
Does God Love *Everyone*?

by
Paul Fahy

PART TWO SUPPORTING QUOTATIONS FROM EMINENT THEOLOGIANs

COPYRIGHT : Paul Fahy 1994

Appendix 3 Introduction

I think that it is important to make the case for the doctrine under discussion entirely from the Bible. The original draft of this paper did not draw from theological works for support for my thesis. Slavish following of men is a repeated failure in these days.

Having said that, some have questioned the results of this thesis criticising it as novel, lacking in academic support, against doctrinal standards and without any theological precursors. Whilst my defence is my own, there is a large body of academic support for the proposal. The quotes here, and in the body of the thesis, were added subsequent to the completion of the paper.

This appendix enters some of the evidence which will major on the paper's title, but will add a few quotes on Limited Atonement. There is no particular order of priority.

Technical Note

Different Theologians sometimes use different terms to describe the same thing. This does not help clarity. Some theologians subdivide God's love (itself sometimes called God's goodness as exercised toward his creatures) into three aspects. These are commonly called:

BENEVOLENCE- love in intention or disposition

BENEFICENCE- love in action

COMPLACENCE- approval of good actions or dispositions.

God's goodness or love is also noted differently towards its objects:

God's goodness to the unworthy is called GRACE

God's goodness toward the suffering is called PITY or MERCY.

Herman Hoeksema (d. 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 the Protestant Reformed Churches.

“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 Publ. Assoc. Grand Rapids 1985, p 116.

“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 them 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 Protestant Reformed Church, 1986, pp 13-14 (Emphasis PF).

Francis Turretin (1623-87)

Was called ‘the best expounder of the doctrine of the Reformed church’ (Samuel Alexander) His “**Institutes of Elenctic Theology**” was pub-

Does God Love Everyone?

lished in 1679-85 after thirty years teaching at the Academy of Geneva.

“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 Publ. Phillipsburg, 1992, Vol. 1 p.244.

“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, Vol. 1, pp.396-397.

“Since his love cannot be vain and inefficacious, those whom he loves unto salvation he ought to love fully and even unto the end (Jn. 13:1).”

Ibid. Vol 1, p.400.

“The love treated in Jn. 3:16 ... cannot be universal towards each and every one, but special towards a few.”

Ibid, Vol 1 p.405 (see his argument).

John Leadley Dagg (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.

“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, pp.319-320.

Augustus Hopkins Strong

Was one of the foremost Baptist theologians. His work is a standard. He was President and Professor of Biblical Theology in the Rochester Theological Seminary, USA. The following quotations are taken from his work; **Systematic Theology**.

“The immanent (or absolute, i.e. an attribute which respects the inner being of God, independent of his connection of 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” (p.127).

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 in 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 it’s principle object, the image of God’s perfections in Christ. Only in the Son do men become sons of God. (pp.137-138).

“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.” (p.433).

“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 or holiness involves hatred of unholiness ... holiness conditions love.” (p.597)

“The benevolence of God, as concerned for the general good of the universe, requires the execution of the full penalty of the law upon all who reject Christ’s salvation.” (p.598).

Systematic Theology, A. C. Armstrong & Son, New York, 1899.

John H Gerstner

Is a contemporary American theologian of repute. (Sadly recently deceased).

“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, p.125.

David J Engelsma

A contemporary American theologian. He is the Professor of Dogmatics and Old Testament at the Protestant Reformed Seminary in Grandville, Michigan. Prior to his appointment he was a pastor for 25 years.

“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 Publishing Assoc. Grand Rapids, Michigan (1994) pp.41-42.

“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.” (**Ibid.** p.45).

“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 *someone*. He presents Christ and calls the hearers to believe on that Christ.”

(Ibid. pp.87-88).

The Helvetic Consensus Formula

Composed by John Heidegger of Zurich in 1675 as a creed for the Swiss churches. (He was helped by Turretin.)

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.

See: A A Hodge, **Outlines of Theology**, Appendix II page 657.

Archibald Alexander Hodge (1823-1886)

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

“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 (pp.156-7). 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

Does God Love Everyone?

means. Gratuitous election, or the positive choice of some does not rest upon God's general benevolence, but upon his special love to its own." (pp.228-9)

Outlines of Theology, Nelson, New York, 1883.

Creeds and Confessions

BB. Warfield, in his 'Predestination in the Reformed Confessions', a part of his book "Studies in Theology", quotes a great many examples of a wide variety of standards which support the doctrine of election and reprobation. Many are germane to this study. I will quote from only one:

The Irish Articles (1615)

11. God from all eternity did, by his unchangeable counsel, ordain whatsoever in time should come to pass; yet so, as thereby no violence is offered to the wills of reasonable creatures ...

12. By the same eternal counsel God hath predestinated some unto life, and reprobated some unto death ...

14. The cause moving God to predestinate unto life, is not the foreseeing of faith or perseverance, or good works, or anything which is in the person predestinated, but only the good pleasure of God himself ... it seemed good to his heavenly wisdom to choose out a certain number toward whom he would extend his undeserved mercy.

Studies in Theology, Baker, 1991, p.204.

Benjamin Breckinridge Warfield (1851-1921)

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

"The Biblical Writers are as far as possible from obscuring the doctrine of election because of any seemingly unpleasant corollaries that flow from it ... (in the election of some) others are passed by and left without the gift of salvation; the whole presentation of the doctrine is such as either to imply or openly assert ...the removal of the elect by the pure grace of God, not merely from a state of condemnation, but out of the company of the condemned ... the discrimination between men in the matter of eternal destiny is distinctly set forth as taking place in the interests of mercy and for the sake of salvation ... God is represented as in his infinite compassion rescuing those chosen to this end in his inscrutable counsels of mercy to the

praise of the glory of his grace; while those who are left in their sins perish most deservedly, as the justice of God demands.”

Biblical Doctrines, Baker 1991, pp.64-5.

The Theological Dictionary of the New Testament

Article on *agapao* (αγαπαω) by E. Stauffer

This dictionary has been a standard scholarly work for many years and is held in high esteem for its technical merit.

“Paul ... makes three main points (in Romans on love PF): (1) God sent his Son even to the cross in love; (2) God calls the elect in love; (3) God sheds his love abroad in their hearts ... This love implies election, which includes both pretemporal ordination and temporal calling. The elect community is in fellowship with God, and he endows with the active compelling power of love (Rom. 5:5) in fulfilment of his own primary purpose of love.”

TDNT, Ed. G. Bromiley, Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, Abr. Version, 1985, p.9.

Dictionary of New Testament Theology

Article : *Love*- by W Gunther, H-G Link

Another standard work, more recent than the above, considered an indispensable resource to Bible scholars.

“At the beginning of the OT stands not only the God who loves, but also the God who elects ...It was the prophets who first ventured to elaborate on the theme of the love of God as the main motif of his electing work ...Essential for an understanding of the NT is the quite different structure of Qumran piety. The community believed that it had been chosen in God’s love. But that this only had reference to the children of light. God loves the angel of light and hates all who belong to the company of Belial ... God’s love is not conceived as having universal application ...Paul stands entirely in the line of OT tradition when he speaks of the love of God. Agape is for him electing love, as is indicated by his use of *Agapetos* ‘the chosen one’ ... As in the OT the motive for the election is God’s love ... God in his electing love rescues those who believe ...The continual oscillation between the subject and object of love in John shows that the Father, the Son, and the believers are all united in the one reality of divine love: the alternative to which is death.”

DNTT, vol. 2, Ed. Colin Brown, Zondervan, Grand Rapids 1986, pp.540-546.

John L Girardeau

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 Calvinism.

“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; R m 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 complacental 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 complacental 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 Publ. Harrisonburg 1984, pp.54-66.

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 complacency. 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.

William G T Shedd (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 Dogmatic Theology is a standard work for scholars.

"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 of the creature. It extends to the animals: (Ps. 145:16, 104:21, Jn. 38:41, Matt. 6:26, Ps. 36:63. 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 ... but he cannot bestow upon a sinful and hostile man his approving love ... Grace is an aspect of mercy. It differs from mercy, in that it has reference to sinful man as guilty, while mercy has respect to sinful man as miserable. The one refers to the culpability of sin, and the other to its wretchedness ...both mercy and grace are exercised in a general manner, towards those who are not the objects of their special manifestation. All blessings bestowed upon the natural man are mercy, in so far as they succour his distress, and grace, so far as they are bestowed upon the undeserving. (Matt. 5 45, Ps. 145:9, 15, 16). This general manifestation of mercy and grace is in and by the works of creation and

Does God Love Everyone?

providence ... Special grace and mercy are exercised only in redemption.”

Dogmatic Theology, Vol 1, Nelson, Nashville, 1980, pp.386-391.

Arthur C. Custance

Is 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.

“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. We are tending increasingly to ignore the other side of God’s love towards 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) pp. 294, 297.

Lack of space prevents me from consideration of further support. One could go to the writings of the Puritans for a rich field of support for instance. I think that the point has been made well enough. This Thesis is not novel. It is as old as Christianity itself. Lack of semantic clarity has sometimes confused the issue but it is clear that God’s saving love, the love that ‘has a wonderful plan for your life’, is only applied to the elect and not indiscriminately to all.

Appendix 4

JESUS’ DEALING WITH EVIL PEOPLE.

INTRODUCTION

Jesus is God. This is a straightforward and simple statement that all Christians believe. If ‘God is love and Jesus shows it’, as the popular saying goes (and there is truth in that), then we will see the attitude of God to different sorts of people in the life of Jesus. What do we see?

ATTITUDE TO THE SCRIBES, PHARISEES and SADDUCEES

Note that in Matthew 23 Jesus says that these people do not enter heaven (v.13), are children of hell (v. 15), have neglected justice, mercy and faith, and are full of

extortion and rapacity (v. 25).”

He said to them, “ Well did Isaiah prophesy of you hypocrites ... you have a fine way of rejecting the commandment of God”. (Mk. 7: 6).

“ Beware of the scribes, who like to go about in long robes, and to have salutations in the market places and the best seats in the synagogues and the places of honour at feasts, who devour widows’ houses and for pretence make long prayers. They will receive the greater condemnation.” (Mk. 12: 38-40).

“And he looked around at them with anger, grieved at their hardness of heart.” (Mk. 3: 5).

“ When you pray you must not be like the hypocrites.” (Matt. 6: 5).

“ When you fast, do not do not look dismal, like the hypocrites.” (Matt. 6:16).

“ You blind fools.” (Matt. 23: 1 7).

“ Woe to Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites ... you make him twice as much a child of hell as yourselves.” (Matt. 23: 13-15).

“ Woe to Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for you are like whitewashed tombs ...you serpents, you brood of vipers, how are you to escape being sentenced to hell?” (Matt. 23:27f).

Jesus said: “ You are of your father the Devil ... He was a murderer from the beginning, and has nothing to do with the truth, because there is no truth in him.. You are not of God.” (Jn. 8:44-47).

FALSE PROPHETS

“ Beware of false prophets, who ... are ravenous wolves.” (Matt. 7:15).

RELIGIOUS HYPOCRITES

“ On that day many will say to me. ‘Lord, Lord’ ... then I will declare to them. I never knew you; depart from me, you evildoers.” (Matt. 7:22-23).

“ The sons of the kingdom (Israelites after the flesh without faith-PF) will be thrown into the outer darkness; there men will weep and gnash their teeth.” (Matt. 8: 12).

CONCLUSION

It is inescapable. The picture of Jesus as a soft, sweet-natured teacher who never spoke harshly is not true. Just as God is love, but shows justice and wrath as part of his character, so also Jesus could speak with force and anger in the right setting. The evidence is in the Bible. Jesus called evil people: wolves, hypocrites, evildoers, children of hell, full of iniquity. He was angry to people’s faces and warned others about them. He condemned people. He was critical, even sarcastic.

Does God Love Everyone?

Does all this show that he loved everyone? Remember Jesus does not love like men do, his love is pure and patient, it loves to the end, it is long suffering. It is not superficial or changeable. If Jesus loved the people mentioned above, he could not have maintained such a barrage of criticism against them.

Now some will say that later many of the religious leaders came to believe in Jesus. That is true (Acts 6:7), but we don't know who they are or even what party they belonged to. We do not know whether Jesus met any of these people personally, still less if they were included in any of the situations mentioned above. Furthermore, we only need to show that Jesus was angry, not in love, with one person to prove the point. Also Peter calls the people that opposed Jesus (the religious leaders) lawless men, a crooked generation, (Acts 2:23, 40). While Stephen calls them 'You stiff necked people, uncircumcised in heart and ears, you always resist the Holy Spirit ... the righteous one, whom you have now betrayed and murdered (Acts 7:51-53, remember that Jesus promised the apostles that when they were dragged before rulers for their faith, they would be given the words to speak. These words of Stephen are the words of Jesus.) The weight of evidence lies with the proposition, God, in the person of Jesus, does not love everyone! Opposers have a huge amount of evidence to overcome before they can even begin to make their point.

ADDENDA TESTIMONY OF JOHN THE BAPTIST

When he saw many of the Pharisees and Sadducees coming for baptism, he said to them, " You brood of vipers! Who warned you to flee from the wrath to come? ... do not presume to say for yourselves, 'We have Abraham as our father' ... every tree therefore that does not bear good fruit is cut down and thrown into the fire." (Matt. 3:7).

Correction: A reader has informed us of a misprint in the first part of the above article, printed in BRJ issue No. 15, page 18, twelfth line, concerning the ref. Titus 1: 11 & 12 *should* read Titus 2 : 11 & 12. We are grateful that he has alerted us to this erratum.

God is not unjust in reprobating some, neither can he be so, for "the Lord is righteous in all His ways and holy in all His works" (Ps. 145: 17) But salvation and damnation are works of His, consequently neither of them is unrighteous or unholy..... if it be not unjust in God actually to forbear saving these persons after they were born, it could not be unjust in Him to determine as much before they were born. What is not unjust for God to do in time, could not, by parity of argument, be unjust in Him to resolve upon and decree from eternity.

Jerome Zanchius ...The Doctrine of Absolute Predestination.