

# ***How To Give Away Your Faith***

***HANDOUT #5***

111. Remember, the so-called “*The Doctrines of Grace*” from *The Synod of Dort* (1618–1619) were written \_\_\_\_ years after John Calvin died, and were in some ways more “Calvinistic” than Calvin himself.
112. In “Handout #3” of this course, we saw that even some of the followers of Jacobus Arminius were actually more “**Arminian**” in their theology than those teachings articulated by **Jacobus Arminius** its \_\_\_\_.
113. You will recall, Arminian theology emphasizes human \_\_\_\_ will in salvation.
114. Although Arminian theology has its own gradations, just as there are gradations within Calvinistic theology — in its purest form Arminius believed that anyone could potentially be saved who responds to \_\_\_\_.
115. Jacob Arminius taught that though all people are affected by the \_\_\_\_, each person with God’s help can still freely choose for or against Jesus, without first being elected or chosen by God ahead of time to do this.
116. Even Arminius believed \_\_\_\_ the eternal security of the believer:

*“With regard to the certainty or assurance of salvation, my opinion is, that it is possible, for him who believes in Jesus Christ to be certain and persuaded, and, if his heart condemn him not, that he is now in reality assured that he is a son of God and stands in the grace of Jesus Christ” (The Works of James Arminius, Vol. 2, p. 219).*

*“Though I here openly and ingenuously affirm, I never taught that a true believer can, either totally or finally, fall away from the faith, and perish; yet I will not conceal, that there are passages of Scripture which seem to me to wear this aspect” (The Works of James Arminius, Vol. 1, p. 176).*

117. You can see that Arminius (1560–1609) did not explicitly teach that a true believer can lose salvation, but many of his followers did, as documented in *The Remonstrance* of \_\_\_\_ written to refute Calvinism.
118. In Article V titled as “**Perseverance of the Saints**” it states \_\_\_\_:  
  
*“True believers, however, may fall from their state of grace through the temptations of the world and the devil, and through their own willful sin, and be finally lost, unless they repent.”*
119. One of the key distinctions between post-Arminius Arminianism, and classical Calvinism concerns the doctrine of eternal security, which is \_\_\_\_ many sound teachers reject Arminianism.

120. We studied how the followers of Calvin responded to the Arminian document with *The Doctrines of Grace* — summarized in the acronym — “TULIP,” written at *The Synod of Dort* (1618–1619) 55 years after Calvin \_\_\_\_.
121. As in *The Remonstrance*, everything written in *The Doctrines of Grace* do not 100% reflect Calvin’s beliefs, though some would debate \_\_\_\_.
122. It is my contention John Calvin was a “\_\_\_\_ point” Calvinist for he wrote:  
*“Christ suffered for the sins of the whole world, and in the goodness of God is offered unto all men without distinction, His blood being shed not for part of the world only, but for the whole human race”* (*Commentary on Gospel According to John*, Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1949, p. 123).
123. We have seen that more than \_\_\_\_ other individual, John Calvin claimed that Augustine had the greatest influence on him such that he could write:  
*“Augustine is so wholly with me, that if I wished to write a confession of my faith, I could do so with all fullness and satisfaction to myself out of his writings.”*  
 (A *Treatise on the Eternal Predestination*, published in 1552, republished 1856, p. 38)
124. If Augustine held to an unlimited atonement, then Calvin, his self-professed disciple—would most likely reflect that view—in his \_\_\_\_ writings.
125. Augustine of Hippo taught that Jesus \_\_\_\_ even for Judas when he writes:  
*“For he threw down the price of silver, for which by him the Lord had been sold; and he knew not the price wherewith he had himself by the Lord been redeemed”*  
 (Augustine of Hippo, “Expositions on the Book of Psalms” ed. Philip Schaff, p. 309)
126. That Augustine believed that Jesus died for \_\_\_\_ is seen also when he writes:  
*“For with righteousness shall He judge the world:” not a part of it, for He bought not a part: He will judge the whole, for it was the whole of which He paid the price.*  
 (Augustine of Hippo, “Expositions on the Book of Psalms” ed. Philip Schaff, p. 474)
127. So we should not be totally surprised that John Calvin never fully embraced the teaching of a limited atonement as most of his followers do today, though as I said \_\_\_\_ Reformed scholars like to debate this.
128. When Calvin comments on Jesus’ \_\_\_\_ in John 3:16 he writes that John:  
*‘has employed the universal term whosoever, both to invite all indiscriminately to partake of life, and to cut off every excuse from unbelievers. Such is also the import of the term world’* (*Commentary on Gospel of John*, p. 125).

129. But then John Calvin quickly \_\_\_\_\_ in commenting further on John 3:16:

*“...while life is promised universally to all who believe in Christ, still faith is not common to all. For Christ is made known and held out to the view of all, but the elect alone are they whose eyes God opens, that they may seek him by faith” (p. 125)*

130. Augustine — often referred to as “**the father of determinism**,” provided the theological foundation upon which Calvin \_\_\_\_\_ much of his understanding of grace, election, the role of Israel in God’s plan, and divine sovereignty.

131. Augustine’s view of election, that Calvin adopted, did not lead him \_\_\_\_\_ embrace the false teaching that Jesus died only for some but not all.

132. In Augustine’s writings, there is not a single statement that Christ’s death was intended \_\_\_\_\_ for the elect as later emphasized in Reformed theology.

133. We have noted previously that John Calvin quoted Augustine over 4,000 times in his writings, making it clear that his hermeneutical framework and his conclusions were deeply \_\_\_\_\_ in Augustinian theology.

134. When accepting a teaching or dismissing criticism, we often say, “**Consider the source**,” because a polluted source \_\_\_\_\_ taint everything downstream.

135. So while the Bible does \_\_\_\_\_ say “**consider the source**” in those words, the principle—assessing the character—motives and the reliability of those who teach or criticize—is a thoroughly biblical principle.

136. *We are admonished* by God to not accept every word & doctrine at face value, but to examine to the teacher by his fruits, to test the spirits & to compare their message \_\_\_\_\_ Scripture (Matthew 7:15–16; 1 John 4:1; Acts 17:11).

137. Though Augustine and Calvin did not teach limited atonement, rejecting God’s plan for Israel paved the way for their warped \_\_\_\_\_ of election.

138. Sadly, from a historical perspective, Augustine has often been regarded as antisemitic & this perception is reflected in his words from *The City of God* where he described the Jewish people in the following \_\_\_\_\_:

*“They must be allowed to survive, but never to thrive so that their proper punishments for their refusal to recognize the truth of the Church’s claims.”*  
(*The City of God*, Book 18, Chapter 46)

139. Augustine believed that the Jews should be preserved, but not destroyed, that they might continue to \_\_\_\_\_ in suffering as a testimony of unbelief.

140. Since John Calvin was such a strong follower of Augustine, this perspective inevitably influenced him, even as \_\_\_\_\_ taught:
- “A student is not above the teacher; but everyone, when he has been fully trained, will be like his teacher” (Luke 6:40).**
141. Scattered throughout Calvin’s writings is a discernible disdain for the Jews, which shaped his view of their future and, in turn, influenced his understanding of election and \_\_\_\_\_ approach to evangelism.
- “Their hearts are harder than iron, and they persist in their obstinacy, so that they deserve to be cast away without hope of return” (A Response To Questions and Objections of a Certain Jew, 1543).**
142. Calvin believed God—was finished with Israel—that the Church \_\_\_\_\_ replaced Israel & that there would be no literal kingdom on the earth.
143. He taught that God had abandoned the nation Israel because of her unbelief and that the blessings of Israel have all gone to the \_\_\_\_\_ (commonly referred to as *Replacement Theology/Supersessionism*).
144. Whether Calvin’s preconceived notion of Israel’s “**replacement**” was the sole or decisive factor in his view of election, none can debate that the manner in which he interpreted Romans 9-11 was driven by \_\_\_\_\_.
145. Calvin’s interpretation of Romans \_\_\_\_\_ is central to his doctrine of election.
146. His perspective on Israel, forces him to see God’s election as individual rather than corporate—which dovetails \_\_\_\_\_ his election theology.
147. The \_\_\_\_\_ could be said for Augustine in that his rejection of Israel as God’s covenant people shaped his views a path towards determinism.
148. Furthermore, if God has rejected Israel corporately, then the “\_\_\_\_\_” are now only those chosen individually in the Church, which created a conceptual bridge—to limited redemption for Calvin’s followers.
149. Again—I want to underscore that the so-called—“**The Doctrines of Grace**” from — **The Synod of Dort** (1618–1619) — were written 55 years \_\_\_\_\_ John Calvin died and were in some ways more “Calvinistic” than Calvin.
150. The reason the Samaritans refer to Jesus as “**the Savior of the world**” (John 4:42 cf. 1 John 4:14) is because He came that “**He might taste death for everyone**” meaning \_\_\_\_\_ every single person (Heb, 2:9).

151. So, while Jesus can potentially be “**the Savior of all men**” (1 Timothy 4:10), because His Atonement is “**unlimited**”—it is nonetheless “**limited**” in effect in the sense — that only those who believe in Jesus — are truly \_\_\_\_.
152. This is what the Bible reveals—that our great salvation is genuinely offered to all making it universal in scope, but people are still responsible, and so one is lost because of unbelief, not because Jesus’ sacrifice was inadequate.
153. Christ’s death makes salvation available to every person while holding \_\_\_\_ individual responsible to respond, as an act of their will, in faith—which is why people are 1st condemned *not for what they have done*, but for unbelief.
154. Condemnation in John 3:18 is directly tied to unbelief, not just \_\_\_\_.

18 “**He who believes in Him is not judged; he who does not believe has been judged already, because he has not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God**” (John 3:18).

155. Likewise, “**the wrath of God**” in John 3:36 is directly \_\_\_\_ to unbelief.
- 36 “**He who believes in the Son has eternal life; but he who does not obey the Son will not see life, but the wrath of God abides on him**” (John 3:36).

156. Jesus states in John 5:24 that “**eternal life**” comes through faith, for God’s wrath rests on all—who do not believe —regardless of their \_\_\_\_.

24 “**Truly, truly, I say to you, he who hears My word, and believes Him who sent Me, has eternal life, and does not come into judgment, but has passed out of death into life**” (John 5:24).

157. This is why the classical Calvinist reasons—that if Jesus died for everyone, then His blood would \_\_\_\_ wasted if He died for some who did not believe.
158. Yet, the verses we just read teach the exact opposite, for Christ’s death, even for one who dies lost—becomes the \_\_\_\_ for his condemnation.
159. The Bible is clear that the same blood that can save those who believe, is the same blood—that \_\_\_\_ condemn those—who do not believe.
160. When a man rejects Jesus Christ he is eternally condemned, not simply because he is a sinner but because he has rejected God’s provision to deal with his \_\_\_\_ (John 3:18; 3:36; 5:24).

161. At God's judgment bar, no one will be able to say, "Yes I am sinner as is everyone born from Adam, and yes I deserve to be condemned, but You were unjust in that You provided an escape for some but not for \_\_\_\_."
162. In one sense, we all see some limitation in the atonement because Christ's atonement will do you no good — unless you believe — but that still does not mean that Christ did not die—for each & every person—ever \_\_\_\_.
163. John the Baptist did not cry out, "**Behold, the Lamb of God who takes away the sin of the elect . . .**" \_\_\_\_ rather he proclaimed, "**Behold, the Lamb of God who takes away the sin of the world.**" (John 1:29).
164. As stated earlier, one way of expressing this is to say that the death of Jesus is sufficient for all men—but it is only efficient for those \_\_\_\_ believe.
165. A non-Calvinist would define "**sufficient**" by saying that Christ's death on the cross fully paid for the sins of the \_\_\_\_ world.
166. Furthermore, by "**efficient**" he would say that the benefits of that payment (forgiveness, justification, eternal life) are received only by faith in Christ, where faith is not a work, but the means of receiving \_\_\_\_ He provided.
167. By contrast, when a Reformed theologian says that His death is "**sufficient**" he is talking about "**the worth**" or "**the dignity**" of Christ who died, but he is not referring to the \_\_\_\_ of those for whom He died.
168. A common analogy used is that they will ask you to imagine a payment \_\_\_\_ large it could pay everyone's debt, *but it is only applied* to specific accounts.
169. This chart might help us to see the difference between the \_\_\_\_ camps:

| Category                         | Historical non-Calvinist   | Reformed / Calvinist          |
|----------------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Extent of the Atonement          | Jesus died for all equally | Jesus died only for the elect |
| Meaning of " <b>sufficient</b> " | Actual provision for all   | Hypothetically for all        |
| Meaning of " <b>efficient</b> "  | Applied by faith           | Applied to only the elect     |
| Nature of faith                  | Non-meritorious response   | Gift given by regeneration    |
| Intent of the cross              | So all might be saved      | Only the elect can be saved   |

170. For the non-Calvinist the issue is not whether sins are paid for, but whether the \_\_\_\_ is received (John 3:16; Romans 5:17).

171. However, the Calvinist teaches that Jesus' death is unlimited in value, but its application is intentionally limited, so that His sacrifice is never viewed as limited in worth or as needing \_\_\_\_\_ suffering to save more people.
172. They believe that Christ did not merely make salvation possible, but actually secured it for the elect—so, because of their understanding of free will, if Christ died for someone, that person \_\_\_\_\_ be saved.
173. A Calvinist argues that Jesus' death *could save all people* if that were \_\_\_\_\_ intention, but it is '**efficient**' only for those who believe & only those chosen to believe will do so—therefore, His death was intended solely for the elect.
174. Again the \_\_\_\_\_, "*The death of Christ is sufficient for all, but efficient only for those who believe*" or as often cited in Latin, "*Sufficienter pro omnibus, efficaciter pro electis*" meaning, "*Sufficient for all, effective for the elect.*"
175. If you believe in an unlimited atonement, a limited redemptionist using the same words means something entirely different—that Jesus' death is \_\_\_\_\_ potentially sufficient, not actually sufficient and universally provided.
176. Both sides can say the identical sentence, but non-Calvinists would say that the word "**sufficient**" means Christ died for all, while Reformed theology means Christ could have died for all, but that He did \_\_\_\_\_ intend to.
177. For this reason some non-Calvinists will \_\_\_\_\_ use the "**sufficiency/efficiency**" wording but prefer, "**He died for all, but only believers receive the benefits.**"
178. In summary, "**sufficient for all**" in Reformed theology does \_\_\_\_\_ mean Jesus died for all but that His death *could be enough for all* because of who He is.
179. The parallel non-Calvinist summary is that "**sufficient for all**" \_\_\_\_\_ Jesus actually died for all, providing real payment for the sins of every person, though that payment is applied only to those who believe.
180. From a non-Calvinist viewpoint, emphasizing that Jesus' death is sufficient for \_\_\_\_\_ people highlights the genuine availability of salvation to everyone.
181. This understanding affects—the urgency, clarity, and the inclusivity of our message as we present the gospel not as something that might be available, but as a real and effective provision—for anyone who responds in \_\_\_\_\_.
182. It reminds us that the barrier to salvation is not the adequacy of Christ's sacrifice, but the individual's acceptance or rejection, prodding us to underscore the responsibility of \_\_\_\_\_ hearer to believe.