

Glossary

Duty faith is the biblical doctrine that it is the duty, the obligation, the responsibility of all sinners to trust Christ, even though they have no ability to comply. The gospel preacher must command all sinners to believe.

The free offer is the biblical doctrine that, even though Christ's atonement was neither intended for all, nor accomplished for all, we must invite all sinners to believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, promising them salvation if they do.

A **hyper-Calvinist** does not hold with the free offer or duty faith. Some hyper-Calvinists are knowingly so, but many are 'incipient', unwitting or *de facto* hyper-Calvinists; that is, while they accept the principles of the free offer, in practice they fail to preach it.

Justification. The elect are justified in God's decree in eternity, justified with and in Christ in his death on the cross and in his resurrection, but only actually justified when they are united to Christ by faith. In fact, the complete justification of the elect will only take place in eternity when they are glorified in and with Christ for ever.

According to hyper-Calvinists, a **sensible** or **seeking sinner** is a regenerate sinner who, conscious of his sin and need of salvation, repents, and desires Christ. He is not trusting Christ, however. Even so, such a sinner is demonstrating that he must be elect. Although I use the term – I have to, since it is ubiquitous in the literature – I do not think the Bible warrants us to speak of such a sinner, certainly not as denominated by hyper-Calvinists. How such a sinner can be repentant and desirous of Christ – without trusting him – beats me, I am afraid. Those who use the term, 'seeking sinner', often misapply Matthew 7:7-11 (Luke 11:9-13) to the unconverted, when it is, in fact, a set of commands and promises to believers.

The hyper-Calvinistic doctrine of **eternal justification** is this: the elect are actually justified in God's decree in eternity, actually justified with and in Christ in his death on the cross and in his

Glossary

resurrection. When the sensible sinner believes, he receives the manifestation (confirmation, revelation, realisation) of his eternal justification, in his conscience. But he is no more justified after believing than before. He never was under the wrath of God. Whereas before believing, he had no assurance that he was right with God, he now has the felt sense of it.

Reformed preparationism teaches that sinners must be prepared, made fit to receive Christ, and that this is accomplished by preaching the law. Sinners may trust Christ only after they have been prepared by the law; that is, after the law has sufficiently convicted them of their sin.

Hyper-Calvinistic preparationism is similar to Reformed preparationism with one vital difference. The hyper-Calvinist says that until sinners are sufficiently prepared, they may not even be invited or commanded to come to Christ.

A **Sandemanian** thinks saving faith is nothing more than mental assent. If a sinner accepts the facts of the gospel, he is saved. To talk about the heart, or feelings, is to introduce works, and ruin the grace of God in salvation. Sandemanianism was developed by the Scots, John Glas (1695-1773) and his son in law, Robert Sandeman (1718-1771), more especially the latter.

An **Amyraldian** thinks that God intended the atonement to be general in that he designed it to be efficient for the elect but sufficient for the world, provisional for every sinner, sufficient to save them all – on condition that they believe. It is named after the Frenchman, Moïse Amyraut (1596-1664), who was taught by the Scot, John Cameron (1580–1625).

When I speak of the **eschatological** aspect of the gospel, I am referring to the New Testament phrase **‘but now’** (Rom. 3:21; 5:9,11; 6:22; 7:6; 8:1; 11:30; 11:31 (NIV, NASB); 16:26; see also John 15:22,24; Acts 17:30; 1 Cor. 15:20; Gal. 4:9; Eph. 2:12-13; 5:8; Col. 1:26; Heb. 8:6; 9:26; 12:26; 1 Pet. 2:10). ‘But now’ carries enormous overtones. It refers to the massive change that God brought about in the coming of Christ, his death and resurrection, his ascension, and the subsequent outpouring of the Holy Spirit. The age of the law has gone. The age of the gospel has

come. The truth is, God, in time, works out his eternal decree to save his elect, and thus exalt his Son in their final glorification. God decreed the redemption of his elect – the purpose, means and ends of their redemption – in eternity, but he is accomplishing it in time, as a part of history. Adam, the promise to Abraham, the law at Sinai, the coming, life, death, resurrection and ascension of Christ, Pentecost, the return of Christ, and so on, are mile-stones in this historical process which is divided into two great ages, two great eras, two great dispensations or epochs – before Christ and after Christ, leaving aside the eternal age following the second coming of Christ. Everything centres on Christ and his work. He is the watershed of the two ages, the climax of all history, especially salvation history.

Calvin promulgated **three uses of the law** of God. *First*, the law prepares sinners for Christ, and leads them to him. *Second*, the law restrains sin in the unregenerate. *Third*, the believer is under the so-called moral law (that is, the ten commandments) for sanctification.¹ Likening the law to a whip with which to beat lazy asses, Calvin argued it is the standard and motive of the believer's holiness. These three uses of the law have dominated Reformed and evangelical theology for the past 500 years or so, and to question, let alone deny, Calvin in this – especially the third use – invariably elicits the retort of 'antinomianism'!

The **Levellers** arose during the English Civil Wars. They wanted democratic rule by a wider suffrage, a fairer legal system and religious toleration. They put their views forward in their manifesto: 'Agreement of the People'.

And an **antinomian** is... Ah, well, that's the issue, isn't it? Read on!

¹ In this book, 'sanctification' nearly always refers to progressive sanctification; that is, the believer's (sadly, imperfect in this life) outworking of his (perfect) positional sanctification in Christ. If my subjects had included positional sanctification when speaking of justification, and differentiated that from progressive sanctification, but linking it to it, they would have given an even fuller picture of the believer's new-covenant experience in Christ. See, for instance, 1 Cor. 1:2,30; 6:11; Eph. 5:25-27; Heb. 10:10-18; 13:12.