

# The Historical Denial of the Free Offer

Modern Calvinist leaders who teach the free offer usually claim that they have support from historic Reformed theology. This is false. They frequently claim that Calvin supports their position and that the chief Reformed standards justify their claims. All this is false also. Historic Calvinism, both in its accepted standards and as expressed by its main theologians, denies the free offer; indeed, it would recognise the teaching of modern free offer preachers as Amyraldism, and condemn it as error.

Now such is the lack of knowledge on these matters amongst today's churchgoers that my claims here must be evidenced. I am happy to comply with this to demonstrate the truth. This paper is written to show what the foremost Reformed standards and theologians teach regarding the free offer.

## What is the free offer?

The free offer is the teaching that:

1. God has a good intent to reprobates.
2. God loves all men without exception.
3. God desires, and even wills, the salvation of all men.
4. God gives grace to all men to some degree.

To this the following is at least implied:

1. The atonement of Christ is universal in scope; he died for all.
2. Conversion is conditioned upon the will of the sinner.

The Arminian basis of this theology is plain to see.

## Where does this come from?

This teaching was once restricted to those who followed the school of Moses Amyraut (or Amyrald, 1596-1664) who sought to unite the universalism of Lutherans with the sovereign particularity of Calvinists. Amyraldism is a self-contradictory theology that tries to harmonise the sovereignty of God in all things with a universalism in the decree to salvation. It thus proposes that although God elects only some to salvation, nevertheless he also wills all men to be saved. This will to save all is hampered by man's depravity and thus it is merely a hypothetical universal redemption. God's good will to all is universal and ideal but God's salvation is actually particular to some. Thus Amyraldians believe two contradictory things at the same time, and to help support their folly they proposed two contradictory wills in God: a secret will to save the elect alone, but a revealed will to save all. This worsened their heresy by positing a deep contradiction in the being of God.

The modern free offer (or 'sincere offer', or 'well-meant offer') is straight out of Amyraldism, of which there are now many forms. John Davenant (1576-1641) had a modified form of Amyraldism which infected Puritanism while Andrew Fuller (1754-1815) taught an extreme and complex form that is probably worse than Amyraut's since he also adopted a form of Grotianism (governmental theory of atonement). American Presbyterianism charted its course on free offer lines after 1924 when the Christian Reformed Church formally agreed that God expresses a favourable attitude towards reprobates and gives them a certain *favour or grace*. Herman Hoeksema's rejection of this error led to his expulsion and the formation of the Protestant Reformed Church. In 1948 The Orthodox Presbyterian Church adopted the position of John Murray and Ned Stonehouse, as published in the booklet *The Free Offer of the Gospel*, which plainly avers

that God has, *'a benevolent lovingkindness towards the repentance and salvation of even those he has not decreed to save'* (p27).

But the free offer had begun to infect other evangelical churches before this time. The idea that God loved all and wanted to save all (the basis of Amyraldism) had been expressed in various movements, such as the Scottish Marrow Controversy in 1645, which even drew in Thomas Boston. However, it was in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century that the idea really took hold. Remember that universalistic ideas about salvation were the province of Arminianism and the popularity of Wesleyan Methodism had taken such notions to the fore in American movements such as, the Holiness Movement, Pentecostalism, frontier camp meetings and so on. Finney's virtual Pelagian revivalism was even worse than Methodism. Universal ideas about salvation were ripe, but Calvinists had generally resisted this, apart from degrading 18<sup>th</sup> century movements such as New Divinity and its successor New Haven Theology.

In the late 19<sup>th</sup> century there were still many Reformed Presbyterians, Anglicans, Baptists and independents who held fast to Calvinism; but a change was afoot. Gradually Amyraldian ideas began to seep into these areas in the wave of universalism that was sweeping the church. Evangelical leaders, preachers and evangelists began to adopt the free offer. The widespread acceptance of the DL Moody campaigns were just one aspect of this attack; even confirmed Calvinist Charles Spurgeon praised Moody, despite his clear Arminian universalistic tendencies. Few Reformed leaders dared to criticise an evangelist who affected so many thousands of people but Scottish Calvinist John Kennedy was one of these having seen the theological issues at stake.

An example of the effect of this can be seen in the indefatigable pioneer missionary Mary Slessor (we will ignore the matter of female ministry here). She had been soundly converted under a strict Scottish Presbyterian minister and pledged her life to serve God in Calabar (West Africa) amongst the Ibo people. Having heard Moody preach she was struck by his emphasis upon God loving everyone and determined no longer to preach the Gospel in the apparently hard form that she had learned in her Calvinist background. Thus she preached what was, at best, Amyraldism to the natives. Now while she did many impressive and brave things and was the first woman to be made a vice-consul in the British Empire, it is clear that there was a terrible weakness in her message. This was often revealed when supposed Christian converts went back to witchcraft or began killing people and waging war according to tribal customs.

The big evangelistic campaigns that followed Moody worsened this universal tendency. All large evangelistic campaigns, of necessity, will emphasise man's free will and the importance of an immediate decision in order to prove the worth of an expensive crusade; this decision is based on Amyraldian principles (God loves you and wants to save you if you will accept him now). Over time this direct appeal for immediate repentance, or 'the invitation system', led to a more and more superficial Gospel message and the statistical analyses of such campaigns prove that over 90% of 'converts' fall away soon after the hubbub has died down. Men who started with a basic Reformed theology found that their involvement in such unbiblical methods lost their way. Presbyterian Billy Sunday went to great lengths to appeal to the masses in dramatic and superficial ways and then got diverted into social issues while Billy Graham went from Southern Baptist roots to outright Pelagian universalism.

As the 20<sup>th</sup> century developed, along with the modernist attack on evangelicalism, more and more supposed Reformed churches began to fall under the spell of the free offer. The Brethren were originally firm on the doctrines of grace, but over time the gradual

acceptance of Dispensationalism ruined this and brought an Arminian emphasis. The Higher-Life Movement (Keswick), while originating with some Reformed influences, gradually adopted more and more Wesleyan / Holiness universalistic ideas. Any Reformed presence remaining in both these movements was not Calvinist but Amyraldian at best. The ecumenical basis of many missionary organisations also succeeded in watering down any Reformed foundation that volunteer missionaries began with.

As well as outright theological attacks based upon evangelistic pragmatism, the multitude of new Bible versions added to the general doctrinal complacency. Some of these versions are outright apologetics for Arminianism (e.g. The Living Bible or the NIV). Over the last 100 years the evangelical church was swamped with one form or another of universalising tendencies. Indeed institutions that once stood firm for historic Calvinism themselves succumbed to Amyraldism by the end of the 20<sup>th</sup> century; The Banner of Truth publishing house now attacks historic Calvinists and defends Amyraldian ideas; the Baptist *Sword & Trowel* magazine (initiated by Spurgeon) prints outright free offer articles. The situation that we are faced with today is that the free offer is considered as orthodoxy, and those who teach original Reformed theology are condemned as legalists, Hyper-Calvinists and heretics. William Perkins, Francis Turretin, Arthur Pink and John Bunyan would not be accepted in modern Christian missions or churches.

This is why it is important to show that true Calvinism has always been opposed to the principles of the free offer. The only problem here is that there is such a wealth of quotations to choose from and many are part of long arguments, all of which are relevant. It will thus be necessary to restrict the choice to a relative few. Here we will find numerous greats of historic Calvinism, plus a few lesser known names, amongst independents, Baptists, Presbyterians, Anglicans and Congregationalists; consisting of theologians, pastors, evangelists, preachers and missionaries. I will group my quotes under several heads in a loosely historical succession.

## **God does not have good intentions towards reprobates.**

### **John Calvin**

[The purpose of the external call towards the reprobate is that] they may turn a deaf ear; he kindles a light, but it is that they may become more blind; he produces a doctrine, but it is that they might be more stupid; he employs a remedy, but it is that they might not be cured. *Institutes*, 3:24,13

Those, therefore, whom he has created for dishonour during life and destruction at death, that they may be vessels of wrath and examples of severity, in bringing their doom, he at one time deprives of the means of hearing his word, at another by the preaching of it blinds and stupefies them the more. *Institutes* 3:24,12

### **John Brown of Haddington**

[God decreed of reprobates] never to know them in the way of peculiar regard, or love them with any good will, or pity them in order to their effectual recovery ... and hence purposed to withhold from them all his undeserved favours of redemption. ... [They are] spiritually blinded, hardened, and given up to strong delusions, vile affections, and a reprobate sense.

*Systematic Theology*, Christian Focus Pub., Fearn, Ross-shire, (2002), p161.

### John Brown

[When God is said to hate] it signifies either, that for wise and good reasons He does not bestow on them such favours as, in the exercise of His sovereignty, He bestows on others; or that, on account of their sins, He punishes them. ... no revelation was given to them, no covenant formed with them. [This decree] does not argue any violation of the Divine faithfulness. *Analytical Exposition of the Epistle of Paul to the Romans*, Tentmaker Pub., Stoke, (2001), p316.

## God does not intend to save the reprobate.

### Augustine of Hippo

And what is written, that "He wills all men' to be saved," while yet all men are not saved, may be understood in many ways, some of which I have mentioned in other writings of mine; but here I will say one thing: "He wills all men to be saved," is so said that all the predestinated may be understood by it, because every kind of men is among them. Just as it was said to the Pharisees, "Ye tithe every herb;" where the expression is only to be understood of every herb that they had, for they did not tithe every herb which was found throughout the whole earth. 'Treatise on Rebuke & Grace', Chapter 44, *Nicene & Post Nicene Fathers*, First Series, Volume 5. AGES CD Rom.

### John Calvin

But the word hardens, when applied to God in Scripture, means not only permission, (as some washy moderators would have it,) but also the operation of the wrath of God: for all those external things, which lead to the blinding of the reprobate, are the instruments of his wrath; and Satan himself, who works inwardly with great power, is so far his minister, that he acts not, but by his command ... Paul teaches us, that the ruin of the wicked is not only foreseen by the Lord, but also ordained by his counsel and his will; and Solomon teaches us the same thing,-that not only the destruction of the wicked is foreknown, but that the wicked themselves have been created for this very end-that they may perish. *Commentary on Romans* 9:18. AGES CD Rom, p279.

### Francis Turretin

The mercy of God ... has its own objects and vessels into which it is poured out (viz., the elect and believers upon whom he determined to have mercy from eternity, who are distinguished from others whom he decreed to pass by and are therefore called "vessels of wrath fitted to destruction," Rm 9:22). *Institutes of Elenctic Theology*, P&R Pub. Phillipsburg (1992), Vol 1, p244.

Now although we do not deny that the reprobate (who live in external communion with the church) are called by God through the Gospel [this is the external call as he has previously explained]; still we do deny that they are called with the intention that they should be made actual partakers of salvation (which God knew would never be the case because in his decree he had ordained otherwise concerning them). .... The external call is extended to the reprobate as well as the elect; but in a different manner ... the call cannot be addressed to men indiscriminately without the reprobate as well as the elect sharing in it. ... [The call to the reprobate] springs from the justice of a judge who wishes to convict the stubborn and rebellious and to render them without excuse. *Institutes of Elenctic Theology*, P&R Pub. Phillipsburg (1992), Vol 2, p504, emphasis PF.

One of his sub-headings is entitled:

Proof that God acts seriously in the calling of reprobates, although he does not intend their salvation.

Under this heading he says,

God cannot in calling intend the salvation of those whom he reprobated from eternity and from whom he decreed to withhold faith and other means leading to salvation. ... God does not intend faith in the reprobate; therefore neither does he intend salvation. ... It is ... absurd to say that he [God] calls the reprobate with the intention that they should be saved. ... [to teach this is] repugnant to the wisdom, goodness and power of God. *Institutes of Elenctic Theology*, P&R Pub. Phillipsburg (1992), Vol 2, p505-506.

The passage [Ezek 33:11] then simply teaches that God is pleased with, or approves, the conversion and life of the sinner ... rather than the death of the sinner, and therefore enjoins it as a duty that men be converted if they expect to be saved.' Translated by Thornwell, *Works*, Banner of Truth, Edinburgh, Vol 2, p168. Giger's translation (*Institutes of Elenctic Theology*, Vol 1, p408) is not as clear.

### **John Owen**

That desires and wishings [e.g. unfulfilled wish of the salvation of the reprobate] should properly be ascribed unto God is exceedingly opposite to all his sufficiency and the perfection of his nature; they are no more in him than he hath eyes, ears and hands. *The Death of Death in the Death of Christ*, Banner of Truth Trust, Edinburgh (1959), p289. Also *Works*, Banner of Truth Trust (1967), Vol 10, p401.

The essence of God, being a most absolute, pure, simple act or substance, his will consequently can be but simply one: whereof we ought to make neither division nor distinction. *Works*, Vol 10, p44 Banner of Truth Trust, Edinburgh (1967). Owen also condemns here the idea that God's will; can be resisted by men or that God may fail in his intentions.

### **John Brown of Haddington**

The Scripture never represents God as *expecting* the conversion of reprobates. To assert that he *expects* any thing which never happens, is to deny his infinite wisdom and knowledge. ... The Scripture never declares, that God is inclined to have every individual of mankind, Judas Iscariot, Antichrist, &c. saved, but the contrary. *Systematic Theology*, Christian Focus Pub., Fearn, Ross-Shire (2002), p165 (emph. original).

The Gospel is so far from declaring that God intends to save all men, that it plainly affirms, that he intends to save but the smaller part of gospel-hearers. *Systematic Theology*, Christian Focus Pub., Fearn, Ross-Shire (2002), p166.

### **William Cunningham,**

Calvinists, while they admit that pardon and salvation are offered indiscriminately to all whom the gospel is preached, and that all who can be reached should be invited and urged to come to Christ and embrace him, deny that this flows from, or indicates, any design or purpose on God's part to save all men. *Historical Theology*, Banner of Truth, Edinburgh (1879), Vol 2, p396

### James Henry Thornwell

The plain doctrine of the Presbyterian Church is that God has no purpose of salvation for all. *Works, Banner of Truth, Edinburgh (1986), Vol 2, p161.*

### AA Hodge

The doctrine taught in the Confession and held by the great body of the Reformed Churches is, that God, moved by a special personal love, [Hodge distinguishes this from those who suggest Christ died from a general love to all mankind] elected certain men out of the mass of the fallen race to salvation, and in order to accomplish that purpose he determined to send Christ to die for them and the Holy Ghost to renew and sanctify them. ... A purpose to save all and a purpose to save only some could not coexist in the divine mind. *Commentary on the Westminster Confession of Faith, Banner of Truth, Edinburgh (1978), c.3, sect. 6, p73-74.*

Reprobation ... involves a determination to pass over these, and to refuse to elect them to life ... it involves a determination to treat them on the principles of strict justice, precisely as they deserve ... and is absolutely sovereign., resting upon his good pleasure. *Commentary on the Westminster Confession of Faith, Banner of Truth, Edinburgh (1978), c.3, sect. 7, p75.*

### Herman Hoeksema

God cannot be merciful to the reprobate wicked... His mercy toward his people must be founded in his sovereign election, according to which he beholds them eternally as perfectly righteous in the beloved.

*Reformed Dogmatics, Reformed Free Pub. Assoc., Grand Rapids (1985), p116*

One must choose between these two: either Jesus purposed to save all men and He is only a possible saviour who does not actually save; or Jesus came to save the elect unto eternal life and then he actually saves... It follows from the nature of the atonement, that he died, not for all, but for the elect, that is, for a certain number in whose stead He died and for whom He arose. Atonement is satisfaction. And satisfaction is the actual payment of our debt with God. If Christ paid the debt for all, all are righteous and saved, which is absurd. If, nevertheless, you maintain that He died for all men without distinction, you must deny the truth of atonement, namely, that He actually satisfied fully for all our sins. However, such is not the truth. Christ's death is a real and full satisfaction for the sins of those for whom he died. Hence He only died for the elect. You must choose between an actual satisfaction for the elect only and the denial of this satisfaction through the blood of Christ. You can express this same truth in another way. Jesus' death was vicarious; He died instead of those whom He represented, whose head He is. Now either He vicariously represented all men and then all are surely saved, which no one believes, or He represented a certain number and these are the elect. And, secondly ... the sinner is dead. He must be raised to life. He must be born again. Therefore, the actual realisation of the salvation which Jesus merited cannot depend on his will, for he will not and cannot will.

*Jesus Saviour and the Evil of Hawking Him, Tract of First Prot. Ref. Church (1986), p13-14. (Emphasis PF)*

### John Piper

There is a correspondence between 'Jacob I loved and Esau I hated' (9:13), on the one hand, and 'He has mercy on whom he wills and he hardens whom he wills' (9:18), on the other hand ... the implication that must then follow is that God's act of

hardening is just as unconditional as the loving and hating of 9:13, which God determined 'before they were born or had done anything good or evil'. *The Justification of God*, p173.

... it is the glory of God and His essential nature mainly to dispense mercy (but also wrath, Ex. 34:7) on whomever He pleases apart from any constraint originating outside his own will. This is the essence of what it means to be God. This is his name. *The Justification of God*, p88-89.

## **God does not give grace or mercy to the reprobate. God is not good to the reprobate. Man can do no good works to please God.**

### **John Calvin**

The fiction of Pighius is puerile and absurd, when he interprets grace to be God's goodness in inviting all men to salvation ... [Pighius] holds fast the fiction that grace is offered equally to all. *The Eternal Predestination of God*, in *Calvin's Calvinism*, RFPA, (n.d.) p49-51.

All the works performed by sinners are contaminated by impurity of heart. Let us then cease to give the name of righteousness to works which the mouth of the Lord condemns as polluted. ... the most splendid works performed by men, who are not yet truly sanctified, are so far from being righteousness in the sight of the Lord, that he regards them as sins. *Institutes* 3:14, 7-8,11.

### **Canons of the Synod of Dort**

[They err] Who teach: That the corrupt and natural man can so well use the common grace (by which they understand the light of nature), or the gifts still left him after the fall, that he can gradually gain by their good use a greater, namely, the evangelical or saving grace and salvation itself. And that in this way God on his part shows himself ready to reveal Christ unto all men, since he applies to all sufficiently and efficiently the means necessary to conversion. For the experience of all ages and the Scriptures do both testify that this is untrue. "He showeth his Word unto Jacob, his statutes and his ordinances unto Israel. He hath not dealt so with any nation: and as for his ordinances they have not known them," Psalm 147:19, 20. "Who in the generations gone by suffered all the nations to walk in their own way," Acts 14:16. And: "And they (Paul and his companions) having been forbidden of the Holy Spirit to speak the word in Asia, and when they were come over against Mysia, they assayed to go into Bithynia, and the Spirit suffered them not," Acts 16:6, 7., Third / Fourth Head (Corruption of man and conversion), Rejection of Errors, 5.

### **John Knox**

[Commenting upon texts which some assert imply common grace to all] Such general sentences of necessity must be so restrained, that difference may be kept between the Elect and the Reprobate; else we shall do nothing in explaining Scriptures but confound light and darkness. *Works*, Vol 5, p415.

### **John Bunyan**

Is the salvation of the sinner by the grace of God? Then here you may see the reason why one backslider is recovered, and another left to perish in his

backsliding. There was grace for Lot, but none for his wife; therefore she was left in her transgression, but Lot was saved notwithstanding. There was grace for Jacob, but none for Esau; therefore Esau was left in his backsliding, but Jacob found mercy notwithstanding. There was grace for David, but none for Saul; therefore David obtained mercy, and Saul perished in his backsliding. There was grace for Peter, but none for Judas; therefore Judas is left to perish in his backsliding, and Peter is saved from his sin. ... It will be said, repentance was found in one, but not in the other. Well, but who granted and gave the one repentance; The Lord turned and looked upon Peter; he did not turn and look upon Judas ... 'The steps of a good man are ordered by the Lord'. *Saved By Grace*, Postscript, in *Works*, Vol 1, Banner of Truth, Edinburgh, p357, (emph. original).

### **Dr. William Cunningham**

Calvin consistently, unhesitatingly, and explicitly denied the doctrine of God's universal grace to all men, - that is omnibus et singulis, to each and every man,- as implying in some sense a desire or purpose or intention to save them all.

That Calvin denied the doctrine of God's universal grace or love to all men, as implying some desire or intention of saving them all, and some provision directed to that object, is too evident to any one who has read his writings, to admit of doubt or require proof.

The fact of Calvin so explicitly denying the doctrine of God's universal grace or love to all men, affords a more direct and certain ground for the inference, that he did not hold the doctrine of universal atonement. *The Reformers and the Theology of the Reformation*, T&T Clark, Edinburgh (1962), p398-399.

### **BB Warfield**

But just because God is God, of course, no one receives grace who has not been foreknown and afore-selected for the gift; and, as much of course, no one who has been foreknown and afore-selected for it, fails to receive it. Therefore the number of the predestinated is fixed, and fixed by God. 'Introduction To Augustin's Anti-Pelagian Writings', *Nicene & Post Nicene Fathers*, First Series, Volume 5, p106. See also, 'Augustine & The Pelagian Controversy', *Works* Vol 4, Baker, Grand Rapids (1991), p408.

What lies at the heart of his [Calvin's] soteriology is the absolute exclusion of the creaturely element in the initiation of the saving process. 'Calvinism', *Works*, Baker, Grand Rapids (1991), Vol 5, p359.

### **Herman Hoeksema**

... if rain and sunshine are a manifestation of God's love to all men, the just and the unjust, what are floods and droughts, pestilences and earthquakes, and all destructive forces and evils sent to all through nature, but manifestations of His hatred for all, the just and the unjust? But it is absurd to say that God hates the just, for He loves them. It is also absurd to say that God changes, now loving the just and the unjust and manifesting this love in rain and sunshine, now hating them and revealing His hatred in upheavals and destruction ... Besides, it must not be overlooked that the text does not at all state that God is gracious to the just and to the unjust, but that He [sends rain] and causes His sun to shine on all ... [Love] is, according to Scripture, the bond of perfectness (Col. 3:14) ... However, it stands to reason that, in the case of loving our enemies that spitefully use us, curse us, and persecute us, love must needs be one-sided. There cannot be a bond of fellowship between the wicked and the perfect in Christ. To love our enemy,

therefore, is not to flatter him, to have fellowship with him, to play games with him, and to speak sweetly to him; but rather to rebuke him, to demand that he leave his wicked way, and thus to bless him and to pray for him. It is to bestow good things upon him with the demand of true love that he leave his wicked way, walk in the light, and thus have fellowship with us. If he heed our love, which will be the case if he be of God's elect and receive grace, he will turn from darkness into light, and our love will assume the nature of a bond of perfectness. If he despise our love, our very act of love will be to his greater damnation ... God rains and causes His sun to shine upon the just and the unjust, thus bestowing good things upon them all, demanding that they shall employ them as means to walk in righteousness and light. For with God love is delight in perfection in the highest sense of the word. If now the wicked receive grace with rain and sunshine, they will walk in the light and have fellowship with God. If they do not receive grace, they will employ the rain and the sunshine in the service of sin and receive the greater damnation. But rain and sunshine are never grace. On Matthew 5:44-45, *Ready to Give An Answer*, p71-73.

A man wills because God shows him mercy. God does not show mercy because a man wills. But when God shows mercy to a man, the result is that he wills, he runs. His willing is not the cause, but the effect. God's mercy is first. And although it is true that one cannot enter into the kingdom of God unless he wills, the cause of this willing is not in man, but in God. God's mercy is sovereign. *Righteous By Faith Alone*, p401.

The vessels of wrath are so constituted that their entire make-up and design and institution serves the purpose of reaching that end of destruction. If we abandon the figure of the vessel, the meaning is that there are men so instituted as to their personality, their power and talents, their position in the world and their place in the whole of the works of God, that everything tends to their destruction, serves the purpose of leading them, not to temporal destruction, but to eternal desolation. Unto this they are fitted. *God's Eternal Good Pleasure*, RFP (1979), Grand Rapids, p76.

### **Robert Harbach**

'Hagar, fear not!' If the reader believes the fundamental scripture principle that God's goodness is always particular, then there should be no difficulty in perceiving the significance of the fact that the words 'fear not,' as used in all scripture, are never spoken to a reprobate. They were spoken to Abraham (15:1), to Isaac (26:24), to believing Israel (Isa. 41:14), to Daniel (10:12), to Zacharias (Lk. 1:13), to Mary (1:30), to the godly women at the tomb (Matt. 28:5), to Paul (Acts 27:24), to the 'little flock' (Luke 12:342), and to the apostle John (Rev. 1:17); but never to the reprobate. The reason is obvious. They have everything to fear; for the longer they live on this earth, the heavier their condemnation in the day of judgment ... Then Hagar and Ishmael are people of God. This gracious language is in keeping with, 'God heard the voice of the lad,' which is declared twice in one verse, 'and God was with the lad' compared with, 'God is with thee' (Abraham). Cp. verses 20, 22. It may be that a godly man may say to another who happens to be a reprobate, 'God is with thee' (as in I Sam. 10:7). But God does not ever say of a reprobate, 'I have blessed him' 'fear thou not,' or 'God was with him.' (Cp. Gen 39:2, 3, 21; Jud. 6:12; I Sam. 3:19; 18:14.) When He uses this language He uses it with reference to his children. (See Isa. 41:10; Matt. 28:20). On 'Fear Not', *Studies in the Book of Genesis*, p440.

### **D. M. Lloyd-Jones**

'What if God, willing to shew his wrath ...' Now this word 'willing'... really means 'wishing', and it is even stronger than that; it could be translated 'What if God inclined to ...' And then even that is not strong enough because it means 'a deep and a strong desire' ... 'His holy will disposes Him not to leave unmanifested His wrath and His power.' That is a very good way of putting it. It is a paraphrase but it does bring out the meaning: 'Notwithstanding that His holy will disposes Him.' And it disposes Him very strongly. God, with this whole disposition of His nature, [wills to show his wrath upon the reprobate]. *Romans 9*, Banner of Truth, Edinburgh (1991) p211.

Moses was asking not only for a manifestation of God's mercy, but for a manifestation of God's glory also to the whole nation. Not only for himself but for the whole nation. And God's reply to him is I am not going to do this for the entire nation. 'I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy, and I will have compassion on whom I will have compassion.' Not the whole people, but upon certain members of the company only and not upon the others. *Romans 9*, Banner of Truth, Edinburgh (1991) p155.

## **God does not love all men.**

### **Martin Luther**

All things whatsoever arise from, and depend upon, the Divine appointments [decrees] whereby it was preordained who should receive the Word of Life, and who should disbelieve it, who should be delivered from their sins, and who should be hardened in them, who should be justified and who should be condemned. This is the very truth which razes the doctrine of freewill [and the free offer] from its foundations, to wit, that God's eternal love of some men and hatred of others is immutable and cannot be reversed. *The Bondage of the Will*, quoted in AW Pink's *Sovereignty of God*, p106.

The love and hate of God towards men is immutable and eternal, existing, not merely before there was any merit or work of 'free-will', but before the world was made; [so] all things take place in us of necessity, according as He has from eternity loved or not loved ... faith and unbelief come to us by no work of our own, but through the love and hatred of God. *The Bondage of the Will*.

### **John Calvin**

[God] by an eternal decree fixed the number of those whom he is pleased to embrace in love, and of those whom he is pleased to display his wrath. *Institutes* 3:29,17.

The reprobate are hateful to God, and that with a perfect justice, since those destitute of his Spirit cannot produce anything that does not deserve cursing. *Institutes* 3:24,17

### **Canons of the Synod of Dort**

*See: First Head (Predestination), Article 10: the text describing that God loved Jacob before he was born (Rm 9:11-13) is used to illustrate God's love for the elect. Second Head, Article 9: everlasting love is towards the elect only. Third & Fourth*

Head, Article 7: *the sovereign good pleasure and unmerited love of God is only communicated to the elect.*

### Francis Turretin

Since his love cannot be vain and inefficacious, those whom he loves unto salvation he ought to love fully and even unto the end. ... The love treated in John 3:16 ... cannot be universal towards each and every one, but special towards a few. *Institutes of Elenctic Theology*, P&R Pub. Phillipsburg (1992), Vol 1, p400, 405.

The question is not whether God is borne by a general love and philanthropy towards men as his creatures, and also bestows upon them various temporal benefits pertaining to the things of this life. We do not deny that God has never left himself without witness with regard to this (Acts 14:17). And we are ready to grant that there is no one who does not owe some gratitude to God and who, whatever he is or can do, is not bound to give thanks to his creator. But the question concerns the special and saving love which tends to spiritual benefits, and by which God willed to have mercy upon them to salvation. We think this is particular to the elect alone, not universal and common to all. *Institutes of Elenctic Theology*; P&R Pub. Phillipsburg (1992), Vol. 1, p396-397.

### The Helvetic Consensus Formula

Canon vi: we cannot give suffrage to the opinion of those who teach:

(1) that God, moved by philanthropy, or a sort of special love for the fallen human race, to previous election, did, in a kind of conditioned willing (i.e. willingness) first moving of pity ... purpose the salvation of all and each, at least conditionally, i.e., if they would believe. Quoted from AA Hodge, *Outlines of Theology*, Nelson, Edinburgh & New York (1883), Appendix, p657.

### William Perkins

The decree of reprobation is that part of predestination whereby God ... determined to reject certain men unto destruction and misery, and that to the praise of his justice ... Further, whom God rejecteth to condemnation, those he hateth. *The Work of William Perkins*, Sutton Courtenay Press (1969), p250-251.

### The Westminster Standards

The love of God (included under the term 'goodness of God') is described as being infinite, eternal and unchangeable. *Westminster Shorter Catechism*, Question 4; Confession 2:2, 4:1, 5:4. Thus this love cannot be temporarily offered to the reprobate, but only the elect - Those of mankind that are predestinated unto life, God ... hath chosen in Christ unto everlasting glory out of His mere free grace and love. *Westminster Confession of Faith*, 3:5.

### Samuel Rutherford

[Spoke of..] God's hatred of the reprobate and love and peace on the elect...[since God's love is] simple [united, indivisible] not contradictory. *Trial and Triumph of Faith*, p348-350.

### John Owen

[Concerning the error of a universal love in God to all men which desires their salvation] That God hath any natural or necessary inclination, by his goodness, or any other property, to do good to us, or any of his creatures, we do deny. ... We deny that all mankind are the object of that love of God which moved him to send

his Son to die; God having 'made some for the day of evil', Prov 16:4. *Works*, Vol 10, Banner of Truth Trust, Edinburgh (1967), p227. Note all Owen's other arguments in this section.

It is, therefore, incorrect to translate, as in Psalm 145:9, 15-16 that God is 'merciful' not only to all men but to his whole creation ... These all feel the benefits of God's general goodness in his providential upholding of his creation ... [but] true mercy ... is the fount of all saving faith and repentance, we can distinguish this from all loose and mistaken concepts of 'mercy' displayed by the general work of God in providence. *Biblical Theology*, Soli Deo Gratia, Pittsburgh (1994), p74.

Look whom, and how many, that love of God embraced that was the cause of sending his Son to redeem them; for them, and so many, did Christ, according to the counsel of his Father, and in himself, intentionally lay down his life. Now, this love is not universal, being his "good pleasure" of blessing with spiritual blessings and saving some in Christ, Ephesians 1:4,5; which good pleasure of his evidently comprehendeth some, when others are excluded, Matthew 11:25,26. Yea, the love of God in giving Christ for us is of the same extent with that grace whereby he calleth us to faith, or bestoweth faith on us: for "he hath called us with an holy calling, according to his own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus," 2 Timothy 1:9; which, doubtless, is not universal and common unto all. Innumerable other reasons there are to prove, that seeing God hath given his elect only, whom only he loved, to Christ to be redeemed; and seeing that the Son loveth only those who are given him of his Father, and redeemeth only whom he loveth; seeing, also, that the Holy Spirit, the love of the Father and the Son, sanctifieth all, and only them, that are elected and redeemed. *Works*, 'Display of Arminianism', Banner of Truth Trust, Edinburgh (1967), Vol. 10, p119.

That God hath any natural or necessary inclination, by his goodness, or any other property, to do good to us, or any of his creatures, we do deny. ... We deny that all mankind are the object of that love of God which moved him to send his Son to die; God having 'made some for the day of evil', Prov 16:4. *Works*, Banner of Truth Trust, Edinburgh (1967), Vol 10, p227. Note all Owen's other arguments in this section.

But those who deny this hatred of sin and sinners, and the disposition to punish them, to be perpetually, immutably, and habitually inherent in God, I am afraid have never strictly weighed in their thoughts the divine purity and holiness. *Works*, vol. 10, Banner of Truth Trust, Edinburgh (1967), p514.

### **Jonathan Edwards**

But this is not the case in another world. The saints in glory will know concerning the damned in hell, that God never loved them, but that he hates them, and that they will be for ever hated of God. This hatred of God will be full declared to them; they will see it, and will see it in the fruits of their misery . . . God has declared his hatred of the damned. *On Knowing Christ*, p 250.

### **John Gill**

Thou hatest all workers of iniquity; not all that have sin in them or do sin, for there are none without it; but such who give themselves up to work wickedness, who make it the business of their lives, and are slaves unto it, living in a continued series and course of impiety; and this character does not only belong to openly profane

sinners, but to some professors of religion . . . these are the objects of God's hatred. *Expositions on the Bible*, on Psalm 5:5.

### **RL Dabney**

Arguing against those who base all God's actions on benevolence as being impious to God, Dabney states that God actually hates the sinner and those who insist that God loves all consistently must become universalists and must either deny the existence of hell or the omnipotence of God, a God who could not convert a Judas even though he loved him. *Discussions*, Vol 1, p283-4, Banner of Truth, Edinburgh (1967), p470, 473-4.

### **William G T Shedd**

Sinful men are the objects of God's providential care, as well as renewed men. Even Satan and the fallen angels are treated with all the benevolence which their enmity to God will admit of ... God's benevolent interest in the sentient creature, and his care for its welfare, is proportioned and suited to the nature and circumstances to the creature. It extends to the animals: (Ps 145:16, 104:21, Job 38:41, Matt 6:26, Ps 36:6). It extends to man (Acts 14:17). It extends to sinful man (Matt 5:45, Acts 14:17, Neh 9:17). Sinful man is deprived of a full manifestation of the Divine benevolence, only by reason of his sin. God manifests to the sinner all the benevolence that he is qualified to receive. He sends him physical and temporal good: rain from heaven, and fruitful seasons [this is God's providence but not grace] ... but he cannot bestow upon a sinful and hostile man his approving love. *Dogmatic Theology*, Vol 1, Nelson, Nashville (1980), p386-391.

### **A. A. Hodge**

God's love for holiness and hatred of sin is represented in Scripture as essential and intrinsic. He loves holiness for its own sake. He hates sin and is determined to punish it because of its intrinsic ill desert. He hates the wicked every day - Ps 5:5; 7:11. *Outlines of Theology*, Nelson, Edinburgh & New York (1883), p156-7.

The facts prove that God's general benevolence is not inconsistent with allowing some to be damned for their sins. This is all that reprobation means. Gratuitous election, or the positive choice of some does not rest upon God's general benevolence [by which Hodge means God's providence], but upon his special love to its own. *Outlines of Theology*, Nelson, Edinburgh & New York, (1883) p228-9.

### **Augustus Hopkins Strong**

The immanent [or absolute, i.e. an attribute which respects the inner being of God, independent of his connection to the universe – PF] love of God is not to be confounded with mercy and goodness toward creatures. These are its manifestations and are to be denominated transitive [or relative, i.e. an attribute of God that refers to his outward revelation of being, related to the creation – PF] love... The imminent love of God therefore requires and finds a personal object in the image of his own infinite perfections. It is to be understood only in the light of the doctrine of the Trinity ... So the love of God is shown in his eternal giving ... This he does eternally in the self-communications of the Trinity; this he does transitively and temporarily in his giving of himself for us in Christ, and to us in the Holy Spirit *Systematic Theology*, A.C. Armstrong & Son, New York, 6<sup>th</sup> ed. (1899), p127.  
Note: Thus God's love can only ever be upon Christ and that which is in him.

By mercy and goodness we mean the transitive love of God its twofold relation to

the disobedient and to the obedient portions of his creatures ... Mercy leads him to seek the good of sinners [pre-conversion elect] i.e. compassionate grace or benevolence, goodness leads him to communicate his life and blessedness to those who are like him, i.e. complacency. (sic)

Notice, however, that transitive love is but an outward manifestation of immanent love. The eternal and perfect object of God's love is his own nature. Men become subordinate objects of God's love only as they become connected and identified with its principle object, the image of God's perfections in Christ. Only in the Son do men become sons of God. *Systematic Theology*, A.C. Armstrong & Son, New York, 6<sup>th</sup> ed. (1899), p137-138.

God's love for us ... dates back to a time before we were born, - aye, even to eternity past. It is a love which was fastened upon us although God knew the worst of us. It is unchanging, because founded upon his infinite and eternal love to Christ. *Systematic Theology*, A.C. Armstrong & Son, New York, 6<sup>th</sup> ed. (1899), p433.

God is not only benevolent but holy, and holiness is his ruling attribute. The vindication of God's holiness is the primary and sufficient object of punishment. This constitutes a good which fully justifies the infliction [of hell – PF] ... Love for holiness involves hatred of unholiness ... holiness conditions love. *Systematic Theology*, A.C. Armstrong & Son, New York, 6<sup>th</sup> ed. (1899), p597.

### **John Leadley Dagg**

God is kind to the unthankful and evil, and bestows blessings on the just and the unjust; but his benevolence, though infinite, does not produce in every one of his creatures the highest degree of happiness ... The justice of God limits the exercise of his benevolence. *Manual of Theology*, Gano books, Harrisonburg (1990), p319-320

### **James Henry Thornwell**

Although Thornwell was sublapsarian, he called the idea of common-grace '*the superficial theory*' resorted to by people confused on election. He also insisted that Providence was sovereign and the Lord did not deal with all men alike; the election of some was just as particular as the providential blessings of some. *Works*, Vol 2, p146. Far from God loving all men, Thornwell says that,

Sinners are by nature odious and loathsome to God, and are under a righteous sentence of condemnation and death. *Works*, Banner of Truth, Edinburgh (1986), Vol 2, p158.

For Thornwell, God's providence is applied to all people in a benevolent fashion (Ps 145:9) but his love is only applied to the elect,

The love of God is always connected with the purpose of salvation ... unconverted sinners have no lot nor part in it'. God is angry with them every day; "he hateth all workers of iniquity". The special love of God is confined exclusively to the elect. The general benevolence of God is common [which he calls providence in this context] but it implies no purpose of salvation at all. *Works*, Banner of Truth, Edinburgh (1986), Vol 2, p162.

The wicked are only treated benevolently in the sense of patience and long-suffering to those who are doomed to destruction.

### **John L Girardeau**

The love involved in election - a peculiar, free, inalienable, saving love of Complacency towards the elect ... (He then quotes in full the following texts which should be consulted: Ex 30:19; Rm 9:13-18; Mal 1:2-3; Deut 7:7-8, 10:15; Isa 43:4, 63:9, 16; Ps 89:19,20,28,30-35, 94:18; Isa 54:8-10, 49:15; Mic 7:20; Jer 31:3, Zeph 3:17; Jn 17:23, 26; Rm 5:5, 8, 9, 8:38-39; Eph 2:4-5; Tit 3:4-7, Heb 13:5; 1 Jn 4:9, 10, 19; 2 Thess 2:16-17) ... The testimonies from Scripture clearly reveal the nature of God's electing love. It is expressly declared to be eternal. It is peculiar: it is directed to the people of God. It is free, that is, sovereign and unconditioned upon any good quality or act in its objects ...

There are two distinct aspects of the divine love or goodness. One of these, in the form of benevolence, terminates on men indiscriminately, the just and the unjust, the evil and the good; and, when it is directed to them as ill-deserving and miserable, it assumes the special form of mercy. The other, the love of complacency, is a peculiar affection, supposing the existence in its sinful objects of a saving relation to Christ as mediator, Federal head and Redeemer. Now let it be supposed that the infinite benevolence of God, in the form of mercy contemplating the lost and wretched condition of man, into which he was conceived as having plunged himself by his sin and folly, suggested his salvation ... That suggestion was checked by the demands of infinite justice, ... For although the attributes of God are all infinite, and cohere in his essence in, perfect harmony with each other, the exercise of mercy ... was checked by wisdom and justice, ...

The Father ... elected some of mankind to be redeemed. This, while it was a sovereign act of his will, involved the exercise of infinite love and mercy ... those thus designated became the Father's elect ones, his sheep ... conceived as in Christ the elect became objects of a complacential love, measured only by the regard of the Father for his well-beloved Son ...

The love of complacency towards the elect is not to be confounded with God's love of benevolence towards all men. It includes the love of benevolence, but it is inconceivably more. It differs from it in important respects. In the first place, it supposes a peculiar relation of the elect to God's only-begotten Son, and is, according to scriptural representations, analogous to the love the Father bears to him. In the second place, the gift of Christ ... is infinitely more costly and precious than that of sunshine, rain and other mere providential blessings which benevolence indiscriminately confers upon the general mass of men. In the third place, the elect, although in themselves unlovely, are conceived as in Christ intrinsically possessed of the graces of the Holy Spirit, which render them appropriate objects of complacential regard. It is this love, this peculiar, intense, unutterable love, which the scriptures declare to be manifested towards the elect in the actual execution of God's eternal purpose of salvation. ...

In connection with this aspect of the subject of election, the Arminian doctrine is open to the charge of being entirely unscriptural ... the Arminian ... reduces the intense, inexpressible, unchangeable affection which God from eternity entertained for his own people to a general regard for all sinners of the human race - his love for his sheep to a love for goats.

*Calvinism and Evangelical Arminianism*, Sprinkle Pub. Harrisonburg (1984), p54-66.

Girardeau clearly discriminates between God's love for his people and a 'love' expressed towards all in the continuance of life. It is unfortunate that he uses the term 'love' for this, even though it is distinguished as mere benevolence not complacence. Scripture does not use *Agape* (and related Hebrew words) for this. 'Providence' or even 'compassion' would have been a much better word to use to describe this general 'love' of God. However,

Girardeau's arguments are very good and should be read in their entirety.

### **Robert Haldane**

Jacob was loved before he was born, consequently before he was capable of doing good; and Esau was hated before he was born, consequently before he was incapable of doing evil. It may be asked why God hated him before he sinned personally; and human wisdom has proved its folly, by endeavouring to soften the word hated into something less than hatred: but the man who submits like a little child to the word of God, will find no difficulty in seeing in what sense Esau was worthy of the hatred of God before he was born. ...

We will not obey those whom we hate, if we can avoid it. Just so, if our parents command us to disobey Jesus Christ, we must not obey them; and this is called hatred, figuratively, from the resemblance of its effects. But in this passage, in which the expression 'Esau have I hated,' occurs, everything is literal. The Apostle is reasoning from premises to a conclusion. Besides, the contrast of loving Jacob with hating Esau, shows that the last phrase is literal and proper hatred. If God's love to Jacob was real literal love, God's hatred to Esau must be real literal hatred. It might as well be said that the phrase, 'Jacob have I loved,' does not signify that God really loved Jacob, but that the expression, is that God hated Jacob less than he hated Esau. If every man's own mind is a sufficient security against concluding the meaning to be, 'Jacob have I hated less,' his judgment ought to be a security against the equally unwarrantable meaning, 'Esau have I loved less'.

*An exposition of Romans*, MacDonald, McLean, Virginia (N.D.) p455-456.

In its obvious and literal meaning, what is said of Jacob and Esau must be true of all the individuals of the human race before they are born. Each one of them must either be loved or hated of God. *Ibid.* p457.

### **William G T Shedd**

God manifests to the sinner all the benevolence that he is qualified to receive. He sends him physical and temporal good: rain from heaven, and fruitful seasons ... but he cannot bestow upon a sinful and hostile man his approving love. *Dogmatic Theology*, Vol 1, Nelson, Nashville (1980), p386-391.

### **CH Spurgeon**

It is not a little dislike, but a thorough hatred which God bears to workers of iniquity. To be hated of God is an awful thing . . . 'The lord will abhor the bloody and deceitful man.' How forcible is the word abhor! Does it not show us how powerful and deep-seated is the hatred of the Lord against the workers of iniquity?  
*Treasury of David* on Psalm 5:5.

There is a story of C H Spurgeon somewhere which goes like this:

After preaching on Esau and Jacob a lady came to him very exercised saying, 'Mr. Spurgeon, I just don't understand how God could hate Esau!' Spurgeon answered, 'I don't have any trouble understanding how he could hate Esau; I have my trouble understanding how he could love Jacob.'

### **James Henry Thornwell**

Sinners are by nature odious and loathsome to God, and are under a righteous sentence of condemnation and death. *Works*, Banner of Truth, Edinburgh (1986), Vol 2, p158.

The love of God is always connected with the purpose of salvation ... unconverted sinners have no lot nor part in it'. God is angry with them every day; "he hateth all workers of iniquity". The special love of God is confined exclusively to the elect. The general benevolence of God is common [which he calls providence in this context] but it implies no purpose of salvation at all. *Works*, Banner of Truth, Edinburgh (1986), Vol 2, p162.

### William Cunningham

That Calvin denied the doctrine of God's universal grace or love to all men, as implying some desire or intention of saving them all, and some provision directed to that object, is too evident to any one who has read his writings, to admit of doubt or require proof.

The fact of Calvin so explicitly denying the doctrine of God's universal grace or love to all men, affords a more direct and certain ground for the inference, that he did not hold the doctrine of universal atonement.

*The Reformers and the Theology of the Reformation*, T&T Clark, Edinburgh (1962), p398-399.

### Arthur Pink

God has loved His people from everlasting, and therefore nothing of the creature can be the cause of what is found in God from eternity. He loves from Himself, "according to his own purpose" (2 Timothy 1:9). *Gleanings in the Godhead*, Banner of Truth, Edinburgh (1975), part 1, c16, p73.

#### THE LOVE OF GOD TO US

BY "US" WE MEAN HIS PEOPLE. Although we read of the love "which is in Christ Jesus our Lord" (Romans 8:39), Holy Writ knows nothing of a love of God *outside* of Christ. ... His providence ministers unto the just and the unjust (Matthew 5:45). But His *love* is reserved for His elect. ... God's love is like Himself, from everlasting to everlasting, immutable. Nothing is more absurd than to imagine that anyone beloved of God can eternally perish or shall ever experience His everlasting vengeance. Since the love of God is "in Christ Jesus," it was attracted by nothing in its objects, nor can it be repelled by anything in, of, or by them. *Gleanings in the Godhead*, part 1, c24. Banner of Truth, Edinburgh (1975), p120.

A study of the concordance will show that there are *more* references in Scripture to the anger, fury, and wrath of God, than there are to His love and tenderness. Because God is holy, He hates all sin; And because He hates all sin, His anger burns against the sinner (Psalm 7:11). *Attributes of God*, chap 16, p81, AGES Software.

That God loves everybody, is, we may say, 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. Perhaps the late DL Moody ... did more than anyone else last century to popularise this concept.

*The Sovereignty of God*, Baker, Grand Raids (1994), p200. The Banner of Truth edition ruthlessly excised large portions of this work which condemn such universal notions as God loving everyone (up to 40%, including key appendices) without any notification or explanation.

One of the most popular beliefs of the day is that God loves everybody, and the very fact that it is so popular with all classes ought to be enough to arouse the suspicions of those who are subject to the Word of Truth. God's love towards all His creatures is the favourite tenet of Universalists, Unitarians, Theosophists, Christian Scientists, Spiritualists, Russellites, etc.... So widely has this dogma been proclaimed, and so comforting it is to the heart which is at enmity with God, we have little hope of convincing many of their error.

To tell the Christ-rejector that God loves him is to cauterise his conscience as well as to afford him a sense of security in his sins. The fact is, the love of God is a truth for the saints only, and to present it to the enemies of God is to take the children's bread and to cast it to the dogs. [Reference lost.]

### **John H Gerstner**

We must also sadly admit that the majority of Reformed theologians today seriously err concerning the nature of the love of God for reprobates ... Most Reformed theologians also include, as a by-product of the atonement, the well meant offer of the gospel by which all men can be saved. *Wrongly Dividing the Word of Truth*, Wolgemuth & Hyatt, Brentwood, Tennessee (1991), p125.

### **Arthur C. Custance**

If God does not love everyone indiscriminately, what then is his attitude towards those who are not the objects of his love? Does He hate them? ... we have a few passages of Scripture which seem to state in no uncertain terms that God does hate some of his creatures ... Sermons more and more emphasize the love of God to the exclusion of his justice, and to speak of God's hate is completely unacceptable to our sensitive ears. *The Sovereignty of Grace*. P & R Publishing, New Jersey (1979), p294, 297.

### **David J Engelsma**

That which is objectionable in the 'free offer of the gospel,' or 'well meant gospel offer' ... and the reason why a Reformed man must repudiate it, is its teaching that the grace of God in Jesus Christ, grace that is saving in character, is directed to all men in the preaching of the gospel. Inherent in the offer of the gospel is the notion that God loves and desires to save all men; the notion that the preaching of the gospel is God's grace to all men, an expression of God's love to all men, and an attempt by God to save all men; and the notion that salvation is dependent upon man's acceptance of the offered salvation, that is, that salvation depends upon the free will of the sinner.

*Hyper Calvinism & the Call of the Gospel*, The Reformed Free Pub. Assoc. Grand Rapids, Michigan (1994), p41-42.

The scriptures know of only one grace of God and one love of God, His grace and love in Jesus Christ. This is the grace and this is the love revealed in the gospel. The doctrine of the offer, therefore, teaches that the love of Christ is universal ... this is the denial of the Reformed, biblical doctrine of election and the sell-out of the Reformed faith to Arminianism. For the meaning of the doctrine of election is that the love of God in Christ is eternally directed towards some definite particular men, willing their salvation and efficaciously accomplishing it. Election is simply the choosing love of God (Deut 7:6-8; Rm 8:28-29). Universal love is universal election, and that was the position of the Arminians. *Hyper Calvinism & the Call of the Gospel*, The Reformed Free Pub. Assoc. Grand Rapids, Michigan (1994), p45.

Reformed preaching will not approach the audience with the declaration: 'God loves all of you.' It will not say to every man: 'God loves you and has a wonderful plan for your life.' It will not proclaim to all hearers: 'God is gracious to all of you and sincerely desires your salvation.' This message is a lie. Not only are these statements false, but they are also the bane of effective missions. Never did the apostles take this approach or proclaim this message to the unconverted. Such a message is incipient universalism, which assures the sinner that all is well with him in his sin - God loves him, and Christ died for him! - so that there is really no need for him to repent and believe. Arminianism, which blusters of its concern to save the lost, peters out in universalism, which blesses all religions, as well as the irreligious ... Biblical preaching assures the sinner of God's love for him personally only in the way of his faith in Christ crucified... a preacher does not call a man to believe some *thing*, but calls him to believe on some*one*. He presents Christ and calls the hearers to believe on that Christ. *Hyper Calvinism & the Call of the Gospel*, The Reformed Free Pub. Assoc. Grand Rapids, Michigan (1994), p87-88.

## **God hates the reprobate**

### **Augustine**

He who said, 'I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy,' loved Jacob of His undeserved grace, and hated Esau of His deserved judgment. *Enchiridion*, xcvi.

### **Martin Luther**

The love and hate of God towards men is immutable and eternal, existing, not merely before there was any merit or work of 'free-will,' but before the world was made; [so] all things take place in us of necessity, according as He has from eternity loved or not loved ... faith and unbelief come to us by no work of our own, but through the love and hatred of God. *The Bondage of the Will*, James Clarke, Cambridge (1973), p226, 228-229.

### **John Calvin**

Now a word concerning the reprobate, with whom the apostle is at the same time there concerned. For as Jacob, deserving nothing by good works, is taken into grace, so Esau, as yet undefiled by any crime, is hated [Rom. 9:13]. *Institutes* 3.22.11.

And as Esau was deprived of this habitation, the prophet sacredly gathers that he was hated of God, because he had been thus rejected from the holy and elect family, on which the love of God perpetually rests ... when Pighius holds that God's election of grace has no reference to, or connection with, His hatred of the reprobate, I maintain that reference and connection to be a truth. Inasmuch as the just severity of God answers, in equal and common cause, to that free love with which He embraces His elect. *Calvin's Calvinism*, RFPA, Grand Rapids (n.d.), 1987, p59, 75.

### **John Knox**

[God] will destroy all the speak lies. He hateth all that work iniquity; neither will he show himself merciful to such as maliciously offend. But all the sinners of the earth shall drink the dregs of that cup which the Eternal holdeth in his hands. For he will destroy all those that traitorously decline from him. They shall cry but he will not

hear. *An Answer to a Great Number of Blasphemous Cavillations Written by an Anabaptist and Adversary to God's Eternal Predestination*, Thomas Charde (1591), p403-404.

### **Jerome Zanchius**

When hatred is ascribed to God, it implies (1) a negation of benevolence, or a resolution not to have mercy on such and such men, nor to endue them with any of those graces which stand connected with eternal life. So, 'Esau have I hated' (Rom. 9), i.e., 'I did, from all eternity, determine within Myself not to have mercy on him.' The sole cause of which awful negation is not merely the unworthiness of the persons hated, but the sovereignty and freedom of the Divine will. (2) It denotes displeasure and dislike, for sinners who are not interested in Christ cannot but be infinitely displeasing to and loathsome in the sight of eternal purity. (3) It signifies a positive will to punish and destroy the reprobate for their sins, of which will, the infliction of misery upon them hereafter, is but the necessary effect and actual execution. *The Doctrine of Absolute Predestination*, Silver Trumpet Pub. Ltd., Chingford, London (1989), p44.

### **William Perkins**

This hatred of God is whereby he detesteth and abhorreth the reprobate when he is fallen into sin for the same sin. And this hatred which God has to man comes by the fall of Adam and is neither an antecedent nor a cause of God's decree, but only a consequent and followeth the decree. *A Golden Chain*, chapter 53.

### **Synod of Dordt**

The good pleasure of God is the sole cause of this gracious election; which doth not consist herein, that out of all possible qualities and actions of men God has chosen some as a condition of salvation; but that he was pleased out of the common mass of sinners to adopt some certain persons as a peculiar people to himself, as it is written, 'For the children being not yet born neither having done any good or evil,' etc., it was said (namely to Rebecca): 'the elder shall serve the younger; as it is written, Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated' (Rom. 9:11-13). 'And as many as were ordained to eternal life believed' (Acts 13:48). *Canons of the Synod of Dort*, First Head, Article 10.

### **Francis Turretin**

For as he who loves a person or thing wishes well and, if he can, does well to it, so true hatred and abhorrence cannot exist without drawing after them the removal and destruction of the contrary. *Institutes of Elenctic Theology*, P&R Pub., Phillipsburg (1992), vol. 2, p237-238.

### **John Owen**

We deny that all mankind are the object of that love of God which moved him to send his Son to die; God having 'made some for the day of evil' (Prov. 16:4); 'hated them before they were born' (Rom. 9:11, 13); 'before of old ordained them to condemnation' (Jude 4); being 'fitted to destruction' (Rom. 9:22); 'made to be taken and destroyed' (II Pet. 2:12); 'appointed to wrath' (I Thess. 5:9); to 'go to their own place' (Acts 1:25). *Works*, Banner of Truth, Edinburgh (1967), vol. 10, p227.

... reprobation ... [is] the issue of hatred, or a purpose of rejection (Rom. 9:11-13). *Works*, Banner of Truth, Edinburgh (1967), vol. 10, p149.

### Matthew Poole

But as for the wicked, let them not rejoice in my [David's] trials, for far worse things are appointed for them; God hates and will severely punish them ... *His soul hateth*; he [God] hateth him [*him that loveth violence*] with or from his soul, i.e. inwardly and ardently ... 7 *For the righteous Lord loveth righteousness; his countenance doth behold the upright.* This is given as the reason why God hateth and punisheth wicked men so dreadfully. *Commentary on the Holy Bible*, Banner of Truth, London (1968), on Ps. 11:5, 7, vol. 2, p17.

### John Kennedy

Nor is it by concluding that because God is love, therefore He loveth all, that you can have before you the view of His character presented in the text. Beware of being content with a hope that springs from believing in a love of God apart from His Christ, and outside of the shelter of the cross. It may relieve you of a superficial fear. It may excite a feeling of joy and gratitude in your heart. It may beget in you what you may regard as love to God. This love, too, may be the mainspring of very active movements in the bustle of external service; but it leaves you, after all, away from God, ignoring His majesty and holiness, dispensing with His Christ, and enjoying a peace that has been secured by a cheating, instead of a purging, of your conscience. The time was when men openly preached an uncovenanted mercy as the resort of sinners, and laid the smoothness of that doctrine on the sores of the anxious. 'Universal love,' in these days in which evangelism is in fashion, is but another form in which the same 'deceit' is presented to the awakened. This is something from which an unrenewed man can take comfort. It is a pillow on which an alien can lay his head, and be at peace far off from God. It keeps out of view the necessity of vital union to Christ, and of turning unto God; and the hope which it inspires can be attained without felt dependence on the sovereign grace, and without submitting to the renewing work of God the Holy Ghost. 'God is love;' but when you hear this you are not told what must imply the declaration that He loves all, and that, therefore, He loves you. This tells us what He is, as revealed to us in the cross, and what all who come to Him through Christ will find Him to be. It is on this that faith has to operate. You have no right to regard that love, which is commended in the death of His Son, as embracing you if you have not yet believed. It is only with the character, not at all with the purpose, of God that you have in the first instance to do. What right have you to say that He loves all? Have you seen into the heart of God that you should say He loves you, until you have reached, as a sinner, through faith, the bosom of His love in Christ? 'But may I not think of God loving sinners without ascribing to Him any purpose to save?' God loving a sinner without a purpose to save him! The thing is inconceivable. I would reproach a fellow-sinner if I so conceived of his love. Love to one utterly ruined, and that love commanding resources that are sufficient for salvation, and yet no purpose to use them! Let not men so blaspheme the love of God. 'But may I not conceive of God as loving men to the effect of providing salvation, and to the effect of purchasing redemption for them, without this being followed out to the result of His purpose taking actual effect in their salvation?' No, verily. For the love of God is one, as the love of the Three in One. The one love of the One God is the love of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. If that love generated in the person of the Father a purpose to provide, and in the person of the Son a purpose to redeem, it must have generated in the person of the Holy Ghost a purpose to apply. You cannot assign one set of objects to it, as the love of the Father, and a different set of objects to it, as 'the love of the Spirit.' And there can be no unaccomplished purpose of Jehovah. 'My counsel shall stand,' saith the Lord, 'and I will do all my pleasure.' 'The world,' which

the Father loved and the Son redeemed, shall by the Spirit be convinced 'of sin, righteousness, and judgment,' and thus the Father's pleasure shall prosper, and the Son's 'travail' be rewarded, through the efficient grace of God the Holy Ghost. *The Pleasure and Displeasure of God*, Eze. 33:11.

### **AW Pink**

'Thou hatest all workers of iniquity'—not merely the works of iniquity. Here, then, is a flat repudiation of present teaching that, God hates sin but loves the sinner; Scripture says, 'Thou hatest all workers of iniquity' (Ps. 5:5)! 'God is angry with the wicked every day.' 'He that believeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God'—not 'shall abide,' but even now—'abideth on him' (Ps. 5:5; 8:11; John 3:36). Can God 'love' the one on whom His 'wrath' abides? Again; is it not evident that the words 'The love of God which is in Christ Jesus' (Rom. 8:39) mark a limitation, both in the sphere and objects of His love? Again; is it not plain from the words 'Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated' (Rom. 9:13) that God does not love everybody? ... Is it conceivable that God will love the damned in the Lake of Fire? Yet, if He loves them now He will do so then, seeing that His love knows no change—He is 'without variableness or shadow of turning! *The Sovereignty of God*, Baker, Grand Rapids (1994), p248.

### **John Murray**

[Divine hatred can] scarcely be reduced to that of not loving or loving less ... the evidence would require, to say the least, the thought of disfavour, disapprobation, displeasure. There is also a vehement quality that may not be discounted ... We are compelled, therefore, to find in this word a declaration of the sovereign counsel of God as it is concerned with the ultimate destinies of men. *Commentary on Romans*, Eerdmans, Grand Rapids (1968), vol. 2, p22, 24.

### **James Montgomery Boice**

Although hatred in God is of a different character than hatred in sinful human beings—his is a holy hatred—hate in God nevertheless does imply disapproval ... [Esau] was the object of [God's] displeasure ... Since the selection involved in the words love and hate was made before either of the children was born, the words must involve a double predestination in which, on the one hand, Jacob was destined to salvation and, on the other hand, Esau was destined to be passed over and thus to perish. *Romans*, vol. 3, p1062.

### **Cornelius Hanko**

God loves His people in Christ, but He hates all the workers of iniquity (Ps. 5:5). Since God loves holiness, that very love turns in hatred against unholiness and sin. Since He is righteous, He burns with righteous indignation against all wickedness. Since He loves Himself as the sole Good, He banishes from His presence all that is in conflict with His Holy Name. God is a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate Him. No one has ever dared to deny that God hates the devil. And yet also the devil is one of God's creatures, who was created as a holy angel. If God hates the devil and his host, does He not hate those who are branded in Scripture as the very seed of the serpent, a generation of vipers? Nor can we distinguish between the deed and the person, as if God hates the sin but loves the sinner. For the deed can never be separated from the depravity of the one who commits the sin, nor can the guilt be reckoned to anyone but the guilty party. Therefore God does not banish sin to hell, but the sinner. The Word of God never hesitates, therefore, to declare that God's

very soul hates the wicked and him that loveth violence (Ps. 11:5). "Jacob have I loved, and Esau have I hated" (Rom. 9:13). See also verses 17 and 18. 'Particular Love, Particular Atonement, and Missions,' *Standard Bearer* magazine, vol. 42, issue 4.

### **DA Carson**

Fourteen times in the first fifty psalms alone, we are told that God hates the sinner, his wrath is on the liar, and so forth. *The Difficult Doctrine of the Love of God*, p79.

### **Louis F. DeBoer**

The Scriptural position is that God hates sinners and intends to put them in hell where the smoke of their torment will ascend for all eternity. The only sinners that a Holy God can love are his elect in Jesus Christ who are clothed with his righteousness and cleansed by his blood. *Hymns, Heretics and History*, American Presbyterian Press, p119.

## **God does not have two contradictory wills.**

### **John Calvin**

Nothing is less accordant with the nature of God that he should have a double will ... He does not in himself will opposites. *Institutes* 3:24,17.

The will of God is immutable, and his truth is always consistent with itself. *Institutes* 3:2,12

### **R.L. Dabney**

He [Turretin] urges that the only merciful volition of God in Scripture is that towards the elect; and "the rest he hardeneth;" that it is inevitably delusive to represent an omniscient and omnipotent Agent as having any kind of volition towards a result, when, foreseeing that the sinner will certainly not present the essential condition thereof - faith – he himself distinctly purposes not to bestow it. [God's providential leaving the heathen without the Gospel also shows that]... it is derogatory to God's power and sovereignty to represent any volition of his ... as failing in a multitude of cases. ... Turretin urges the inconsistency of "an ineffectual and imperfect will (in the Almighty) "which does not bring to pass the thing willed". ... The plain Christian mind will ever stumble on this fatal question, how can a truthful and consistent God have two opposite wills about the same object? *Discussions*, Banner of Truth, Edinburgh (1967), vol. 1, p283-4,

### **James Henry Thornwell**

God cannot be said without absurdity to will and not will the same thing in the same sense; but God may be said to command a thing which he does not decree shall be done. *Works*, Banner of Truth, Edinburgh (1986), vol. 2, p164.

## **‘Offer’ does not mean ‘a tender of a conditional promise to be accepted or rejected’.**

### **Canons of the Synod of Dort**

[The error] of applying to all equally the benefits gained by the death of Christ; but that, while some obtain the pardon of sin and eternal life, and others do not, this difference depends on their own free will, which joins itself to the grace that is offered without exception. Second Head (Of the Death of Christ, and the Redemption of Men Thereby), Rejection of Errors, 6.

Faith is therefore to be considered as the gift of God, not on account of its being offered by God to man, to be accepted or rejected at his pleasure; but because it is in reality conferred, breathed, and infused into him; or even because God bestows the power or ability to believe, and then expects that man should by the exercise of his own free will, consent to the terms of that salvation, and actually believe in Christ; but because he who works in man both to will and to do, and indeed all things in all, produces both the will to believe, and the act of believing also. Third / Fourth Head (Corruption of man and conversion), Article 14.

### **The framers of the *Westminster Standards (Confession, & Catechisms)***

‘Offer’ or ‘offered’ in the Standards means to preach, present or proclaim, based upon the original meaning of the word, as seen in the illustrative texts used. It is usually found in connection with the discussion on effectual calling.

When the *Shorter Catechism* speaks once of ‘freely offering’ it defines this by applying it to the effectual calling of the elect. *Westminster Shorter Catechism*, Question 31

In the main Reformed standards the exposition of the doctrines of reprobation and particular redemption cut across any idea of a sincere offer in the Gospel to all. The statements on reprobation being from eternity are clear and unequivocal, thus this obstacle must be overcome (if it were possible) before teachers of the free offer can establish any apologetic for their case.

## **Biography and Events**

### **Augustine of Hippo (340-430)**

The greatest Latin church father and bishop of Hippo Regius in North Africa (not the later Augustine of Canterbury) whose works against Pelagius set the scene for Reformation theology. Augustine was a great inspiration for the Reformers, including Luther and Calvin. Calvinism was originally called ‘Augustinianism’; both terms champion the absolute sovereignty of God and the utter inability of man in salvation. Augustine’s opponent, Pelagius, stood for the ability of man to work his own salvation (hence ‘Pelagianism’) and subsequent church movements which modified Calvinism were forms of Semi-Pelagianism (such as Roman Catholicism or Arminianism).

### **Bunyan, John (1628-1688)**

Independent English Puritan whose preaching in Bedford was much esteemed by John Owen. He suffered for his beliefs but used the time in prison to write the *Pilgrim’s Progress*, one of the most popular Christian books ever written. He is also famous for, *The Holy War* and *Grace Abounding*. Bunyan was a Calvinist regarding grace, but a separatist

or independent in his views on baptism and the church. His church contained those who had been baptised by immersion and those who had been poured.

**Boice, James Montgomery** (1938-2000)

Popular pastor of 10<sup>th</sup> Presbyterian Church in Philadelphia, writer and radio presenter.

**Brown, John, of Haddington** (1722-1787)

One of the most beloved of 18<sup>th</sup> century Scottish Christian leaders. A superb preacher, theologian, pastor and writer. He started life in poverty with no social advantage but with a great capacity for work and learning. He memorised catechisms and taught himself Latin, Greek and Hebrew – for which he was castigated. Seeking a Greek NT in a St Andrew's bookshop, and seeing his shabby clothes, a professor said that if he could read it he would buy it for him. He left with the copy. He later became pastor at Haddington for 36 years and Professor of Divinity in the Associate Church.

**Brown, John** (1818-1892)

Great, great grandson of John Brown of Haddington. An outstanding Presbyterian teacher and prolific writer and commentator.

**Calvin, John** (1509-1564)

The great French theological systematiser of Reformation thought. He was not only one of the foremost teachers in church history, but a compassionate pastor in Geneva during very difficult times. His *Institutes of the Christian Religion* is even claimed by secular historians to be one of the most influential books in history, initiating the course of modern political history.

**Carson, Donald A** (1946-)

Contemporary Canadian research professor of the New Testament at Trinity Evangelical Divinity School (Illinois) and respected writer/editor of many books. Carson is typical of many modern theologians in that his Biblical analysis confirms that God does not love or intend to save all, yet in his preaching he says that God does!

**Cunningham, William** (1805-1861)

An excellent Scottish historical theologian whose works are standard texts for theologians. He was Thomas Chalmers' successor as principal of New College Edinburgh.

**Custance, Arthur** (1910-1985)

Was a member of the Canadian Physiological Society, a Fellow of the Royal Anthropological Institute and a Member of the New York Academy of Sciences. He has written many books on theological issues, most notably the series of *Doorway Papers*. An important book was his *The Sovereignty of Grace*.

**Dabney, Robert Lewis** (1820-1898)

Highly regarded American Presbyterian theologian, educator and pastor with an independent bent of thinking. He was very influenced by Turretin and urged his students to read him. He also served as a chaplain in the Civil War and was a strong defender of Confederate principles.

**Dagg, John Leadley** (1794-1884)

Was one of the most respected Baptists of his time. In 1879, the Southern Baptist Convention endorsed Dagg's theological position and requested him to draw up a catechism for the instruction of the young. His *Manual of Theology* is very useful and concise.

**DeBoer, Louis F (1944-)**

A contemporary American (though born in the Netherlands) Presbyterian teacher and educator. He was the first Moderator of the American Presbyterian Church at its inception. In the late 1970's he founded the American Presbyterian Press and has written several works.

**Dort (Dordrecht), Synod of (1618-19)**

The gathering of international representatives to deal with the problems caused by the Remonstrants (Arminians) in Holland. It was here that the five points of Calvinism were drawn up to contend against the fivefold errors of the Remonstrants. The Canons of this synod form one part of the *Three Forms of Unity* held as authoritative by continental Presbyterians.

**Engelsma, David J.**

A contemporary American theologian. He was the Professor of Dogmatics and Old Testament at the Protestant Reformed Seminary in Grandville, Michigan for 20 years from 1988 until his retirement in 2008. Prior to his appointment he was a pastor for 25 years of the Protestant Reformed Church in Loveland, Colorado, and then in South Holland, Illinois.

**Gerstner, John H. (1914-1996)**

A recently deceased American Reformed theologian of repute. He was Professor of Church History at Pittsburgh Theological Seminary and Knox Theological Seminary and taught RC Sproul. He wrote a number of useful books.

**Gill, John (1607-1771)**

English Reformed Baptist who produced a voluminous array of theological and Biblical writings. His church was later pastored by CH Spurgeon. Though attacked as a Hyper-Calvinist, his sermons clearly show that he did not deny duty-faith, but he did teach eternal justification.

**Girardeau, John L. (1825-1898)**

Was Professor of Systematic Theology in Columbia Theological Seminary, South Carolina in the late 1800's. He was considered to be one of the greatest defenders of Southern Calvinism. He was a man of deep piety and compassion, which he evidenced not only in the seminary but also on the battlefields of the Civil War as a chaplain for the Confederates. He also developed a very large church mostly comprised of black people.

**Haldane, Robert (1764-1842)**

Scottish evangelist, preacher, Bible commentator and philanthropist. Best known for his commentary on Romans.

**Hanko, Cornelius (1907-2005)**

An esteemed pastor-teacher in several Protestant Reformed Churches until 1977, and preached emeritus afterwards.

**Harbach, Robert C. (1914-1996)**

Another esteemed pastor-teacher in the Protestant Reformed Churches. He served congregations in Lynden, Washington (1955-1963), Kalamazoo, Michigan (1963-1974), and as Home Missionary (1974-1979). He is the author of a number of helpful tracts and books.

**The Helvetic Consensus Formula (1675)**

Was composed by John Heidegger of Zurich (with some help from Francis Turretin) in 1675 as a creed for the Swiss churches.

**Hodge, Archibald Alexander (1823-1886)**

The son of the great theologian Charles Hodge. He was professor in Systematic Theology at Princeton Seminary from 1877. It was said by W G T Shedd that he had 'an uncommon ability to popularise scientific theology'.

**Hoeksema, Herman (1886-1965)**

For almost fifty years he was the pastor of one of the largest Reformed congregations in the USA. For almost forty years he was professor of Dogmatics in the Theological School of Protestant Churches. His *Reformed Dogmatics* is not only helpful but contains valuable independent thought.

**Kennedy, John, of Dingwall (1819-1884)**

Scottish preacher and theologian and friend of Charles Spurgeon. He was pastor of Dingwall Free Church congregation from 1844 until his death in 1884. Kennedy was a stalwart opponent of the drift in Scottish Presbyterianism away from the Westminster Confession, allying himself with Hugh Martin and James Begg to resist erosion of the doctrine of the particular design in Christ's atoning work, definite atonement, and to contend for the propriety of a cooperative association of church and state to promote the true religion.

**Knox, John (1514-1572)**

The formidable Scottish Reformer who did more to change his country for the better than any other man. He was fearless in the face of monarchs and yet his life was spared, enabling him to work tirelessly for Reformation and liberty in Scotland.

**Lloyd-Jones, D. M. (1899-1981)**

Extremely popular Welsh pastor of Westminster Chapel in London for many years (1943-1968), formerly a pastor in Aberavon who was very influenced by the Calvinistic Methodists. He was considered the key voice of evangelicalism in Britain during his London ministry and his books, chiefly transcriptions of his sermons, remain very influential.

**Luther, Martin (1483-1546)**

The great Reformer who, almost single-handedly, spearheaded the early Reformation against great odds. He bravely faced down all the opposition thrown at him by the Roman Church and miraculously survived. He then worked assiduously in preaching, leading, advising princes, writing, and yet found time to translate the Bible into German. In this work he set the tone for future German literacy. His works are found in over 20 volumes and some of them remain great classics to this day (such as *The Bondage of the Will* and his *Commentary on Galatians*).

**Owen, John (1616-1683)**

The superlative English Puritan thinker and Congregational pastor who helped to compose the Savoy Declaration. His theological works in 16 volumes are still required reading for theologians, though they are very heavy going. Some of his writings are absolute classics, such as his *Death of Death*. There are now modern abridgements in updated English of some of his best works.

**Perkins, William** (1558-1602)

Very important early English Reformation pastor-teacher and systematic theologian whose works are sadly neglected in these days. He was greatly esteemed by later Puritans, such as William Ames and many in the Netherlands.

**Pink, Arthur W** (1886-1952)

English pastor-teacher who ministered in England, America and Australia at various times and is famous for his many books collated from his magazine, *Studies in the Scriptures*. Pink's independent thought and drawing from different theological sources makes him very valuable.

**Piper, John Stephen** (b. 1946)

Contemporary American, Reformed Baptist, pastor-teacher. He has served since 1980 in Bethlehem Baptist Church in Minneapolis, Minnesota, and is the writer of many popular books.

**Poole, Matthew** (1624-1679)

English Nonconformist theologian, rector of St Michael le Querne, London. Subsequent troubles led to his withdrawal to Holland, and he died at Amsterdam in 1679. He wrote *English Annotations on the Holy Bible*, as far as Isaiah chapter 53 - a work which was completed by several of his Nonconformist brethren, and published in 2 folio volumes in 1683. It has been subsequently published as Matthew Poole's Commentary on the Holy Bible in 3 volumes.

**Murray, John** (1898-1975)

A major American Presbyterian theologian of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Though he authored a seminal work on the free offer, his stature as a theologian and commentator is still assured.

**Rutherford, Samuel** (1600-1661)

Beloved Scottish Puritan pastor and theologian. He was one of the Scottish commissioners to the Westminster Assembly, which he influenced significantly. In the four years he was away from his family in London, two of his children died; this was to have a profound effect on his ministry, enabling deep empathy for those in affliction. He later became Rector of the University at St Andrews and a prominent Scottish church leader with a European reputation.

**Shedd, William GT** (1820-1894)

Is considered a definitive writer on the Christian faith. He was a Professor at various academies including Professor of Systematic Theology at Union Theological Seminary from 1874-1890. His three volume *Dogmatic Theology* and his *History of Christian Doctrine* are standard works for scholars.

**Spurgeon, Charles Haddon** (1834-1892)

Popular Baptist preacher based in London at the Metropolitan Tabernacle for most of his ministry, though born in Essex. His sermons and other works are regularly reprinted in many volumes. Though a confirmed Calvinist by conviction, he was sometimes guilty of loose speech in his evangelistic sermons, which has been jumped on by teachers of the free offer. However, these slight faux pas are not in keeping with his fundamental, strong, Reformed convictions.

**Strong, Augustus Hopkins** (1836-1921)

Was one of the foremost Baptist theologians and his Systematic Theology is a standard Baptist text. He was President and professor of Biblical Theology in the Rochester

Theological Seminary, USA.

**Thornwell, James Henley (1812-1862)**

A very important American Presbyterian theologian whose collected works are very useful today. He was Professor of theology at Columbia Theological Seminary and is considered to be the most influential Southern minister before the Civil War. Unafraid to contend for Biblicality (even against Charles Hodge) his teaching demonstrates independent thought.

**Turretin, Francis (1623-87)**

Francis Turretin was called '*the best expounder of the doctrine of the Reformed church*' (Samuel Alexander). His *Institutes of Elenctic Theology* was published in 1679-85 after thirty years teaching at the Academy of Geneva.

**Warfield, Benjamin B (1851-1921)**

Famous American theologian. He was Professor of didactic and polemic Theology in the Theological Seminary of Princeton between 1887 and 1921 (succeeding AA Hodge). Prior to that he was an assistant pastor and Professor at Western Theological Seminary.

**Westminster Assembly (1643-1648)**

Was a gathering of theologians, convened by the Long Parliament, which sought to unite the Scottish and English Reformed churches. The Confession of faith was presented to Parliament in 1646 and both governments gave it their approval. The longer and shorter catechisms were written as a précis of the teaching in the confession, the shorter being for children. These standards were very influential, not only in England but also in America. Presbyterians, Congregationalists and Baptists subscribed to the confession with slight variations. The Baptist 1689 Confession and the Congregationalist Savoy Declaration are closely based upon the Westminster Confession.

**Zanchius, Jerome (1516-1590)**

Italian Protestant Reformation clergyman and educator. In 1551, under growing persecution against the Reformation, he left Italy and accepted the professorship of Old Testament at the college of St. Thomas in Strasbourg where he began to teach in 1553 for nearly 11 years. In 1563 he left the College and pastored the Italian Protestant congregation in the Grisons in the city of Chiavenna. Finally, in 1567 Prince Frederick III (1515-1576) prevailed upon Zanchius to accept a divinity professorship in the University of Heidelberg, joining Zacharias Ursinus (1534-1583). He held this post for 9 years when, at the death of Frederick III, he chose to take the pastorate of the church at Neustadt an der Haardt.

Scripture quotations are from *The New King James Version*  
© Thomas Nelson 1982

**Paul Fahy Copyright © 2009  
Understanding Ministries**

Contact

[understandingministries@yahoo.com](mailto:understandingministries@yahoo.com)