

# Dr. Robert A. Peterson, Salvation, Session 5, Election, Historical Reconnaissance

© 2024 Robert Peterson and Ted Hildebrandt

This is Dr. Robert Peterson and his teaching on Salvation. This is session 5, Election, Historical Reconnaissance.

We continue our lectures on Salvation.

We're exploring the Doctrine of Election. God's choosing people for salvation before creation. And we're continuing with our Historical Reconnaissance.

We've talked about Augustine, Pelagius, and Martin Luther. We move to John Calvin. Although John Calvin, 1509 to 1564, respected Melancthon, remember the brilliant Greek professor and successor to Luther in the Lutheran Reformation in terms of leadership, but one who diluted Augustine's Doctrines of Grace and Predestination diluted Luther.

Melancthon diluted Luther's Doctrines of Grace and Predestination. Although Calvin, from 1509 to 1564, respected Melancthon for his scholarship and related to him as a brother in Christ, he took issue with his synergism and preferred Luther's monergism. Calvin, the reformer of Geneva, devoted himself to biblical exegesis to build a Christocentric theology.

Calvin was many-sided. He was a reluctant pastor but a faithful one for many, many years in a city where he was reviled and disrespected by many. His lifelong activities in terms of scholarship were writing his Institutes of the Christian Religion, a systematic theology book, at first as a young man of 27 years old, which kind of made his fame, and then in recurring improvements and expansions until the final 1564 Institutes in which he gave us his definitive understanding of the Christian faith.

And the other task, again, he preached and taught every day and did a lot of pastoral work, but the other task, along with the writing of the Institutes and the improvement of it and enlargement of it, was his biblical commentaries. He did every book of the New Testament except Revelation, which he admittedly didn't understand, and 2nd and 3rd John, which were of minor importance, he did do 1st John. And commentaries on the Old Testament, he died halfway through Ezekiel. Otherwise, we would have had maybe a full set of commentaries for the Old Testament.

Calvin, the reformer of Geneva, devoted himself to biblical exegesis to build a Christocentric theology. He emphasized God's sovereignty and developed a strong doctrine of election. Calvin stated his views on predestination in his famous Institutes

of the Christian Religion, quote, in conformity, therefore, to the clear doctrine of Scripture, we assert that by an eternal and immutable counsel, God has once for all determined both whom he would admit to salvation and whom he would condemn to destruction.

Institutes, Book 3, Chapter 21, Section 7. Opponents attacked Calvin's views on election and free will, and he responded with, concerning free will, 1543, and concerning the eternal predestination of God, 1552, which is remarkable in my estimation because it answers almost every contemporary objection to election that I've ever heard of. And he did it in the mid-16th century. Calvin acknowledged his debt to Augustine's theology "if I wanted to weave a whole volume from Augustine, I could readily show my readers that I need no other language than his."

Institutes, 3, 22, 8. Book 3, Chapter 22, Paragraph 8. After Calvin's death, the leadership of the Geneva Academy fell to his successor, Theodore Beza. 1519 to 1605, Beza accepted Calvin's theology but pursued a different theological method. He was a leader in Protestant scholasticism that followed the time of Luther and Calvin, a movement that emphasized philosophical theology more than the magisterial reformers.

Beza's theological system was more complete and stronger than Calvin's. Jacob Arminius, a young Dutch ministerial candidate, was taught this strong Calvinism at the Geneva Academy at the end of the 16th century. Arminius and the synod, the church council, the church meeting, and the general assembly are good words, of Doort, Doort, short for the Dutch city of Doortrek.

Jacob Arminius, 1550 to 1609, was a theological student in Geneva under Theodore Beza. After graduation, he returned to Amsterdam and accepted a call to pastoral ministry in the Dutch church. I think he was highly regarded. My understanding is that he was highly regarded as a pastor who preached the Bible and loved the people.

Later, he taught theology at the University of Leiden, where he found success in his teaching. He also encountered criticism from a colleague, Franciscus Gomarus, 1563 to 1642, a strong Calvinist who took exception to Arminius' soteriology to his doctrine of salvation. They disputed for a time, and then Gomarus formally accused Arminius of aberration from the doctrinal standards of the Dutch church, which in his time were the Belgic Confession and the Heidelberg Catechism.

In response, Arminius wrote a systematic defense of his views, the Declaration of Sentiments. At the end of this whole debate, this historical movement back and forth and debate were the canons, the theological pronouncements of Dort. And today, around the world, Reformed churches, churches in the Reformed tradition, as opposed to Presbyterian churches who hail from Scotland and use the Westminster

standards, the larger and shorter catechisms, and the Westminster Confession of Faith, the Reformed churches, Reformed Church of Hungary, Reformed Church of South Africa, everything, everywhere like that, they use the three forms of unity, which in addition to the Belgic Confession and Heidelberg Catechism, include the canons of Dort.

But in Arminius' time, there was no canons of Dort. His protest led, and that of his disciples led to the Canons of Dort. In the meantime, Arminius himself protested against a move to add to the formal symbols the doctrinal statements of the church.

We've got the Belgic Confession and the Heidelberg Catechism. We don't need something else. We shouldn't mess with them.

So, these things can be viewed from different perspectives. The Dutch Calvinists as a whole disagreed with him because although the details of the canon of Dort weren't in the Belgic Confession and Heidelberg Catechism, the outlines were certainly in that direction. Arminius followed his former teacher Baez's approach to systematic theology but forged a different path concerning the plan of salvation.

I was surprised some years ago to read a book on different views of either predestination or eternal security and to understand two different chapters and viewpoints. There was Reformed Arminianism and Wesleyan Arminianism. At first, I said, Reformed Arminianism? That sounds like an oxymoron, a contradiction in terms.

But it was correct. Wesleyan Arminianism, a much later development, came from John Wesley, of course. Reformed Arminianism refers to that of Arminius and the Arminians, and in a sense, it is true.

The Dutch church was reformed, and so Arminius held to things like decrees. I refer with allusion, if not direct quotation, to more recent Wesleyan Arminian theology books. We hail our ancestor in the faith, Jacob Arminius, but he held to decrees.

Should Wesleyans hold to decrees, and they go back and forth to the decrees of God before the creation of the world? They go back and forth a bit, and then they say, although we respect Arminius so much for his teachings, the answer is no, we don't believe in decrees. Well, Arminius did. The whole Dutch church did. And although, in general, the Wesleyan tradition does not believe in penal substitution, but to some form of the governmental theory and views other than the view of penal substitution, no question about it, Arminius held to penal substitution.

So, there are different Arminianisms, and it is true in a sense to call Arminius' tradition. Maybe it's better to call it Dutch Arminianism, but Reformed Arminianism it is, as opposed to Wesleyan Arminianism. It certainly isn't the same as Reformed

Calvinism of the Dutch church and its heirs. Arminius' famous writing was the Declaration of Sentiments.

In a biography of Arminius, which I enjoyed, written by Carl Bangs, he is very positive and friendly toward Arminius, presents his views in the best possible light, but admits at times he wasn't upfront, he wasn't, I don't want to say dishonest, but he wasn't, I don't want to say he wasn't honest, but he wasn't frank. For example, Bangs quotes Arminius saying that no one who is a believer in Christ can fall away from grace. And the footnote says, frankly, Arminius is not being straightforward here because his view of a believer in Christ here means someone who continues to believe in Christ because he held somebody who formerly believed could cease believing and thus fall away.

Well, there's a problem, there's a problem indeed. On the other hand, it is true that Arminius was not treated well by Gomarus, and I think he was probably hurried to an early death by mistreatment at the hands of some stronger Calvinist brethren. Arminius followed his former teacher Beza's approach, which is a Reformed scholasticism, rather than Calvin's more biblical approach.

Is that wrong, especially? No, theologies develop, and it makes sense that the second generation in a particular tradition would expand and develop the views of their father in the faith. Against Augustine, Luther, and Calvin, Arminius taught that God planned to save all those whom he foresaw. That's how he understood the Bible's teaching on foresaw, that is foreknew, that is foreknowledge. God planned to save all those whom he foresaw, foreknew, would believe in Christ.

This means an election to salvation is contingent upon, dependent upon, and conditioned by God's foreseeing, foreknowing people's faith. Arminius agreed with Augustine and Calvin regarding sinners' inability to do anything to save themselves. That's another place where there's a difference between Arminius' theology and many Arminian theologies of a semi-Pelagian variety.

However, Arminius attempted to ameliorate spiritual inability by positing that God gives prevenient, preceding grace to everyone. "The grace sufficient for salvation is conferred on the elect and on the non-elect, that if they will, they may believe or not believe." Augustine and Calvin had taught that prevenient grace was particular, not given to everybody, not universal, and efficacious, effective.

But for Arminius, it was universal and not efficacious. He was anticipating Wesley's popular exposition and publication of a notion of universal prevenient grace as the linchpin of Arminian systematics. Following Calvin and Beza, Arminius affirmed God's foreknowledge, but he diverged from their view when he said that it was not causal.

“A thing does not come to pass because it is foreknown, but it is foreknown because it is yet to be.” Arminius' Private Disputations 28.14, translated by James Nichols. The determining factor in salvation resides not in God, according to Arminius, but in human beings.

It is not God's sovereign grace but human's free will that makes the difference. Although man's will is naturally corrupt and cannot choose the good, God's universal, prevenient grace enables all to exercise saving faith in Christ, if only they will. According to Arminius, God's part in salvation is to foresee what sinners freely choose and then to elect or reject based on this foreknowledge.

Arminianism grew among the Dutch Reformed clergy, and an influential minority developed a few years after Arminius' death. The Arminians drew up a systematic defense of their views called the Remonstrants, or Protest, and the protesters themselves came to be called the Remonstrants. Actually, that's not very different from the word Protestants, although it's used here in a different context than the Reformation.

Their protest was called the Remonstrants, and the people who promulgated these views were called the Remonstrants. The Remonstrants made a Remonstrance. The Remonstrants consisted of five points of debated doctrine, and here is their order.

Number one is conditional election. Two, universal atonement. Three, total depravity slash prevenient grace. Four, resistible grace. Five, conditional perseverance. Actually, they were not dogmatic about that, but it was an issue that needed further debate.

A brief summary of the five Arminian points is in order. Conditional election means God chooses salvation; there's no question. The Bible plainly teaches God is the elector.

He's the one who chooses people for salvation. The Arminians made this election conditional, dependent, contingent upon foreseen human faith or lack thereof. Conditional election means God chooses for salvation, conditioned upon his foreknowledge of a person's faith.

So, the great election passages in Ephesians 1, Romans 8, and Romans 9, which we will look at, really mean God chooses based upon his foresight, his prescience, and his knowing beforehand what people would do with the gospel. If he foresees they would believe, then he chooses them. If not, he does not choose them.

Universal atonement means Jesus died to make the salvation of everyone possible. This is not an effective atonement. It is a possible atonement.

It is an atonement for everyone that enables everyone to exercise their free will and to believe in Christ for salvation. Jesus died to make salvation possible. Some have called this a hypothetical atonement rather than an actual purchasing of men and women and boys and girls for salvation.

Total depravity means that because of Adam's fall and human sin, people cannot save themselves. This surprises many people, and some have inaccurately portrayed the five points of Arminianism, saying they taught people didn't fall that fall far down the well if you will. Not true.

They did. Again, the climate in the Dutch church was reformed. And according to Heidelberg and the Belgian Confession, we're unable to save ourselves.

So, the Arminians and the Reformed agreed on total inability. However, this total inability does not actually exist in human beings because it is modified. It is ameliorated by universal prevenient grace.

Universal. Everyone gets this grace. Prevenient grace.

It comes before salvation. Nullifying the effects of original sin in one area, the will. The bound will is now made free by grace, enabling people to choose Christ and be saved.

Universal prevenient grace nullifies the effects of Adam's original sin on the human will so that sinners have the gracious ability to believe and be saved. I'll say it again. Reformed theology textbooks say they teach inability.

Wesleyan theology textbooks teach gracious ability. It is not a natural ability. It is by grace bestowed on everyone.

My theological method says these statements must be tested upon the bedrock of biblical exegesis. Resistible grace means sinners can and do reject the grace of God and perish. It's so obvious biblically.

People resist the grace of God, and they're lost. They perish in their sins. So, grace is resistible, right? The Arminians thought so.

The Reformed thought that their opponents were presenting things rather simplistically. Yes, people do resist grace and perish, but none of the elect do so because God apprehends them with the gospel and saves them unfailingly. Conditional perseverance indicates that the Arminians were uncertain if believers could fall away from grace and be lost again.

They said there are strong statements in scripture. John 10:28 and 30, Jesus said, I give my sheep eternal life. They'll never perish.

No one can snatch them out of my hand or the Father's hand. The Father and I are one in our preserving the sheep. And Romans 8, there's no condemnation for those who are in Christ.

Who will bring a charge against God's elect? Nothing can separate us from the love of God. But those statements they saw as counterbalanced by Hebrews 6 and 10, which taught, apparently to them, that people could fall away from grace and be lost. How we put these two apparently opposing teachings together is a matter for further reflection.

So they acknowledge scripture's strong statement on preservation, but they debate how that should be put together with strong apostasy texts. Here's another place where Reformed Arminianism disagrees with Wesleyan Arminianism. Wesley studied the Bible.

He has notes on the whole Old Testament and notes on the whole New Testament. He knows what he's doing, but he does not present this as a conundrum or as a topic to be further studied. Of course, as I said before, theology is developed, and Arminius' Arminianism, sorry, became Wesley's Arminianism, and he took away the question mark.

People can fall away from grace. There's no question about it in his estimation. Conditional perseverance indicates the Arminians were uncertain.

They believed people could fall away from grace and be lost again. No doubt that was part of their Reformed atmosphere, and I respect that fact. Though it is not common knowledge, these five points of Arminianism were promulgated historically before the five points of Calvinism.

Is that true? Yes. Is it true there were no five points promulgated of Calvinism promulgated before? Yes. Was it true there was no belief in those things before? No, it's not true, of course.

The Arminians are reacting against Reformed teaching, but those were not ensconced in any kind of official doctrinal statements. As I said, the three forms of unity were only the two forms of unity. And out of this whole thing, the controversy, there comes the canons, the teachings, the official promulgations of Dort, which did state matters in a way that would no longer be debated.

These five articles of remonstrance moved the Calvinist majority to respond by calling a church synod, general assembly, at Dortrek, also known as Dort, in 1618.

The synod of Dort was a general assembly of the Dutch church. Because the synod was a court of the church, and not an exploratory committee examining these things, it was a church court.

It was a deliberative and judicial body convened to evaluate and judge the Arminians' views. As the synod deliberated, it published the five points of the synod of Dort, a point-by-point response to the five points of the remonstrance. The five canons were total depravity, unconditional election, limited atonement, irresistible grace, perseverance of the saints.

There's an acronym here, T-U-L-I-P, T for total depravity, U for unconditional election, L for limited atonement, I for irresistible grace, P for perseverance of the saints. Actually, it's very hard to determine where that acronym actually came from. They didn't write in English, by the way.

They wrote in Dutch, of course, probably Latin and Dutch. It's very hard to know where that came from historically. It's a problem.

My church historian friends, to the best of my knowledge, have not solved yet. The ideas are plainly those of the Calvinists at Dort. A summary of these five points is in order.

The Calvinists agreed with the Arminians that sinners cannot rescue themselves, but the Calvinists rejected the Arminian concept of universal, prevenient grace. They agreed on total depravity, which means a couple of things. It means, most importantly, sinners are unable to save themselves.

It also means, against Roman Catholic theology, total depravity does not mean that sinners are as bad as they could be. If that were the case, human life on earth would be impossible. And later, Reformed theology said something like they called common grace was God's goodness to all human beings, including the structures of government and society and police forces and so forth, so that human beings don't destroy themselves.

But they disagreed with the Arminian. Yes, Rome taught theology, the fall effect of human beings, except the mind was kept somewhat free from the effects of the fall. Wrong, the Reformers said, and wrong, the Dordian Calvinists said.

Wrong. Paul emphasizes the effects of sin on the human mind. Good grief.

Romans 1 and many other places. The whole human being is sinful. Total depravity means not people are as bad as they could be, but that the whole human being in all of our faculties is affected by sin and, most importantly, we are unable to save ourselves.



Furthermore, this notion of universal prevenient grace, although it is a theological masterpiece, is a biblical fiction. There's no gracious ability but rather an inability. Unconditional election means that the ground of election resides in God himself, not in anything in humans.

As somebody who would subscribe to the five points of Calvinism rightly understood, I groan at these titles. Total depravity sounds like everybody's a child molester. Unconditional election sounds like there's no rhyme or reason to election.

Of course, the five Calvinist points must be read as counterpoints to the Arminian points. Election is unconditional, not that there's no rhyme or reason for it in God, but that it is against the Arminian view that it is conditional. My own understanding, as we'll see later, is election is conditioned by God's own character, specifically his love and his will.

To try to get beyond that is impossible. 2 Timothy 1:9 is the briefest summary of this, in my estimation. Ephesians 1, Romans 8, and Romans 9 are the best places to go, but 2 Timothy 1:9, God saved us and called us to a holy calling, not because of our works, but because of his own purpose and grace, which he gave us in Christ Jesus, literal translation, before eternal ages.

I don't even like the ESV at this point. God's purpose, that's his will and his grace, that's his love. If we push it back as far as we can go, why am I saved? I believed in the gospel.

Is that the ultimate statement? No. Jesus died for my sins. That's what I believed in, to be saved.

Is that the ultimate statement? I skipped one. I believe in the gospel. Is that the ultimate? No.

The Holy Spirit opened my heart. Is that ultimate? No. Jesus died and rose again to save me, and that's what the gospel, that's what faith resides that saves.

Is that the ultimate statement? No. Mysteriously, the ultimate statement is God chose us in Christ before the creation of the world. More about that and how those things relate later on, but all four are true.

Limited or definite or particular atonement means that although universal benefits flow from the cross, Jesus died to save the elect, not each and every person. Limited atonement sounds like something is lacking in the work of Christ. I've done enough gasping, so I won't gasp again, but yikes, maybe a yikes is appropriate.

The atonement is in some ways universal, of course. It grounds the universal free offer of the gospel and benefits from it come to every person, but the salvation, the salvific intention of God is limited to his people, those whom the Father chose, the Son redeemed, and those people, and those people the Spirit works to bring them to Christ. Jesus doesn't merely make salvation possible, but as Revelation 5 says, by your death, O Lamb of God, you purchased, actually it's blike in the Greek, it's a partitive genitive, you purchased from every tribe and language of people and nation.

Every translation says some, or people, or believers, or humans. You've got to add a word there. That is, every tribe, language, people, and nation that represents the world biblically, if you will, is the big circle of which the sum that he purchased is the subset.

That is not a potential or hypothetical or universal atonement. Oh, it's universal in the sense that he purchased some from every country, every people group, every language and dialect, every place, but he purchased them with his death. Do I sound like I am biased? I am.

Limited or definite or particular atonement means Christ died not to make salvation possible or hypothetical but to actually save his people from their sins otherwise they would not be saved. Irresistible grace denies not that sinners successfully, in quotation marks, resist God's saving grace until death but that none of the elect do so. God is the holy hound of heaven who gets his man, he gets his woman, he perseveres with us until we believe in his son.

His grace is resisted, of course, by those who perish in their sins, but none of the people the Father gave to the Son resist his love and loving appeal until death. For the father gave them to the son, John 6. The father draws them to the son, John 6. They come to the son in the same chapter, and they believe in him. Jesus gives them eternal life, keeps them, preserves them, and will raise them on the last day.

Perseverance of the saints means both that God perseveres with them, he preserves them to the end, and they persevere in the faith. True believers, as St. Augustine said, do not do so perfectly. I'm lacking a couple of his adverbs.

Not perfectly and consistently, but they keep on keeping on, and sometimes even if they fall, they get up, dust themselves off, and keep on keeping on by the grace of God. They can fall away, here's the language I had, they can fall away, Augustine said, but not totally and finally. In other words, they can fall away partially and temporarily, but God in his grace will not let them do that to the end.

As a pastor, and even as a professor training pastors, applying theology to life is difficult, and we surely can't always see things in simple black and white colors.

There are lots of grays out there, and pastors need a lot of wisdom and the Holy Spirit to successfully try to apply the Bible's truth to life, but we need to try to understand that truth, and we need to do our best to apply it to life indeed. Perseverance also means believers do not merely profess faith in Christ but continue to believe until the end.

Today, we recognize these five canons as the five points of Calvinism. Despite the name, it's important to note that the five points did not come from John Calvin in the 16th century but from the 17th century Synod of Dort in Holland. They do not represent. Furthermore, they do not represent a complete presentation of Calvinism, which holds too many truths besides the five points.

As a matter of fact, to regard them as the sum and substance of the Reformed faith is a misrepresentation. The five canons of Dort represent the rebuttal of the Dutch Calvinist to the Armenian remonstrance. Let's say you hold a particular political persuasion of views.

Would it be fair to call the essence of your views your rebuttals to your opponent's attack on your position? I don't think so. No, that would be part of your presentation, but then you have the right to present your own views in a positive light, and in that regard, the Reformed faith is much bigger than the five points of Calvinism. By promulgating them, the Dutch Reformed Church officially reaffirmed its acceptance of Augustine and Calvin's view of predestination and judged Arminius's interpretation of the Reformed Confessions to be out of bounds.

The canons of the Synod of Dort were added to the Belgic Confession and Heidelberg Catechism to constitute the three forms of unity. The doctrinal standards of the Reformed churches in Holland and Reformed churches around the world. We'll finish our reconnaissance of the historical views looking at Charles Haddon Spurgeon and the Hyperists, his word.

Charles Haddon Spurgeon, 1834 to 1892, grew up in a rural Congregationalist church that basically espoused Calvinism, showing extraordinary preaching ability. At 20 years old, he was ordained as a particular Baptist and a few years later was called to New Park Street Church in London. No sooner had he arrived than he was drawn into controversy with hyperism, an extreme form of Calvinism.

I might say that Spurgeon was self-taught. He did attempt to go to theological seminary, a theological college, but by a quirk of God's providence, he went to one room, and the dean went to another room, and never did the two meet together. He concluded that the Lord didn't want him to go to school and he taught himself.

Being a self-educated genius didn't hurt him too much, and amazingly, around the world today, his sermons are still respected and quoted. My own pastor quotes them, I would say, in every other sermon, at least. He had a great biblical insight.

He emphasized majors, de-emphasized minors, and had a wonderful ability to apply the truth of God to the people of God, starting with himself. Good grief. He was in his early 20s.

The pastors in London were Calvinists to a man, Calvinist Baptists commonly, and they were old enough to be his father. Nevertheless, what they taught was wrong. It was hyper-Calvinism, and as a young whippersnapper, he withstood them, not with malice.

Church newspapers were the order of the day. He did not do that. He did not enter into a debate there.

He did it from the pulpit. He did it with respect. He did it firmly and eventually, he won the battle, which was incredible.

Here are the five, the main points. There are not five of them, by the way, of hyperism. Number one, God loves the elect, not the non-elect.

Two, there's no universal gospel call, only an efficacious call to the elect. You do not preach the gospel indiscriminately, as Dort said. The canons of Dort said you should preach the gospel promiscuously.

Promiscuously. How do you like that? Oh, no, no, no, no. You only preach the gospel to the elect.

Spurgeon is so colorful. He says we don't know who the elect are. We cannot go around to men and pull the shirt out of the back of their pants and find an E on it for the elect.

We preach the gospel indiscriminately, and God draws his people to himself. The Holy Spirit does this through the preaching of the word. Unbelief is not a sin.

Gasp. Sorry, couldn't resist the gasp. Unbelief is not a sin because the non-elect cannot possibly believe.

The Bible regards unbelief as a sin. Any views that do not accept this Calvinism are not Christian. Sadly, I have seen hyper-Calvinist websites that affirm this same business.

Here's how it comes about. You start with the Bible and its strong statements, in this case concerning Calvinist soteriology, reformed doctrine of salvation, and then you elevate those and minimize other biblical statements that teach the efficacy of prayer, the desire of God to save sinners, and publish the gospel widely and broadly, and so forth. You use the Bible against itself.

That is a totally wrong theological method. This Calvinistic system holds divine agency that totally overwhelms any human agency. This is why Spurgeon called it hyperism and its advocates hyperists.

Since this time, it has come to be known as hyper-Calvinism, which unfortunately is still alive in our day. James Wells, a hyperist leader, wrote blistering condemnations of Spurgeon, in particular Baptist magazines. Spurgeon disappointed many believers when he failed to respond to these attacks, except in sermons.

I am amazed not only at his wisdom, theologically, his homiletical ability, which is of the first rank, but of his wisdom politically, if you will, publicly, in not stooping. He was their match, but he did not stoop to that public desecration of fellow believers. First, Spurgeon said, God's sovereign love for his elect.

God has a general love for all humans, but a special sovereign love for his people. Second, despite hyperist claims of the contrary, the gospel call is universal. Spurgeon said the hyperists, quote, are too orthodox to obey the will.

They desire to understand first who is appointed to come to the supper, and then they will invite them. Ha ha, the master sent them out to the highways and byways, inviting everybody to come in. And indeed, said later, many are called, but few are chosen.

It's not the other way. Many are chosen, therefore we only, few are chosen, therefore we only invite a few. No, we're not God.

We don't take his roles. Good grief. Third, Christ invites whosoever will to come to him.

This means those who reject him bring condemnation on themselves. Spurgeon's teaching was not original, but instead a restatement of the historical views on predestination taught by Augustine and Calvin, and beautifully popularized for late 19th century Great Britain. Partly because of Spurgeon's Christian testimony and excellence as a preacher of the word, traditional Calvinism eventually met with wider approval than hyperism among the particular Baptists in England.

In fact, the hyperists became an entrenched minority. But by the end of the 19th century, Calvinism had been overtaken by Arminianism among English evangelicals.

This did not matter much either, however, because neither party was any longer concerned about the other, as both were preoccupied with a new third party that was outstripping them both, theological liberalism, which had little concern for any orthodox doctrines, including election.

Perhaps I'll do a brief review of Spurgeon's ideas in the next lecture because they're so good. But then we will begin to undertake election in terms of systematic formulations, that is, a systematic theology of the doctrine of election.

This is Dr. Robert Peterson and his teaching on Salvation. This is session 5, Election, Historical Reconnaissance.