

The Wrong Form: Amyraut's Position

Let me remind you, reader, of Amyraut's position: God the Father intended and designed the atonement to be universal in that he decreed Christ should redeem the whole world, sufficiently for all on condition that they believe, but effectively only for the elect. God, therefore, had a twofold will, purpose or intention in redemption; consequently, Christ wrought this twofold redemption. Amyraut: 'Jesus Christ died for all men sufficiently, but for the elect only effectually... His intention was to die for all men in respect of the sufficiency of his satisfaction, but for the elect only in respect of its quickening and saving virtue and efficacy... This was the most free counsel and gracious purpose both of God the Father, in giving his Son for the salvation of mankind, and of the Lord Jesus Christ in suffering the pains of death, that the efficacy thereof should particularly belong unto all the elect, and to them only'.⁶⁷ Thus, as Clifford said: 'Correlating with the twofold will of God, Amyraut's view of the atonement's design involved a twofold intention... [which led to] a potential universal provision'. 'Notwithstanding the limited efficacy of the atonement, the divinely-intended provision is universal according to... Amyraut'.⁶⁸ 'The Amyraldian position [is]: Christ died (with dual intent) for all "provisionally" but for the elect "receptively". We believe in a "particular efficacious redemption" as well as a "general sufficient redemption"'.⁶⁹

This is wrong. God did not design the atonement to be efficient only for the elect, but sufficient for all on condition of faith. Such a statement cannot be found in Scripture, nor can the doctrine be inferred from Scripture. Indeed, it runs counter to Scripture. For six reasons.

1. God does not have a twofold decree in Christ's redemption

There is a twofold aspect to the one will of God, the secret and the revealed, yes; God's secret decree to save his elect, and his revealed desire to save all.⁷⁰ This is written large in Scripture.⁷¹ But to say

that God, in his secret will, his decree, intended Christ's redemption to be effective for the elect, but sufficient for all on condition of faith, means that God's decree in Christ's death is twofold; it means that the Father has decreed, and Christ has wrought, two very different redemptions; one effective, the other conditional.⁷² This is wrong. As James Durham put it: 'The Scripture makes not two considerations of Christ's death'.⁷³ God had a single will of intention or decree in the death of Christ.⁷⁴ 'I have come to do your will' (Heb. 10:5-10), Christ said; not: 'I have come to do your wills'.⁷⁵ 'It is finished' (John 19:30), he cried; not: 'They are finished'. Paul could speak of 'the eternal purpose'; not 'the eternal purposes', but 'the eternal purpose which [God] accomplished in Christ Jesus' (Eph. 3:11; see 1:11). 'Our Lord Jesus Christ... gave himself for our sins, that he might deliver us from this present evil age, according to the will of our God and Father' (Gal. 1:3-4). Christ came to do his Father's will; the Father willed that Christ should come and save all whom he had given him, the elect; Christ redeemed them all; all of them will come to Christ (John 4:34; 5:30; 6:37-40; 17:1-26). Thus the believing elect can say: 'By that will we have been sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all' (Heb. 10:10), that is, once for all time, by 'one sacrifice for sins for ever' (Heb. 9:12,26; 10:12,14). One will in one sacrifice; not two wills in one sacrifice.

This can be pressed a little further. According to the Amyraldian, Christ died for all – effectively for the elect, but only sufficiently for the non-elect. If so, when he died, he must have been united to the elect (and they to him), but not united to the non-elect (nor they to him),⁷⁶ both at the same time in the one sacrifice. In other words, in addition to dying for, and in union with, those whom he knew his Father had elected, in whom he knew the Spirit would work effectually, and for whom he himself would intercede, Christ must have died for, but not in union with, those whom he knew his Father had not elected, in whom he knew the Spirit would never work effectually, and for whom he himself would never intercede, and all according to the ordination of God in the one sacrifice.⁷⁷ If this does not represent two distinct 'redemptions', or two wills in one redemption, what does?⁷⁸

This, of course, means that the Amyraldian is wrong. God does not have a twofold decree in the redemption accomplished by Christ – one, absolute; the other, conditional.⁷⁹

And this leads to the next point.

2. God's decree is not conditional

Not only does God not have a twofold decree – one absolute; the other, conditional – but how, in any case, could God's *decree* be conditional?⁸⁰ It is absolute (Ps. 33:11; Isa. 14:24-27; 46:11; Rom. 9:18-19; Eph. 1:11; Rev. 4:11 *etc.*) It must be absolute. It can be nothing else but absolute.⁸¹ When God decreed the death of his Son, for whom he intended it, and what he intended by it, that decree was totally free of conditions, absolutely certain of fulfilment. There can be no question of any conditional decree in God.

Nowhere is this more true than in the death of Christ. Booth: 'Both reason and revelation concur to forbid our supposing that the Son of the blessed [God] should engage as mediator, and act as substitute, for he did not know whom; or that the counsels of heaven should terminate in mere peradventures'.⁸²

Just so! God cannot have a conditional decree; in particular, he does not have a conditional decree in Christ's redemption. This is the second reason why the Amyraldian form of the sufficiency formula is wrong.

3. Christ earned the gift of faith for the elect

Christ did not die for believers.⁸³ Nor did he die for any on condition that they believe.⁸⁴ He died for sinners; sinners as unbelievers. But saving faith is essential, yes, and all the elect will be brought to it. Why? This is a crucial question. Why will all the elect come to faith? Because God decreed it; in choosing them to salvation, he decreed that they should come to faith in Christ.⁸⁵ Yes. But this is not the whole story; the elect do not come to faith 'merely' because God elected them, as Amyraldians say.⁸⁶ A sinner comes to faith because God elected him *and Christ died for him and purchased*⁸⁷ *the gift of faith for him* in fulfilment of God's

decree in election.⁸⁸ This is no splitting of hairs. I have just said it is a *crucial* question. I go further; it is the *cardinal* question.

Why? Why is it the cardinal question? For this reason: If Christ, in his death, earned the gift of faith for sinners, he could not have done so provisionally or conditionally. To say that Christ purchased *the gift of faith* for sinners, *on condition that they believe*, would be utterly ludicrous; the two emphasised parts of the statement are patently self-contradictory, mutually exclusive. No! If Christ purchased the gift of faith for sinners by his death, he did so absolutely. Consequently, if, in his death, Christ purchased the gift of faith, he could have died only for the elect, because only the elect come to faith.⁸⁹

The cardinal question is, therefore: Did Christ earn the gift of faith? I say: Yes. Although, I admit, no verse simply states that Christ purchased the gift of faith, this is far from conclusive; it can be properly inferred from Scripture.⁹⁰

Of course, I am not saying there is a 'cause-and-effect relationship between the atonement and the bestowal of faith'⁹¹ – the cause of the whole system of salvation – including the gift of faith – is the will of God, his loving decree to elect those he would save; that is, to redeem, call, keep and glorify them. Nevertheless, this can only mean that at the very least there is a direct connection between God's decree, Christ's redemption, and the gift of faith to the elect. But it is stronger than that; much stronger. In his decree – which can only be a unity entirely consistent from start to finish⁹² – God designed Christ's redemption in which he merited and earned the entirety of salvation for the elect, including 'the bestowal of faith' by the Spirit (Eph. 2:8).⁹³ Indeed, in Christ,⁹⁴ God blesses his elect with 'every spiritual blessing' (Eph. 1:3).⁹⁵ Saving faith is a spiritual blessing, is it not?⁹⁶ Thus God blesses his elect by giving them saving faith. And he gives it to them, with all the other blessings, *in Christ*; that is, he gives them faith, and every other blessing, by Christ's work, because of the redemption which he designed and accomplished in Christ.⁹⁷ 'God was *in Christ*' accomplishing reconciliation (2 Cor. 5:19).

The elect are saved by grace through faith – and that not of themselves, 'it is the gift of God' (Eph. 2:8),⁹⁸ the 'grant' of God (Phil. 1:29),⁹⁹ 'the faith which comes through [Christ]' (Acts 3:16),

which 'they have obtained [or received]... by the righteousness of our God and Saviour Jesus Christ' (2 Pet. 1:1),¹⁰⁰ that is, by the Father's promise to Christ for the completion of his will in redemption.¹⁰¹ Christ, having been given 'all authority', 'being exalted to the right hand of God, and having received from the Father [the fulfilment of] the promise of the Holy Spirit,¹⁰² he poured out' all the blessings of Pentecost (and since) – including faith and repentance to those who had been 'appointed to eternal life' (Matt. 28:18; Acts 2:33; 13:48). As I have already noted, it matters not whether Paul was speaking of the faith or the grace (in Eph. 2:8); the grace encompasses the faith – and repentance: 'Him [Christ] God has exalted to his right hand to be Prince and Saviour, to give repentance' (Acts 5:31; see also Acts 11:18). Why has Christ been given this authority? Because he earned it; he, by his death, earned the gifts of faith and repentance for his elect,¹⁰³ earned the right to bestow these gifts upon them – in accordance with the promise of the Father in consequence of his obedience. Thus, all the means of salvation – regeneration, conviction, conversion, repentance, faith and so on – all are the gift of God to his elect, earned and deserved for them by Christ.¹⁰⁴ 'Christ... suffered once for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God' (1 Pet. 3:18). He died for sinners that he might – in order to¹⁰⁵ – bring them to God.¹⁰⁶ In other words, he did not merely *provide* salvation for the sinners for whom he died; he died to earn all that was necessary to bring them to God, including faith. Indeed, he died to *bring* them to God! 'In Christ Jesus you who once were far off have been brought near by the blood of Christ' (Eph. 2:13).¹⁰⁷ Christ did not make it *possible* for the elect to come to God, to draw near to him, to *be brought* to him; he died to *bring* them to God. Hence his dogmatic assertion: 'All that the Father gives me will come to me' (John 6:37); he earned and guaranteed their coming by his death. All was accomplished and announced with his last triumphant cry: 'It is finished' (John 19:30). So now we must say: 'What do [we] have that [we] have not received?' (1 Cor. 4:7); 'the excellence of the power [is] of God and not of us' (2 Cor. 4:7); 'we are [God's] workmanship, created in Christ Jesus' (Eph. 2:10); 'his divine power has given to us all things that pertain

to life and godliness, through the knowledge of him' (2 Pet. 1:3). *All things!*

If not, we end up with the absurdity that Christ died to procure the end of redemption, but not its means (faith and repentance). Durham rightly called it 'a strange assertion, that [Christ] has bought life, and not the condition [of that life]; the end, and not the [means]'.¹⁰⁸ No! Christ died to obtain both eternal redemption and the application of it, *and he did it for the same people*. There is nothing conditional about it.¹⁰⁹ Christ 'bore the sin of many', being 'wounded for' their 'transgressions' (that is, he wrought certain redemption for them), so that the same 'many' are healed or justified (that is, he obtained the certain application of it to them) (Isa. 53:5,11-12). Those for whom God did not spare his own Son, but for whom he delivered him up (that is, to die for them to earn their redemption), to them he freely gives all things (Rom. 8:32).¹¹⁰ Using this verse, James Haldane drew attention to the mistake of assuming 'that there is a possibility of the gifts of God being separated'. As he observed:

Christ is God's unspeakable gift. Now, the supposition that this gift was bestowed on all, while the secondary, and consequently inferior gifts of faith, repentance, pardon and salvation, are withheld, is utterly unscriptural. This is decided by the question: 'He that spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not with him also freely give us all things?'¹¹¹

And this includes faith – and whatever else is required to bring the elect to everlasting salvation.¹¹² As a consequence, it is absolutely certain (I use the words advisedly) that Christ 'shall see his seed... he shall see the labour of his soul, and be satisfied' (Isa. 53:10-11).

4. The ultimate condition of redemption is Christ's death, not faith

If Christ's redemption is provisional for any, conditional on faith, then their redemption is to be assigned, ultimately, to man and not God,¹¹³ turning faith into a work and thus leading to salvation by works, something utterly ruled out by Scripture (Rom. 11:5-6; Eph. 2:8-9; 2 Tim. 1:9; Tit. 3:5).¹¹⁴ The question for the Amyraldian is: 'Who makes the (supposedly) provisional redemption effective?'

Durham: To 'say that though he has not bought all men absolutely, nor died to procure life absolutely to them, yet that he did so conditionally, and upon supposition that they should afterward believe on him', is wrong, because 'there can be no conditional satisfaction intended' in Christ's death, since a conditional redemption leaves the effect of that redemption 'suspended... on man's will'.¹¹⁵ Again, if any sinner is saved on this basis, then instead of *ascribing to the death of Christ* his freedom from all accusation – which is Paul's doctrine (Rom. 8:33-34) – he will be able to ascribe it to his faith; an unbiblical, dreadful suggestion.¹¹⁶

It is *Christ's* righteousness, his obedience – *not their faith* – which is imputed to believers for justification (Rom. 5:14-19).¹¹⁷ It is true that Christ, the believer's righteousness, 'the LORD our righteousness' (Jer. 23:6), 'the righteousness of God', has to be received by faith (Rom. 1:17), but Christ had to die – and *this* was *the* condition which had to be fulfilled for the elect to be saved.¹¹⁸ Christ met the condition.

Booth:

This pardon, far from being suspended on conditions to be performed by us, flows from sovereign grace, is according to the infinite riches of grace, and is intended by Jehovah to aggrandise his grace in the view of all the redeemed, and before the angels of light, both here and hereafter... When the blessed Jesus died, he did not do something to assist our weak but willing endeavours to save ourselves; he did not lay in a provision of grace, or purchase the Spirit for us, by which... we... [might be] rendered capable of performing the condition of our justification. But... when he bowed his head and expired, he, by himself alone, perfectly finished that righteousness which is the proper condition and the grand requisite of our justification. That the [gift of the] Spirit of grace and truth... is a precious fruit of the death, resurrection and glorification of Christ, is freely acknowledged; but that Jesus died to purchase the Spirit to work in us any part of that righteousness, on account of which we are accepted of God, must be denied.¹¹⁹

Quite! Christ accomplished redemption for the elect. He did not provide a redemption sufficient for all on condition that they believe. And this is the fourth reason why the Amyraldian form of the sufficiency formula is wrong.

5. No good purpose is served by any supposed redemption for the non-elect

If God decreed that Christ should die to atone provisionally and sufficiently for the non-elect, will any of the non-elect be saved? Clifford: 'No, by definition the question makes no sense... That said, I believe the gospel provision is made conditionally and sufficiently for all, not to [for?] elect or non-elect but to [for?] sinners in general, all being "potentially" recoverable. Empowered by special grace, only the elect "actually" fulfil the conditions of faith and repentance. Then the all-sufficient atonement becomes particularly efficacious in their salvation. Thus those who are saved are still saved on the basis of a redemption made conditionally available for all'.¹²⁰

If this is so – Christ died for the non-elect, but they will not be saved – why, I ask, did God decree to provide redemption for them? why did Christ die for them?¹²¹ Is it: 1. To try to justify God's offer of salvation to the non-elect, even though he knew they would refuse it and perish? Clifford: 'God decreed to provide redemption for them to express the generosity of his grace even when he permits the non-elect to perish in their ingratitude. Thus Christ still offered himself to those whom he knew would reject him (see John 6:32)'.¹²² Or is it: 2. To give himself a reason for justly condemning the non-elect, on the ground that they refused a redemption that was made for them? Clifford: 'Unbelievers are... rejecting redemption provided'.¹²³

Both suggestions are wrong – and worse. As for the first, the basis of the offer is not some supposed universal atonement – I will return to this.¹²⁴ What is more, talk of God *permitting* the non-elect to perish is a smoke screen which masks the reality of the Amyraldian position: God does not *permit* the non-elect not to believe and perish; nor is he a mere *observer* of the scene. The fact is, God has not *decreed* to give them faith because he has not *elected* them.¹²⁵ Even so, according to the Amyraldian, he decreed to redeem them. That is, as I have already noted, the Amyraldian says God decreed to give his Son for the redemption of the non-elect, even though he decreed not to give them the necessary faith to benefit by that redemption; and this, to express his 'generosity'!

It is hard to accept that Christ should die for such an end. So much for the first possible 'explanation' of why Christ should die for all.

As for the second, as John Leland put it, to think 'that many will gain nothing by the atonement but an aggravated curse, the heart sickens to think that God would be at so much expense to get a pretence to condemn men'.¹²⁶ Owen: 'To what purpose serves the general ransom, but only to assert that Almighty God would have the precious blood of his dear Son poured out for innumerable souls whom he will not have [that is, whom he has not decreed]¹²⁷ to share in any drop thereof, and so, in respect of them, to be spilt in vain, or else to be shed for them only that they might be the deeper damned?'¹²⁸ The fact is, as Gill said: 'God might have required repentance of men, and have justly condemned them for final impenitence, supposing Christ had never died at all, or for any at all'.¹²⁹

In short, no good purpose is served by any supposed redemption for the non-elect. And this is the fifth reason why the Amyraldian form of the sufficiency formula is wrong.

6. The Amyraldian scheme fatally weakens the atonement

It bears repeating: The Amyraldian scheme fatally weakens the atonement.¹³⁰ I have already noted how vital the *nature* of the atonement is;¹³¹ imputation and substitution,¹³² union with Christ,¹³³ vicarious sacrifice, propitiation, reconciliation and redemption are at its heart. To think that any of this might be conditional on the sinner's response, is breath-taking. Fuller's reply to Dan Taylor (though an Arminian and not an Amyraldian)¹³⁴ is excellent. Did Christ have 'any absolute determination in his death to save any of the human race?' asked Fuller. If so, 'the limited extent of that purpose must follow of course. The reason is plain', he said:

An absolute purpose must be effectual. If it extended to all mankind, all mankind would certainly be saved. Unless, therefore, we will maintain the final salvation of all mankind, we must either suppose a limitation to the absolute determination of Christ to save, or deny any such determination to exist... [Taylor's] scheme, instead of making redemption universal, supposes that Christ's death did not properly redeem any man, nor render the salvation of any man a matter of

The Wrong Form: Amyraut's Position

certainty. It only [in its advocates' view] procured an offer of redemption and reconciliation to mankind in general.¹³⁵ We apprehend this is diminishing the efficacy of Christ's death, without answering any valuable end. Nor is this all; such an hypothesis appears to be utterly inconsistent with all those scriptures where God the Father is represented as promising his Son a reward for his sufferings in the salvation of poor sinners... If [since] the doctrine of eternal, personal and unconditional election be a truth, that of a special design in the death of Christ must necessarily follow.¹³⁶

A provisional atonement? Certainly not! Christ's death procured an absolute propitiation, an absolute reconciliation and an absolute redemption for all the elect. 'It is finished', he said (John 19:30); not 90% finished. 'Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners' (1 Tim. 1:15).

This is the sixth reason why the Amyraldian use of the sufficiency formula is wrong.

* * *

For these six reasons,¹³⁷ to speak of a redemption which God decreed to be universal, sufficient for all, but conditional on faith, is contrary to Scripture. Amyraut was wrong.¹³⁸ God sent his Son to accomplish an unconditional redemption for the elect – that is, a redemption which included the certainty of their believing. He did not send his Son to provide a redemption for all on condition that they believe.¹³⁹

Booth¹⁴⁰ tackled this (Amyraldian) 'hypothesis respecting the limitation of our Lord's atonement'. He traced where it came from, and why:

Extremely adverse and irreconcilable as the necessary consequences of maintaining, on the one part, that Christ, by his death, made an atonement for all mankind,¹⁴¹ and, on the other, that he made an atonement for the elect only, are usually thought [to be], a reconciling expedient or compromise between them has been invented. This expedient, if I mistake not, may be justly represented in the following position: The particularity of the atonement consists in the sovereign pleasure of God, *with regard to its application*. By viewing the subject in this light, it is imagined that provision is made for the satisfaction of all reasonable demands on each side of the question.

In other words, on this (Amyraldian) hypothesis, Christ wrought a redemption for all; the particularity consists only in its application; that is, in limiting the bestowal of this general redemption to those to whom God has decreed to give it – the elect. Before dealing with the ‘invention’ itself, Booth spelled out what is involved in ‘the application of redemption’. What are we talking about when we use such a phrase? As he said, it is impossible to divorce God’s intention¹⁴² in the application of redemption from his intention in its accomplishment:

It is necessary to be observed, before we enter into the merits of this position, that the application of the atonement is here to be understood as including not only what the New Testament denominates, *receiving* the atonement – the sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ – and, faith in his blood (Rom. 3:25; 5:11; 1 Pet. 1:2), but also the *absolute intention* of Christ in his death to save all those who shall be finally happy.

That is, the application of redemption involves not only the sinner’s reception of it, but God’s intention in accomplishing it. Booth, rightly stressing ‘intention’, argued that Christ *intended* to make reconciliation by his death, knowing full-well those for whom he intended that atonement, and that this intention covered not only the *benefit earned* by his death, *but also its application*:

That our Lord had a completely wise and most serious intention, in laying down his life to make an atonement for sinners, neither the perfection of his character, nor the nature of the case, will suffer us to doubt. But this very consideration forbids our supposing that he made an atonement with his own blood for any whom he did not intend it should be applied; or that he died as a sponsor for any of those whom he did not intend should live through him... But is it not strange and unnatural, to connect the idea of peculiarity with an *application* of the atonement, while implicitly [explicitly?] denying that any such limitation attaches to the *work* of [the] atonement? As it is natural to suppose that our Lord’s atonement, whatever limits may attend its *application*,¹⁴³ should virtually prescribe those limits, it seems unreasonable to imagine that its *application* should impose limits which would not otherwise have existed... Whatever peculiarity there is in the latter, must be included in the former; or else the atonement by blood, and the *application*¹⁴⁴ of it by power, must wear different aspects, and be at variance.¹⁴⁵

The Wrong Form: Amyraut's Position

On the (Amyraldian) 'hypothesis' Booth was criticising, however, 'the one' – the *accomplishment* of the atonement – is said to be 'general and unconfined', that is, to all men, while 'the other' – the *application* of the atonement – is said to be 'particular, and, it should seem, peculiar to God's elect'. Booth observed that this system 'has very much the appearance of the... Arminian [scheme of] redemption', though he admitted it is not.¹⁴⁶ But on this (Amyraldian) 'hypothesis', Booth declared:

There is nothing in the [Amyraldian concept of the] atonement of Christ that infallibly ascertains its application to all those for whom it was made... Millions of those for whom our Lord, by the sacrifice of himself, made expiation, for want of the necessary application [of it], must finally perish under the curse... On this principle, therefore, myriads and millions, for whom divine benevolence provided an atonement, must everlastingly perish for want of that atonement being applied. Must we then consider Jesus Christ as intending to make, and as actually making, a real atonement for mankind in general? But how, or in what way, was atonement made for those who, in consequence of not having it applied to them, sink into perdition? Was it by the death of Jesus? If so, he must have died for them; which, in the estimation of Paul, was perfectly good security against final condemnation (Rom. 8:34)... On the [Amyraldian] principle [Booth was opposing]... Jesus Christ is to be considered as making atonement for all mankind; by shedding the same blood, by undergoing the same sufferings, and precisely at the same time, equally for [all – both the ultimately lost and saved.¹⁴⁷ But, according to Rom. 4:25,] the atonement for sin depended on the death of our substitute, so that the justification of our persons depended on the discharge of our substitute, in his resurrection from the dead, by the divine Father; which two grand blessings, perfect atonement and complete justification, have been usually considered... inseparable. But according to the [Amyraldian] sentiment here opposed, there is no certain connection between atonement for sin by the death of Jesus, and justification before God. For, with regard to the atonement... [on this system] Peter and Judas were on a perfect level, the whole of the important difference in favour of Peter arising from the application [of the atonement, but not the atonement itself].

This is wrong: 'As, therefore, the only atonement for sin, the only redemption for sinners, and the only satisfaction made for our crimes, have the same Jesus for their author – suffering under the same character – effecting the whole by shedding the same blood –

and precisely at the same time, we may safely conclude that, in the design of our divinely merciful substitute, they are commensurate with regard to their application; that the application of them all is made at the same instant; and that their efficacy and consequences must be commensurate'.¹⁴⁸

Haldane put his finger on it. When Amyraldians insist that 'the peculiarity of redemption consists in its *application*, according to the sovereign pleasure of God', an inevitable conclusion follows; not only an inevitable conclusion, but a conclusion obviously false: 'Whence it inevitably follows that men are not saved by the atonement [*per se*], *but by its application*; and, consequently, that the Holy Spirit, and not Christ, is the Saviour'.¹⁴⁹ The Amyraldian view of the atonement, therefore, inevitably leading as it does to this false conclusion, is clearly wrong.

As a consequence, I am at one with Gill when he said:

The distinctions of Christ dying sufficiently for all, but intentionally only for the elect, and for all if they will believe and repent... for my own part, I [cannot]¹⁵⁰ admit... I firmly believe that Christ died for all the elect of God, and them only; that, by his death, he has procured for them actual pardon, reconciliation and salvation; and, that in consequence... faith and repentance are bestowed upon and wrought in these persons... in which way they are brought to the full enjoyment of that salvation Christ has obtained for them.¹⁵¹

As Gill observed: Anxious sinners can find no comfort in a universal or provisional atonement which 'leaves the salvation of every man very precarious and uncertain... when it depends on conditions to be performed by themselves'. What comfort is it to tell a sinner that Christ died for him 'and yet he may be damned [even so] for all this...?' None at all! 'Whereas the doctrine of particular redemption ascertains the salvation of some, and all that believe in Christ have reason to conclude their interest in it, and take comfort from it, [rightly] believing that they shall have, in consequence of it, every blessing of grace here, and eternal life hereafter'.¹⁵²

Haldane again:

When we consider the dignity of the Redeemer's person, it may be asked: Was his atonement of infinite value? and if so: Why might not all mankind have been saved by it? We answer: Such was not the will

The Wrong Form: Amyraut's Position

of God; he had a special [specific] end in view, and this shall be fully accomplished. But does it, in the smallest degree, derogate from the glory of the Redeemer that his atonement extended no farther than the commission which he received when he became the Father's servant, and undertook to redeem all the children given him from death and to ransom them from the power of the grave?¹⁵³

Certainly not! The upshot? This:

Admitting that it was not God's *intention* to save all by the atonement, [as Amyraldians do, then the sufficiency formula as used by them] gets rid of no difficulty.¹⁵⁴

Just so.

* * *

I close this long chapter by raising once again 'the cardinal question': Did Christ earn the gift of faith in his redemption? He did or he did not. If the latter, then the elect come to faith simply by God's decree. And this makes faith unique in the spectrum of salvation – since all the other gifts, graces and ends of salvation are purchased for the elect 'in Christ', by him in his death, and conveyed to them by the Holy Spirit poured out by the exalted Christ. Faith, apparently, is the exception!

This cannot be! As I have shown, Christ earned the gift of faith for his elect in his death. This, Amyraldians deny. They are wrong.¹⁵⁵

What is more, this fact – that Christ earned the gift of faith for his elect – explodes their case. Whatever their assertions in terms of the sufficiency formula, on their scheme Christ did not die effectively for any. He died sufficiently for all, yes, but effectively for none. He died as much for the non-elect as the elect. In particular, he did not obtain the gift of faith for any. That essential gift – essential because without it there is no salvation – is given to the elect simply through God's decree, independent (whatever the Amyraldian's protestations)¹⁵⁶ of the death of Christ.

As I have shown, this is contrary to Scripture. Why is any sinner saved? Because God the Father, from eternity, elected him to salvation in his Son, so that Christ should redeem him, and thereby merit the gift of the Spirit to bestow *all* the means and ends of

The Wrong Form: Amyraut's Position

salvation upon him, and bring him to everlasting glory. Nothing is left out. All is included. None of it is merely sufficient or provisional. All is absolute.

So much for the first expression of the formula. What about the second?