand, those others arguing from the few difficult passages more readily dismiss as irrelevant the explicit assertions of Universalism produced by their opponents. The correct procedure would be to show from that evidence what Calvin was saying rather than merely dismissing it without comment. At least Helm has done this on occasion, though we disagree with his conclusions. When one deals with the data, he may very well come to a different conclusion than what he had previously expected. Such was the case with the present author.

If there have been those alleging that Calvin taught limited atonement, there have been equally many or more who have denied this and asserted otherwise. These also tend to share the persuasion that Calvin taught the same theory that they themselves accept, but not always. By and large they have produced more citations from Calvin than has the other side. While of itself this does not prove their case, we feel that it is significant and bears special noting. They tend to deal with the data in an inductive manner. That is, they will produce passages in which Calvin says Christ died for all and that all must believe that He died for them. They take this at face value in context and then relate it to what Calvin elsewhere says about other subjects.

5. In addition to Kendall's book and article, see the following: Watts, Works; vol.VI, pp.285-288; Brian Armstrong, pp.137-138, 269; James Morison, Atonement, pp.175ff. (hereafter 'Morison'), and his Commentary on Matthew (20:28) and Commentary on Mark (14:24); Douty, pp.56-61, 64, 66, 79, 99, 116-117; Davenant, p.337; Baxter, Catholick Theology, Part II, pp.50ff.; James Orr, 'Calvinism', in Hastings' ERE, vol.III, pp.152-153; Van Buren, Christ in Our Place, pp.52-53, 77; S.W. Jackson, Concise Dictionary, p.395; Richards, Theology, pp.302-327 (especially pp.305-311); J.C. Ryle, John, vol.I, pp.63, 160; Hodges, The Doctrine of the Mediator, p.52; Underwood, History, p.204; Daille, Apologia Pro Duabus Ecclesiisum in Gallia Protestantium Synodis Nationalibus, vol.II, pp.1044-1087; Aikman, Judgement, p.207; Amyraut, Eschantillon de la Doctrine de Calvin: Touchant la Predestination; Doddridge, Works, vol.V, p.214; Klaema, The Obedience of Christ in the Theology of John Calvin, pp.264-266; Payne, Lectures, pp.222-223, 424-425; Edward Williams, Works, vol.I, pp.131, 232; Thomas Scott, Works, vol.VIII, p.6; Wardlaw, Discourses on the Nature and Extent of the Atonement of Christ, p.lxxvii. Ironically, this is the interpretation of the nineteenth-century translator of Calvin's Commentary on Romans (CTS edition), one 'Rev. John Owen' (cf. his footnote to p.212). This is probably the position also of T.H.L. Parker, The Oracles of God, p.257, and Calvin's Doctrine of the Knowledge of God, p.118; F.F. Bruce, Answers to Questions, pp.102, 113-114, 197-198; Basil Hall, 'Calvin Against the Calvinists', in Duffield, John Calvin, p.27. It is strange that Holmes Rolston does not comment on the issue in his study of the differences between Calvin and Westminster (John Calvin Versus the Westminster Confession), though he would probably take this line, as does James B. Torrance in 'Covenant or Contract?', p.68. Several Arminians have felt that Calvin taught universal atonement, e.g. John Goodwin, Redemption Redeemed, pp.142, 176-177, 188, 529, 707-711; Dan Taylor, Observation on Fuller, p.140. Many others could be added to this and the previous list, but the lists would probably show the critics evenly divided.
such as election. This is generally the reverse of the deductive method of the other party, which starts from election and concludes that Universalism is inconsistent with election, therefore the passages which say that Christ died for all men must mean something other than the plain meaning. Now we grant that later Particularists may have shared Calvin's view of election and that it was inconsistent with Universalism. This may or may not be true in the ultimate sense, but it is not the place of this essay to agree or disagree. Our point is merely that if there is in fact a contradiction, Calvin may not have seen it as such. He may have considered election and universal atonement to be a paradox, granted that he taught the same view of election as later Calvinists (which we are not persuaded of as yet). At least Letham considers this to be a possibility.

This leads us to the position of those who say that Calvin changed his position. Some Calvinistic Universalists have contended that Calvin changed his views from the early Particularism of the *Institutes* to the later Universalism of the Commentaries. While this view deals inductively with the evidence, it still attempts to pit one group against another and does disservice to Calvin's theology as a whole. Moreover, it ignores the fact that Calvin continued to edit and re-arrange the *Institutes* throughout his life and that Universalism can be found in the *Institutes* as well as in the Commentaries. Further, the Commentaries were written over a long space of time. This viewpoint does credit to the fact that we must examine what Calvin wrote in different works at different times, but unfortunately it tends to limit its data to the *Institutes* and Commentaries. Even so, they have produced some vital and adequately explicit citations. At least this school deals with the subject, while several others who have dealt with Calvin's doctrine of the work of Christ completely ignore the important question of the extent of the atonement.


7. E.g., Jansen, *Calvin's Doctrine of the Work of Christ*; Wendel, *Calvin*, pp.215-232 (p.231 may... Cont'd
Not entirely dissimilar to the theory of the aforesaid Universalists is the contention of others of a similar theological standpoint. They too suggest some discrepancy in Calvin. Anthony Lane, for example, says that in one place "Calvin explicitly states that Christ did not die for unbelievers" but adds "the main thrust of Calvin's teaching is that Christ died for all and that Beza and Calvinism taught limited atonement". Toon thinks that "sometimes he seems to have believed in limited atonement and sometimes in general redemption". One of Kendall's propositions is that Calvin taught that Christ died for all men but does not intercede for all men. Kendall stresses the evidence of the Commentaries and Sermons, but has been taken to task for placing such emphasis on this doctrine in Calvin. Kendall feels that Universalism was of fundamental importance to Calvin's soteriology and doctrine of faith. If Calvin does not say this repeatedly in the Institutes, it is because he everywhere assumes it to be true. Bell cautions Kendall on this, but even Bell ignores the fact that there

Cont'd:

contain a possible reference, however vague); Niesel, The Theology of Calvin, pp.110-119. Van Buren barely touches on the question in Christ in Our Place, which is remarkable. Occasionally the Calvin biographies have touched on the matter, none of them to our knowledge devoting much space to the question. As will be seen in the previous and following notes, most of the discussions are found in treatments of other subjects, often unrelated. Unfortunately, this means that those who want to pursue dialogue on the debate confront difficulty in finding the discussions in the places where one would expect them to be. One of the subsidiary purposes of our present effort is to provide an index to these discussions, as well as something of a catalogue of the citations from Calvin himself. Of course, it is not possible to mention where each of these discussions deal with each citation; we have occasionally referred to some of the more significant ones.

8. Lane, p.30. Doyle echoes these sentiments with reservations (Decision Making in Calvin, pp.274-279), for which see below. Cf. Cunningham, Reformers, p.396. One often reads that it was Beza who was the first Reformer to have taught Particularism (e.g., Steinmetz, Reformers in the Wings, p.167); but while being convinced that Calvin was universal and Beza was limited, we feel that the other Reformers cannot be ignored. Calvin was not the Reformed Pope, nor was Beza his successor in this capacity. Letham and Godfrey have shown that there was development and diversity on the subject.

9. PC, p.61. So too the Arminian, Fletcher, Works, vol.III, pp.225-227; Foster, 'Liberal Calvinism', pp.19, 21, 24-25, 28; and probably Engelsma, p.75. In another work Toon writes, "Calvin did not teach the specific doctrine of limited atonement" (HC, p.128), but we are not entirely sure of what he means by the qualifying adjective 'specific'. Does he mean that Calvin did not teach limited atonement at all, or that Calvin taught it but not as specifically (explicitly?) as others?

10. E.g., Calvin and English Calvinism to 1649, pp.17-18.

11. Bell: "though it may be granted that Calvin holds to a universal atonement, and that this is the underlying view in his Institutes, nevertheless the lack of explicit references in the Institutes to the relation between atonement and assurance is troubling and leads us to question whether it is as fully significant as Kendall maintains" (Saving Faith and Assurance of Salvation, p.18). Bell's discussion is found on pages 10-21. Like Letham with whom he interacts, ... Cont'd:
are several explicit instances of universal atonement in the Institutes.

This brings us to William Cunningham. In many ways his position is stricter than that of Helm, certainly more than that of Letham, though all three share several basic common presuppositions and conclusions. Cunningham, in our opinion, displays the same intrinsically incongruous method and position which at first says that Calvin does not address the subject, then says that Calvin did not teach Universalism, and then asserts that he held to Particularism. There can hardly be any other conclusion than that Cunningham considered Calvin a Particularist. In one place he asserts that "no sufficient evidence has been produced that Calvin believed in a universal or unlimited atonement", which is a bold statement to make in the light of the many quotations adduced by those before him (e.g., Daille, Watts, Richards, Morison). Cunningham barely even mentions these quotations except to dismiss those of Daille as "irrelevant and inconclusive materials". That Cunningham hardly deal with the explicit materials himself makes us reluctant to accept his findings based mainly on deduction from other doctrines. Cunningham's own bias is evident in his further contention that proof of Universalism cannot "be derived from his writings". It is difficult to understand how such a bold assertion can be made without examining the evidence, much less without the admission that further evidence may yet be produced. It is strange, then, that while denying that Calvin taught Universalism, Cunningham also cautions against affirming conclusively that Calvin taught Particularism. Hence, like Letham, Cunningham reveals a reluctance to make a final judgement, even if the implication of Cunningham's article is that Calvin indeed was an advocate of limited atonement.12

Cont'd:...

and Doyle with whom he basically agrees, Bell's citations can almost (if not entirely) always be found in earlier sources. It is significant that the works of these three were produced at the University of Aberdeen at approximately the same time - all under the supervision of J.B. Torrance. The Professor's positive influence is readily apparent in Bell and Doyle, while obviously less so in Letham. This is but another reminder of the complicated network involved in the debate. Another area of overlapping interaction can be found with Kendall, Helm, Iain Murray, etc.; the Universalists listed in note 6; and others.

12. Cunningham's article in The Reformers and the Theology of the Reformation (hereafter 'Reformers') has exerted considerable influence on those advocating the Particularist Calvin theory, often without credit. Cunningham's article closely parallels the discussion of A.A. Hodge, The Atonement, pp.357-360. Cunningham was more or less the senior of the two and while the Scotsman has been used mostly in Great Britain, the American has exerted his influence more in the United States. Cunningham's treatment must be understood in the context of his discussions and defence of Particularism in his Historical Theology. Cunningham opens himself to criticism by ignoring ... Cont'd:
As Helm's arguments were co-ordinated to Kendall, and Bell's to Letham's, so Cunningham's arguments find an answer in the recent discussion of Robert Doyle. While Doyle does not appear to be as emphatic an advocate as others of the view that Calvin taught universal atonement, nevertheless he represents a position that cannot be ignored. Unlike Kendall, but like Bell, he deals with the "one explicit denial of the universality of the atonement" put forth by Cunningham, Hodge and others. Doyle feels that "there are many explicit references to the universal scope of the atoning effect of the death of Christ" and "there are a number of places where the tenor of Calvin's exposition relies heavily on the implicit assumption that he affirms universal atonement". Cunningham had argued that Calvin dealt with certain passages in a way which assumed Particularism, but Doyle rightly challenges this.\(^{13}\)

Unfortunately, none of the above have devoted much space to the discussion. Those mentioned thus far are listed because of their significant contributions. Thus far we have only provided guidelines upon which the discussion should take place, while mentioning some of the different ways in which various persons have conducted the research. All this has been, as it were, a matter of introduction to the debate itself. From now on we will concentrate our discussion of the material from Calvin himself, while simultaneously mentioning the pros and cons of the different interpreters.\(^{14}\)

Cont'd:...

\(^{13}\) Doyle's treatment is found in Decision Making in Calvin, pp.274-279 and Doyle adduces several original and significant references pertinent to the discussion, but as in others his discussion is brief and merely in the context of a wider investigation which is not always immediately related to the issue at hand.

\(^{14}\) We aim to collect, collate, organize and discuss material from all strands of Calvin's writings. If some such as Helm give special attention to the Institutes, and others to the Commentaries, we feel that these and others must all be mentioned. Although Calvin himself gave the highest priority to the Institutes as the fullest exposition of his theology, each of the other sources have their own special place. The numerous collections of sermons deserve special mention here. With the exception of Doyle, Kendall, Bell, and one or two others, most scholars have tended to ignore the valuable data to be found in the sermons. As T.H.L. Parker has pointed out, the sermons capture much of the heart of Calvin, who considered his ministry of preaching at least as important as that of teaching - if not more so! Moreover, the sermons always serve as a vital companion to the Commentaries: the two must be read simultaneously (as Parker has shown in his edition of Calvin's Sermons on Isaiah), for they were produced simultaneously. We also present nuggets from other mines, such as controversial tracts and treatises, letters and so on.
In reading Calvin himself one is struck by the large amount of unqualified statements of a Universal nature. These can be found in all sorts of his writings (Institutes, Sermons, Tracts, Commentaries, etc.) and over a long space of time. The following are but a few:

... the hour was approaching in which our Lord Jesus would have to suffer for the redemption of mankind...  

... this redemption was procured by the blood of Christ, for by the sacrifice of His death all the sins of the world have been expiated.

(God) took Him as being there in the place of all sinners.

... by His mediation God is satisfied and appeased, for He bore all the wickednesses of all the iniquities of the world.

Christ interceded as his advocate, took upon himself and suffered the punishment that, from God's righteous judgement, threatened all sinners; that he purged with his blood those evils which had rendered sinners hateful to God; that by this expiation he made satisfaction and sacrifice to God the Father.

... God commends to us the salvation of all men without exception, even as Christ suffered for the sins of the whole world.

---

15. Deity, p.55. Calvin often uses 'redemption' and 'atonement' synonymously, but not always in an exact sense. The same is true with 'reconciliation'. As we shall see, it is vital to see that Calvin can use the terms 'redemption' and 'reconciliation' as referring to both the death of Christ and the application of salvation to the sinner for justification, whereas we do not recall him ever using 'atonement' in this way. As for the death itself, as noted in this quotation, suffering was necessary for the atonement. Christ "suffered ... the anguishes that were due to all wretched sinners..." (Sermons on Job, p.566).

16. Comm on Col. 1:14. Note also that Calvin says that 'all' and not just 'some' sins of the world were expiated. We need hardly mention how this contradicts John Owen's famous 'treble choice' (see Chapter IX). Nor need we enter into the differences, if any, between expiation and propitiation in Calvin's theology.

17. Sermons on Isaiah, p.70. We refer to the Parker edition of these sermons rather than to the Nixon edition. On this quote, see Hodges, The Doctrine of the Mediator, p.52.


19. Institutes, II, 16, 2. Calvin here virtually equates expiation, satisfaction and sacrifice. It is curious that Helt quotes this passage to support his viewpoint (Calvin, p.14). We are not satisfied with his explanation. For a parallel statement, compare: "He is to be considered as a sacrifice of expiation, by which God is appeased towards the world" (quoted in John Goodwin, Redemption Redeemed, p.710).

... Cont'd:
... it was a terrible thing to Him to be found before the judgement-seat of God in the name of all poor sinners (for He was there, as it were, having to sustain all our burdens)...  

... He willed in full measure to appear before the judgement seat of God His Father in the name and in the person of all sinners, being then ready to be condemned, inasmuch as He bore our burden.  

... the death and passion of our Lord Jesus would not have served anything, to wipe away the iniquities of the world, except insofar as He obeyed...  

(Christ was) buried with the sins of the whole world.  

It is that He must be Redeemer of the world. He must be condemned, indeed, not for having preached the Gospel, but for us He must be oppressed, as it were, to the lowest depths and sustain our curse, since He was there, as it

Cont'd:  

20. Comm on Gal. 5:12. This quotation, found in Kendall (p.14), Doyle (p.275) and Daille (pp.1073-1074), shows that Calvin grounded the universal offer of the Gospel in the universal atonement. We are to offer salvation to those for whom the Saviour died: all men without exception. Helm deals with this quotation since Kendall uses it (Calvin, pp.45-46; Kendall, p.14), but his treatment contains several factual errors. Helm says the passage is from Calvin's Sermons on Isaiah, when in fact it is from the Comm on an entirely different passage. Consequently, he greatly errs in his interpretation because he founds so much upon citing what he mistakenly considers to be the true context. He also is mistaken in his documentation of Kendall and of the context itself, not to mention his failure to note that he has left some words out of Calvin's words. Moreover, we are not convinced of Helm's interpretation of both passages, concluding with the bold assertion, "But what Calvin is not saying here is that Christ expiated the sin of the whole world" (p.46). It seems to us that when Calvin says Christ "suffered for the sins of the whole world", he means that He expiated the sin of the whole world. We have already noted how Calvin associates expiation and suffering with the atonement, and it would be pedantic to differentiate 'sin' and 'sins'.

21. Deity, pp.155-156. Note the eschatological aspect: Christ went to the judgement seat and then to Hell for sinners. Cf. Institutes, II, 16, 5 and 8-12; Tracts and Treatises, vol.II, p.47. Note also that Calvin says that Christ died for all the sins of all men. On burdens, see below.

22. Deity, p.52. This shows that Calvin explicitly taught substitutionary atonement. See Van Buren, Christ in Our Place.

23. Deity, p.156. The thrust of Calvin's argument is that since Christ obeyed, His death served to wipe away the sins of the world. This does not necessarily mean that Calvin taught that the active as well as the passive obedience of Christ is imputed to the believer in justification as taught later by Piscator and others. See Chapter VI and IX and below.

were, in the person of all cursed ones and all transgressors, and of those who had deserved eternal death. Since then, Jesus Christ has this office, and He bears the burdens of all those who had offended God mortally, that is why He keeps silence. 25

And when he says 'the sin of the world' he extends this kindness indiscriminately to the whole human race, that the Jews might not think the Redeemer has been sent to them alone. 26

Some point out that the final verdict of Calvin on the subject must be Calvin's statement in his last Will (April 25, 1564):

I further testify and declare that as a suppliant I humbly implore of him to grant me to be so washed and purified by the blood of that sovereign Redeemer, shed for the sins of the human race, that I may be permitted to stand before his tribunal in the image of the Redeemer himself. 27

Strict Particularists would have great difficulty using such boldly Universalist statements as these. They prefer only to speak of Christ dying for the Church, the elect, believers, etc. Calvin speaks in those terms as well but we cannot ignore his Universalist statements. Later Particularists refrained from such statements for fear of being misunderstood, and some might suggest that this fear had not occurred to Calvin. The reason, however, might be that Calvin did not fear that he would be thought to be Universalist, for the very reason that he was Universalist.

25. Deity, p.95. Calvin often associates these two ideas, contrasting men's sins and Christ's atonement for their sins. See especially the passages on Isaiah 53 below. He often calls Christ "the Redeemer of the world" (e.g. Sermons on Deuteronomy, p.764; Sermons on Galatians, p.87).
27. Calvin's Last Will is referred to by F.F. Bruce, Answers to Questions, p.197; Edward Williams, Works, vol.I, p.131; Payne, Lectures, p.223; and others. It is translated in the following: Calvin, Letters, vol.IV, pp.365-369; Dillenberger, John Calvin: Selections from his Writings, pp.34-37; Beza, Life of Calvin, in Calvin's Tracts and Treatises, vol.I, pp.cxiii-cxvii, and elsewhere; Hillerbrand, The Reformation in its Own Words, pp.207-208; Thomas Sayth, Calvin Defended, p.131; Schaff, Church History: The Swiss Reformation, vol.II, pp.828-831; Morison, p.178; Douty, p.117; and in some of the biographies of Calvin. Observe how Calvin speaks of a future washing - cleansing from sin is not completed at the point of justification and regeneration but belongs also to the ongoing work of sanctification and ultimately to final glorification.
Some writers point out that when Calvin wrote in refutation of the Decrees of the Council of Trent he expressed no disagreement with the blatant Universalism of Trent. Trent was clearly within the tradition of the predominating Scholastic tradition and even Particularists admit this. Cunningham, for example, admits that Calvin did not disagree with the Tridentine decree on this point, but he does not explain the difficulty.

We have not found any evidence suggesting that Calvin taught the fundamental Particularist principle that all those for whom Christ died were automatically or actually reconciled or would be. This is crucial. It is true that Calvin defined redemption as "what he acquired for us," and redemption in this sense is therefore past. But he also stresses that redemption needs application. Though Christ paid the full price of redemption, says Calvin, we have not fully entered into this redemption. Calvin explains the relationship between atonement and application:

First, we must understand that as long as Christ remains outside of us, and we are separated from him, all that he has suffered and done for the salvation of the human race remains useless and of no value for us.
For it is not enough that Jesus Christ suffered in His person and was made a sacrifice for us; but we must be assured of it by the Gospel; we must receive that testimony and doubt not that we have righteousness in Him, knowing that He has made satisfaction for our sins.\(^{33}\)

... unless we are by special grace called to be sharers of the fruit of the death and passion of the Son of God, it will be useless to us. It is not enough, then, that our Lord Jesus Christ has suffered, but the good which He acquired for us must be communicated, and we must be put in possession of it. That is done when we are drawn to Him by faith.\(^{34}\)

Paul makes grace common to all men, not because it in fact extends to all, but because it is offered to all. Although Christ suffered for the sins of the world, and is offered by the goodness of God without distinction to all, yet not all receive Him.\(^{35}\)

These statements establish several things. According to Calvin, Christ died for all but unless the atonement is applied ('communicated')

---

33. Sermons on Isaiah, p.117. Cf. pp.128, 131. On Calvin and assurance, see Lane's article in Vox Evangelica; Kendall, Calvin and English Calvinism to 1649, Chapter I; and Chapter VII above.
This quotation alone should suffice to refute Helm's contention that "Nowhere in Calvin is there the suggestion that Christ's death merely made redemption possible for some, or merely possible for all, or that some further action of Christ's, in addition to his death, was necessary" (Calvin, p.16). For Calvin, atonement was not enough; it must be applied. Helm and other Particularists so emphasize the 'definiteness' of the atonement that they tend to weaken the necessity (or at least the place) of faith. Particularists rarely deny that faith is essential to salvation (except in some extreme Hyper-Calvinist instances), but their stress on complete redemption in the atonement alone appears to some critics to approach dangerously close to the Hyper-Calvinist doctrine of justification before faith. Calvin further says that Christ's atonement does not profit those who do not repent, even though He redeemed them. "It was to small purpose for us that Jesus Christ had redeemed us from everlasting death, and had shed his blood to reconcile us to God, unless we were certified of this benefit, and it were told us, and God should call us to enter into possession of this salvation, and to enjoy this price which was thus paid for us. As for example, behold the Turks, which cast away the grace which was purchased for all the world by Jesus Christ: the Jews do the same: the Papists (also)..." (Sermons on Timothy, p.177). Doyle appeals to this passage as proof that Calvin taught universal atonement (pp.274-275).

34. Deity, p.100. This is a clear example of Calvin's acceptance of the concept of 'special grace', a phrase which has little significance if he did not also accept the idea of common grace as well. Cunningham, as we shall see, argues that Calvin did not accept a view of common grace so as to teach universal atonement. According to Calvin, God's common love concerns the universal atonement and offer, while special grace makes both of these effectual to the elect alone. See Sermons on Deuteronomy, p.167.

35. Comm on Rom. 5:18. This is a splendid example of Calvin's acceptance of the practice of the free offer. Cf. Chapter VIII. On Rom. 5:18 at this point, see Douty, p.65; Engelsma, pp.75-76; Wats, Works, vol.VI, pp.287-288.
and received it is useless. How is it applied? By the Gospel becoming effective through grace. How is it received? By faith, believing that Christ died for oneself. Those who disbelieve the Gospel are rejecting Christ and the atonement for their sins. They are therefore condemned with a double condemnation. Also,

... God, to render the wicked all the more inexcusable, willed that Jesus Christ in His death be declared sovereign King of all creatures...

Christ therefore is the judge of all men because He died for all men. When a person rejects the Gospel, he incurs damnation not just because he rejects the Gospel but because He is rejecting that Christ died for him, which the Gospel proclaims. The implication is that if Christ did not die for all men, then Christ would not be the sovereign King over all men. Calvin, it seems, disagrees with the Particularists who contend that Christ is Lord of all merely because of His intrinsic Deity, not because He died for all men.

This naturally raises the question of the intent of the atonement. Why, it may be asked of Calvin, did Christ die for all men if in the secret will of God it was never determined that they will be saved? The above quotations give part of the answer. "Christ died for all so that all would be inexcusable. But are not all men already sinners and without excuse (Romans 2:1)? Yes, but the atonement leaves them 'all the more inexcusable'. That is, they incur extra condemnation when they reject the Gospel, for the Gospel tells them that Christ died for them. If Christ did not die for all men, there would be no extra condemnation for failure to believe that Christ died for oneself, as argued by High and Hyper-Calvinists.

36. Deity, p.153. The foreordination of God is important with respect to the atonement. "Christ was foreordained before the foundation of the world to wash away the sins of the world by His sacrifice. Without a doubt this means that the expiation of the sin executed by Christ was ordained by the eternal decree of God" (Predestination, p.71). This ordination is seen in retrospect as well: "Let us learn from this to proceed to consider the cause of Christ's death: seeing that God avenged it so severely, He would never have let His Son face it, unless it were an expiation for the sins of the world" (Comm on Luke 23:28).

37. Cf. Sermons on Isaiah, p.98; Comm on Rom. 14:9; Institutes, II, 15, 5; Sermons on Deuteronomy p.186. Similarly, Christ is the only Mediator and Saviour. "Hence we see that to Christ alone belongs this honour of expiating the sins of the world and taking away the enmity between God and us" (Comm on I John 4:10).
Later Particularists have said that Christ died for 'many', meaning 'some'. We saw that the early Luther taught this but later changed to Universalism. What did Calvin teach? For Calvin, 'many' means 'all' in specific places in Scripture, such as Matt. 20:28 ('the Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many'). Calvin interprets this verse as follows:

'Many' is used, not for a definite number, but for a large number, in that He sets Himself over against all others. And this is the meaning also in Rom. 5:15, where Paul is not talking of a part of mankind but of the whole human race.34

Similarly Calvin commented on Mark 14:24 ('This is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many') as follows:

The word 'many' does not mean a part of the world only, but the whole human race: he contrasts 'many' with 'one', as if to say that he would not be the Redeemer of one man, but would meet death to deliver many of their cursed guilt. No doubt that in speaking to a few Christ wished to make His teaching available to a larger number... So when we come to the holy table not only should the general idea come to our mind that the world is redeemed by the blood of Christ, but also each should reckon to himself that his own sins are covered.39

In the same vein, Calvin says that though Christ died for 'many', meaning 'all', not all of those for whom Christ died will receive the benefits of the atonement. Note his comments on Heb. 9:27 ('Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many'):

38. Comm on Matt. 20:28. 'Definite' here means 'limited' (see below). The Commentary on Rom. 5:15 itself is not fully clear on this point, however. In that place Calvin is mainly concerned with teaching that "since the sin of Adam has destroyed many, the righteousness of Christ will be no less effective for the salvation of many". Note Calvin's uses of 'effective' here, for it is important for the understanding of his treatment of the 'sufficient-efficient' formula (see below). Cf. Daille, p.1053. On the I Cor. 15 parallel to Romans 5, Calvin says this: "Therefore just as Adam did not die for himself alone, but for us all, so it follows that Christ, who is the antitype, did not rise again merely for himself. For He came to restore everything which had been brought to ruin in Adam... In the fifth chapter of Romans he uses the same contrast" (Comm on I Cor. 15:21-22). Cf. Tracts and Treatises, vol.III, p.456. Because Christ became a man, "the salvation provided by Christ is common to all mankind. For Christ, the Author of salvation, was begotten of Adam, the common father of us all" (Institutes, II, 13, 3).
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'To bear the sins' means to free those who have sinned from their guilt by his satisfaction. He says many meaning all, as in Rom. 5:15. It is of course certain that not all enjoy the fruits of Christ's death, but this happens because their unbelief hinders them. The question is not dealt with here because the apostle is not discussing how few or how many benefit from the death of Christ, but means simply that he died for others, not for himself. He therefore contrasts the many to the one.

Here Calvin says that Christ died for all who have sinned; he is not saying merely that all those for whom Christ died were sinners (as Particularists often interpret II Cor. 5:14-15). Furthermore, Calvin grounds their ultimate condemnation in their unbelief, not in lack of atonement. And it should be noted that in equating 'many' with 'all' Calvin explicitly and repeatedly says that these passages are contrasting 'many' with 'the one' rather than 'all', as Particularists contend. For Particularists, 'many' means 'some' as opposed to 'all'; for Calvin 'many' means 'all' as opposed to 'one'. The same equation is also made in Calvin's comments and sermon on Isa. 53:12 ('he bare the sin of many'):

... he alone bore the punishment of many, because on him was laid the guilt of the whole world. It is evident from the fifth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, that 'many' sometimes denotes 'all'.

That, then, is how our Lord Jesus bore the sins and iniquities of many. But in fact, the word 'many' is often as good as equivalent to 'all'. And indeed our Lord Jesus was offered to all the world. For it is not speaking of

40. Comm on Heb. 9:27-28. Cf. Daille, p.1076. Helm: "But in view of our earlier discussion, is it not natural to take Calvin to be saying, in effect, that Christ's death is sufficient for all but efficient for the elect alone?" (Calvin, p.44).

41. Comm on Isa. 53:12. Helm mentions this passage but dismisses it, saying it means "all classes" and therefore cannot teach universal atonement. (Calvin, p.44). Later Helm even goes so far in discounting the 'many equals all' passages adduced by Kendall that he boldly states: "it is impossible to advance such a far-reaching reconstruction of Calvin's doctrine of the work of Christ on such flimsy foundations" (p.46). We find it incredible that Helm would class as 'flimsy' the many and explicit statements of Calvin himself, especially without producing equally many and explicit examples himself, or at least exegeting the examples given by Kendall by dealing with the crux of the issue.

42. The French is "a tout le monde" ("to all the world"), not "pour tout le monde" ("for all the world") (Corpus Reformatorum, vol.XXXV, col.678). Calvin here speaks of the universal offer of the Gospel but, in our opinion, the context shows that he grounds it in a universal atonement. Elsewhere he states that on the basis of the (universal) atonement "Jesus Christ offereth himself generally to all men without exception to be their redeemer" (Sermons on Deuteronomy, p.167).
three or four when it says: 'God so loved the world, that he spared not His only Son'.

But yet we must notice what the Evangelist adds in this passage: 'That whatsoever believes in Him shall not perish but obtain eternal life'. Our Lord Jesus suffered for all and there is neither great nor small who is not inexcusable today, for we can obtain salvation in Him. Unbelievers who turn away from Him and who deprive themselves of Him by their malice are today doubly culpable, for how will they excuse their ingratitude in not receiving the blessing in which they could share by faith?

Calvin here speaks of unbelievers as 'doubly culpable'. This seems to contradict entirely the 'double payment' argument of Duns Scotus and others. To our knowledge Calvin never employs the 'double payment' argument. He never argues that all those for whom Christ died must

43. Calvin here mingles John 3:16 and Rom. 8:32, a common practice with him. It is significant that he sees universalism in the latter text, for his Commentary on it offers no explicit material on the debate about the extent of the atonement. The verse is a favourite of Particularists. On this mingling, cf. also Sermons on Deuteronomy, pp.167, 784; Sermons on Ephesians, p.488; Sermons on Galatians, p.165(B).

44. Parker adds this note: "1558: pour tous. CR: pour nous tous" (Sermons on Isaiah, p.141). The difference is minor but in preferring the former Parker leaves even fewer options open for those who would read Particularism in Calvin here.

45. Sermons on Isaiah, p.141. Cf. Hodges, p.52. Moreover, "it is no small matter to have the souls perish which were bought by the blood of Christ" (Sermons on Timothy, p.817). It is debatable whether Calvin is speaking about Christians or unbelievers. The context could be interpreted as speaking of believers ('brethren'), though he does not often speak of believers as 'perishing'. Helm refers to this passage but denies the interpretation of it given by Kendall (Calvin, pp.39-40; Kendall, p.16). On some perishing eternally for whom Christ died, see Comm on I Cor. 8:11-12, I Peter 1:18; II Peter 2:1, Jude 4. Calvin elsewhere explicitly taught that some of those for whom Christ redeemed in His death have and will perish eternally. "Also we ought to have good care of those that have been redeemed with the blood of our Lord Jesus Christ. If we see souls which have been so precious to God go to perdition, and we make nothing of it, that is to despise the blood of our Lord Jesus Christ" (Sermons on Ephesians, p.521). "It follows, moreover, that the poor souls whom our Lord Jesus Christ has bought so dearly that he did not spare himself to save them, perish and are given into Satan's possession. Yet we remain quite indifferent. Do we not in this show that we do not have so much as one drop of love in us?" (ibid., p.525). Note that in both places Calvin chides those who show no concern for those who perish eternally. Surely Calvin would apply this rebuke to Hyper-Calvinists, for they do not bother to evangelize those who are perishing. But would not this rebuke also apply to High Calvinists as well, for they also limit the atonement and deny that Christ redeemed those who are perishing? Elsewhere in this work we have shown how the Hyper-Calvinists ground their non-offer in the limitation of the atonement, and that they have been accused by some for lack of love for the perishing. High Calvinists closely parallel their views; some feel that their motives are also similar to those of the Hypers.
automatically be saved else God demands double payment. Now we grant that the above quotation could conceivably be interpreted to mean that Calvin says unbelievers are doubly guilty in that they sin against the light of nature (conscience) as well as against the Gospel, irrespective of whether or not Christ died for them. This, however, is rather improbable in the present context. Calvin roots the Gospel in the atonement in such a way that to believe the Gospel in a saving way is to believe that Christ died for oneself; to disbelieve the Gospel is to disbelieve that Christ died for oneself. What makes this unbelief of enormous consequence is the fact that it insults the very One who died for the unbeliever. Moreover Calvin says that all men can obtain salvation because Christ died for all men; unbelievers reject what is already there. Particularists, on the other hand, argue that all men can obtain salvation because (and if) the Gospel is preached to them, not because Christ died for them, for that is not so. And, they add, men are not required to believe that Christ died for them, therefore they are not rejecting what is there in this respect. They are condemned because they reject what is there: the Gospel, not an atonement for their sins. We feel that this view is entirely alien to Calvin's theology.

One may then ask, Does not Calvin redefine 'all' in the manner of later Particularists? Some⁴⁶ point out Calvin's comments and sermons on 1 Tim. 2:4-6 ('God ... will have all men to be saved ... (Christ Jesus) gave himself a ransom for all'). There Calvin says that 'all' are not "every particular man, but ... all sorts, and ... all people"."⁷ Also,

The universal 'all' must always be referred to classes of

---

⁴⁶. Cunningham briefly mentions Calvin's comments, adding that "this is in substance just the interpretation commonly given of these and similar texts, by the advocates of the doctrine of particular redemption" (Reformers, p.400). Actually, Calvin's views here are appealed to by both sides in the debate. For example, Schaff, Church History: The Swiss Reformation, vol.II, p.580; Shank, Life in the Son, pp.350-353; Bell, p.15; Bruce, Answers to Questions, pp.113-114; Kirsch, James Morison, pp.243-244; Hodges, The Doctrine of the Mediator, p.52; Helm, 'Calvin', p.180; Richards, p.311; Daille, vol.II, p.1075. Doyle: "there is a group of passages where Calvin qualifies 'all' as referring to classes of men, not to individuals. However, it needs to be noted that none of these comments concerns the scope of the atonement in the divine intention" (p.276).

⁴⁷. Sermons on Timothy, p.149 (cf. pp.151, 160). We quote from the 1576 edition rather than the more recent abridgement, The Mystery of Godliness and Other Selected Sermons. For similar uses of 'all', see Calvin's Calvinism, pp.105-106; Ἀποκρίτης on Titus 2:11. In his Ἀποκρίτης on John 6:45 Calvin says, "When he says all, it must be limited to the elect", but he is referring to that one verse in its context (Helm refers to this reference, Calvin, p.46). Cf. also Ἀποκρίτης on John 12:32.
men but never to individuals. It is as if he had said, 'Not only Jews, but also Greeks, not only people of humble rank but also princes have been redeemed by the death of Christ.'

A Particularist might argue as follows: Calvin says that these verses and all of similar import always concern 'all sorts' and 'all classes' and never 'all men'; therefore God does not will 'all men' but only 'all sorts' to be saved, and Christ died for 'all sorts' but not for 'all men'. If this is the correct interpretation then it shows that Calvin changed his views from elsewhere; or that he was not aware of a contradiction; or that there is no contradiction and these words can be harmonized with what he said and what we observed above and will observe below.

First we must note that Calvin explicitly denies that these verses are speaking about the secret will of God. In the revealed will God certainly "wills to offer the Gospel to all without exception". Calvin is saying that this passage does not concern 'individuals' in the sense that the Gospel does not say that God wills this particular man or that man to be saved, or that the Gospel says that Christ died for this individual man or that. The verses mean that God wills the salvation of all classes of men rather than a few individuals. Calvin explicitly says that this teaches that Christ did not die only for Peter or John or the Jews, but rather for all others including Gentiles.

There is very likely a parallel in thought to what Calvin said in his Sermon on Isaiah 53:12 quoted above, when he equates 'many' with 'all', adding that "it is not speaking of three or four". Moreover,

48. **Comm** on I Tim. 2:5. Cf. **Comm** on I Tim. 2:4, "he is speaking of classes and not of individuals". Cf. also **Comm** on Dan. 7:27; **Institutes**, III, 24, 16.

49. **Sermons** on Timothy, p.152. Cf. Calvin's Calvinism, pp.105-106. His **Comm** on II Peter 3:9 says much the same thing. Contrary to the opinions of some critics, Calvin did accept the differentiation of secret and revealed wills, though perhaps not in the exact way the later Calvinists did. The relationship between these wills was hotly debated in the Amyraldian Controversy. See Chapter III.

50. **Comm** on I Tim. 2:3.

51. **Sermons** on Timothy, p.149. Cf. **Sermons** on Isaiah, p.81. This parallels Luther's views that Christ died for all and not just for Peter and Paul (Works, vol.22, pp.169, 381; vol.28, pp.262, 264; vol.30, p.237). See Chapter IX above and note 61 below. Luther says that I Tim. 2 concerns the revealed, not the secret will, and that though 2:6 at first sounds like it speaks about 'all the faithful' (i.e. all Christians), he feels that these verses refer to all men everywhere in the revealed will (vol.28, pp.261-267).

... Cont'd;
Calvin explicitly castigates any who would limit this number:

Since therefore He intends the benefit of His death to be common to all, those who hold a view that would exclude any from the hope of salvation do Him injury. 33

Calvin here is not saying that all men will receive the benefits of the atonement. He does not defend universal salvation and this is not in dispute. The question is over 'the hope of salvation', which is rooted in the Gospel, the revealed will of God, and the atonement. Of course, some Particularists may again point out that Calvin is only addressing the limitations delineated by Jews against Gentiles. After all, it may be said, does not Calvin himself mention the Jew-Gentile division? Universalists claiming Calvin agree. Their view is that Calvin is saying, 'God wills salvation to, and Christ died for, all men everywhere, not just for all Jews and men of low rank but also for all Gentiles and all men of high rank'.

Cunningham's views of Calvin on I Tim. 2, we feel, are incorrect. It should be obvious that Calvin does not exegete this passage as Particularists do. Calvin equates the 'all' of 2:1 with the 'all' of 2:4 and 6. The Particularist, however, usually takes the 'all' of 2:6 to be limited to the elect who merely belong to all classes, etc. It is not strictly universal. But they then are forced to take the 'all' of 2:4 as only some of all according to the secret will (but Calvin says it concerns the revealed will), or absolutely all in the revealed will (thus differentiating 2:4 and 6, unlike Calvin), or even limiting the revealed will/external call to only some (but Calvin says it is universal). A final quotation of Calvin's should clarify exactly what Calvin felt about these verses:

Who does not see that the reference is to orders of men rather than individual men? Nor indeed does the distinction lack substantial ground: what is meant is not individuals of nations but nations of individuals. At any rate, the

Cont'd:...

52. Sermons on Isaiah, p.141.

53. Comm on I Tim. 2:5. This is similar to Bunyan's warning that limiting the atonement limits the Gospel and thereby limits or prevents faith (Works, vol.II, p.348. See Chapter IX above). Fletcher felt that this statement of Calvin's teaches universal atonement (Works, vol.III, p.226).
context makes it clear that no other will of God is intended than that which appears in the external preaching of the Gospel. Thus Paul means that God wills the salvation of all whom He mercifully invites by preaching to Christ". 56

We remind the reader of Calvin's words that 'all' (and 'many') is used "not for a definite number, but for a large number ... not a part of mankind but of the whole human race". 55 Obviously 'definite' here means 'limited' or 'small', which better accords with the theory of limited atonement than with that of Universalism. Calvin speaks of the cross as God's means of salvation for mankind, the human race, humanity as an entity. "Christ offered himself as a victim for the salvation of the human race", 56 even "indiscriminately to the whole human race". 57 In commenting on John 3:16 Calvin equates 'world' with "indiscriminately all ... all without exception" and contrasts the few who believe with the rest of the world, not all of whom believe. 57 On

54. Predestination, p.109. Recalling that this passage begins with an exhortation to pray for all men, we refer to Calvin's sentiments on this idea elsewhere in one of his own prayers: "Moreover, we offer up our prayers unto thee, o most gracious God and most merciful Father, for all men in general, that as thou art pleased to be acknowledged the Saviour of the whole human race by the redemption accomplished by Jesus Christ thy son..." (Tracts and Treatises, vol. II, pp.102, 111-112). It would prove interesting to see how Calvin relates our praying for all men to Christ's praying for all men. Echoing his comments on Ephesians quoted above (note 45), Calvin says this: "For the wretched unbelievers and the ignorant have great need to be pleaded for with God; behold them on the way to perdition. If we saw a beast on the point of perishing, we would have pity on it. And what shall we do when we see souls in peril, which are so precious before God, as he has shown in that he has ransomed them with the blood of his own Son? If we see then a poor soul going thus to perdition, ought we not to be moved with compassion and kindness, and should we not desire God to apply the remedy? So then, St. Paul's meaning in this passage is not that we should let the wretched unbelievers alone without having any care for them. We should pray generally for all men..." (Sermons on Ephesians, pp.684-685). Calvin's views are consistently universal in this chain: God wills all to be saved, Christ died for all, we should preach to all, and we should pray for all. To insert any exceptions would be a limitation of grace on God's part or love on our part.


58. Comm on John 3:16. Calvin also says in this place, "The word 'world' comes again so that no one at all may think he is excluded, if only he keeps to the road of faith... He has ordained His Son to be the salvation of the world". Cf. Daille, vol. II, pp.1062-1063; Douty, p.59; Richards, p.309. Though Christ redeemed "the lost race of man" (i.e., all of Adam's descendants), not all are saved, because not all believe. This is because "the manifestation of Christ" (by the Spirit in regeneration) "does not refer to all indiscriminately, but belongs only to those whom He illumines by the Gospel" (Comm on I Peter 1:20). In the light of Calvin's comments on John 3:16 and other places in which he bases universal offers on universal atonement, we must disagree with Helm's opinion that "In Calvin's view, the use of words such as 'all' and 'world' tell us nothing about the extent of the atonement. Rather, it has to do with the indiscriminate and unqualified preaching of the gospel" (Calvin, p.45). To discriminate in the atonement...
John 1:19 he equates 'world' with 'the whole world' and 'the whole human race', who are not to be distinguished from "all men without exception (who) are guilty of unrighteousness". On 1 John 5:4 he says, "The term 'world' has a wide meaning here, comprehending whatever is against God's Spirit."

This is his use of 'all' in Isa. 53 as well. In both the Commentary and Sermon on Isa. 53:6 ('all we like sheep have gone astray ... and the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all"), Calvin does not distinguish these two classes. It was as if he said, 'The Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of those who have gone astray, and that means all without exception, for all have sinned'. Indeed, Calvin explicitly says that this refers to 'the whole human race': 'none is excepted', 'the Prophet includes all', 'even to the last individual', 'without any exception'. And so as to leave no doubt about what he means Calvin further says,

By adding the term 'each one', he descends from a universal statement, in which he included all, to a particular, that each person may consider in his own mind whether it be not so ... he adds this word 'all' to exclude all exceptions ... even to the last individual ... all men are included, without any exception ... the Prophet, when he has said, 'All have erred', adds 'each one, each one': as if he were saying, 'Do not look at the general state of the human race, but let each one of you withdraw into himself and there consider and examine what he is' ... For neither St. Peter, nor St. Paul, nor the Virgin Mary, nor anyone else, is an exception. So then, let us learn to come to the source and fountain and to draw thence what we lack. For our Lord Jesus has enough to satisfy us all; and we need never fear that the fulness of grace which He has...

Cont'd:... certainly qualifies the Gospel. In fact, sometimes Calvin speaks of 'salvation' in such general terms that one cannot precisely discern whether Calvin is speaking of atonement, Gospel offer, or application. In places where the motifs of John 3:16 are found, we find Calvin saying things like: "Christ has brought salvation to all indiscriminately" (Comm on Isa. 42:6. Cf. on Heb. 5:9, Rom. 10:16). In these places Calvin closely associates the atonement, the Gospel offer, and faith in such a way as places the blame for damnation upon the unbeliever for rejecting the provision which is set before him in the Gospel. This could imply universal atonement; but being implicit rather than explicit, we do not press the point.


60. Comm on I John 5:4. Elsewhere he says, "I think that under the word 'world' are included both those who were to be truly converted to Christ and hypocrites and reprobates" (Comm on John 16:8).
in Himself will be exhausted...⁶¹

All this is necessary for us to understand what Calvin means when he goes on to say that 'many' means 'all' in Isa. 53:12. Again, he does not differentiate the 'all' individuals in Isa. 53:6 and the 'many' of 53:12. This is a vital point, for contrary to Cunningham's views of Particularism, and his opinions on Isa. 53:6 and 12 shows this quite clearly. Particularists usually claim that the whole chapter speaks only of 'all the elect'. That is, Christ laid down His life for all the elect, all of whom have gone astray. (A few take the 'all' of 53:6a to be Universal, after Rom. 3, while taking the 'all' of 53:6b and the 'many' of 53:12 to refer to the elect.)

We now come to Calvin's treatment of the 'sufficient-efficient' motif. We have found several places in which he touches on it but will mention only a few of the more pertinent ones. The first is from a sermon on Isa. 53:9–10, as follows:

... not only were the death and passion of our Lord Jesus Christ sufficient for the salvation of the world, but that God will make them efficacious and that we shall see the fruit of them and even feel and experience it.⁶²

This may well be a reference to the Lombardian formula. He says that Christ's death is sufficient for the salvation of the world. Though he does not here specify who this includes, this must be interpreted in the context of the rest of his Isaiah sermons, where he explicitly says that Christ died for all without exception. But Calvin refrains from saying that all for whom the Saviour died will enjoy the fruit of that atonement. Nevertheless Calvin does state that the atonement will not be in vain. His thrust is that the Church will certainly be saved, and that

---

⁶¹ Sermons on Isaiah, pp.66, 70, 78, 79, 81; Comm on Isa. 53:6. Note again the reference to Peter and Paul. The theme 'All are sinners, Christ died for all' is also found in the following extract: "As all mankind are, in the sight of God, lost sinners, we hold that Christ is their only righteousness, since, by his obedience, he has wiped off our transgressions; by his sacrifice, appeased the divine anger; by his blood, washed away our stains; by his cross, borne our curse; and by his death, made satisfaction for us" (Tracts and Treatises, vol.I, p.42).

⁶² Sermons on Isaiah, p.116. Cf. Institutes, II, 16, 7. In his Comm on I Peter 1:18, he says that the atonement can be rendered "of no effect" by unbelief. Calvin occasionally says that "Christ is the salvation of the world" (e.g., Tracts and Treatises, vol.II, p.47).
by the work of Christ. They will certainly enjoy the fruit of the atonement. This occurs when the atonement is 'made efficacious'. Note that Calvin here differentiates the times of sufficiency and efficiency. The death and passion of Christ 'were (i.e., have already been) sufficient for the salvation of the world'. The act of sufficiency is past and complete, but the act of efficiency is later: 'God will make them efficacious'. But we do not press this unduly, for sometimes Calvin speaks of efficiency in the atonement itself. For instance, elsewhere he states that "the one sacrifice effects sufficient atonement". In another place Calvin observes that "the death of Christ is universally efficacious for the expiation of sins". And again, "the reconciliation effected by Christ is extended to the Gentiles also". What Calvin means in these places is that the death of Christ actually effected a real payment and atonement and that this is on behalf of all men.

The death of Christ, according to Calvin, was efficacious at God's bar of justice but must also be efficacious in the life of an individual if that man is to receive the fruit of the atonement and actually be reconciled to God. In one place Calvin describes what happened in the life of a person when "God called him so suddenly", viz: "our Lord made effective for him His death and passion which He suffered and endured for all mankind". Now Calvin does not explicitly state here that the death and passion of Christ was 'sufficient' for any or all but he does say that it occurred 'for all mankind'. And this is past and contrasted with the later efficiency for an individual person. Nothing is

---

64. Comm on I Peter 2:24.
65. Comm on John 12:52. Calvin often states that Christ reconciled the world to God by His death: "He is the Mediator in whom He reconciles the world to Himself" (Comm on Matt. 17:5); "by the expiation of sins the world has been reconciled to God" (Comm on John 17:1); "God governs all this to reconcile the world to Himself by the death of the Son" (Comm on John 19:2); "The draught appointed to Christ was to suffer the death of the cross for the reconciliation of the world" (Comm on John 18:11). Similarly, "our condemnation is blotted out by Christ's, because it pleased the heavenly Father thus to reconcile mankind to Himself" (Comm on John 18:32). That Calvin uses the terminology of II Cor. 5:19 in this manner is significant, for he uses 'world' in its usual meaning and never, to our knowledge, does he feel the need to speak of II Cor. 5:19 as referring to 'the world of the elect' or other interpretations given by Particularists. Furthermore, as we saw with his understanding of redemption, reconciliation is in two stages: the atonement for all men and the application for the elect alone.
66. Deity, p.151. Comm on John 3:16: "faith embraces Christ with the efficacy of His death". See also Comm on I Peter 1:18. Eschatologically, "the effect and full fruition" is given when Christ returns (Sermons on Ephesians, p.78).
said about the number of those to whom the atonement is made effective. Our point is merely that here Calvin says that the atonement was made for all men and later becomes efficient for at least some.

The most debated instance of the 'sufficient-efficient' formula in Calvin is naturally that found in his Commentary on I John 2:2. It is best that we quote it in full:

He puts this in for amplification, that believers might be convinced that the expiation made by Christ extends to all who by faith embrace the Gospel. But here the question may be asked as to how the sins of the whole world have been expiated. I pass over the dreams of the fanatics, who make this a reason to extend salvation to all the reprobate and even to Satan himself. Such a monstrous idea is not worth refuting. Those who want to avoid this absurdity have said that Christ suffered sufficiently for the whole world but effectively only for the elect. This solution has commonly prevailed in the schools. Although I allow the truth of this, I deny that it fits this passage. For John's purpose was only to make this blessing common to the whole Church. Therefore, under the world 'all' he does not include the reprobate, but refers to all who would believe and those who were scattered through various regions of the earth. For, as is meet, the grace of Christ is really made clear when it is declared to be the only salvation of the world."

Several points must be made on this difficult paragraph. First, Calvin clearly believes that this verse refers to the application of the atonement, not the foundation. When he says that "the expiation ... extends to all who by faith embrace the Gospel", he uses the word 'extends' in the sense of 'applies' or 'effects'. As we saw in his comments on Rom. 5:18 and John 12:52, Calvin denies that the atonement 'extends to all' because 'not all receive him'. The application necessarily effects reception. Particularists usually use the phrase 'extent of the atonement' to refer to the identity of the subjects of the

---

67. Comm on I John 2:2. We have quoted from the Torrance edition but it does not differ substantially from the CTS edition. Some confusion has arisen over the wording of the text of the Commentary here due to A.H. Strong's citation in Systematic Theology, p.778. Strong attempts to show that Calvin teaches universal atonement in this verse and gives what purports to be a quotation from the Commentary. Much of Strong's quotation, however, is from Calvin's Commentary on Romans 5:18, which we have already quoted showing that it teaches the universal view. Strong either makes the mistake himself or relies on an unnamed source, but much of what he says is still correct. On Calvin and I John 2:2, see also Shank, Life in the Son, pp.353-354; Richards, p.310; Watts, Works, vol.VI, p.288; Daille, vol.II, p.1076; Cunningham, Reformers, p.400; Aiken, Judgement, p.207; Turretin, The Atonement of Christ, pp.170-171; Kirsch, James Morison, p.244. It will be seen that Calvin's comments are appealed to by those on both sides of the debate.
substitution of the atonement. That is, they identify the subjects of the intent with the subjects of the extent. For them, there is no distinction between those who have been elected, those for whom the Saviour died, and those to whom the atonement is applied with faith. However, here Calvin refers the 'extent' to the applicatory phase alone.

Secondly, we ask, Who are these 'fanatics'? He could be referring to those who 'extend salvation' to literally all and teach that literally all will eventually be saved, including Satan himself. Such a one would include Origen, who was no special favourite of Calvin's. The parallel explanation in On the Eternal Predestination of God (see below), however, explicitly refers to Georgius. Georgius evidently taught that all men will be saved and based this on I John 2:2. Calvin, of course, repeatedly denies universal salvation. Calvinistic Universalists and Dualists also rigidly deny universal salvation, so it is quite unlikely that Calvin was referring to those who taught universal atonement. The 'fanatics' are those who teach a universal application and ultimate salvation, not those who teach universal atonement.

Next Calvin more or less quotes the Lombardian formula, though without mentioning Lombard himself. Note, however, that he does say that this is the prevailing view among Schoolmen. Calvin knew his medieval scholasticism well and was obviously referring to the views of Lombard, Aquinas et al and not the minority theory of Abelard and Duns Scotus. As we saw above, Duns actually rejected the formula. The majority view was certainly not Particularist. Lombard and Aquinas, as we saw above, taught a universal atonement and limited application. The atonement is sufficient and universal; the application is efficient and particular. This matches the dual decree in eternity: God was willing to give Christ for all but not to all.

Furthermore, Calvin accepts the formula. This is crucial to our

68. Cf. Predestination, pp. 148-149. In his Comm on Col. 1:20 Calvin says that Christ died for all men and that the atonement is offered to all men but not to devils because He is not their peacemaker. Cf. Sermons on Job, p. 81. According to David Wright, "Several of the leading figures in the 'Radical Reformation' believed in at least the possibility of the ultimate salvation of all men, and even of demonic beings as well" (in Wright's edition of Bucer, Common Places, p. 104). So too G.H. Williams, The Radical Reformation, p. 843.

69. Lane (p. 30) corrects Kendall (p. 16) on this. See also Good, Are Baptists Calvinists?, p. 75; Buswell, Systematic Theology, vol. II, p. 141; Hodges, p. 52; Cunningham, Reformers, p. 397; J.K.S. Reid, Introduction to Calvin's Predestination, p. 36; W.S. Reid, 'Review of Kendall', pp. 159-160; ... Cont'd:
whole discussion. Some later Particularists who claimed Calvin felt that Aquinas and Lombard were Particularists because Calvin accepted theirs views on the atonement. These Particularists show a lack of understanding of what the Schoolmen actually taught. On the other hand, even Kendall, who feels that Calvin was a Universalist, says that the Schoolmen were Particularists and that Calvin rejected their formula. Of course it is agreed all around that Calvin rejected the rider to the formula attached by Aquinas, that the atonement becomes effective through the sacraments, good works and love in addition to faith. Calvin was solidly in the Reformation tradition of **sola fide**. The burden of proof, then, is on the Particularists to show that Calvin misunderstood the Schoolmen's theology when it comes to the basic formula.

Confusion arose among later Calvinists about the formula. Some accepted it and made it teach Particularism. Other came to see that Lombard and Aquinas meant it to be Universalist, or at least Dualist, and so they came to reject it. Lane correctly says that Beza "rejected the formula, while allowing that it could be given an acceptable meaning", but Lane incorrectly feels that the formula does not touch on the matter of infinite value. On the contrary, we earlier showed that Lombard and Aquinas identified infinite value and universal sufficiency in order to counter Abelard's view of finite value and limited sufficiency. But Lane is right to point out that the question of intent was in dispute.

It is curious that Calvin accepted the formula but denied its

---

Cont'd:...

Hyslop, *Ralph Wardlaw*, p.261; Klempa, pp.265-266; Godfrey, 'Reformed Thought on the Extent on the Atonement to 1618', p.137; Helm, *Calvin*, p.39. Thus, opinions vary on whether Calvin accepted the formula or not. Some of the differences of opinion arise out of misunderstandings about the formula itself; therefore we have traced its history in Chapter IX. Latham draws attention to the fact that Calvin does not actually use the formula; he only allows its validity and acknowledges its truth (Latham, vol.1, p.126). Technically Latham is correct, as he mentions only the **Comm** on I John 2:2 and Predestination. Nevertheless, as we show in this essay, Calvin seems quite satisfied with the formula. That he explicitly accepted its truth is plain; that he also implicitly refers to it in numerous other places is equally plain.

70. Ursinus is a good example of an early Reformed acceptance of the formula (**SUMMA*, 1601 edition, pp.525-529). Ursinus is closer to Calvin than is Beza, we feel. See Chapter IX, Sections A and C.


72. Lane, p.30. Cf. Davenant, p.416; and Chapter IX, Section A.
relevance to I John 2:2, for Aquinas and others based the formula on this very verse. While accepting the formula as it stands, Calvin prefers another interpretation of I John 2:2 that parallels his view of John 11:52. Both texts refer to the actual application of the atonement. The phrase 'the whole world' in both instances means 'the whole Church, irrespective of nationality, whether Jew or Gentile'. Some Particularists might see this as bolstering their theory that Calvin was a Particularist, forgetting that Calvin refers it to the application, not the atonement. That is, Calvin holds that I John 2:2 teaches that the atonement is applied to all Christians of every nation and to them alone, not to the reprobate or Satan. If it be asked, Does this not mean that Calvin always uses the phrase 'whole world' (and synonyms like world, all, mankind, human race, etc.) to mean 'the whole Church'? That is hardly possible for anyone and certainly not the case with Calvin. Calvin here explicitly says what he means by the phrase, whereas in other instances he explicitly takes the phrase in the other sense, and sometimes he does not give any explanations at all.73

Parallel with this whole discussion is Calvin's observation on the formula in On The Predestination of God. We quote it in its entirety:

Georgius thinks he argues very acutely when he says: Christ is the propitiation for the sins of the whole world; and hence those who wish to exclude the reprobate from participation in Christ must place them outside the world. For this, the common solution does not avail, that Christ suffered sufficiently for all, but efficaciously only for the elect. By this great absurdity, this monk has sought applause in his own fraternity, but it has no weight with me. Wherever the faithful are dispersed throughout the world, John extends to them the expiation wrought by Christ's death. But this does not alter the fact that the reprobate are mixed up with the elect in the world. It is incontestable that Christ came for the expiation of the sins of the whole world. But the solution lies close at hand, that whosoever believes in Him should not perish but should

73. Latham does not grasp that Calvin is speaking of the application of the atonement rather than the propitiatory aspect per se. Hence he errs in saying, "This statement ought to encourage us to think of those passages where Calvin appears to teach universal atonement in a slightly different light. If 'all' means all without distinction, as he says it does, rather than all without exception, Calvin cannot be said to have taught universal atonement" (vol.II, p.67). Bell correctly points out to Latham that in I John 2:2 Calvin is speaking of the reception of the atonement by faith, not the atonement as it concerns election (Bell, p.15). That is, according to Calvin, I John 2:2 speaks of the propitiation as applied to man, not as accepted by God.
have eternal life (John 3:15). For the present question is not how great the power of Christ is or what efficacy it has in itself, but to whom He gives Himself to be enjoyed.  

Some of the problems of this paragraph are due to the lack of inverted commas in both the original and the translation by Reid (above). Cole (Calvin's Calvinism) inserts quotation marks as follows: "Christ is the propitiation ... somewhere out of the world". If so, as we think it to be, then it is Calvin and not Georgius who refers to the 'common solution' (as he referred to it in his Commentary on I John 2:2). On the other hand, if one punctuated it as follows, "Christ ... elect", the conclusion is that it was Georgius and not Calvin who refers to the solution. Grammatically this is possible but we feel that it is unlikely.

Georgius's argument is this: all men will be saved because Christ died for all men. There is therefore no difference between elect and reprobate, for all are elect. In his opinion, those who believe in Calvin's doctrine of election and reprobation teach that only the former partake of the benefits of the atonement, presumably because Christ died only for the elect. Georgius says that I John 2:2 extends salvation to all men. The atonement will be applied to all those for whom Christ died. Georgius was no mere redemptive Universalist as were later Calvinistic Universalists, nor was he a mere Socinian or pre-Arminius Arminian; he was a strict Universalist. Perhaps he also suggested that even Satan would eventually be saved, as Origen held.

Calvin refutes Georgius as follows. Firstly, he says that "the common solution" (the Lombardian formula) "does not avail". Calvin is not saying that he rejects the common solution, as Kendall believes he does. He clearly accepted it in the Commentary on I John 2:2 and in both places he merely says that the solution does not apply to either I

74. Predestination, pp.148-149. This passage is briefly commented on by Helm, Calvin, p.22; and Doyle, pp.284-285.
75. Calvin's Calvinism, p.165. The problem of quotation marks may be compared with the difficulties of exegesis in John 3, Acts 19, etc.
76. Cole translates the phrase, "Now we will not permit the common solution of this question to prevail on the present occasion..." (Calvin's Calvinism, p.165). Letham feels that Calvin's acceptance of the Lombardian formula here is "entirely compatible with definite atonement" (vol. II, p.66). We grant that the formula has been accepted by many later Particularists, but many others have rejected it. What matters is what Calvin himself says about it in the context of the historical use before him. See Chapter IX.
John 2:2 or to the question at hand per se. Here, as there, he contends that John 2:2 refers only to the application, not to the atonement itself. The application is for men of all nations, as per John 11:52 (referred to in both instances). The sentence, "For this ... the elect" is parenthetical. Calvin's refutation really begins two sentences later. His argument is that Georgius misinterprets the verse. The true interpretation, says Calvin, is that the atonement will certainly 'extend' (be applied) to all the elect, the faithful.

Next Calvin says that the elect and reprobate are mixed together in the world, the world for which Christ came to expiate the sins. To him this is "incontestable". It appears that Calvin reverts to his usual use of "the whole world" at this point. Christ died for the whole world, elect and reprobate together, for both classes are mixed together in the whole world. Georgius's question becomes, "If then Christ died for all, will not the atonement be applied to all?" Georgius says yes, but Calvin says no. Calvin's reason is that only believers receive the atonement. Since not all will receive it, it does not 'extend' to all. Again he refers to John 3:15-16. Christ died for the world but unless it is applied and received, men will perish. There is not the slightest hint here that Calvin accepts the Particularist ex opere operato theory that all for whom Christ died will be saved, though he would agree that all to whom the atonement is applied will necessarily believe. Georgius is the one accepting an ex opere operato theory, even though it is Universalist in nature.

Finally Calvin agrees with Georgius about the infinite worth of the atonement. Both assert that the intrinsic 'efficacy' of the atonement is infinite; that is, Christ's death actually accomplished all that it intended to accomplish - payment for sin. This is the inherent sufficiency, not the application. The question under dispute is not the identity or number of those for whom the Saviour was given but rather those to whom the Saviour is given. Both Georgius and Calvin accept Universal atonement. But Georgius believes in a universal application and therefore a universal salvation. Calvin believes in a limited application and therefore a limited atonement. Note again that there are several differences between the way in which the passage is interpreted by Calvin and by the Particularists.

Another passage in Calvin touches on some of the motifs raised in
regard to I John 2:2, viz:

Christ was so ordained for the salvation of the whole world that He might save those who are given to Him by the Father, that He might be their life whose head He is, and that He might receive those into participation of His benefits whom God by His gratuitous good pleasure adopted as heirs for Himself ... We read everywhere that He diffuses life only to members of His ... the virtues of Christ belongs only to the sons of God. Even those opposed to men will concede that the universality of the grace of Christ is not better judged than from the preaching of the Gospel. But the solution of the difficulty lies in seeing how the doctrine of the Gospel offers salvation to all. That it is salvific for all I do not deny. But the question is whether the Lord in His counsel here destines salvation equally for all."

Helm takes this passage to mean that Calvin must have believed that Christ died only for 'the children of God' (the elect), and asks, "And why should Christ be said to die for all, or for the whole world, if the purpose of his death, the provision of life is to be confined to the elect?" Our answer is as follows. Firstly, it is evident that Calvin is mainly dealing with the problem of the two wills of God. How can God will some to be saved in one will but not in the other? Pighius, his opponent, asserts that, "That Christ, the redeemer of the whole world, commands the Gospel to be preached promiscuously to all does not seem congruent with special election" (Calvin's summary of Pighius).

Note that Pighius starts with the assumptions that Christ is the redeemer of the world (all men everywhere) and that the Gospel is to be preached to all men indiscriminately. Note also that Calvin does not reject these assumptions; indeed, acceptance of them is fundamental to his reply. Neither person is suggesting any incongruity between universal redemption (atonement) and universal evangelism. A Particularist, however, would disagree and argue that universal atonement means that all will necessarily be saved (because all for whom Christ died will definitely be saved), and hence there would be no need for evangelism. They therefore reject the universality of the atonement. They would disagree with what Pighius and Calvin are in agreement on, namely that universal evangelism demands universal

78. Helm, Calvin, pp.19-20.
That Calvin accepts universal redemption here is seen in his words "Christ was so ordained for the salvation of the whole world". Just before this Calvin said that Pighius taught that Christ is 'the redeemer of the whole world' and Calvin does not differentiate his 'whole world' from Pighius's 'whole world'. According to a Particularist interpreter, Calvin makes such a distinction, but we fail to see where. What Calvin says in effect is this: Christ died for all men, for unless He did He could not be the redeemer of the elect, for the elect are scattered and mixed with the reprobate. Calvin is not saying that God's division occurs in the atonement but in the secret counsel on the one hand and in the work of the Holy Spirit in the Gospel on the other.

To say that Christ died for all with a special intention of gaining a few is not Particularism, for Particularism denies that Christ died for all. In fact, Calvin's words here may well be a rare instance in which he accepts the Dualist position (that Christ died for all, especially the elect). We refrain, however, from making a final conclusion on this point because Calvin does not dwell on it. Rather, he discusses the alleged incongruity between the secret will of election and the revealed will of evangelism. One is Particular, the other Universal. Pighius refuses to accept such a distinction. Pighius does not charge Calvin with explicitly limiting the atonement. Rather, he seems to be saying that by Particularizing the secret will Calvin logically must particularize the revealed will in a way which Calvin does not want to do. Calvin refuses to accept the consequences of his position as suggested by Pighius. In our opinion, Calvin would have refused to accept the position of the Particularists as well, as their position closely parallels the one which Pighius suggests at times is what Calvin's view leads to.

The preceding section is admittedly a difficult one. However, one aid to the interpretation is the fact that immediately after this passage Calvin deals with I Tim. 2.

While we are touching on Calvin's views of I John 2:2 we will mention in passing a recent theory advocated by Kendall. He suggests

79. Kendall, pp.14-18. On Christ's intercession, see Klempa, The Obedience of Christ in the
that Calvin taught that Christ died on earth for all men but interceded in heaven only for the elect. This may be true, but Kendall hits some difficulties. Calvin indeed states in his Commentary that the prayer of John 17:9 ('I pray not for the world') is limited to the elect alone, but he also feels that the prayer of Luke 23:34 ('Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do') is unlimited and refers "to all indiscriminately". The difference governing the limitation is not merely the dichotomy between Christ's priestly work on earth and His work in the heavenly sanctuary, but between the subjects of His prayer and the content of the prayers. It is possible that Calvin feels that Christ prayed for all men in Luke 23:34 because this was a prayer in the context of atonement and forgiveness, whereas that in John 17:9 concerned the unity of the elect with Christ and the Father.

Moving on, we admit that Calvin regularly follows Scripture in speaking of Christ dying for the Church, His sheep, us, and so forth. But we have not found any instances in which Calvin explicitly states that Christ died only for the Church, etc. Calvinistic Universalists themselves use the words of Scripture saying that He died for the Church, His sheep, and so on, but they deny that He died only for these. Dualists such as Davenant, Amyraut, Baxter and Douty agree that Christ died for all and add that He died especially for the Church, etc. But we do not find even this limitation explicitly stated in Calvin. To show that Calvin said that the atonement was for the Church no more proves his alleged Particularism than pointing out that Scripture speaks in these terms proves that Scripture asserts Particularism. We remind our readers of our comments on Gal. 2:20. Paul confesses that Christ died... Theology of John Calvin, pp.321-328. Helm considers Kendall's theory "novel and unprecedented". We do not recall reading it before, not even in the Amyraldian Controversy. Helm argues that it is basically inconsistent and does not fit the evidence (Calvin, pp.32-50) and we partly agree but for opposite reasons. That is, we feel that Calvin taught a universal intercession which matches a universal atonement, while Helm thinks that both are limited. Helm, however, is correct in saying that Calvin does not differentiate the extent of the two. Kendall's theory needs more documentation and criticism; neither he nor Helm have investigated it to the depth it deserves. Perhaps they or another will research it further in the future.

80. Helm concedes ground on this point, thusly: "To say, in Calvin's typical fashion, that 'Christ died for us' is certainly compatible with the statement, 'Christ died for the elect'. But as it stands it is also compatible with 'Christ died for all men'. A precision that is out of keeping with the style should not be expected. Yet Calvin's over-all position is strikingly clear" (Calvin, p.13). Some other Particularists would not be so frank on this.
for him, but he does not say only for him; indeed, elsewhere he adds the Church and 'all' men (see below).

Cunningham\(^1\) gives two reasons for feeling that Calvin did not teach Universal atonement: (1) "Calvin consistently, unhesitatingly, and explicitly denied the doctrine of God's universal grace and love to all men ... as implying in some sense a desire or purpose or intention to save them all"; (2) Calvin interpreted the so-called 'Universal atonement' passages in Scripture in such a way that cannot be construed as teaching Universalism. We find the latter reason quite incredible in the light of the many quotations we have supplied in this excursus. Cunningham rarely even refers to such documentary evidence but prefers to rest on deduction. The former assertion demands a few comments.

We find it surprising that Cunningham would claim that Calvin believed in only one form of grace, namely special grace. This is as dubious as the claim by others that Calvin believed only in universal (common) grace. In fact we feel confident in thinking that Calvin held to both universal and special grace. This matches his views of the two 'wills' of God - an important dichotomy in Calvin's theology.

Cunningham may be in confusion about the exact position of the Calvinistic Universalists and Dualists on the matter of grace. In one place, he says that they are in agreement with "Calvinistic doctrines upon other points" (i.e., other than the extent of the atonement), but later implies that they hold to Universal grace in such a way which logically challenges the doctrine of election. In fact, these men held to two kinds of grace: universal and special grace.

Now Calvin often roots the atonement in the love of God, as all parties agree. In one place, he even seems to assert what Cunningham would make him say:

\[
\text{Christ laid down His life for strangers, yet He already loved them; otherwise He would not have died for them.}\]

\(^81\) Cunningham, Reformers, pp.398-400.
\(^82\) Com. on John 15:13. On Christ dying for His enemies, see Sermons on Job, p.597; Com. on Rom. 5:6-10; Institutes, II, 16, 2-4; II, 17, 2.
This deserves comment. Calvin is seeking to show that Christ's atonement did not cause God or Himself to begin loving those for whom Christ died. Rather, it was out of love in the first place that Christ was sent, came and died. Christ died for His friends even while they were enemies, for God's grace loved them while they were still sinners. The contrast is not between the elect (friends) and non-elect (strangers), for Calvin says that Christ died for strangers. The Particularist argument would imply that He then died only for the non-elect(?), but that is absurd. Instead, the point Calvin makes is that Christ died for those for whom He died when they were still enemies. This seems to be a reference to Rom. 5:6-10. He loved and died for them as enemies and in this is the glory of grace. If Christ died for them as friends (i.e., those who loved Him), there is no extra virtue in what Christ did on the cross. But the glory of the atonement is that Christ died for men as sinners, not as elect or reprobate. We sense in this and other places that Calvin grounds the atonement in the universal love of God, not the special love of God for the elect. This would place the decree of atonement before that of election/reprobation (as Universalists contend), not vice-versa (as Particularists contend).

Armstrong suggests that Calvinistic Particularism arose as a result of a 'logical' deduction from the deterministic view of divine sovereignty that produced supralapsarianism. But, he adds, Calvin escaped Particularism because he was not so 'logical'. He may well be correct. We will not enter here into the complicated discussion about whether Calvin was ever a Supralapsarian, but we do agree that there is more 'logic' (especially syllogisms, probably due to Ramus) to be found in the theology of Beza, Perkins, Ames and the Hyper-Calvinists. All of these, incidentally, accepted Supralapsarianism.

83. Armstrong, p.138. Cf. Toon, HC, p.15; Hodges, The Doctrine of the Mediator, p.52. Doyle says that when Calvin felt that there might possibly be any disharmony between the doctrines of election/reprobation and universal atonement, he placed the emphasis on the universal scope of the atonement and would not compromise on its relation to the public manifestation of Christ in the Gospel (Doyle, pp.281-282, 284). We agree with Doyle also on his observation that Calvin evidently placed the decree of universal atonement before the decree of election/reprobation. As is well known, the first edition of the Institutes had Calvin's treatment of election before his discussion of atonement, but in later editions this order was reversed - for election must be viewed in relation to faith. This would illustrate his views of the decrees, except that we do not feel that Calvin was ever Supralapsarian or Particularist. He simply came to see the Biblical order. Note how the Westminster Confession places the discussion on election (III) before that of atonement (VIII), clearly illustrating its view that the election decree precedes that of the atonement decree. Cf. Doyle, pp.279, 282-283.
Some Calvin scholars suggest that there were no debates about the extent of the atonement until Dort, or at least not in the Reformed community. This does not fit the historical evidence. For example, Luther appears to have held to limited atonement in his early years while still in the Roman Catholic Church. Though he expressed this position in his Lectures on Romans, it is plain that he very quickly rejected particular redemption and thereafter regularly taught universal atonement. We do not know of any further debates about the extent of the atonement within Lutheran churches, but even in Calvin's own lifetime there were those who were identified with the Swiss branch of the Reformation who taught the limited scheme, notable Beza and possibly Zanchius.

We admit, however, that the heat of the controversies arose after Calvin's lifetime but we see it the exact opposite as certain Calvinists do. That is, they posit that the Reformation was uniformly Particularist; Universalism with regard to the atonement was a later accretion put forth in the post-Calvin era. Usually Arminius is named as the first, or one of the first, exponents of this view within Reformed circles. Consequently, they see Particularism as being orthodox Calvinism and Universalist/Dualist Calvinism as being a minority heresy.

Their analysis does not fit the facts. As we saw in Chapter IX, with the exception of the early Luther, Particularism was virtually unknown in the Reformation until it was introduced by Beza and Zanchius and even then it was the minority viewpoint. And even through the seventeenth century, Calvinistic Universalists/Dualists were by no means the small minority they are often pictured to be. Moreover, our contention is that it was the Low and not the High Calvinists who were in the correct tradition of the leading Reformers, especially Calvin.

We sometimes read that Arminianism was the first attempt to teach Universal Atonement within the Reformed churches. Actually, there were several writers before Arminius who taught the basics of the system called Arminianism. Several of them were even more radical, namely Pighius, Georgius, and Bolsec. It is plain that they were Romanist, but their debates with Calvin centred on election and not the extent of the atonement."

84. Calvin's debates with Pighius and Georgius are examined in this essay because there is ... Cont'd;
Hence their views respecting the atonement were basically the ones presented at Trent - and Calvin did not reject the Trent decree on atonement, even though it was expressly universalist in nature. If we were to speculate on the question, we would tend to say that Calvin would have disagreed with the majority at Dort. This is not to say that he was in agreement with the Remonstrants. He probably would have been in sympathy with Bishop Davenant.

Cunningham and A.A. Hodge ignore most of the examples we have quoted thus far. Hodge dismisses them as irrelevant: "It is true that at times Calvin uses general terms with respect to the design of Christ's death, in a more unguarded manner than would now be done by one of his consistent disciples". We accept that on some points, such as the Supralapsarian issue, Calvin was not as precise as later Calvinists have been. This could be because of his less 'logical' method. Hodge goes on to state that "... one deliberate statement limiting the design of Christ's death is sufficient to define the sense of any finite number of vague and indefinite expressions..."

We have mentioned a few such instances to which a Particularist with the methodological presuppositions of Cunningham and Hodge could appeal. In fact, however, they have not even used these. Let us add another and give the sense. In his comments on I Peter 2:22 Calvin says:

... if anyone boasts of his own innocence, Christ did not suffer as a punishment for his misdeeds.

---

85. The Atonement, p.359. Engelsa (pp.75-76) apparently takes the same position, though he adds that Calvin opened the door to universalism by such statements. Douty tersely remarks that "some of John Calvin's statements have been an embarrassment to 'Calvinists' for more than three centuries" (pp.116-117). Cf. Godfrey, 'Reformed Thought', p.138; Kirsch, p.243.

86. The Atonement, p.360.

87. Comm on I Peter 2:22. As the latter verses of I Peter 2 are an exposition of Isaiah 53, Calvin's comments on both passages help shed light on each other. His comments on I Peter 1:19-20 and in Tracts and Treatises, vol.II, p.45, are also pertinent.
We would expect the Particularist to interpret this in this fashion: Calvin says that Christ did not suffer for those who boast of their own innocence; but some men boast of their innocence (through sin and unbelief); therefore Christ did not die for them; and if Christ did not die for these, then it is not true that He died for all men. In fact, however, this is close to the very opposite from what Calvin asserts here. This interpretation goes entirely against the context. The context is not about sinners boasting of their innocence, but of Christ boasting of His innocence. Christ suffered a perfect death because He was innocent and did not assert His innocence. This, says Calvin, is what the text means in its words, 'Christ also suffered for us ... who did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth'. We would paraphrase Calvin's words as follows: 'those who assert their innocence when unjustly charged do indeed suffer unjustly but this can have no merit for others; it was necessary that Christ remain silent in order to provide a substitutionary death'. We might also bring out another aspect of Calvin's words about boasting as follows: 'if Christ had opened His mouth and boasted of His innocence, then He would have been guilty of pride and not innocent after all; and if not innocent, then He suffered for His own misdeeds and not for ours'. In some other places Calvin touches on this motif:

... the death and passion of our Lord Jesus would not have served anything, to wipe away the iniquities of the world, except insofar as He obeyed...

It is that He must be the Redeemer of the world. He must be condemned, indeed, not for having preached the Gospel, but for us He must be oppressed...

Note that in these places Calvin asserts Universal atonement.

88. Deity, p.156. Cf. Institutes, II, 16, 5. One often finds in Calvin the motif of Christ's necessary obedience in relation to the atonement, e.g.: "The Son of God did willingly submit Himself to death that he might reconcile the world unto the Father" (quoted in Dunn, Christian Theology: By John Calvin, p.124); "By this He did not suit His own advantage, but won acquittal for the whole human race" (Comm on Matt. 27:12). "It was this obedience that made His death a sacrifice of sweet savour for expiating all sins" (Comm on John 19:12). Note the continuing theme of obedience and submission before Pilate's tribunal, for with Calvin this was a type of submission to God's tribunal – Christ was judged a sinner in our place. See Klepa, The Obedience of Christ in the Theology of John Calvin.

89. Deity, p.95. This is another reference to Isaiah 53.
We now come to another important quotation from Calvin. This is the "very explicit denial of the universality of the atonement" to which Cunningham appeals as the only example he could find. In a refutation of the Lutheran writer Heshusius on the true partaking of the Lord's body at the Supper, Calvin offers this argument:

But the first thing to be explained is, how Christ is present with unbelievers, as being the spiritual food of souls, and, in short, the life and salvation of the world. And as he adheres so doggedly to the words, I should like to know how the wicked can eat the flesh which was not crucified for them? and how they can drink the blood which was not shed to expiate their sins? I agree with him, that Christ is present as a strict judge when his supper is profaned. But it is one thing to be eaten, and another to be a judge ... Christ, considered as the living bread and the victim immolated on the cross, cannot enter any human body which is devoid of his Spirit.

We cannot ignore this example, as Davenant, Morison, Douty and Kendall do. Several options are open to us at the outset. First, this

---

90. Reformers, p. 396. This is probably one of the "explicit statements" Engelsma refers to without quoting (p. 75). After stating that "This is a very explicit denial of the universality of the atonement", Cunningham adds "But it stands alone — so far as we know — in Calvin's writings, and for this reason we do not find much upon it" (Reformers, p. 396). This seems to contradict what he said earlier on the same page: "we do not find in Calvin's writings explicit statements as to any limitation in the atonement, or the number of those for whom Christ died". And later on the same page: "he has not usually given any distinct indication, that he believed in any limitation as to the objects of the atonement". Some critics might be forgiven for supposing that it is Cunningham and not Calvin who fails to give distinct and consistent affirmations on the subject in question. Note further that in dismissing Daille's evidence he castigates him with respect to 'consistency' (p. 401). The quotation is mentioned in Lane, p. 30; A.A. Hodge, The Atonement, p. 360; Helm, Calvin, p. 21; Letham, vol. I, p. 126; Bell, pp. 15-17; and others. It strikes us as very strange indeed that those such as Cunningham could search so widely among the many writings of Calvin — as we assume they have — and can only produce this solitary quotation which, from their point of view, is obscure at best. Cunningham may sense the embarrassment of this difficult situation by confessing that it stands alone and should not weigh for much. It would be stranger still if in fact this is the only hint at all in which Calvin touches on the whole question of extent. This is why we again stress the absolute importance of repeated, explicit quotations. Surely to argue on the basis of this solitary quote, no matter what it means, against the flood of the rest of the testimony is precarious at best.

91. We quote from the Tracts and Treatises (CTS edition), vol. II, p. 527. This was the translation available to Cunningham and Hodge, although the former quotes the Latin and the latter offers what seems to be his own translation. Lane and Helm refer to the more recent translation in J.K.S. Reid, Theological Treatises, p. 285.

92. Kendall briefly refers to Cunningham's article but has been chided in reviews for failing to discuss this quotation. Cunningham: "we do not recollect to have seen it adverted to except by a single popish writer" (Reformers, p. 396).
paragraph could teach limited atonement. If so, then either Calvin contradicts his other statements espousing Universal atonement (perhaps without knowing it) or has changed his views on the subject. After all, differences and changes are not entirely without example in Calvin. The tract was written in 1561, a late work. The second option is that affirmed by Cunningham and A.A. Hodge. They feel that this proves that Calvin did not teach Universal atonement. The "vague and indefinite statements" about the atonement written in "a more unguarded manner" must be interpreted in the light of this one explicit statement. Calvin's other statements are then interpreted as Particularist. The third option is that the quotation above does not teach Particularism, though Calvin elsewhere teaches it. The fourth option is that neither in this place nor anywhere else does Calvin assert limited atonement. We seek to prove that the last option is the correct one.

We need not go into much depth on Calvin's views of the Supper, for that has been done by others at considerable length. We do not have access to the original propositions of Heshusius, but they can be deduced from what Calvin says in reply.

Being a Lutheran, Heshusius taught consubstantiation. This means that all who eat the bread and drink the wine at the Table do actually eat and drink Christ, for Christ is really present in, with and under the elements. Calvin, of course, does not accept Christ's presence at the Table in this way. Christ is spiritually present, says Calvin, and therefore linked with the Word rather than with the elements. This is what Calvin is seeking to prove in the tract. Since Christ is present only in a spiritual sense, He is eaten only in a spiritual sense. And that spiritual eating is done by faith alone. No man truly eats

---

93. Lane seems to imply this (p.30) as well as Strong (p.778) - only the latter does so in reverse, that Calvin changed from Particularism to Universalism. In this, Strong is followed by those such as Baker who rely on his evidence, which has been shown to be faulty.

94. Hodge, The Atonement, pp.359-360. Cf. Hals, Calvin, p.13. Is it possible that Calvin's 'unguarded manner' is due to his less Scholastic approach? Kendall and others contend that Particularist Calvinists rely on a Scholastic logic. Crisp's bold style is certainly not Scholastic: we feel that it has more in common with that of Luther and that of Calvin. See Chapter II above.

95. Three notable studies should be consulted; McDonnell, John Calvin, The Church and The Eucharist; Wallace, Calvin's Doctrine of the Word and Sacrament; and Barclay, The Protestant Doctrine of the Lord's Supper. See also the relevant sections in the biographies and general studies of Calvin. Fortunately, Calvin himself wrote at length on the subject, so the researcher has a plethora of material to study.
(receives) Christ except through faith." Unbelievers therefore do not eat Christ at all. They are, however, judged by Christ at the Table for their lack of faith. Their judgement for daily lack of faith is compounded when they partake of the elements because the Sacrament is the ultimate expression of personal communion between a believer and His Lord. An unbeliever pretending to be a believer thus insults Christ Himself. Christ certainly is present at the Table but He judges unbelievers because of their unbelief, not because they eat the elements and Himself.

Other passages in Calvin's work bear special relevance to the interpretation of the passage in question. One is in the Institutes. There Calvin deals with the question of unbelievers 'eating Christ': "However, I should like to know from them how long they (the wicked) retain it (the true body of Christ) when they have eaten it". Note the same introductory phrase, "I should like to know..." In the Institutes quotation, what follows the introductory phrase is something that Calvin denies - that the wicked actually eat and retain Christ. He is not accepting that the wicked actually eat and retain Christ; the inquiry is rhetorical. We feel, therefore, that the instance with Heshusius must be interpreted as parallel in form and content. In the Institutes

96. Cf. Institutes, IV, 17, 33; Comm on John 6, etc. Though we eat Christ by faith, faith itself is not the eating (Comm on John 6:35), for "spiritually to eat the flesh of Christ is something greater and more excellent than to believe" (Tracts and Treatises, vol. II, p. 553) and "eating differs from faith, inasmuch as it is an effect of faith" (ibid., p. 283).

97. IV, 17, 33. In at least two other places in his works Calvin uses this phrase 'I should like to know' with reference to the Supper. "I should like to know to what end Christ invites us to partake of his flesh and blood in the Supper, if it be not that he may feed our souls" (Tracts and Treatises, vol. II, p. 378). Note that the second clause includes what Calvin denies ('if it be not...'). Later he says this: "I should like to know whether, according to them, this communion belongs indiscriminately to unbelievers as well as to believers" (ibid., p. 415). Again he rejects what is in the query, for Calvin holds that the communion belongs only to believers.

98. In the Treatises quotation, Battles/Reid correctly omit the question mark which the CTS translator inserts. Both are, in fact, sentences which are rhetorical enquiries. Recognizing the form of the construction, we feel, is vital. For example, Alan Clifford (in private correspondence) exegetes the passages differently from ourselves while denying that the passage restricts the atonement in the way thought by Cunningham and Helm. Clifford feels that the clause "as he adheres so doggedly to the words" means that "the flesh" in the second clause refers to the literal element in the Supper rather than that which was crucified for them. He paraphrases the passage thusly: "If our Lord's words are to be taken literally, are we to imagine that the actual bread and the actual wine about which he spoke were crucified? How can the wicked (or anyone else for that matter) eat that 'flesh' and drink that 'blood' since the elements themselves were not 'crucified' for their sins. Christ himself was crucified for them, not the symbolic elements." Clifford sees the debate at this juncture as centering around Consubstitution rather than faith, if we understand him rightly. There is something to be said for his interpretation, but we feel that it does not do full justice to the rhetorical construction, ...
quotation, the second clause (that the wicked eat and retain Christ) is asserted by the protagonist; in the Treatise quotation the second clause (that the wicked eat the flesh which was not crucified for them) is asserted by Heshusius, not by Calvin.

When Calvin says that Heshusius "adheres so doggedly to the words", he refers to the Lutheran exegesis which interprets literally Scriptures like 'Take, eat. This is my body'. (Matt. 26:26) and the verses in John 6 (esp. vss. 35, 51, 53, 54, 55, 56). It is on the basis of this literalising that Heshusius asserts that even the wicked eat Christ. But Calvin does not interpret these verses literally but spiritually. What Calvin is denying is that these verses are to be interpreted literally and that the wicked eat Christ. He is not denying that the flesh of Christ was crucified for the wicked. Lutherans such as Heshusius, of course, did not deny Universal atonement. Something else, therefore, is being said about the atonement and those for whom Christ died.

Cunningham probably wishes to insert a comma after 'flesh', viz: 'I should like to know how the wicked can eat the flesh, which was not crucified for them'. This would make a subordinate clause with a separate assertion, as if there were possibly two sentences: '... how the wicked can eat the flesh. The flesh was not crucified for them'. But that is not what Calvin is saying. This punctuation would make it more probable that it was Calvin who was making the assertion in the second clause of the inquiry. But we have argued that this clause belongs to Heshusius. What then is he saying?

To answer this we turn to another important parallel. In his Commentary on I Cor. 11:24, Calvin notes:

... the Supper is a mirror which represents Christ crucified to us, so that a man cannot receive the Supper and enjoy the benefits, unless he embraces Christ

Cont'd...

the flow of Calvin's argument, or the parallel passages. Doyle seems to follow our interpretation: "Calvin is using a stunning piece of hyperbole, which for its potency depends, in turn, on a belief in a universal scope of the atonement" (p.277). And yet Doyle hesitates on this, adding that this is a 'blunt denial' that Christ died for the wicked and that "here Calvin flatly contradicts himself, perhaps due to the heated and protracted nature of the controversy he is conducting with Heshusius" (pp.276-277). Unfortunately, Doyle does not elaborate his views. Bell also thinks that this is hyperbole (p.17).
Here Calvin says that true eating is dependent upon embracing Christ crucified. Often he defines this as believing that Christ was crucified for oneself. For instance:

For it is not enough that Jesus Christ suffered in His person and was made a sacrifice for us; but we must be assured of it by the Gospel; we must receive that testimony and doubt not that we have righteousness in Him, knowing that He has made satisfaction for our sins.  

Calvin says the same thing in his comments on Mark 14:24, which describes the Last Supper:

So when we come to the holy table not only should the general idea come to our mind that the world is redeemed by the blood of Christ, but also each should reckon to himself that his own sins are covered.

Calvin says that the faith which truly partakes of Christ's body at the Table is the same faith which justifies.  

---

99. Comm on I Cor. 11:24. Cf. Kendall, p.18. The mirror motif is prominent in Calvin's works. Christ is the mirror of God and man; only through Christ does man know God and thereby himself. Christ is the mirror of election, therefore He is also the pledge of salvation (Predestination, p.127). He is also the mirror and pledge of divine love and grace (Comm on John 15:9) and the Gospel is the mirror in which we see Christ (Letters, vol.III, p.23). Hence, one knows Christ and God through the Gospel but this faith must include the persuasion 'Christ died for me' because the mirror also shows us ourselves. The Supper is, as it were, a visible picture of the Gospel and therefore true partaking includes faith that Christ died for oneself. "Now our heavenly Father, to succour us in this, gives us the Supper as a mirror, in which we may contemplate our Lord Jesus Christ, crucified to take away our faults and offences" (Tracts and Treatises, vol.II, p.168). And "the Supper is given us as a mirror in which we may contemplate Jesus Christ crucified in order to deliver us from condemnation" (ibid., p.169). Similarly, "the Supper is a solemn memorial of the redemption which has been purchased for us" (ibid., p.210). Since redemption is by grace, the sacraments are "mirrors in which we may contemplate the riches of the grace which God bestows upon us" (Institutes, IV, 14, 6).

100. Sermons on Isaiah, p.117 (cf. pp.128, 131). See also Comm on John 3:16, "Faith embraces Christ with the efficacy of His death". Similarly, Sermons on Deuteronomy, p.299. See Chapter IX, Section C and below.

101. Comm on Mark 14:24. Note the explicit universalism (see above). The Commentary on the parallel in Matt. 25:26 adds little to our discussion at this point except to reaffirm that true eating is by faith. Cf. Sermons on Galatians, pp.106-107.

102. The faith of justification is "not doubting but that our sins are forgiven us for our Lord Jesus Christ's sake", with special reference to the atonement, meaning faith says 'I believe in Christ who died for me' (Sermons on Deuteronomy, p.167). The Roman Catholic error of justification is reflected in its wrong view of the Supper and its statements about faith and the atonement. The Mass re-cruccifies Christ and thereby rejects the only atonement. Faith, therefore, becomes impossible because the Mass is substituted for the atonement. "By means whereof the death... Cont'd:
grounded in the Gospel and the atonement. We are to renew that faith at the Table by faith in the Word about the cross. This means that we again believe that Christ satisfied for our sins and thereby covered them. This is embracing Christ crucified: believing that Christ died for us. Without this faith, there is no true partaking at the Table. This is contrary to the Particularist theory. Particularism denies that saving faith believes that Christ was crucified for oneself; consequently it further denies that this conviction is necessary for the true partaking of Christ at the Table. This represents a radical departure from Calvin on the Sacrament of the Supper.

We would paraphrase the words in the Treatise quotation as follows: 'I should like to know how the wicked can eat the flesh of Christ if they do not believe that Christ was crucified for them'. It is Heshusius, not Calvin, who claims that a person can truly eat without this faith. This is not to make Heshusius a Particularist. Not at all. But Heshusius and Particularists share the conviction that one need not believe that Christ was crucified for oneself in order to partake truly of the Supper and Christ.

What about Calvin's words here about the Spirit? How do we explain them? Calvin is simply saying that there is no true eating without the Spirit within oneself, for the plain reason that there is no faith without the Spirit. This is also brought out in the Commentary on I Cor. 11:27. There Calvin argues that without the Spirit, no one truly eats Christ. Some weak believers eat unworthily but they still do eat, for even weak

Cont'd:...

and passion of our Lord Jesus Christ was utterly defaced, in spite of the redemption that he had wrought. Inasmuch that if it be admitted that Jesus Christ was sacrificed daily; it is all one to reject the benefit that was purchased us by his death and passion" (Sermons on Deuteronomy p.311).

103. Also: "Indeed the death of Christ was death for the whole world, and that is surely supernatural" (Comm., on Heb. 8:2). Christ is portrayed in the Supper, therefore "We maintain that in the sacrament Christ is eaten in no other way but spiritually" (Tracts and Treatises, vol.II, p.374). In order for one to eat spiritually one must have the Holy Spirit. Calvin therefore rebukes those who "insist that Christ is received by the wicked, to whom they do not concede one particle of the Spirit of Christ" (ibid., p.234). And in a nearly exact parallel to the passages in disput, Calvin again stresses the place of the Spirit: "And in fact it were grossly absurd to hold that Jesus Christ is received by those who are entire strangers to him, and that the wicked eat his body and drink his blood while destitute of his Spirit... Their offence then is that they rejected Christ when he was presented to them" in the Gospel (ibid., p.158). They eat unworthily not because they eat elements which portray what was not crucified for them, but because they do not have the Spirit, because they do not believe that Christ was crucified for them, and because they do not believe the Gospel. Cf. Institutes, IV, 17, 33.
believers have the Spirit and are united to Christ. The wicked may have historical faith that Christ died but this is not enough to truly partake of Christ. But this is not disputed by Cunningham.

Cunningham's only support, then, actually teaches the very opposite. Calvin taught that one must believe that Christ died for oneself and that the only way we can know this is for the Gospel to tell us. Though the Gospel does not specify individuals (this man or that man) or particular men, it does say that Christ died for all men. The believer knows that he is a man and therefore that Christ died for him. Saving faith accepts this. The conclusion is that without a Universal atonement no man can know by the Gospel that Christ died for him. In this sense we can agree with Kendall's introductory sentence to his first chapter: "Fundamental to the doctrine of faith in John Calvin (1509-64) is his belief that Christ died indiscriminately for all men".

Of special importance here is Calvin's interpretation of Galatians 2:20, "I live by the faith of (or in) the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me". We have previously seen that Particularists are forced to make this confession the pinnacle or 'pleropheryl of faith. For them it is the full assurance of faith, but it is not of the essence of saving faith. But the very opposite is true with Calvin. For him, this

104. Union to Christ is vital to true partaking, for it is associated with believing that Christ died for oneself (cf. Gal. 2:20). Calvin explains: "We confess that the holy supper of our Lord is a testimony of the union which we have with Jesus Christ, inasmuch as not only he died and rose from the dead for us, but also truly feeds and nourishes us with his flesh" (Letters, vol. III, p.376). Also, "under the symbols of bread and wine an exhibition of the body and blood of Christ is held forth; and we are not merely reminded that Christ was once offered on the cross for us, but that sacred union is ratified to which it is owing that his death is our life" (Tracts and Treatises, vol.II, p.574). This principle is shown in reverse in the example of Judas. He was at the Supper and ate the elements but he did this wickedly because he was never in union with Christ, neither did he truly believe in Him. Therefore Judas did not feed on Christ, as Peter did. Most Particularists deny that Judas was at the Table (see Chapter IX), but Calvin explicitly says that he was (e.g. Tracts and Treatises, vol.II, pp.93, 297, 370-371, 378; Comm on Matt. 26:21, John 6:56). Kuiper mentions that Calvin felt that Judas was there but not in union with Christ, but Kuiper fails to see the problem (For Whom Did Christ Die?, p.68). The problem for Particularists is that at the Supper Christ said, "This is my body, which is broken for you". If Judas was there, Christ therefore said that He died for him. And if He died for Judas, then it was not for the elect alone, for Judas was not elect. But this was no problem for Calvin. Luther, another Universalist, also held that Judas was present. But Bucer questions this, adding that in any case the words of the 'Bold Proclamation' did not apply to Judas. See Common Places, pp.330-332; and Chapter IX above.

105. Kendall, p.13. Kendall's study on Calvin and the atonement is very brief but it is the first chapter of what has proven to be a very controversial book. Yet evidently he saw some of the implications of Calvin's doctrines of faith and assurance which we have investigated in this paper.
confession is essential to saving faith. Let Calvin speak for himself here:

It is not enough to regard Christ as having died for the salvation of the world; each man must claim the effect and possession of this grace for himself personally.¹⁰⁶

And he contenteth not himself to say, that Christ gave himself for the world in common, for that had been but a slender saying: but (sheweth that) every of us must apply to himself particularly, the virtue of the death and passion of our Lord Jesus Christ. Whereas it is said that the Son of God was crucified, we must not only think that the same was done for the Redemption of the world: but also every of us must on his own behalf join himself to our Lord Jesus Christ, and conclude, It is for me that he hath suffered... But when we once know that the thing was done for the redemption of the whole world, pertaineth to every of us severally: it behoveth every of us to say also on his own behalf, The son of God hath loved me so dearly, that he hath given himself to death for me... we be very wretches if we accept not such a benefit when it is offered to us... Lo here a warrant for our salvation, so as we ought to think ourselves thoroughly assured of it.¹⁰⁷

Several comments are in order here. First, note that in the first quotation Calvin says that the effect of the atonement occurs when the grace of salvation is possessed personally by the believer. This concurs with our earlier comments about the atonement being efficacious only for believers. But the implication is surely that no man can possess this grace without the conviction that Christ died for the whole world. Particularists, on the other hand, often contend that one not only need not believe that Christ died for oneself but also hold (whether implicitly or explicitly) that one must not believe that Christ died for all men. It is enough, they say, to believe merely that Christ died for the elect or that He died for 'sinners', with no reference to their number. But Calvin says that one must believe that Christ died for all, but adds that this alone is not enough. One must also believe that Christ died for oneself.¹⁰⁸ And because one cannot believe the latter without first

¹⁰⁶. Comm on Gal. 2:20. This is a favourite verse of Calvin's in describing saving faith and he often minglest it with other verses. The motif is to be found in other contexts as well. For example, he says that faith apprehends acquittal in the condemnation of Christ (Institutes, II, 16, 6). Cf. Sermons on Deuteronomy, pp.167, 169, 676.

¹⁰⁷. Sermons on Galatians, pp.106-107. Note that in this passage Calvin relates this persuasion to the faith which truly receives the Lord's Supper.

¹⁰⁸. Of course, Calvin denies that saving faith is merely the acceptance of the truth that Christ... Cont'd:
believing the former, Christ necessarily must have died for all.

In the second quotation Calvin goes on to say the same thing in stronger and more elaborate language. It is a 'slender saying' that the atonement is universal; it is true but not enough. This would not suffice for saving faith. One 'must' believe that Christ died for oneself. This occurs when one applies to himself particularly the atonement. The atonement alone does not save. It must be applied. This is the effect of the atonement. It is also particular and personal. And again he says that it is not enough to believe that the atonement was for all. Christ did die for all, yes, but that conviction is insufficient. Note that here he explicitly asserts that "the Son of God was crucified ... for the Redemption of the world". The conclusion is that one is required also to believe that Christ died for oneself. This is what the Gospel reports. It 'offers' the benefit of atonement by the proclamation that Christ loved all and gave himself for all. One is a wretch to reject that. Particularists, on the other hand, state that one is not a wretch to reject that proposition. It is not a true proposition, they say, and therefore one need not believe in it. There is no condemnation for believing what is not true. Calvin, however, says that this is a 'warrant' for salvation: the love of Christ and the atonement for all. Particularists limit the warrant to the command to believe; grace and atonement are irrelevant at this point.  

It is crucial to observe that Calvin's comments here are not about a later reflex assurance of faith some time after initial saving faith. He is talking about the very essence of saving faith. The benefit ordered is not the 'plerophory' of faith for one that is already saved.

Cont'd:...

died for oneself. Saving faith includes personal trust in Christ and results in drawing upon divine life. This is seen, for instance, in what Calvin says about the faith that eats Christ worthily at the Supper. He denies that "I taught that Christ is eaten in no other way than when faith looks to him as having died for us" (Tracts and Treatises, vol.II, p.284. Cf. p.377). Our point is merely that Calvin taught that this conviction is essential to faith, while it is not the entire content of that faith.

109. On the warrants of faith and preaching, see Chapters VII and VIII above. For Calvin, Jesus Christ is "our redeemer, who is ordained to be our pledge and warrant" (Sermons on Job, p.567. Cf. pp.644-645, 648, and footnote 99 above). The guarantee of salvation is the person of Christ (and He is not to be separated from His work), not merely the command and promise, as affirmed by Particularists. Cf. Sermons on Deuteronomy, p.187; Comm on I Peter 1:18.
What is offered is salvation and the benefit of the grace of atonement. One 'ought' to be assured that Christ died for oneself. If he does not, he cannot receive the benefit of atonement. A parallel passage in Calvin is the following:

However, does it therefore follow that all men are partakers of this benefit purchased for us by our Lord Jesus Christ? No, for unbelievers have neither part nor lot in it. It is, then, a special privilege for those whom God gathers to himself. St. Paul also shows us that faith is essential or Christ will profit us nothing. Although, then, Christ is in a general view the Redeemer of the world, yet his death and passion are of no advantage to any but such as receive that which St. Paul shows here. And so we see that when we once know the benefits brought to us by Christ, and which he daily offers us by his gospel, we must also be joined to him by faith.  

Here Calvin states that Christ died for all but not all are partakers of the benefit purchased for them because not all believe. Faith is a 'special privilege'. The implication is that atonement is a general or universal privilege. Moreover, this concerns saving faith. He is speaking about those whom God 'gathers to himself' and to whom God gives faith and thereby applies the benefits of the atonement. Unless one believes, then Christ's atonement will profit him nothing. On the contrary, unbelief of the benefits of personal atonement (that Christ died for all and therefore for all whom the Gospel addresses) only compounds one's damnation, as we noted above. Note next that Calvin explicitly states that "Christ is in a general view (or way) the Redeemer of the world". This is a clear assertion of universal atonement. He is not speaking about the Jews-Gentile question but about the believer-unbeliever matter. He could hardly have expressed his views in clearer or more universal terms than he does here. Note again that he relates all this to the offer of the Gospel. The Gospel tells us that Christ redeemed all, including ourselves in particular. It offers us the benefit of that atonement, which is reconciliation. One receives that benefit by faith.

110. Sermons on Ephesians, p.55. This explicit assertion of general atonement was brought to our attention, curiously, by one who quoted it to prove that Calvin was a Particularist(1). The argument in this passage is found elsewhere (e.g., Sermons on Deuteronomy, p.187).

111. Cf. Comm on Matt. 23:37, John 6:44, etc.
In this excursus we have examined Calvin's views from several angles and from many of his own words, and the conclusion has always been the same. Calvin did not believe in limited atonement. In the light of the clarity and multiplicity of his statements on the subject, we are surprised that anyone should reach any other conclusion. Even so, we admit that some passages present difficulties. Those who argue that Calvin was a Particularist are usually Particularists themselves and surely that is no coincidence. One is led to speculate that they misinterpret Calvin here because they prefer to remain in the 'pure line' of Calvinism. Rather than altering their own views they alter Calvin's. But the problem does not end there. In limiting the atonement they necessarily limit the offer of the Gospel. The High Calvinists sought to limit the atonement without explicitly denying the 'free offer', while the Hyper-Calvinists saw the inconsistency of this and rejected the 'free offer' entirely. The latter were to a large extent more consistent. But both failed to heed Calvin's warning about limiting the atonement. The result had necessary implications also for the doctrine of assurance.

Our point is this: if Calvin did not teach limited atonement, then those who do are not Calvinists on the subject of the extent of the atonement. The same applies to the matters of faith, assurance and the offer of the Gospel in relation to the atonement. Hence, it is fully proper to speak of some as High and Hyper-Calvinists on the subject, for they went beyond and against Calvin on one of the so-called 'Five points of Calvinism'. This cannot be ignored in a study of Hyper-Calvinism.

It has not been the purpose of this excursus to comment on the ultimate merits of the various theological persuasions mentioned in it. Perhaps we shall do so in a later work. But a final comment may be appropriate. If one came to hold limited atonement because he respected Calvin and thought that Calvin taught this view, then a re-examination of Calvin's view may mean that the person may find himself back at the

112. Richards is quite right: "We need not be afraid, therefore, that our Calvinism will be essentially marred by holding the doctrine of a general propitiation, unless we wish to be more Calvinistic than John Calvin himself" (Theology, p.311). Likewise, Payne says about those Particularists who claim Calvin for their views: "Is there not reason to suspect that they are not Calvinists, but ultra Calvinists?" (Lectures, p.223). Ralph Wardlaw charges these same Particularists with "out-calvinizing Calvin", thereby giving the Arminians cause for rejecting true Calvinism (Discourses on the Nature and Extent of the Atonement of Christ, p.lxxvii). Cf. Alexander, Biblical Theology, vol.II, p.102 (quoted in Chapter IX, Section B, note 1).
crossroads. Of course, he is at liberty to continue to believe in limited atonement while admitting that Calvin did not believe in it. Others have chosen to go back and search the Scriptures themselves on the matter, reasoning that if they were led astray concerning Calvin's position then they may have been led astray concerning what the Scriptures teach as well.

We repeat the sentiments of Principal Cunningham to the effect that Calvin is not to be viewed as a source of infallible authority or something of a Reformed Pope. As valuable as the writings of Calvin are, they are not Scripture. If the reader has come to appreciate this truth more and has been driven deeper into the Scriptures themselves, then this excursus has accomplished something worthwhile.
APPENDIX B

JOHN EATON'S SUMMARY OF JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH

Free Justification was first enjoyned to be diligently taught for the Reformation of the Church, by King Henry the eighth, but was by King Edward the sixth, and Queene Elizabeth, principally established by Parliament; and singled out from all the rest of the established Articles of Religion; and reduced into Sermons and Homilies, to be (after the Peoples sight of their lost estate, and wofull misery by sin) principally taught, and chiefly knowne, and understood of all the Subjects and Commons of the Land, for these foure causes especially.

First, because it is the onely immediate cause, and means of our peace with God; For, Being justified by faith, we have peace with God, Rom. 5.1. and our assurance of free salvation by Jesus Christ; and therefore is called the Justification of life, Rom. 5.18. For, Whom God justifieth, them he also glorifieth, Rom. 8.30.

Secondly, because it is the ordinance of God, and cause (contrary to the judgement of Popish and Carnall Reason) that powerfully causeth people to leave their sinnes, and to live a true sanctified and godly life, Titus 2.11. to 15. Rom. 5, and 6. Chapters.

Thirdly, because it is the chiefest cause and meanes, to discover and suppress the Romish Antichrist, Popery, Arminians, Brownists, Anabaptists, Familists, and all other Superstitions, Sects, Errors, and Schismes, out of the Land; and to establish unity, peace, and concord in matters of Religion, and of assurance of free salvation ; and makes every man to keepe in a lawfull vocation, and to doe it profitably in love. Galat. 5.13.

Fourthly, to direct Ministers, to goe with a right foot to the truth

1. The following is found as an Appendix to Eaton's Honeycombe (pp.485-491) and may serve as a summary of the Antinomian theology, specifically of justification, faith and grace.
of the Gospel, Galat 2.14. in sound preaching, and pure declaring of the Word of God, by true faith of Free Justification; Because (saith the established Doctrine of our Church) sincere Preachers ever were, and ever shall be but a few; and their preaching of Gods Word (most sincere in the beginning) by processe of time waxeth lesse and lesse pure, and after is corrupt, and last of all, quite laid downe, and left off; because Free Justification is a Doctrine hardly learned in a Church, and soon lost againe, Galat. 1.6. and yet is the true strength, happinesse, and safety of the whole Land, Esay 62.1. to 6.

Hereupon the fifth part of the Sermon against disobedience, and rebellion, established by Queene Elizabeth, teacheth the Commons, that such Bishops, or Ecclesiasticall persons, as by pride, and ambitious rule, doe by termes of Error, Schisme, or Heresie, hinder this maine light of Gods Word from the people, are the chiefest Traytors in the Land: And the sixth and last part largely teacheth, that such Subjects, and Commons to whom, through ignorance of Gods Word, this light of righteousnesse, and Sun of understanding doth not shine, although they may bragge, as did sometimes the Jewish Clergy, and people, that they cannot lacke knowledge, yet are such, by the blind dead faith, Traytors to God, Traytors to their King, Traytors to their owne soules and bodies, and Traytors to the whole Land and Country.

And hereupon the testimony of the learned Protestant Writers is most true: saying, Secut fola fide in Christum, peram justitiam & Salutem consequimur; ita nihil difficultus, quam hoc, hominibus persuadetur, nihil Satan (præsertim candidue ille Satan) aquè oppugnat.

Certaine fundamentall Positions, or Doctrines of Religion, tending to peace, and to the reducing of Popish Arminians, and Anabapticall Ministers, and people, to the true saving faith; and to the established Protestant Doctrine of the Church of England, by the Godly authority, and publique consent of Parliament, to be faithfully taught, and diligently observed, and kept of all the Subjects, for the quieting of their consciences, in the assurance of their free salvation by Jesus Christ, and for the suppressing of the Romish Antichrist in all Superstitions, Errors, Sects, and Schisms, for the beating down of sin, and all vitiousnesse of life out of the Land (for the maintaining, and keeping of peace and unity in the matters of Religion, by the pure preaching of the Law, and of the Gospel) as followeth in these five
Poynts, or Positions.

First, the horrible filthinesse of sinne is such to Gods infinite pure and righteous Nature, and so defiles a man before God, Mark. 7.20. that God cannot but abhorre, curse, and detest the creature that hath any sinne in his sight, as these and such like Scriptures teach, Deut. 27.26. 2 Pet2.4. Rom 5.12. Hab 1.13. Job 15.15,16. And this true meaning of the Law, and right understanding thereof, this revealing the infinite, pure, and righteous Nature of God, and the horrible filthinesse of sin, is to be diligently taught, and continually preached of all faithfull Ministers in every mixt Congregation, Esay 58.1,2.

Secondly, that the best good workes of the most sanctified children of God, as they (though moved thereunto by the holy Ghost) do them, are sin, because of their originall corruption, and by breaking the tenth Commandement in them; & thereby they are so slaine, that is, truely humbled, by feeling themselves, and all their best workes to be so shut up under sin, that they daily bewail that they can performe no obedience, nor do any good worke before God in any of all his Commandements, as these and such like Scriptures teach, Rom. 7.9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 18,24. Galat 3.22. Rom 4,5. Phil. 3.8,4. Esay 64.6.

Thirdly, that the onely remedy to heale this our wofull misery by sinne (thus seen and felt to hang fast upon us in this life) this only remedy is Free justification, whereby God by the power of his imputation, doth so cloth us with the Wedding-garment of his sonnes perfect righteousnesse, Esay 61.10. that all our sins being utterly abolished, not out of us , I John 1.8,10. that there may be place for faith, Heb. 11.1. Rom. 4.18, 19, 20, to 25. but yet truely abolished from before God, or out of Gods sight, Colos. 1.22. Wee and all our workes are of unjust made just before God; that is, so perfectly holy and righteous from all spot of sin in the sight of God freely, that (as the expresse Word of God teacheth, and the Protestant Writers abundantly testifie) God doth not, and, by reason of his actuall power, can see no sinne in his justified children, freely (I say) by faith only, without workes, and our perfect workings. And I say by faith onely without workes, because faith onely sees this, and faith onely enjoys this: and thus, we and all our workes, both naturall workes, civill workes, or morall workes, and religious workes, are perfectly pure and
cleane in Gods sight, Acts 15.8.9. Titus 1.15. and doe fully please, satisfy, and content God, because we are fullfillers of the whole Law of God in his sight, for the righteousnesse of the Law is thus freely fulfilled in us, Rom. 8.4. Thus by Christes stripes we are healed, Esay 53.5. thus God, forgiving all our sins, is ever well pleased, and at perfect peace with us; for, being justified by faith, we have peace with God, Rom. 5.1. and are freely made and adopted the sons, and the daughters of the living God, Rom. 9.26. And thus are truly blessed, Rom. 4.6. for, As many as are of faith, of FREE JUSTIFICATION, are blessed with faithfull Abraham, Galat. 3.8, 9. and shall be certainly glorified; for whom God justifieth, them also he glorifieth, Rom. 8.30. And thus we see how perfectly by Christes stripes we are healed, Esay 53.5. And all this Protestant Doctrine of Free justification, and these two parts of the same, are cleerely and abundantly taught, by these and such like Scriptures, Esay 43.25. Esay 44.22,23. John 1.29. Heb. 1.3. Heb. 9.13.14. 26. 1 John 1.7. Revel. 1.5,6. Dan. 9.24. Rom. 3.21,22. Ephes. 5.26, 27. Rom. 5.17, 18, 19, 21. Revel. 3.18. Colos. 1.22, 23. Rom. 8.4. Colos. 2. 10. Heb. 10.14. Rom. 9.30. Esay 61.10. Phil. 3.8, 9. Tit. 1.15. Heb. 11. 4.

Fourthly, that this true faith of Free Justification (contrary to the judgement of Popish and carnall reason) unseparably brings the holy Ghost to dwell in people, Galat. 3.2. Acts 10.44. Acts 13.38,39,52. which holy Ghost infallibly inflames our hearts with true love, Galat. 5.6. and makes the true believers in right zeal of Gods glory, and in true thankfulness, to break off from sinne, and to mortifie, by true repentance, their former profane life, and ungodly conversation, and brings forth a declarative obedience, righteousnesse, and readiness to every good worke, now made good workes indeed freely, by Free Justification; and so brings forth a sincere, and though an unperfect, yet a free and cheerfull walking in, and keeping of all Gods will and Commandements, declaratively to manward, which is true sanctification. And thus is the Law not destroyed by Free Justification, but established; Rom. 3.21. and written in the hearts of true believers, and they are fullfillers and keepers of the Law, two manner of wayes; first, perfectly making their hearts perfectly righteous, freely, to the full content and satisfying of God by faith (as it was said before) of Free Justification, as these and such like Scriptures teach, Rom. 10.4, 5, 6, 10. Acts 15.8, 9. Heb 8.10. Secondly, it is written in their hearts, and they are fullfillers and keepers of the Law inchoatively, actively, and
declaratively to manward by love and true sanctification, as these Scriptures teach, Galat. 5.13,14. Rom. 13.8, 9, 10. Yea, this true faith of Free Justification, deeply, truely, and soundly learned, is a thing of perfect vertue, and wonderfull operation, strength, and power to bring forth all good motions inwardly, and all good workes outwardly, or else it is not the true lively justifying faith, but the blinde dead faith, that leaves men in sinne, death and double damnation; as these and such like Scriptures teach, Rom. 5. and 6. whole Chapters teach, Titus 2.11 to 15. 1 John 3.3 to 10, Ephes. 2.10. Ephes. 4, 5, 6, whole Chapters, Rom. 12, 13, 14, 15, whole Chapters, James 2.14,17 to 26. Matth. 5.16,2 Pet. 1.9.

5. That all such Ministers as doe not diligently teach, and cause people diligently to observe and keep this established true Protestant doctrine, but do deny, sophisticate, and wrangle against the same, must needs be like the false brethren amongst the Galathians, in the dead faith, doting about questions, and making controversies about the Law and works, and cannot but seduce the people from Christ; that is, from the simplicity of the faith that is in Christ Jesus, to depend and hang for assurance of their salvation upon the Law and works, and cannot but be troublers of the Church, Gal. 1.7. and of peoples consciences, distracting them into Popery, Arminianisme, Anabaptisme, Familisme, Brownisme, and all manner of Sects and Schisms, about works: because by a carnall understanding of Free justification, they cannot but rest in the light of reason, morall virtues, and religion of nature described Rom. 2.14,15. varnished and deceitfully gilt over with the titles of Grace, Graces, and Regeneration, Popishly and falsly understood, and other phrases of the Gospel: and being herein carryed with a blind, legall zeale, that they must and can keep, by their endeavours, the law of God, the blind zealous multitude doe bearre them record, and give them the applause that they have the zeale of God, but it is without knowledge; not but that they seeme to have all knowledge, save onely, that they want the right knowledge, and true faith of Free justification: Because being ignorant of the righteousnesse of God, namely how complete it makes us before God, wanting nothing, Colos. 2.10. they and their applauding Disciples cannot chuse but goe about to stablish and set up the Golden Calfe of their owne dung-righteousnesse, Phil. 3.8,4. and have not submitted themselves to rest and rejoice onely in the righteousnesse of God, Rom. 10.23. whereby they being thus blinde Leaders of the blind, both Preachers and
applauders doe fall into the ditch of destruction, Matth. 15.14. And thus are such Ministers the false Ministers of Satan, and teach a Satanicall righteousnesse and good works, as both are described 2 Cor. 11.13, 14, 15. and yet transorme themselves as if they were the true Ministers of Christ; and therefore doe stand accursed and damned by the Holy Ghost, and excommunicated by Saint Paul, Gal. 1.8, 9. untill they repent of their erroneous manner of teaching: And thus are they those grievous wolves that should stand up in the allowed Ministry, teaching not false things, but, Preposterous things, or things out of order, setting the Cart before the Horse; that is, calling for works and a good life, before people have the right knowledge, joyful faith, and true assurance of their full and perfect Justification, and free salvation by Jesus Christ; whereby good words, and good works, and good life may follow, as the good fruit of their thankful hearts for the same; and thereby doe not spare, but make havoc of the flock of Christ, Act. 20. 29, 30. Because Popishly, and carnally, and ignorantly thinking that Free Justification is soon and easily learned, and blasphemously conceiving that it opens the gate to all loosenesse of life, they drowne in silence Christ, their Free Justification, destroy the true faith of hanging onely upon the spiritual and invisible benefits and riches of Christ, marre true sanctification, and superstitiously carry way the blind zealous multitude of Professors in the fools Paradise of a false, bastard, Pharisaitcall, and legall sanctification, Phil. 3.6. Act. 22.3. and vaine glory and opinion of their good works and well doings, into hell and eternall destruction: And thus in this blind zealous dead faith are fourfold Traitours; namely, Traitours to Christ and his Gospel; Traitours to his Church and Children; disobedient Traitours to their King and whole Countrey that they live in; and lamentable Traitours to their owne souls and bodies; seeming the greatest friends to all these, and yet betraying all these with a Judas his kisse into the wrath of God and his jealous displeasure, into most dangerous ruine and fearfull destruction, and are therefore openly to be reproved in the face of the whole congregation, for not going with a right face to the truth of the Gospel, far more sharply than Peter was, Gal. 2.11, 14. Because such do sinne against souls far more grievously. All which these and such like Scriptures plainly teach: 2 Pet. 2.1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6. Jer. 23. 2 Cor. 11.13, 14, 15. 2 Tim. 3.1. to 9. 1 Tim. 7. Rev. 3.1, 2, 3. Gal. 1.6, 7 & 2.4, 5, 11. & 5.7, 8, 9, 10, 12. Esay. 29.9, 14. & 42.18, 19. Ezek. 14.9, 10.
But here mark and observe for the distinguishing of these five points:

First, that the third point is of highest esteem in the hearts and affections of the truly faithfull, and is most earnestly followed after of true Protestant and right saved Christians, as it is manifest Phil. 3.8, 9, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16. Rom. 9.30.

Secondly, That the fourth point is of highest esteem in the hearts and affections of them that are yet in the light of reason and religion of nature, described Rom. 2.14, 15. and thereby preposterously and most eagerly followed after of blind zealous hypocrites and work-mongers, whereby they run into the manifold inconveniences and dangers of the fifth point, Rom. 10.2, 3. Phil. 3.6. Rom. 4.31, 32, 33.

Summa Summe, the short and long, and upshot of all is this:

Remember that God will not be dallied or trifled withall, in the blood, death, and dear-bought righteousnesse of his onely Sonne, Joh. 3.16. freely and perfectly justifying, and so freely saving us, as the wretched multitude of Ministers and of people in the dead faith, both on the left hand and on the right hand, Prov. 4.27. doe dally and trifle with God, contrary to those Scriptures, Heb. 12.25. to vers.29. Matth. 22.11, 12, 13. and therefore let us search and look diligently into these five points, and keep them faithfullly, and then we are certainly saved. Pro. 4.10, 11, 12, 13. Mar. 16.15, 16. 2 Cor. 11.23. therefore I say again, remember Pro. 4.25, 26, 27.

Io. Eaton.
A

DECLARATION

OF THE

FAITH AND PRACTICE

OF THE

CHURCH OF CHRIST

IN CARTER-LANE, SOUTHWARK,

Under the Pastoral Care of Dr. JOHN GILL,

Read and Assented to at the Admission of MEMBERS

Having been enabled, through divine grace, to give up ourselves to the Lord, and likewise to one another by the will of God; we account it a duty incumbent upon us, to make a declaration of our faith and practice, to the honour of Christ, and the glory of his name; knowing, that as with the heart man believeth unto righteousness, so with the mouth confession is made unto salvation, which declaration is as follows, namely,

I. We believe, That the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, are the word of God, and the only rule of faith and practice.

II. We believe, That there is but one only living and true God: that there are three persons in the Godhead, the Father, the Son, and

1. Found in several sources: Church Record Book, Metropolitan Tabernacle; Commentary, vol.I, pp.xiv-xvi; S & T, vol.III; Spurgeon, Autobiography, vol.I, pp.551-553; Seymour, pp.315-318. There is some discrepancy among the different printings concerning Paragraph II. That which Rippon includes in Gill's Commentary, vol.I, omits most of this Paragraph, as well as the Scripture references. Seymour omits the Scripture references but gives the full text of Paragraph II. According to Seymour, the Declaration underwent revision. Cf. Styles, Guide, pp.239-240.

the Holy Ghost, who are equal in nature, power, and glory; and that
the Son and the Holy Ghost are as truly and properly God as the Father. These three divine persons are distinguished from each other,
by peculiar relative properties: The distinguishing character and
relative property of the first person is begetting; he has begotten a Son
of the same nature with him, and who is the express image of his person;
and therefore is with great propriety called the Father: The
distinguishing character and relative property of the second person is
that he is begotten; and he is called the only begotten of the Father,
and his own proper Son; not a Son by creation, as angels and men
are, nor by adoption, as saints are, nor by office, as civil magistrates
are; but by nature, by the Father's eternal generation of him in the
divine nature; and therefore he is truly called the Son: The
distinguishing character and relative property of the third person is to
be breathed by the Father and the Son, and to proceed from both," and
is very properly called the Spirit, or breath of both. These three
distinct divine persons, we profess to reverence, serve, and worship as
the one true God.

III. We believe, That before the world began, God did elect a
certain number of men unto everlasting salvation, whom he did
predestinate to the adoption of children by Jesus Christ of his own free
grace, and according to the good pleasure of his will; and that in
pursuance of this gracious design, he did contrive and make a covenant
of grace and peace with his son Jesus Christ, on the behalf of those
persons; wherein a Saviour was appointed, and all spiritual blessings
provided for them; as also that their persons, with all their grace

---

g. Acts 5.3, 4. I Cor. 3.16, 17. 2 Cor. 3.17, 18.
h. Psal. 2.7. Heb. 1.3.
j. Psal. 2.7.
k. Psal. 2.7.
m. I John 5.7. Matt. 4.10.
q. 2 Sam. 23.5. Isa. 55.8. Eph. 1.3.
s. 2 Tim. 1.9. Eph. 1.3. Col. 3.3, 4.
and glory, were put into the hands of Christ, and made his care and charge.

IV. We believe, That God created the first man, Adam, after his image, and in his likeness, an upright, holy, and innocent creature, capable of serving and glorifying him; but he sinning, all his posterity sinned in him, and came short of the glory of God; the guilt of whose sin is imputed; and a corrupt nature derived to all his offspring descending from him by ordinary and natural generation: that they are by their first birth carnal and unclean; averse to all that is good, incapable of doing any, and prone to every sin: and are also by nature children of wrath, and under a sentence of condemnation; and are so subject, not only to a corporeal death, and involved in a moral one, commonly called spiritual; but are also liable to an eternal death, as considered in the first Adam, fallen and sinners; from all which there is no deliverance, but by Christ, the second Adam.

V. We believe, That the Lord Jesus Christ, being set up from everlasting as the Mediator of the covenant, and he having engaged to be the Surety of his people, did in the fulness of time really assume human nature, and not before, neither in whole, nor in part; his human soul being a creature, existed not from eternity, but was created and formed in his body by him that forms the spirit of man within him, when that was conceived in the womb of the virgin; and so his human nature consists of a true body and a reasonable soul; both which, together and at once the Son of God assumed into union with his divine nature he really suffered, and died as the substitute of his people, in their room and stead; whereby he made all that satisfaction for their
sins, which the law and justice of God could require; as well as made way for all those blessings\textsuperscript{1} which are needful for them both for time and eternity.

VI. We believe, That that eternal Redemption which Christ has obtained by the shedding of his blood\textsuperscript{n} is special and particular: that is to say, that it was only intentionally designed for the elect of God, and sheep of Christ, who only share the special and peculiar blessings of it.

VII. We believe, That the justification of God's elect, is only by the righteousness\textsuperscript{n} of Christ imputed to them, without the consideration of any works of righteousness done by them, and that the full and free pardon of all their sins and transgressions, past, present, and to come, is only through the blood of Christ\textsuperscript{0}, according to the riches of his grace.

VIII. We believe, That the work of regeneration, conversion, sanctification, and faith, is not an act of \textsuperscript{p} man's free-will and power, but of the mighty, efficacious, and irresistible grace\textsuperscript{q} of God.

IX. We believe, That all those, who are chosen by the Father, redeemed by the Son, and sanctified by the Spirit, shall certainly and finally\textsuperscript{r} persevere; so that not one of them shall ever perish, but shall have everlasting life.

X. We believe, That there will be a resurrection of the dead\textsuperscript{s}, both of the just and unjust; and that Christ will come a second time to judge\textsuperscript{t} both quick and dead; when he will take vengeance on the wicked, and introduce his own people into his kingdom and glory, where they shall be for ever with him.

\textsuperscript{1} 1 Cor. 1. 30. Eph. 1. 7.
\textsuperscript{0} Rom. 3. 28, and chap. 4. 6, and chap. 5. 16-19.
\textsuperscript{p} Rom. 3. 25. Eph. 1. 7. Col. 2. 13. 1 John 1. 7, 9.
\textsuperscript{q} John 1. 13. Rom. 9. 16, and chap. 8. 7.
\textsuperscript{r} Phil. 2. 13. 2 Tim. 1. 9. James 1. 18. 1 Pet. 1. 3. Eph. 1. 19. Isa. 43. 13.
\textsuperscript{2} Heb. 9. 28. Acts 17. 31. 2 Tim. 4. 1. 2 Thess. 1. 7-10. 1 Thess. 4. 15-17.
XI. We believe, That Baptism and the Lord's Supper are ordinances of Christ, to be continued until his second coming; and that the former is absolutely requisite to the latter; that is to say, that those only are to be admitted into the communion of the church, and to participate of all ordinances in it, who upon profession of their faith, have been baptized, by immersion, in the name of the Father, and of the Holy Ghost.

XII. We also believe, That singing of psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs vocally, is an ordinance of the Gospel, to be performed by believers; but that as to time, place and manner, every one ought to be left to their liberty in using it.

Now all, and each of these doctrines and ordinances, we look upon ourselves under the greatest obligation to embrace, maintain, and defend; believing it to be our duty to stand fast in one spirit, with one mind, striving together for the faith of the Gospel.

And whereas we are very sensible, that our conversation, both in the world and in the church, ought to be as becometh the Gospel of Christ; we judge it our incumbent duty, to walk in wisdom towards them that are without, to exercise a conscience void of offence towards God and men, by living soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world.

And as to our regards to each other, in our church communion; we esteem it our duty to walk with each other in all humility and brotherly love; to watch over each other's conversation; to stir up one another to love and good works; not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together, as we have opportunity, to worship God according to

---


e. Phil. 1. 27

f. Col. 4. 5. g. Acts 24. 16.

h. Tit. 2. 12.

i. Eph. 4. 1-3. Rom. 12. 9, 10, 16. Phil. 2. 2, 3.


k. Lev. 19. 17. Phil. 2. 4.

l. 1. Hab. 10. 24, 25.

- 840 -
his revealed will; and, when the case requires, to warn\textsuperscript{n}, rebuke, and admonish one another, according to the rules of the Gospel.

Moreover, we think ourselves obliged\textsuperscript{n} to sympathize with each other, in all conditions, both inward and outward, which God, in his providence, may bring us into; as also to\textsuperscript{o} bear with one another's weaknesses, failings and infirmities; and particularly to pray for one another\textsuperscript{p}, and that the Gospel, and the ordinances thereof, might be blessed to the edification and comfort of each others souls, and for the gathering in of others to Christ, besides those who are already gathered.

All which duties we desire to be found in the performance of, through the gracious assistance of the Holy Spirit; whilst we both admire and adore the grace, which has given us a place, and a name in God's house, better than that of sons and daughters\textsuperscript{q}.

\textsuperscript{n} Rom. 12. 15. 1 Cor. 12. 26.  
\textsuperscript{o} Rom. 15. 1. Eph. 4. 12. Col. 3. 13.  
\textsuperscript{p} Eph. 6. 18, 19. 2 Thess. 3. 1.  
\textsuperscript{q} Isa. 56. 5.
"This is the last will and testament of me, William Gadsby, of the township of Cheetham, in the parish of Manchester, in the county of Lancaster, Baptist minister of the everlasting gospel of God our Saviour, by the matchless grace of God, through the invincible power of God the Holy Ghost, made and published as follows: that is to say, First, I am brought firmly to believe and maintain that the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament are the word of God, and the only certain rule of faith and practice. And I also further observe that I firmly believe in Three equal Persons, namely, God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost, in one glorious undivided Jehovah; and that each glorious Person is an object of spiritual worship, and is loved, praised and adored as such by all the heaven-born family of God; and that a denial of this glorious truth is altogether Anti-Christian, and repugnant to the glory of God. I also believe in the glorious doctrine of absolute, personal and unconditional election; and that God's dear elect were chosen in Christ before the foundation of the world, both to grace and glory. I believe in special, definite and particular redemption, by the glorious Person of Immanuel; and that the doctrine of an indefinite, atonement is, to say the least of it, an invention of men, calculated to vamp up a whole-hearted sinner, and distress those whose hearts the Lord has broken. I believe in effectual grace in calling; and that God the Holy Ghost both has made and will make all the elect willing in the day of God's power. I believe that all the sins of the elect are absolutely pardoned through the glorious atonement of the Lord Jesus Christ; and that their persons are justified in his glorious righteousness, without any idea as to their works, worth or worthiness, as the cause, in any sense whatever, of their justification before God, but absolutely in and by the righteousness of Christ imputed to them, and that they stand complete in Christ. I believe in the eternal and

1. Found in John Gadsby, Memoir of William Gadsby, pp.139-141. It is striking that Gadsby omitted any explicit reference to the distinctive Gospel Standard doctrines, such as the rejection of the Law as a rule or standard, denial of free offers and Duty-Faith, and so on. Undoubtedly these fall into the classification specified in the closing paragraph.
inseparable union of the elect to the Lord Jesus Christ, as the glorious Head of the church. I believe that all spiritual blessings are treasured up in Christ, and that all grace and glory, necessary for the holiness and happiness of God's elect, are secured in Christ for them, and made sure to them. I believe that nothing short of the divine quickening power and special teachings of God the Holy Ghost can make a sinner spiritually acquainted with the glorious truths of God's grace; and all religion short of that which God the Spirit teacheth and leadeth into his glorious, quickening, enlightening, teaching, guiding, anointing, and sealing power, is at best but a fair show in the flesh; and every elect sinner must have his fleshly religion rooted up by the roots, to be fuel for the fire, in the day when God purgeth his people "by the spirit of burning" (Isa. iv.4); for every real believer in Christ must and shall in this world have his works tried by fire (I Cor. iii.13). I believe that the kingdom of God is a spiritual kingdom in all its bearings; and that God the Spirit sets up and maintains the kingdom of grace in the hearts of all his people, and by his invincible power enables them to give God the whole of the glory. And I believe that all religion short of a spiritual religion, taught and maintained by the Spirit of God, will leave its possessor to perish in his sins. I believe that while God's quickened children remain in this vale of tears there will be a constant warfare between flesh and Spirit, the old man and the new, but that "grace shall reign through righteousness unto eternal life". I believe that when God's people walk contrary to the will of God in Christ, as the Lord and Head of the church, he will visit (as a Father) their transgressions with the rod; nevertheless, he will not cease to love them, nor suffer his faithfulness to fail. I believe in the final perseverance of all real saints to glory. I believe in believers' baptism, by immersion, to the total exclusion of infant sprinkling; and that the Lord's supper is a privilege belonging to the church of Christ, to show forth the death of Christ till he come. I believe in the resurrection of the body, both of the just and the unjust; and that the bodies of the saints will rise a glorious body, like unto the body of Christ, and that they shall live and reign with him in glory, in the presence of the Three-One undivided Jehovah, for ever and ever. I believe in the last judgement and eternal punishment of all the ungodly.

The above solemn truths, together with those truths in direct union to, and immediately connected with, them, I firmly believe and maintain; and I pray that, if it be the will of God, the Lord will make all my dear family acquainted with the same.
APPENDIX E

GOSPEL STANDARD ARTICLES OF FAITH AND RULES

I. We believe in the divine inspiration of the Holy Scriptures, and receive them as a gracious revelation of the mind and will of God (Deut. iv. 2; Ps. xix. 7; Prov. xxx. 5, 6; 2 Pet. i. 19-21; Rev. xxii. 18, 19; Jno. v. 39); and we believe that therein are revealed all the doctrines and truths which we here state. (2 Tim. iii. 15-17).

II. We believe that there is but one living and true God (Exod. iii. 14; Deut. iv. 35, vi. 4; Num. xxiii. 19; 1 Sam. ii. 2, 3; Ps. xc. 2; cxv. 3; cxxxv. 5; cxxxix. 7-10; Prov. xv. 3; Ecc. iii. 14; Isa. xl. 28; xlvi. 22; xlvi. 9; Jer. x. 10; xxiii. 24; Mal. iii. 6; Mark xii. 29; Jno. iv. 24; 1 Cor. viii. 6; Col. i. 16); that there are Three Persons in the Godhead, - the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost (Matt. xxviii. 19; Jno. i. 1, 2; Cor. xiii. 14; 1 Jno. v. 7; Jude 20, 21), and that these Three Persons are equal in nature, power, and glory; and we believe that the Son and the Holy Ghost are as truly and as properly God as the Father. (Jno. x. 15, 30; Eph. ii. 22; Heb. i. 3; ix. 14).

III. We believe in the everlasting and unchangeable love of God (Jer. xxxi. 3); and that before the foundation of the world the Father did elect a certain number of the human race unto everlasting salvation, whom He did predestinate unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to Himself, according to the good pleasure of His will (Gal. iv. 5; Eph. ii. 2-13; 1 Thess. v. 9; 2 Thess. ii. 13; 2 Tim. i. 9; 1 Jno. iii. 1; 1 Pet. i. 2; ii. 9); and we believe that in fulfilling this gracious design, He did make a covenant of grace and peace with the Son and with the Holy Ghost on behalf of those persons thus chosen (2 Sam. xxiii. 5; Jno. i. 17), and that in this covenant the Son was appointed a Saviour, and all spiritual blessings provided for the elect, and also that their persons, with all the grace and glory designed for them, were put into the hands of the Son as their Covenant Head, and made His care and charge. (Ps. cxi. 8, 9; Isa. xlii. 6; liv. 10; lv. 4; Jer. xxxi. 3; Jno. vi. 37; xvii. 2; Acts iv. 12; Rom. viii. 29, 30; Eph. i. 3; ii. 13; Heb. ii. 13; vi. 17, 18; viii. 8, 9).
IV. We believe in the Fall of our first parents, and that by it the whole of the human race became involved in, and guilty of, Original Sin; and that as they are born into the world, the whole of their posterity are, in consequence, actual transgressors against God (Rom. v. 12-21; Ps. lvi. 3). And we believe that by the Fall all men were rendered both unable and unwilling spiritually to believe in, seek after, or love God until called and regenerated by the Holy Ghost (Gen. vi. 5; viii. 21; Job. xiv. 4; xxv. 4; Ps. li. 5; Jer. xiii. 23; xvii. 9; Matt. xv. 19; Rom. iii. 10-24; v. 12-19; 1 Cor. xv. 22, 45-50; Eph. ii. 3; 1 Jno. v. 19.)

V. We believe that the Lord Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God, being set up from everlasting as the Mediator of the New Covenant, and having engaged to be the Surety of His people, did, in the fulness of time, really and truly assume human nature, and not before, either in whole or in part. (Prov. viii. 23.) And we believe that, though He existed from all eternity as the eternal Son of God (Jno. 1.18; Phil. ii. 5-8; Heb. i. 5, 8; xiii. 8; 2 Jno. 3; Rev. i. 8), the human soul of the Lord Jesus did not exist before it was created and formed in His body by Him who forms the soul of man within him, when that body was conceived under the overshadowing of the Holy Ghost, in the womb of the Virgin Mary. (Isa. vii. 14; Matt. i. 23; Luke i. 26-38; Jno. i. 14; Gal. iv. 4.) And we believe that Christ's human nature consists of a true body and reasonable soul, both of which, together and at once, the Son of God assumed into union with His Divine Person, when made of a woman and not before (Luke ii. 40; Heb. ii. 14-17); that this human nature was not sinful, peccable, or mortal (Ps. xvi. 10; Acts ii. 27), though capable of death by a voluntary act (Jno. x. 17, 18), but essentially and intrinsically pure and holy (Song v. 9-16; Heb. vii. 26); and that in it He really suffered, bled, and died, as the Substitute and Surety of His church and people, in their room and stead, and for no others (Jno. x. 15, 26; xvii. 9, 13); whereby, together with His holy, spotless life, He fulfilled the law, and satisfied all the claims of justice, as well as made a way for all those blessings which are needful for His people, both for time and eternity. (Heb. ix. 22-28.)

VI. We believe that the eternal redemption which Christ has obtained by the shedding of His blood is special and particular (Gal. iii. 13; Heb. ix. 12-15); that is to say, that it was intentionally designed only
for the Elect of God, the Sheep of Christ, who therefore alone share in the special and peculiar blessings thereof. (Isa. xxxv. 10; Jno. x. 15, 25-28; Acts ii. 47; xiii. 48; xx. 28; Rom. v. 8-10; viii. 33, 34; ix. 13, 15, 16; Rev. xiv. 4.)

VII. We believe that the justification of God's elect is only by the righteousness of the Lord Jesus Christ imputed to them (Isa. xliv. 24; lxiv. 6; Jer. xxiii. 6; Matt. vii. 18; Lu. xviii. 13; Acts xiii. 39; Rom. iv. 4, 5; v. 19; x. 4; 1 Cor. i. 30; 2 Cor. v. 21; Phil. iii. 9; Tit. iii. 5), without consideration of any works of righteousness, before or after calling, done by them, and that the full and free pardon of all their sins, past, present, and to come, is only through the blood of Christ, according to the riches of His grace. (Rom. iii. 20-27; iv. 22; ix. 11; 2 Tim. i. 9; Heb. i. 3; ix. 22; 1 Pet. iii. 18; 1 Jno. ii. 1.)

VIII. We believe that the work of regeneration is not an act of man's free will and natural power, but that it springs from the operation of the mighty, efficacious and invincible grace of God. (Jer. 1. 20; Ps. cx. 3; Jno. i. 13; vi. 29, 63, 65; xvi. 8; Rom. viii. 16; xi. 4, 6; Jas. i. 18.)

IX. We believe that all those who were chosen by the Father and redeemed by the Son, and no others, shall, at the appointed time, certainly be convinced in their hearts of sin, by the Spirit (Jno. xvi. 8; 1 Cor. ii. 14; Eph. ii. 1), be brought in guilty before God, and made the recipients of eternal life, coming to Christ for salvation, and believing on Him as the Anointed of the Father and the only Mediator between God and man (1 Tim. ii. 5; Heb. viii. 6; ix. 15; xii. 24); but that none can spiritually come to Christ unless drawn by the Father (Jno. vi. 44, 65); and that all the elect shall be thus drawn to Christ, and shall finally persevere; so that not one of the elect shall perish, but all arrive safely in glory. (Job. xvii. 9; Matt. xxv. 34; Jno. iv. 14; v. 24; vi. 37, 44-47; x. 28; xvii. 6; 12, 24; Acts ii. 47; Rom. viii. 29-39; Phil. i. 6; 1 Pet. i. 3-5.)

X. We believe that all men are by nature so completely dead in trespasses and sins that they cannot, while in that state, know or feel anything of God in Christ, spiritually, graciously and savingly. (Eph. ii. 1-3). And we believe that, when quickened into everlasting life in Christ (as the elect alone are, or can be, or will be), the vessel of
mercy then first feels spiritually the guilt of sin, and is taught to know in his own experience, the fall and ruin of man. (Isa. i. 6; Rom. iii. 10-19; vii. 18.) Thus every quickened child of God is brought, in God's own time and way, through the Spirit's teaching, from necessity to depend for salvation on Christ's blood and righteousness alone. (Jno. vi. 68; x. 9; xiv. 6; Acts iv. 12; Eph. ii. 8-10; Heb. iv. 18.) And we believe that this teaching will not lead him to licentiousness, but make him willing to walk in good works, to which he is ordained, and which are acceptable to God only through Jesus Christ. (Rom. vii. 14; Gal. v. 16-25; vi. 14-16.)

XI. We believe that man can never do a good work, properly so called, until the grace of God is implanted in his heart (Rom. viii. 8), and that nothing is spiritually good but what God Himself is pleased to communicate to, and work in, the soul, both to will and to do of His good pleasure. (Phil. ii. 13.) And we also believe that man's works, good or bad, have not anything to do with his call, or being quickened, by the Holy Spirit. (2 Cor. iii. 5; Eph. ii. 3-9; Tit. iii. 5; Heb. xiii. 21.)

XII. We believe in the effectual calling of all the elect vessel of mercy out of the ruins of the Fall in God's appointed time, and that the work of regeneration, or new birth, is the sovereign work of God, and His work only, the sinner being as passive therein as in his first birth, and previously thereto dead in trespasses and sins. (Jno. iii. 3-8; vi. 37-65; Rom. vii. 30; 1 Cor. i. 26-29; Eph. ii. 4, 5.) We believe in the application of the Law to the elect sinner's conscience by the Spirit of God (Rom. vii. 7, 9, 12), showing the sinner how greatly he has broken that law, and feelingly condemning him for the same; and in the manifestation of mercy and pardon through Christ alone made known to the soul by God the Holy Ghost. (Ps. xxx. 3; cxxx. 7; Isa. xl. 2; Jer. xxxiii. 8; Mic. vii. 18; Rom. vii. 5-10.)

XIII. We believe that faith is the gift of God (Eph. ii. 8), as well as true spiritual repentance and hope (Acts v. 31; Rom. xv. 13; 2 Thess. ii. 16; 1 Pet. i. 3), and a manifestation of pardon to the soul; that through faith Christ is made precious to the soul (1 Pet. ii. 7), and the soul drawn out in love to God (1 Jno. iv. 19); that all are the fruits and effects of the blessed Spirit, and that they will most certainly be productive of good works, and a walk and conversation
XIV. We believe in the Resurrection of the body, both of the just and the unjust (Acts xxiv. 15); that the just (the elect) shall be raised up in glory and honour (Matt. xxiv. 31; xxv. 31-40), and be openly acknowledged and fully acquitted in the Judgement Day, before angels, devils and sinners, and made fully and eternally blest both in body and soul; and that the wicked shall be raised up to be condemned, body and soul, to the unspeakable torments of hell for ever and ever. (Isa. xxvi. 19; Dan. xii. 2; Matt. xxv. 31-46; Jno. v. 28, 29; Acts xxiii. 6; Rom. vi. 23; viii. II, 23; xiv. 10-12; 1 Cor. xv. 52; 2 Cor. v. 10; Rev. xx. 12-15.)

XV. We believe that Baptism and the Lord's Supper (1 Cor. xi. 2, 26; xiv. 40; Col. ii. 5-8) are ordinances of Christ, to be continued till His Second Coming; and that the former is requisite to the latter; that is to say, that those only can scripturally sit down to the Lord's Supper who, upon their profession of faith, have been baptised by immersion in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; and that, therefore, what is called "Mixed Communion" (Rom. xvi. 17) is unscriptural, improper, and not to be allowed in the churches of Christ. (Matt. iii. 13-16; xxviii. 19, 20; Jno. iii. 22-23; Acts ii. 37-42; viii. 12; ix. 18; x. 47, 48; xvi. 14, 15, 30, 31, 33; xviii. 8; xix. 1-6; Rom. vi. 3; Col. ii. 12.)

XVI. We believe that the Believer's Rule of conduct is the gospel, and not the law, commonly called the Moral Law, issued on Mount Sinai, which hath no glory in it by reason of the glory that excelleth; that is to say, the gospel (Gal. vi. 15, 16; 2 Cor. iii. 10; Rom. vii. 2-4); the gospel containing the sum and substance and glory of all the laws which God ever promulgated from His throne, and the Jews, because of the hardness of their hearts, being permitted some things which the gospel forbids. (Deut. xxiv. 1; Matt. xix. 8, 9.)

XVII. We deny and reject, as unscriptural and erroneous, the baptism of infants, whether by immersion, sprinkling, pouring, or any other mode. (Heb. xi. 6; Acts viii. 12, 37.)

XVIII. We reject as blasphemous the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration; that is, that the person baptised is or can be regenerated
in, by or through baptism, much less, if possible, by infant sprinkling. (Jno. 1. 13; 1 Pet. 1. 22.)

XIX. We believe in the sanctification of God's people, the term sanctification signifying a separation and setting apart by and for God. This, in the child of God, is three-fold: 1, by election by God the Father (Jude 1); 2, by redemption by God the Son (John xvii. 19); and 3, by the almighty regenerating operation of God the Holy Ghost (Rom. xv. 16.) We believe that the blessed Spirit is the Author of what is styled in Scripture the new creature, or creation (2 Cor. v. 17; Eph. iv. 24), or new heart (Ezek. xxxvi. 26); being, in truth, an implantation of the Divine nature (2 Pet. i. 4), through which the child of God would according to the inner man (Rom. vii. 22), be holy as God is holy, and perfectly fulfil all the good pleasure of the Father's will; but groans being burdened, being constantly opposed by the contrary workings of the old man. (Rom. vii.; Gal. v. 17.) We reject the doctrine of progressive sanctification, or that a child of God experiences such a gradual weakening, subduing, or rectification of the old nature, called in Scripture the old man (Eph. iv. 22; Col. iii. 9), or such a continued general improvement as shall make him at any time less dependent upon the communications of the Spirit and grace of Christ for all goodness, or less a poor, vile, wretched, helpless sinner in himself, and in his own estimation. (Jno. xv., part of 5; 2 Cor. iii. 5; Rev. iii. 17.)

XX. We believe that the grace of God produces a real change in a man and teaches him to deny ungodliness and worldly lusts, and to live godly (Tit. ii. 11, 12), and that there is a growth in grace (2 Pet. iii. 18; Phil. iii. 8-10; Mark iv. 26-29; 1 Jno. ii. 12, 13), which consists principally in a growing experimental knowledge of a man's sinful self (1 Kings viii. 38; Ezra ix. 6; Job. xl. 4-6; Ps. lxxiii 22; Dan. x. 8), the vanity of the creature, the glory of God, the spirituality of His law, and the want and worth of Jesus Christ. This is accompanied by a deepening distrust of everything but the grace and love of God in Christ for salvation, and is not a growth in conscious goodness, but in felt necessity and the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ (Jno. iii. 30; 1 Cor. ii. 2; Tit. iii. 3-8; Eph. iii. 8; 1 Tim. i. 15.)

XXI. We reject the doctrine of perfection in the flesh or that the
believer ever becomes free from indwelling sin in this life, or whilst in the body. "If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us." (1 Jno. i. 8; 1 Kings, viii. 46; Job ix. 2; xv. 14; Ps. cxix. 96; Prov. xx. 9; Ecc. vii. 20; Rom. vii. 18.)

XXII. We reject the doctrines that the children of God cannot backslide, and that God does not chastise His people for sin. (1 Cor. xi. 32.) For, though we believe that a child of God is called from a death in sin to a life of righteousness, and would, according to the law of his mind, or new nature, in all respects obey God's holy will as declared in the Scriptures, yet through the temptations of Satan, the allurements of the world, and the power and deceitfulness of indwelling sin, he may fall for a season like David, Peter, and other Bible saints did. (Jer. iii. 14, 22; Hos. xiv.) But we believe that when the children of God thus sin against God, and transgress His holy revealed will, God does in various ways and degrees chastise them for it (Ps. lxxxix 30-33; Prov. iii. 11, 12), not in vindictive anger, but in tender love, as a father does the son in whom he delighteth. (Job. v. 17; Ps. xciv. 12; cxix. 67; Isa. liv. 7, 8; Heb. xii. 5-11.) We believe, too, that in this matter of chastisement for sin God will deal in a most sovereign way, and as a God of judgement; so that, though the punished child shall be made to discern the reason of the rod (Mic. vi. 9), it is seldom safe for others to judge according to the outward appearance. We further believe that no man living in habitual sin gives any proof that he is a child of God, and we cannot, therefore have fellowship with him, be his profession what it may.

XXIII. We believe, as expressed in Article IX., in the doctrine of the final perseverance of the saints, and that, however much the elect of God may be tried by sin, and opposed by Satan, they shall all eventually attain to everlasting glory. Not one of them shall perish, for none can pluck them out of the Father's hand. (Isa. li. 11; Jno. x. 28, 29.)

XXIV. We believe that the invitations of the Gospel, being spirit and life,* are intended only for those who have been made by the blessed Spirit to feel their lost state as sinners and their need of Christ as their Saviour, and to repent of and forsake their sins. (Isa. lv. 1;

* That is, under the influence of the Holy Spirit.
XXV. We deny that Christ died for all mankind. (Matt. xxv. 31-46; Jno. x. 11, 15, 26.)

XXVI. We deny duty faith and duty repentance - these terms signifying that it is every man's duty spiritually and savingly to repent and believe (Gen. vi. 5; viii. 21; Matt. xv. 19; Jer. xvii. 9; Jno. vi. 44, 65.) We deny also that there is any capability in man by nature to any spiritual good whatever. So that we reject the doctrine that men in a state of nature should be exhorted to believe in or turn to God. (Jno. xii. 39, 40; Eph. ii. 8; Rom. viii. 7, 8; 1 Cor. iv. 7.)

XXVII. We deny that the Holy Spirit ever enlightens the non-elect, to make them capable at all of receiving grace. (Isa. vi. 9, 10; Jno. xiv. 17; Rom. xi. 7, 8; Mark iv. 11, 12; Lu. viii. 10; Jno. xii. 39, 40.)

XXVIII. We reject the doctrine called "Baxterianism"; that is to say, that while all the elect shall assuredly be saved, there is a residuum of grace in Christ for the rest, or any of the rest, if they will only accept it. (Jno. iii. 27; 1 Cor. ii. 14.)

XXIX. While we believe that the gospel is to be preached in or proclaimed to all the world, as in Mark xvi. 15, we deny offers of grace; that is to say, that the gospel is to be offered indiscriminately to all. (2 Cor. iv. 3, 4.) See Arts. XXIV., XXVI.

XXX. We believe that the glorified body of the Lord Jesus Christ is the same flesh and bones now in heaven as that which hung upon the cross. (1 Cor. xv. 16, 20; Lu. xxiv. 39; Acts i. 9, 11.)

XXXI. We reject the doctrine of the annihilation of the wicked, and believe that all who die out of Christ shall be turned into hell, the fire of which shall never be quenched, the wicked there suffering for ever the torments of eternal fire. (Matt. xxv. 46; Rev. xix. last part of 20; Rev. xiv. 10, 11; xx. 10, 15.)

Note. - It is the same word in Greek which, in Matt. xxv. 46, declares the eternity of life for the sheep which declares the eternity of punishment for the goats. So (Rev. xx. 15), those who are "not
written in the book of life" are "cast into the lake of fire", where they are "tormented for ever and ever." (Ver. 10.) Now the same words which are there translated "for ever and ever" are also used in Rev. x. 6, where the angel "swore by Him that liveth for ever and ever." Therefore if God is "to live for ever and ever", the torment in the lake of fire is to be for ever and ever; for the words are exactly the same in both passages.

XXXII. We believe that it would be unsafe, from the brief records we have of the way in which the apostles, under the immediate direction of the Lord, addressed their hearers in certain special cases and circumstances, to derive absolute and universal rules for ministerial addresses in the present day under widely-different circumstances. And we further believe that an assumption that others have been inspired as the apostles were has led to the grossest errors amongst both Romanists and professed Protestants.

XXXIII. Therefore, that for ministers in the present day to address unconverted persons, or indiscriminately all in a mixed congregation, calling upon them savingly to repent, believe, and receive Christ, or perform any other acts dependent upon the new creative power of the Holy Ghost, is, on the one hand, to imply creature power, and, on the other, to deny the doctrine of special redemption.

XXXIV. We believe that any such expressions as convey to the hearers the belief that they possess a certain power to flee to the Saviour, to close in with Christ, to receive Christ, while in an unregenerate state, so that unless they do thus close with Christ, etc., they shall perish, are untrue and must, therefore, be rejected. And we further believe that we have no Scripture warrant to take the exhortations in the Old Testament intended for the Jews in national covenant with God, and apply them in a spiritual and saving sense to unregenerated men.

XXXV. We believe that there are various degrees of faith, as little faith and great faith (Matt. vi. 30; xv. 28); that when a man is quickened by the blessed Spirit, he has faith given to him to know and feel he is a sinner against God (Lu. xviii. 13), and that without a Saviour he must sink in black despair. And we further believe that such a man will be made to cry for mercy, to mourn over and on account of
his sins (Matt. v. 4), and, being made to feel that he has no righteousness of his own (Isa. lxiv. 6; Phil. iii. 9), to hunger and thirst after Christ's righteousness; being led on by the Spirit until, in the full assurance of faith, he has the Spirit's witness in his heart that his sins are for ever put away (Rom. viii. 16; Eph. iv. 30; Heb. ix. 12, 26; vii. 27; x. 14); but that the faith is the same in nature as is imparted in his first awakenings, though now grown to the full assurance thereof.

*****************************************************************

Now all and each of these doctrines and ordinances we can honestly say it is our desire to maintain and defend in one spirit and with one mind, striving together for the faith of the gospel.

And we desire, by the grace of God, that our conversation, both in the world and in the church, may be such as becometh the gospel of Christ, and that we may live soberly, righteously, and godly in the present world.

And, as it regards each other in church communion, we desire to walk with each other in all humility and brotherly love; to watch over each other's conversation, to stir up one another to love and good works; not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together, but, as we have opportunity, to worship God according to His revealed will; and when the case requires, to warn and admonish one another according to God's Word.

Moreover, we desire to sympathise with each other in all conditions, both inward and outward, into which God, in His providence, may bring us; as also to bear with one another's weaknesses, failings, and infirmities; and particularly to pray for one another, and for all saints, and that the gospel and the ordinances thereof may be blessed to the edification and comfort of each other's souls, and for the gathering in of vessels of mercy unto Christ.

And for every blessing and favour, both temporal and spiritual, we, who are as deserving of hell as the vilest of the vile, desire to ascribe all the praise to the glory of the grace of a Triune God.

**************************
RULES

NOTE. - Several of the Rules hitherto in circulation being found impracticable, the Gospel Standard Committee has formulated the following Rules, and issues them in the hope that they will be useful to the churches. Although it believes that these Rules will be generally acceptable, the Committee desires to make it quite clear that each Church will act independently in regard to adopting them or otherwise in regulating its own affairs.

**************

ADMITTANCE INTO CHURCH MEMBERSHIP

1. Any person desiring to become a member of this church, must first be interviewed by the pastor (if there be one) and deacons, who, if in their judgement the candidate is suitable for membership, shall duly bring the matter before the church. A copy of the church's Articles of Faith and Rules to be given to each candidate for their instruction.

2. At a regularly constituted church meeting (see rules 13-15) the candidate (whether already a member of another church or not) shall make a verbal confession of faith, and declare what he or she believes God has done for his or her soul. If accepted by a vote of the majority of members present and voting, signature in the church book to the Articles of Faith and Rules will be required. Thereafter, at the earliest convenient opportunity, the person shall, unless previously baptised by immersion, be so baptised in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; and be formally received into church fellowship at the next observance of the Lord's Supper.

3. Any person who, having been baptised while only in a carnal profession of religion has since been called by the Spirit of God to a knowledge of his or her lost condition by nature and practice, and to living faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, being desirous of uniting with this church, shall attend to the ordinance of believers' baptism, according to rule 2 (last clause), for "whatsoever is not of faith is sin" (Rom. xiv. 23.)

THE PASTORATE

4. No minister shall be appointed as pastor until he has supplied at least months on probation, and unless there be in favour at least
two-thirds (three-fifths) of the members present and voting at a church meeting duly convened for this particular purpose (see rules 13-15); nor shall any minister be invited to supply on probation without a like majority, also at a duly convened meeting.

5. If at any time where there is a pastor, the conduct of such a pastor should be contrary to the precepts of the gospel, or if he should depart from the Articles of Faith or any one of them, or if his ministry should become unprofitable, a majority of the members present and voting at a properly convened church meeting (see rules 13-15) shall be competent to declare that he shall no longer be the pastor; and he shall be removed from the pastorate accordingly. And at such meeting the pastor shall not be present. Always presuming that adequate opportunity has been afforded the pastor to explain himself.

DISCIPLINE

NOTE. - The object of discipline in the Church of Christ is (i.) The vindication of the truth; (ii.) The restoration of any offending brother.

6. Any member of this church knowingly receiving the ordinance of the Lord's Supper with any church not of the same faith and order with ourselves, shall be reproved; and should the offence be repeated, be withdrawn from.

Any member knowing another to act disorderly, shall tell the offending brother or sister of his or her fault alone, in the spirit of meekness (Gal. vi. 1); and if not satisfied with the explanation, shall acquaint the pastor or deacons of the church with the matter; and if any member neglect to do so, and be found reporting it to others, such member shall be visited and reproved as acting contrary to Scripture rule.

8. Any member bringing, in any manner, an open reproach on the cause, shall be suspended; and no member suspended for any reason shall again be admitted to the Lord's Supper and to the privileges of membership, until godly sorrow and repentance are manifest, and satisfactory acknowledgement is made to the church.

9. Any member relating to any other person, not a member, what has
been said or done at any church meeting, shall be liable, according to the judgement of the pastor and deacons, to be brought before the church to be dealt with.

10. If any member repeatedly neglect to attend the preaching of the Word, the Lord's Supper and prayer meetings, unless from unavoidable causes known to the pastor and deacons and the church, a reason will be required for his or her absence; and if he or she shall be absent from the Lord's Supper upon more than three successive occasions, without being able to give the pastor or deacons who shall visit such member a satisfactory reason for such absence, they shall bring the matter before the church to be dealt with as it shall determine, whether for reproof, suspension, or withdrawal from the offending party.

11. Members having private differences between themselves shall not bring the same before the church before the rule laid down in Matt. xviii. 15, 16, has been first attended to by the offended party; and in the event of satisfaction not being given, that the peace of the church may if possible be preserved, the offended party shall first inform the pastor or deacons (assembled); but if not satisfied with his, or their mediation or decision, the member shall bring the case before the church, by giving one month's notice in writing to the minister or deacons.

CHURCH MEETINGS

12. A church meeting, at which the pastor (or deacon present if there is no pastor) shall preside, shall be held every months, and oftener if required; and it is expected that all the members who are able will attend. No person shall be present at our church meetings but regular members of this church, except by special consent of the church. No member who may be under church censure shall be present at any church meeting.

13. All church meetings shall be audibly announced from the pulpit or desk when the people are regularly assembled for worship at least on the two Lord's-days immediately preceding the date of any such meeting.

14. The pastor or deacons shall have it in his or their power to call
a church meeting whenever he or they consider it necessary; also he or
they shall be required to do so when requested by not less than of
the members, in any case considered urgent; but in every case proper
notice (rule 13) shall be given; and any meeting held, whether called
by pastor or deacons, or both, not according to such rule, shall be of
none effect.

15. No motion of any serious importance (e.g., cases of discipline,
application for membership, call to the ministry, appointment of pastor,
etc.) shall be brought forward at any church meeting, unless notice
thereof shall have been given at a church meeting held at least one
month previous thereto; except in such a case as (in the judgement of
the pastor and deacons) the cause of truth would suffer prejudice by
delay.

16. All propositions, whether for church membership or otherwise,
and all motions, shall be seconded before being put from the chair; and
in the event of the voting being equally divided on any subject to be
decided, the chairman (president) shall be allowed a second (casting)
vote. Any debate or difference that may arise shall be settled by the
majority of the members present and voting.

17. When any question has been decided by the majority of the
church, if any member shall attempt to set aside or oppose the same
decision within six months afterwards, such member shall be accounted
as acting disorderly and contrary to rule 16 of this church.

18. Female members may ask questions through a male member or
may, if asked by the chairman (president), answer any question put
from the chair; otherwise they are not permitted to speak at church
meetings. Should any female member persistently violate this rule, she
shall be liable to suspension from the privileges of membership for
months.

19. A statement of the finances of the cause shall be laid before the
church every months when the vote of satisfaction or otherwise
shall be recorded.

20. The number of the deacons of the church shall not be less than
two where practicable; no deacon shall at any time be appointed unless
at least two-thirds (three-fifths) of the members present and voting at a church meeting held for the appointment of such deacon, be in favour of such appointment.

VISITORS

21. Members of churches of the same faith and order may commune with this church by giving notice (naming their own church) to the pastor or deacons of their desire to do so not later than before the commencement of the service immediately preceding the communion service; or where the communion service is held separately, not later than the close of the preceding service.

CESSATION OF MEMBERSHIP

22. The severance of any member from this church may be only effected by the church itself acting under its duly appointed officers (pastor and deacons), at a properly convened church meeting (see rules 12-15), in the following instances:—

(a) In respect of an orderly member for transfer to another church of the same faith and order, in which event an honourable dismissal should be granted; or,

(b) By disciplinary action of withdrawal AS A LAST RESORT in the case of any disorderly member neglecting to hear either

(i) An offended member's private remonstrance; or, after that,
(ii) The additional exhortations of two or three other brethren; or still further
(iii) The admonition of the whole church, according to Matt. xviii. 15-17.

SANCTIONING A MEMBER TO PREACH

23. Any member of the church considering that he has received the call of the Holy Spirit to the solemn work of the ministry of the Gospel, shall before engaging to preach anywhere, relate to the pastor (or deacons where there is no pastor) his exercises relating thereto; who,
if in his (or their) judgement the matter is indeed of the Lord, shall name the same to the church assembled according to rule 13. In the event of any question or reason entertained by any member or members (or grounds relating to walk or character) why the case should not proceed, the same must be raised and considered at this preliminary meeting; and no examination of the credentials to the member's call shall be undertaken until such question or reason shall have been satisfactorily disposed of by the church. If then agreed by not less than four-fifths (two-thirds) of the members present and voting, the church shall assemble, a month later (according to rule 15), to hear from the member a relation of the matter, and (either then or at a subsequent meeting, as agreed) to hear also an exercise of his gift in preaching. If approved by four-fifths (two-thirds) of the members present and voting, the member shall be given the church's sanction to preach.

Any member preaching contrary to or in neglect of this rule shall be dealt with as walking disorderly.

Should the member consider that his case has been prejudiced, or if through assumed prejudice the pastor or deacons do not bring it forward, the matter may be dealt with according to rule 11. But except for very serious defection in the church it is believed that when such a matter is truly of the Lord no such course will be needful.

NOTE. — (i.) In some cases where the majority stated is not quite reached, that there may be no precipitate conclusion in so solemn a concern, it may be considered advisable for the church to hear the member preach on some further occasion or occasions, before coming to a final decision. This course should only be adopted when the church agrees by a majority of four-fifths (two-thirds) voting in favour.

(ii.) In cases of pastorless churches, it may be proper for the church to agree to invite the pastor of another church of the same faith and order to preside at the meetings relating to this important subject.

(iii.) Bearing in mind the solemn importance of such cases, and the serious responsibility assumed by the church in deciding the same, much earnest prayer is required that the great Head of the church would so dispose each member to act under the spirit of the fear of the Lord, and in the spirit of discernment, and of love to His truth and cause, that the voting may be regulated thereby with a single eye to His glory, according to the will of God.

NOTE. — The blanks in Rules 4, 12, 14, 18, 19 should be filled up, and the alternative majorities in rules 4, 20, 23, be defined, by each individual church.

- 859 -
THE BASIS, AIMS AND OBJECTS OF THE SOVEREIGN GRACE UNION

BASIS

i. The Absolute Sufficiency of Holy Scripture for all matters of Faith and Practice.

ii. The Triune Jehovah.
   a. The Sovereignty of God.
   b. The Deity and perfect Humanity of our Lord Jesus Christ.
   c. The Personality of the Holy Ghost.

iii. *The Fall of Man.

iv. Unconditional Election.

v. Particular Redemption.

vi. Effectual Calling.

vii. Justification by imputing the Obedience and Satisfaction of Christ.

viii. Final Preservation.

* Whereby he has "wholly lost all ability of will to any spiritual good accompanying salvation." — Westminster Confession.

On the whole of the above, see the Doctrinal Articles of the Church of England, and of the Westminster Confession of Faith.

AIM AND OBJECTS

To proclaim and defend the Doctrines of Free and Sovereign Grace.

To print and reprint literature expounding such doctrines.

To encourage publishers to issue such literature and to assist its

---

1. These are found printed in most pamphlets and books published by the Sovereign Grace Union. Of special note are the following books: Luther, The Bondage of Will; Calvin, Calvin's Calvinism; Zanchius, Absolute Predestination; Parks, The Five Points of Calvinism. An exposition of the above articles of faith can be found in Donald Beaton, Some Foundation Truths of the Reformed Faith.
circulation by purchase and distribution to Clergy, Ministers, Preachers, Theological Students, Members of Parliament and others.

To hold Conferences and Meetings to reaffirm the Old Truths in these days of Apostasy and Declension.

To raise a Testimony against Romanism, Ritualism, Rationalism, Arminianism, Modernism and other evils in religion.

To circulate tracts, pamphlets and books, maintaining the Doctrines of Grace, which may be presented to the Union for that purpose, and to print and circulate such publications subject to the approval of the Council, for which any person or Society undertakes to provide the funds.
BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTE

A major contribution of this thesis is the collecting of an extensive bibliography of works having to do with Hyper-Calvinist theology and history. At least half of the works listed herein are by those whom we have identified in Chapter XII as Hyper-Calvinists, though the catalogue of authors and works is by no means exhaustive. We have not listed all separate items published by those whose works were collected, notably Gadsby and Huntington. Likewise, we have not listed all the separate sermons and tracts found in Gill's Sermons and Tracts (1773 and 1814); a full list of these can be found in Seymour, John Gill, Baptist Theologian. Further bibliographical information on all sources can be found in the published catalogues of the British Museum Library, the Library of Congress, and Dr. William's Library. Other helpful bibliographies can be found in: Starr, A Baptist Bibliography; Brook, Lives of the Puritans; Dictionary of National Biography; Copinger, A Treatise on Predestination, Election and Grace. Biographical information can be found in many sources, the standard of which are the works of Brook, Neal, Crosby, Ivimey, Bogue and Bennett, Paul, Wilson, McClintock and Strong, The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopaedia of Religious Knowledge, and the DNB.
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