

A DEFINITIVE STUDY
OF
HARDSHELLISM AND HYPER-CALVINISM
BY

Stanley C. Phillips

Published by:

The Predestinarian
1159 County Road 420
Quitman, MS 39355

2007 a.d.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

If a New School, or evangelical Baptist, were to insist that the Holy Spirit was Sovereign and not dependent upon a creature to accomplish His will, his pastor, and others, would accuse him of being “a Hardshell.” If the same man, stating the same belief, were a Presbyterian, or Reformed “Christian,” his pastor would accuse him of being a “Hyper-calvinist.” Both terms are used to the same purpose – to castigate a false notion to the adherent and attempt to embarrass him into giving up his conviction, or at least remaining silent; but these are not equivalent terms: they really are two different things. “Hardshellism” is only one aspect of the truth held to by “Hyper-calvinists.” In other words, this concept is much more limited than “Hyper-calvinism.”

There are, however, individuals that use the words as synonyms, or interchangeably. Since the purpose of using the labels is to prejudice people against the one(s) holding those views, it matters little to them how many negative adjectives they muster together to achieve their nefarious end.

Name-calling is both effective and entertaining. While it is not considered politically “correct,” nevertheless, politicians constantly do it and the practice is rewarded

sufficiently at the voting polls to encourage them to continue the practice. Small children often do it, and if their parents, teachers, and classmates reward them for doing so, they will more than likely continue the practice. If they find it rewarding, or “fun,” the practice might continue through high school and into adulthood. Nevertheless, the practice is still an outgrowth of childish behavior and an evidence of intellectual immaturity. One would think that converted “Christians” would overcome the selfish tendency, but alas! It seems more pronounced among so-called “Christians,” than by politicians. The behavior undermines the gravity and humility that ought to be associated with the children of “grace.” However, since these labels are used, it is our self-appointed task to put them into perspective for anyone interested in the topic.

Let it first be noted that the truth, regardless of how it is labeled, is the possession of the true church of God on earth. The Church is the “*pillar and ground of the truth.*” The church was not given a name in the New Testament, but was referred to in many different ways; such as, “the church of God,” “the church,” “the churches of Christ,” *etc.* Invariably, in time, as heresies and sects split off and became “*synagogues of Satan,*” identifying names were used to express which group were in fellowship with the truth “*once delivered to the saints.*” Today there are many identifying nomenclatures to communicate varying religious societies and doctrinal differences. It is in this latter sense that we use the terms “Hardshell” and “Hypercalvinist.” This is a definitive study of the truth of

the New Testament faith that carries these labels assigned by Calvinists and Arminians who come short of the understanding of what the Gospel of Christ is as taught in the New Testament. To this writer, these two terms are synonyms for the historic Christian faith.

The definition of “hardshellism” is much easier to give than “Hyper-calvinism.” This euphemism developed during the rise of the Modern Missionary Movement among Baptists of the New Divinity school (which commenced in 1782 with Andrew Fuller in Kittering, England) who used it against the anti-Fullerites – the Old School of divinity - who insisted that “*He shall saved His people from their sins,*” (Matt. 1:23), “*Other sheep I have, which are not of this fold: them also I must bring, and they shall hear MY voice; and there shall be one fold, and one Shepherd*” (John 10:16), and, “*They shall not teach every man his neighbor and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord, for they shall all know Me. . .*”*etc.* (Hebrews 8:11). Even though the New Divinity school were, in most part, Five Point Calvinists, their insistence upon the need for Mission Societies was based primarily upon their belief that if the gospel was not preached to the heathen, the elect among them would perish. This view gave rise to a very fertile debate about the New School’s conditionalism, and they would reply: “Here you come with those hard shalls.” Very quickly, these “hard shalls,” became “Hardshells,” and the definition entered into the American vocabulary, meaning, “One that is stubborn, unyielding and uncompromising in defense of a principle.” Since this

battle was waged most strongly among the Baptists, Baptists most often use the term “Harshellism” more readily than did Calvinists against other Calvinists.

Today, of all the issues debated among Baptists in the 1820’s and ‘30’s, the belief that the Eternal Godhead: Father, Son, and Holy Spirit is sovereign and independent of any need for His creatures in the production of spiritual life in an elect sinner, has remained as the chief view that brings the euphemism of “hardshellism” against one embracing this view.

One can find “Hardshells” in many groups of Baptists. Anyone who believes in “Holy Spirit regeneration, or quickening to spiritual life” is a “Hardshell.” But the groups that are not ashamed to wear this label, and even sometimes refer to themselves as “Hardshells,” are those found among the Old School of Baptists. The label, to them, is no euphemism at all. They do, in fact, believe and defend the view that the Holy Spirit is as much sovereign over all His work as either the Father or the Son, and the giving of spiritual life is His blessed work. They do not believe the Godhead is divided, nor that sovereignty can be divided between the Creator and the created. They would agree fully with Paul’s sentiment: “*But this I confess unto thee, that after the way which they call heresy, so worship I the God of my fathers, believing all things which are written in the Law and the Prophets*” (Acts, 24:14). As with Paul, there are always sufficient numbers of Pharisees available calling Christians “heretics” for this truth to remain an issue to this date.

“Hyper-Calvinism’s” definition is much more difficult to ascertain. It seems that it can be used by anyone against anyone else that disagrees with them. For that reason, it can entail almost anything in its definition. The writer typed in “hyper-calvinism” into his computer’s search engine and found a good example of this on the Internet. It stated, “Most Calvinists reject as deplorable the following hyper-Calvinistic and destructive beliefs,” wrote the author:

- that God is the author of sin and evil
- that men have no will of their own, and secondary causes are of no effect
- that the number of the elect at any time may be known by men
- that it is wrong to evangelize
- that assurance of election must be sought prior to repentance and faith
- that men who have once sincerely professed belief are saved regardless of what they later do
- that God has chosen some races of men and has rejected others
- that the children of unbelievers dying in infancy are certainly damned
- that God does not command everyone to repent
- that the sacraments are not means of grace, but obstacles to salvation by faith alone
- that the true church is only visible, and salvation is not connected with the visible church

- that the Scriptures are intended to be interpreted by individuals only and not by the church
- that no government is to be obeyed which does not acknowledge that Jesus is the Lord, or that Biblical Law is its source of authority
- that the grace of God does not work for the betterment of all men
- that saving faith is equivalent to belief in the doctrine of predestination
- that only Calvinists are Christians (Neo-gnostic Calvinism)

The above list is a good example of someone making up a montage of things, from their own imagination, which should be considered “*Hyper-calvinistic and destructive beliefs;*” which beliefs apparently are contrary to whatever the composer of the above believes! We question if the man ever met anyone as crazy as this!

In a two-volume hatchet-job on “The Hardshell Muhammadan or The ‘Baptist’ Allah,” by a pastor of a First Baptist Church in OK, the author, (who this writer has never met and does not know personally), wrote this: “Phillips, a modern day chief Hardshell writer. . .” (Vol. I, page 1) and “Phillips (sic) a Hyper-calvinist, states “Classical Calvinism held to the means doctrine.” (Vol. I, page 136). This objector apparently makes Hardshellism and Hyper-calvinism synonymous. We wondered, then, just what are we? Conflicting definitions as these are enough to

make a man question his own identity! Stanley Phillips admits that he is a “Hyper-calvinist,” but he certainly cannot qualify as a “hardshell” by the definition given in dictionaries. But, if the above list is principles of “Hyper-calvinists,” I doubt seriously that there ever has been such a creature on the face of the earth in recorded history!

I briefly entertained myself by trying to detect what the composer of the above list must believe, since the “Hyper-calvinists,” according to him, believed otherwise than himself. Here is what he *might believe*:

- * that God has nothing to do with the existence of sin
- * that man has a will, and secondary causes are of some effect
- that the number of God’s elect can not be known by men; or perhaps, that the number of God’s elect can always be known by men
- that it is right to evangelize in any method one can think up
- that assurance of salvation cannot be sought until after repentance and faith
- that men who have once sincerely professed belief are not saved regardless of what they do; or, maybe, that men who have sincerely professed belief are saved regardless of what they never do later
- that God has not chosen some races or rejected others
- that the children of unbelievers dying in infancy are certainly saved, “thus saith the Lord.”

- That God commands every man, woman, and child on earth to repent
- That the **sacraments** are means of grace, and obstacles to salvation by faith alone.
- That the true church is only invisible, and salvation is connected with the invisible church
- That the Scriptures are intended to be interpreted by the church (I still haven't figured out which one, or if he means by Confessions of Faith of some denomination???)
- That the government is to be obeyed which does not acknowledge that Jesus is Lord, or that Biblical Law is its source of authority; or maybe he meant, that no government is to be obeyed that acknowledges that Jesus is the Lord, or that Bible Law is its source of authority; or maybe yet, that no government is to be obeyed which does not acknowledge that Jesus is the Lord, or that Biblical Law is not its source of authority. In any case, we still have not identified what this irrational anti-Hyper-calvinist believes!
- That the grace of God does work for the betterment of all mankind
- That saving faith is not equivalent to belief in the doctrine of predestination
- That Calvinists are not Christians

Well, it was interesting, but of no profit at all. That he is against Hyper-calvinism is certain, but what Hyper-calvinism is, according to his list, is not so certain. And that is my point. (We concluded that since he seemed to believe in “infant sprinkling” and “sacraments” he must be some kind of Protestant or Reformer, or one of the other former Catholic organizations; but what kind escapes me).

Following the above list, the composer added these remarks: “Arminianism and Hyper-calvinism were both among the historical errors battled by Charles Spurgeon, who was himself a 5-point Calvinist.” So say most ardent followers of Spurgeon. In the 1960’s, Pastor John R. Gilpin, of Ashland, Kentucky, went through Spurgeon’s massive Pulpit Libraries of Sermons, and pulled out the sermons on Total Depravity, Election, Limited Atonement, Irresistable Grace and Perseverance of the Saints. Collected together, the *sum total* of free grace sermons in Spurgeon’s Library was a book about one inch thick! So much for Spurgeon’s “Calvinism.” He spent more time fighting those he termed “Hyper-calvinists” than the Arminians. Would you wonder why? It seems to this writer that he had much more sympathy for Arminianism than for either Calvinism or Hyper-calvinism! And, in one publication on the “Down-Grade,” he admitted as much.

The list above demonstrates one point fairly clear. Much of what people *claim* to be held by Hyper-calvinists is not true. The writer has traveled all over the Southeastern United States, some of the Mid-west, and Canada, and of

the list above, the following points are not held to by any of the Hyper-calvinists he has met:

- Of all the articles written by Old School and Primitive Baptists, he has found *none* that advocated that God is the author of sin
- He has met no one so stupid as to claim that men do not have a will of their own, nor that secondary causes are of no effect. All of them are smart enough to know that all causes produce effects.
- He knows of none that believe that: “the number of God’s elect may be known by men.” Of course the number could be known if they could number the “sands of the seashore, or the stars in the heavens.” But none claim to know that number
- None believe it is wrong to evangelize; their elders travel more frequently, and further distances, annually, than most Evangelicals. They only object to the modern organized mission system – both its financial industrial and organizational model.
- He has never met anyone, not even Calvinists, that believe “that assurance of election must be sought prior to repentance and faith.” Maybe this was a typo error, or else his brain had taken leave of himself for a moment.
- He certainly has never found a “Hardshell” or “Hyper-calvinist” who believed “that men who have once sincerely professed belief are saved regardless of what they later do.” This is the position of most Evangelical

- that hold to “eternal security” based upon birth or decisional regeneration! It is certainly not “Hyper-calvinism” or “Hardshellism.”
- None that he has met believe that God has chosen **any race** of men, or that He has rejected other races. In fact, they believe there are some “redeemed out of every nation, kindred, tongue, tribe and people” (Rev. 5:9).
 - The next one is a real “boogie-boo”, *i.e.*, “that the children of unbelievers dying in infancy are certainly damned.” In fact, the only person we have actual heard state such a position was a Missionary Sovereign Grace Baptist at Noblesville, Indiana in 1965. The Hardshells and Hyper-calvinists would marvel that anyone would distinguish between children of “believers” and children of unbelievers!
 - He has met none that say that God does not command everyone to repent. They actually believe that repentance and remission of sins are to be preached in His name in all nations whithersoever the gospel is preached. And they fully understand that God must “*grant repentance unto the Gentiles*” if ever they are to be numbered among the saved. However, they do not believe the gospel has been, or ever will be, preached to all men., or that the gospel is the instrument of regeneration or the new birth.
 - He has never met an Old School nor Primitive Baptist, a Hardshell or Hyper-calvinist, which believed in

“**sacraments**” of any kind! Let alone that they are “means of grace.” The word “*sacrament*,” is a Catholic term for a conditional practice that conveys saving benefit, and some of her daughters still use it. It is not a term used by Hyper-calvinists and Hardshells among Baptists.

- He has never met any Hyper-calvinist or Hardshell that believed the true church is only visible; but he has heard that being a member of a true church, whether visible or invisible, is a result of having previously received a hope of eternal salvation.
- The individuals he has met, believe that no scripture is by private interpretation; but hold that the church is the pillar and ground of the truth.
- They all, without exception, believe that the government is to be obeyed, and all of the ones connected with this writer believe in a total separation of church and state. None support theocratic rule as Moslems, Catholics, and *some* Protestants. Most consider this tenet as being one of the earliest marks of the anti-Christ, or “Mystery Babylon.”
- Not understanding this next one, about all he can testify to is that they do not believe in “common grace” in reprobates, but will agree most nearly the position of the former Professor Hoeskema of the Protestant Reformed Church on this point.
- He has met none that believe that saving faith is equivalent to belief in anything! Nor do any of them

use the prefix “saving” to the word “faith.” Belief and faith are altogether two different things according to their understanding.

- He has never heard one of them say that only Calvinists are Christians. Occasionally, one may refer to Calvinists as daughters of Rome due to their former connection with the Augustinian Order, and their claim to hold to St. Augustine’s doctrines and having received both their baptism and ordination from that body. If a Calvinist has only a creedal faith, many Hardshells and Hyper-calvinists doubt seriously that such have been “saved” at all.

If one will compare this list with the first, he will find that Hyper-calvinists do not believe in **any of the foolishness the above composer claims they believe!** So, what then **is** “*Hyper-calvinism*” after all? It is obviously a derogatory euphemism used by opponents against those with whom they disagree and with such a position they cannot refute. Such terms are intended as shortcuts to intellectual discussions whereby one may not explore their opponents’ position, and at the same time warn others of some deep dark dangerous views. As you have seen, the definition is very flexible. It can include any and all things the user does not believe, and can allow him to escape scrutiny for his own illogical or unbiblical views. The dictionary definition for a “*euphemism*” is: “The act or example of the substitution of an inoffensive term for one considered offensive.” – The American Heritage

Dictionary, (Houghton Mifflin Company), Boston, 1985. The inoffensive term is “consistent Christianity,” and the substitution of the offensive term is “Hyper-calvinism.” However, for those who recognize the Arminian tenets found in Modern “Calvinism,” the term is not considered “offensive.” It is a compliment!

CHAPTER TWO

A DEFINITION OF HYPER-CALVINISM

First, Hyper-calvinism, a term for New Testament Christianity, does include *Hardshellism*. Hyper-calvinism predates “Hardshellism” as a euphemism for a doctrinal position. It is interesting that the author of the two-volume book on Hardshellism mentioned above, labors on and on endlessly to prove that Calvinism embraced the concept that God could not “regenerate a sinner without the preaching of the gospel by a man.” This would be a clear “anti-Hardshell” position. His position is the foundational principle of Fullerism and the driving force for the rise of the Modern Missionary Movement after 1782. Yet, the same writer then admits that Joshia Crispe, William Huntington, James Wells, and others in their century, (all of whom predated the organization of the *Baptist Missionary Society* by Andrew Fuller) were “Hardshells.” On the Website, an excerpt by John Flavel (1630-1691) is titled “A Reply to Baptist Hyper-calvinism.” Note the dates of John Flavel’s life: **1630-1691**. That was almost a century before Andrew Fuller and his *Baptist Missionary Society*, or “Rope-Holding Society” for William Carey. Flavel named Dr. Crispe, Mr. Eyre, and others as being “**Antinomian**,” and he said, “vehemently so.” At that time, in **1644**, there were only **seven** Baptist churches in all of England! Flavel’s arguments against the Hyper-calvinism held by these early Baptists were, in this article, designed to prove

the sacrament of infant baptism, and that it was one of the conditions of the “gospel-covenant.” Obviously these Baptists, though few they were, did not believe so. Yet, they were this early, considered “Hyper-calvinists” or “**Antinomians!**” [The Baptist ministers then were: William Kiffin, Thomas Patience, John Spilsbery, George Tipping, Samuel Richardson, Thomas Skippard, Thomas Munday, Thomas Gunne, John Mabbatt, John Webb, Thomas Killcop, Paul Hobson, Thomas Goare, Joseph Phelpes, and Edward Heath.” All of these signed the Baptist Confession of 1644, and were even then considered Hyper-calvinists or Antinomians]. We are in good enough company today if standing together with them!

In the views by these authors, the “Hardshell” position is one point, and Flavel’s point is that the *Gospel Covenant is conditional*, whereas the Baptists he is opposing denied that it was conditional. Flavel’s Argument III, was against the Baptists’ view that the “New Covenant” was “*absolute and unconditional.*” So this, then, is another position that we can honestly say is historically classified by *some* as being Hyper-calvinistic. It is one of its earliest euphemism.

Throughout the “Works of William Huntington,” he spent much effort rebutting the charge that he was an *Antinomian*. Perhaps the greatest of his chapters was written in 1805 or 6, on the subject of “The Divine Law.” He stated that he had determined previously never to write on the subject again, but of late young men who did not even know him was charging him with *antinomianism*. So, once again, he raised his pen as a sword in battle for the

truth, and did a very creditable treatise on the subject. Also, in the 1830's, William Trott, an Old School Baptist itinerate frontier minister in America, wrote against the views of the New School Baptists that accused him of *antinomianism*. Therefore, again, it is safe to conclude that historically, Evangelicals included what they term *antinomianism* as a part of their concept of Hyper-calvinism.

The reason this author enters into the fray on the subject of Hyper-calvinism is twofold: One, no one else has stepped forward to offer a definitive position of our faith, now under attack by Calvinists, Neocalvinists, Arminians, and Pelagians; and, the charges against so-called Hyper-calvinists are coming principally from Neocalvinist – the new comers to Calvinism from Pelagian and Arminian denominations. These new arrivals bring both elements of Freewillism and a “know-it-all” spirit with them from their former religious affiliations. Some are so bold as to declare themselves the standard of orthodoxy sufficient to teach Hyper-calvinists “the truth”!

As the oldest organized denomination of Baptists in the United States that has faithfully, without deviation into Arminianism and evangelical Fullerism, any attack on Hyper-calvinism is basically an attack against the fundamental New Testament principles held to by Old School Baptists.

Before entering into this presentation, we wish to note that we will have occasion to refer briefly to the ancient Greek language. We should, therefore, give the reader an

explanation. Some of our opponents are seminary graduates, proud of their skill in Greek grammatical rules, and very boldly insinuate that Hardshells and Hypercalvinists are so ignorant that they need Calvinistic seminarians to correct their insight, and teach them “the truth.”

While this writer did not take Hebrew (which is not necessary unless one has need to trade and speak to an Israeli – Alexander The Great long ago had the Hebrew Torah and Prophets translated into Greek), he did take Greek and Latin. I bear you witness of a truth from personal experience: My professors in ancient languages, at Mercer University at Macon, Georgia, claiming to be “Christians,” and who held doctors’ degrees from Theological schools, (1) denied the Bible was the inspired Word of God, (2) taught that Christ Jesus was not born of a virgin, (3) denied every single doctrine that Calvinistic believers love and adore, (4) blasphemed the Holy Spirit on a daily basis before their ministerial students, and (5) taught that Jesus was a bastard son of a German mercenary soldier stationed near Nazareth. This is only a partial list. The point we make: The knowledge of the Greek language, by a so-called “Christians,” is of **no advantage at all** to the revelation of the Christian faith to a child of God. Not only so, but the theologically trained translators of the standard Greek concordance are actually *revising* both the ancient Greek language (a *dead language, no less!*) and the Holy Bible that they dismiss as a vulgar text full of errors from the Greek Texts. Another point then: We have far more

confidence in the faithfulness, integrity, and scholasticism of the King James translators than any one of these atheistic or agnostic unbelieving modern infidels now at work to discredit the sacredness of our precious Bible. Hence, we use the Greek only to infuriate these so-called “Greek authorities” by making monkeys of them in defense of the New Testament faith. I will use it reservedly, but deliberately. And, by the way, no one has a need for the study of the Greek language unless one intends to teach it. It is a “dead language”. No one speaks it today, no, not even in Greece! The ancient Greek language has no other utility, since in the realm of the Christian religion the Bible has long ago been delivered to us by the most serious scholars of the Greek language, who were, to the man, absolute predestinarians, with a holy awe toward that sacred Book. The King James Version may be trusted to be **correct** by a true believer. It is both a correct and **honest** text. The translators placed all words they added to make a complete grammatically and correct sentence in italics so that the reader would know these *italicized words* were not in the Received Text. They also took the minor text, where it differed from the majority text, and placed it in the margin. The King James translators were the only honest translators. All others put their own slant on the texts without any warning to the reader. Can you imagine a Calvinist’s Bible Study Class, with five to eighteen versions of the so-called “Bible” in the hands of these “students?” One can imagine the madness!

A few weeks ago, this writer received a phone call from Dr. James Willingham, a Southern Baptist “five-point Calvinist” and a Baptist historian in North Carolina. While speaking, he mentioned that the Southern Baptist pastor that baptized him was a “Hyper-calvinist.” This writer stopped the good doctor and asked him, “Give me your definition of Hyper-calvinism.” (He had several times mentioned that he had over 6000 research note cards, including many from my dissertation) He said: “Hyper-calvinism has reference to the supralapsarian view of election in regard to the fall of man. The supralapsarian views God’s choice of the elect without regard to the fall of Adam.” It is not our intention to discuss “superlapsarianism,” but we shall briefly attempt to defend it as a part of Hyper-calvinism. If the reader wishes more information of that subject, most good encyclopedias give more details than will be found herein.

In discussing the subject of Hyper-calvinism, then, we will include in our discussion the following topics:

First, that Hyper-calvinism sets forth a view that the work of the Holy Spirit is *sovereign* in the production of spiritual life in an elect sinner antecedent to his ability to hear, read and believe the preached or written word of God and be able to comprehend the message of the gospel of Christ. This is one aspect of so-called, “Hardshellism.”

Second, that the *Word of God* that produces spiritual life in a child of God is the *living Word*, Christ, and not the preached or written word, nor the words of a man quoting

what God has previously spoken. The written or spoken word of God is not the *living, or engrafted word*. Christ alone is the living Word of God. This is another aspect of so-called “Hardshellism.”

Third, that the Covenant of Grace is an absolute and unconditional covenant, insofar as there are no conditions to be met, or preformed, by the recipients of the blessings of that covenant. This is an aspect of so-called “Hyper-calvinism.”

Fourth, that *Antinomianism* is no longer an issue, because all modern-day “Christians” are antinomians – not just Hardshells and Hyper-calvinists.

Fifth, a conclusion, consisting of a rebuttal of other *supposed* beliefs of Hyper-calvinists and Hardshells, which are falsely imputed to them by ignorant and/or unlearned religionists. Some of these, most of the informed readers know. Such as:

- a). They believe babies go to hell “not a span long.” (See: Bailey’s History of the United States, quoting a Puritan adage.)
- b). They do not believe in education.
- c). They do not believe in preaching the gospel.
- d). They do not believe in preaching the gospel *to sinners*.
- e). They are misers: they don’t believe in tithing and offerings.
- f). They do not pay their preachers

While the list above are those most often charged against “Hardshells,” some are frequently laid against

“Hyper-calvinists” as well. Nevertheless, we will address them in the concluding chapter. Some are not held to by them, while others are. Those that are held to need an explanation, which we intend to give.

Few “Hardshells” are *Supralapsarians*. Those that are may be found among those who are “Predestinarian Primitive Baptists,” in some places referred to as “Predestinarian Old School Baptists” and yet in others, “Predestinarian Particular Baptists.” The Conditional Primitives refer to them as “Absolutists,” meaning, that the Predestinarians hold to “Absolute Predestination of All Things”- which is true. Most “Hardshells” are *Sublapsarians*, and they are found among the Conditional Primitive Baptists, a semi-Arminian group that call themselves “Old Line Primitive Baptists”.

Briefly stated, *supralapsarianism* is a view of God’s decrees that God decreed all things without any consideration of the fall of man influencing Him in the election of a people to be the bride of Christ – the church. “*Supra*” is “above” and *lapsus*” is the fall, meaning the fall of Adam. The largest group of Supralapsarians in the United States is found among the Predestinarian Baptists. To them, God is of one eternal mind, and His eternal purpose comprehends all things, and this solely according to His own will and good pleasure. Being alone, the Eternal God was uninfluenced by anything He could foresee, and hence He works His own will in heaven, in earth, and all deep places. He chose His people in Christ before the foundation of the world (Ephesians 1:3-6) for the praise of

His own glorious grace. Obviously, this choice was prior to His creation of the world or His formation of man. His creation turned out, and is still coming to pass, exactly as He purposed it from the beginning in every way it can be surmised or empirically demonstrated to be. To them, truly, “What is to be will be,” because His eternal mind comprehended it to be exactly as it falls out to be, by His own creative energy.

Paul certainly expressed the Supralapsarian view when he wrote: (“*For the children being not yet born, neither having done any good or evil, that the purpose of God according to election might stand, not of works, but of Him that calleth:*”) *It was said unto her, the elder shall serve the younger. As it is written, Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated*” (Romans 9:11-13). His selection of Jacob, and the election of grace, was prior to any foreseen works or conditions by either one of the twins; but rather, it was purposed and brought to pass that election might stand purely of grace unforeseen! As with Ephesians, the choice was “*in Christ.*”

The *Sublapsarian* position is that God foresaw His creation, and then based His election upon what He foresaw as the consequence of either His creation or the man’s deportment. In this regard, one must conclude the Sublapsarians hold that God “*chose His people in Adam before the foundation of the world.*” That is, He foresaw the fall of Adam and upon the consequence of his fall, chose some of Adam’s race to salvation. If this be contended for, then it cannot be correct that He chose them

“*in Christ*” who was one in the Eternal Godhead, and as such more ancient than Adam. The Sublapsarian position creates an overwhelming problem with the entrance of sin into the world. Did God foresee that and make adjustments or accommodations for something He unwittingly leased upon the earth? Or was it not included in His eternal purpose? Did God “make” Adam to sin, or did He “suffer him to sin”? If He “suffered” Adam to sin, did He *willingly suffer* him to sin; or *unwillingly suffered* the man to sin? Hence, was it sin, or grace, that motivated God’s selection of the members of Christ’s body – the church? Strangely, the Sublapsarians are the ones that charge Predestinarians as believing that God is the Author of sin; yet their own position does the same, or worse! It makes God, even at creation, impotent to prevent that which He had no purpose in coming to pass!!

Relative to the election of grace, then, the two views can thus be briefly compared: The *Supralapsarians* hold that divine election was *in Christ*, and preceded the fall of Adam, “*before the foundation of the world.*” The *Sublapsarians* hold that divine election was by foresight *in Adam*, and was a consequence of Adam’s fall, which could not have been “*before the foundation of the world,*” seeing that Adam’s fall was post-creation. The Supralapsarian position is unconditional; the Sublapsarian is conditional.

We do not offer the above explanation as a comprehensive presentation of the two views. The issue is much more complicated than the above, and entails far

more ramifications than herein presented. The reader may research this subject on his own elsewhere.

A humorist once mocked the conditional position is this wise: If a redeemed child of God could fall from grace and the devil get him, then while the devil is at it, he could get all the rest of them too. If the devil could get any of God's children, and does not, then those that he leaves to go to heaven are saved by the grace of the devil, rather than of God!

Another reasoned, that if Christ went to prepare a place for His children, and any of them could fail to be saved, then those who teach such are making a "ghost-town" of glory!

A Predestinarian reasoned with a Freewiller: "Who saved you: Christ or your preacher?" The Freewiller answered, "Of course, Christ saved me!" "Did He save you on purpose, or was it quite accidental?" asked the Predestinarian. "Why, it was on purpose!" replied the Freewiller. "When did He purpose to save you: before He did it, or after you believed?" Before thinking the answer out, the Freewiller exclaimed: "Before He did it, of course!" The Predestinarian closed the trap: "How long before?" The answer from the Bible: "*Who hath saved us and called us according to His own purpose and grace which was given us in Christ before the world began.*"

CHAPTER THREE

THE SOVEREIGNTY OF THE HOLY SPIRIT IN THE PRODUCTION OF DIVINE LIFE IN AN ELECT SINNER

It is strange to find that one as close to the truth as a Calvinist would take issue with the subject of this chapter. Calvinists are well known for their insistence on two cardinal Christian doctrines, *i.e.*, that God is **Sovereign**, and that the Eternal Godhead is a **Trinity**. The inconsistency we find in them is that while they declare boldly that the Father is Sovereign, and can “*do His own will in the army of heaven and among the inhabitants of the earth, so that none can stay His hand or say into Him, What doest Thou?*” (Daniel 4:11), and, that the Son of God is all powerful, His Father having given Him “*power over all flesh that He should give eternal life to all those the Father has given Him;*” (John 17:1-4) and then hear this dissonance, “God can’t save a sinner without the preaching of the gospel.” According to them, He can create a universe with only His Word, but cannot save a little tiny man without the help of another little tiny man! In other words, according to this notion, the Holy Spirit is not sovereign, or is not of equal omnipotence with the Father and Son. It is this belittling concept that the “Hardshells” oppose. According to their understanding, the Eternal Godhead is Sovereign over all His works, and the Godhead is equal in each and all His attributes and essence.

If you were to enquire of a Calvinist if he believed in the Sovereignty of the Holy Spirit, he would, without hesitation, answer that he did. But if you tested his real view, and asked him pointedly if He believed that the Holy Spirit quickened the elect to life and salvation without the instrumentality of the preached or written gospel, he would immediately answer, “No!” He might also add, “That’s Hardshellism!” Or, “That is Hyper-calvinism!” In other words, he will claim to believe in the Sovereignty of the Holy Spirit, when in fact, his concept of salvation is Arminian. He will insert some form of human works as conditions to one’s being saved. Without the performance of these conditions by a sinner, the Holy Spirit is standing by completely helpless in delivering a redeemed elect from his darkness and unbelief. That is a denial of His sovereignty. It is very little different from the Arminian concept that “God has done all He can do; now it is left up to you.” Or as a popular Twentieth Century “Evangelist” said in Indianapolis at the close of a meeting: “Your parents have been praying for you, your pastor has been praying for you, and your friends have all been praying for you. But now it is left up to you. They can’t help you now. God Himself can’t help you now! The decision is yours.” That, too, is a denial of the Sovereignty of the Holy Spirit.

God is sovereign in the production of spiritual life in an elect person. Both Calvinists and Hyper-calvinists agree that a descendant of Adam is born into this world “*dead in trespasses and sins.*” (Ephesians 2:1). Both believe that God chose a people to Himself from among the race of

man, and that “*before the foundation of the world.*”(Ephesians 1:4-6). Neither believes this election to salvation was predicated upon a foreseen goodness or faith in the recipient of His blessings. This being true, then what is the problem? The problem consists of a basic difference between the two groups relative to how God gives those that are “*dead in sins*” that everlasting and eternal *life*. To briefly compare the two groups:

The Calvinists, in general, (there are exceptions) believe that the gospel must be preached, and this preached-gospel is the “*word of God*” by which the Holy Spirit uses as a “*seed of life.*” This preached or written word is in some manner mixed with the Spirit, and produces “belief” in the recipient. Upon the reception of this belief, the person that believes is born again, or “*saved.*” This viewpoint could better be received if it were not that the Calvinists seem to ignore the condition of the recipient in his lost condition. That is, they seem to deny the “*total depravity and inability*” of one “*dead in trespasses and sins.*” He is not, it seems, totally d-e-a-d ! Some Calvinists agree with the Arminians that the “dead alien sinner” still has a “spark of divinity” residual within his human nature, and this “spark of divinity” is capable of believing unto salvation. The sharpest difference is in their view that it takes another man to present the word to the recipient absolutely, and there can be no salvation apart from the instrumentality of the preached or written word by another man. This, surely, appears to deny God’s sovereignty; and makes salvation conditioned upon the works of the creature. This mixture of

the preacher, preached message, word about Jesus, and a hearer, plus the Spirit and some other unknown ingredient seems more as a magical incantation than the truth of the Scripture.

The Hardshells, in general, (there are exceptions here also) believe that every man is born “*totally dead in trespasses and sins,*” and in that condition by natural birth, they “*walk according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience.*” Thus, they all by nature are in Satan’s kingdom, and does Satan’s will, which will is their disobedience to God. Being dead spiritually, and in Satan’s kingdom, they cannot “*hear*” the word preached, or *believe* the word written. He is d-e-a-d ! period! Spiritually lifeless! Unable to “*see the kingdom of God,*” unable to “*enter the kingdom of God,*” and “*desperately wicked.*” As proof of their position, they appeal to such texts as:

“*And you hath He quickened, who were dead in trespasses and sins; wherein in time past ye walked according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience: among whom also we all had our conversation in times past in the lusts of our flesh, fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind; and were by nature the children of wrath, even as others*” (Ephesians 2:1-3).

“*Why do ye not understand My speech? Even because ye cannot hear My word*” (John 8:43). “*He that is of God*

heareth God's words: ye therefore hear them not, because ye are not of God" (John 8:47). To the Hardshell, it is very clear that life must *precede* the ability to hear, or the ability to believe the word preached or written. Hence, the hearing and believing cannot bring that one "*life and immortality.*" Just as the dead in trespasses and sin cannot "hear" the word preached, they cannot "*believe*" the word preached or written either:

"But ye believe not, because ye are not My sheep, as I said unto you" (John 10:26).

"For I say unto you, That except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no wise enter the kingdom of God" (Matt. 5:20), and *"Verily I say unto you, Except ye be converted, and become as little children, ye shall not enter the kingdom of heaven"* (Matt. 18:3).

Thus, the Hardshells predicate their view that the new birth is *antecedent* (comes before) to both the ability to hear, believe, see, and enter the kingdom of God. To them it is logical and Biblical that life itself must precede life's activities, and that as in the animal kingdom, so among men, kind begets like kind. The dead in the grave cannot hear, believe, see, or enter the activities of the life they have departed, and to ever exercise those activities, they must be quickened, or made alive. But until they are quickened and made alive, they are helplessly passive in any realm in which they are "dead." If they are "dead in hell," surely they can be active in that realm; and if they are spiritually dead in this natural life, they cannot perform any

of the fruits of the spirit, although they may be very active in natural religion that is an aspect of natural life. They had no thought, say, or activity in their natural birth; so too, they can have no thought, say, or activity in their spiritual or new birth. In both cases, they are confined by sin to passivity. As kind can only reproduce after its own kind, and each kind has its seed within itself (the basic lesson of the first three chapters of Genesis), a cow cannot produce a horse or hickory-nut tree; so neither can a spiritually dead and fallen man reproduce a spiritual and heavenly man; neither in himself, or in another. The “Hardshell” position is Biblically, logically, and consistently, true. The “Hardshell” position recognizes the Eternal Godhead, in the Trinity, as of one essence, unified in all attributes, and equal in all parts ***sovereign, independent, and self-sufficient: The Great I Am!*** To the Eternal Godhead alone they ascribe all glory in the salvation of sinners!

CHAPTER FOUR

SUPPORTING SCRIPTURES FOR HOLY SPIRIT QUICKENING

This is not the place to discuss the subject of “*regeneration*;” whither it is the same as the New Birth, or the renewing of the Spirit in the body to enable Christ (and/or His people) to be resurrected from the dead. Since our position is the latter, we use the term above – “*quicken*ing” – as the implanting of spiritual life through which the New Birth is initiated.

“*It is the Spirit that quickened, the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that **I speak** unto you, **they** are Spirit, and **they** are **life***” (John 6:63). If there were no other texts in the Bible to sustain the Hardshell and Hyper-calvinist position, this one within itself is sufficient. Notice the words we have highlighted: It is the Spirit that quickeneth. He did not say that it was the Spirit and a preacher that gave life. In fact, He actually declared that the flesh did not profit at all! If a preacher was included in that event, he would be bragging and boasting of how many souls he and the Spirit got saved! But that isn’t by any means all that is implied in that remark. The flesh, or “old man,” or “natural man” does not profit thereby either! The carnal, natural man is not changed or modified physiologically at all by this quickening! He remains as he was, that is, “of the flesh.”

Jesus said also in this verse that the “words that **I speak**,” “they are Spirit,” and “they are life.” Can anything be made any clearer than this? He did not say, nor did He mean, that the words a preacher quoted from His sayings, were “spirit” and “life.” He said that the words that *He spoke* were such. Now, for those that believe in the inspiration of the Holy Scriptures, all other texts, regardless as to how they may appear to one’s natural understanding, must imperatively be consistent with this verse.

This truth is fundamental in the conversation Jesus had with Nicodemus, and absolutely consistent with the above text: “*Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God*” (John 3:3). “*Except a man be born of water and of **the Spirit**, he cannot enter the kingdom of God*” (John 3:5). Notice here, that not a word is mentioned of God needing a preacher to help Him. The necessity of a new birth is first introduced. Decisionism, legalism, or any type of work-mongering is not given as a part of the new birth process. It is simply, “Ye must be born again,” and no directions are given as to how one is to born himself again, or acquire help from preachers to meet this requirement. As Nicodemus was puzzled as to how one could enter his mother’s womb and be born a second time, Jesus emphasized that he not only had to be “born of the water,” but in addition “of the Spirit.” He made, it seems to us, rather clear, that which is born of the flesh is only and always flesh. Again, no change or modification physiologically is hinted at. Just as that, so too, is the birth of the Spirit. “That which is born of the Spirit is spirit.”

Hence, Hardshells and Hyper-calvinists insist that the Spirit is independent in the production of spiritual life to one who once was dead, but now is alive. That is clearly a different point of view from Calvinists and Arminians, some of whom believe the preachers' preaching uses the words recorded that God has spoken, coupled with some nudging by the Holy Spirit, produces the spiritual birth, while others of them believing the preaching of itself will produce this effect. One great and cardinal truth presented in Judges of Gideon call to defeat the Midianites is that "*the people that are with thee are too many for Me to give the Midianites into their hands.*" No Calvinist or Arminian ever could conclude that there could be *to many* for the Lord to save! The Lord sent 22,000 soldiers home! Then there were only 10,000 soldiers left. Again, the Lord told Gideon, "*The people are yet too many.*" So the Lord separated the remainder into two groups. One was composed to 300 soldiers, and the other 9,700. The Lord sent home the 9,700! Why did He do this? "*Lest Israel vaunt themselves against Me, saying, Mine own hand hath saved me.*" (Judges, chapter 7) The Lord was opposing the very nature of every Calvinist and Arminian, to wit: The more they persuade or enlist, the more they "vaunt themselves against the Lord, saying, Our own hand has saved them!" Many dare to conclude, "God Himself cannot save you without a preacher!" And thus they ascribe the glory to preachers, evangelists, counselors, soul-winners, witnesses, and many even dare to boast, saying, "We saved many during our

revival!” Nevertheless, every one born of God is “*born from above*” and that by being “*begotten of God.*”

The divine quickening will produce life, and this life is of necessity for one to be enabled to bring forth any spiritual fruits attendant upon that life. One such spiritual fruit is faith in Christ. But never use carnal logic to overthrow what Christ has said above. Faith is always the evidence and effect of spiritual life, and never its cause. “*He that believeth on the Son **hath** everlasting life; and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth upon him*” (John 3:36) Again, “*He that heareth **My word**; and believeth on Him that sent Me, **hath** everlasting life, and shall not come unto condemnation; but **is** passed from death unto life*” (John 5:24). So, where these evidences are, there one may find a living soul. But do not confuse cause and effect. Life must precede its evidences.

“*For as the Father raiseth up the dead, and quickeneth them; even so the Son **quickeneth whom He will***” and “*For as the Father hath life in Himself; so hath He given to the Son to have life in Himself*” (John 5:21 & 26). In the above texts, we see that the Father quickeneth, the Son quickeneth, and the Spirit quickeneth. Thus, we find the eternal Godhead quickens His elect to life, for only the Godhead has “life in Himself.” This is seen again in a text favorite with those who oppose this precious, God-honoring truth. It reads, “*Being **born again**, not of corruptible seed (or man’s seed), but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which **liveth and abideth for ever***” (I Peter 1:23).

This text says that this “word of God” both “lives and abides for ever.” This cannot be said of the preached or the written word of God, neither of which live, nor abides forever. Since our theologically trained opponents attempt to use the Greek language to “teach Hyper-calvinists the truth,” we shall, with apology, point out the usage of the Greek, and show that the King James translators were as skilled in the ancient languages as these pseudo-Calvinists. “*In the beginning was the Word (logos), and the Word (logos) was with God, and the Word (logos) was God*” (John 1:1). Compare this with the opposite citation: “*Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the Word (logos), which liveth and abideth for ever*” (I Peter 1:23). The same Greek word is used in both texts. In the text in John 1:1, there is no doubt allowed by the Holy Spirit of who *this Logos* is. He was with God, but further, He is God! This Word is the progenitor of all those “*born again,*” so teaches the Apostle Peter. In continuing his narrative in the first chapter of John, John made it clear that no human had anything to do with this birth: “*He (the Logos) came unto His own, and His own received Him not. But as many as received Him (the Logos), to them gave He (the Logos) power to become the **sons of God**, even to them that believed on His name: which were **born**, not of blood, nor the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God*” (John 1:12-13). How blind can Calvinistic and Arminian Greek scholars be? This text teaches that the sons of God are born of God; and then John swept away ever vestige of human endeavor in this process. They were not born of

blood, or family connection. The Calvinists of the Protestant persuasion sprinkle infants, speaking of them as children of God in a covenant with Christian parents. John outright denies it! But lest Evangelicals claim higher ground than Protestants and Catholics, John swept their pet theory away as well. The children of God are not born by the “will of the flesh”! “God wants you to be saved,” they claim loudly. “He left it to whosoever wills, and He is not going to violate your freewill!” But John denies it! He added, “not the will of man.” Even the high-powered evangelist, the gentle loveable pastor, the praying mother or father, or the church’s soul-winner counselor had anything to do with it. Take it from John – nobody had anything to do with the generation of life in God’s people. That is why they can be termed the “**sons of God**” – because that is exactly what they are! “*It is the Spirit that quickeneth.*”

Another pet text of these Greek scholastic works folk is, “*But the Word (rhema) of the Lord endureth for ever. And this is the word (rhema) which by the gospel is preached unto you*” (I Peter 1:25). This word “*rhema*,” according to *Strong’s Exhaustive Concordance Of The Bible*, means, “an utterance, by implication, a matter or topic, especial of narration, command or dispute.” It is, to me, an amazing way “scholars” have of citing “authority” to prove their own views. The Word, “Logos” is the agent in spiritual generation, or quickening, as already amply proven. How does He do it? He speaks (rhema) and says, “*Live, and they live.*” When He (the Logos) says “Live,” this word, “live” is His word or “rhema,” and they live. Life is produced, or

rather, imparted from Him to the one to whom He spoke. After that spoken word by God Himself quickens the soul to life, every moment and event thereafter, experimentally develops that soul to the new birth, when he is delivered from the kingdom of darkness to the kingdom of light and revelation. “*Ye must be born again.*” And they are, without fail brought all the way from divine quickening to life to the new birth experience. Merely because the Greek word “rhema” is used instead of “logos,” has no bearing whatsoever as to who it was that begat them to life. These scholars act as if they think God (Logos) is speech (rhema) impaired, or maybe even “deaf and dumb” as the older generation spoke of these handicapped people.

But this explanation is still too shallow, although needed for such as are shallow in their Greek knowledge. Some Calvinists among Baptists talk about the preached word as being a “seed” that the Holy Spirit uses to “beget” one to bring about “regeneration.” But is this correct? Hardshells and Hyper-calvinists deny it. God is the spiritual and heavenly Father of His own elect and living people.

Our Lord used the word “born again,” or “born from above” to express this act of calling one from death to spiritual life. He selected a word that was fairly well understood by His hearers, and the analogy is very well documented in the New Testament. “*And you hath He quickened, who were dead in trespasses in sins. . . .*” (Ephesians 2:1, 5). To quicken one to life in his mother’s womb, that one must be “begotten.” Does the Scriptures teach this process? It surely does! “*Whosoever believeth*

*that Jesus is the Christ **is born of God**: and every one that loveth Him that **begat** loveth him also that is **begotten** of Him” (I John 5:1) In order to be “begotten,” one must have had his father’s seed planted in his mother’s womb. Again, I ask, does the Scripture teach this aspect of the new birth process? It certainly does! “*Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin; for **His seed** remaineth in him: and he cannot sin, because he is **born of God**” (I John 3:9). Does the New Testament identify this “seed” more specifically? It does indeed! Since the fall, Adam’s seed is referred to as “*corruptible seed*,” which it clearly is. But the seed used in divine quickening, or “begetting” is the incorruptible seed. It is incorruptible because it is pure, holy, heavenly, and it is of God. We read: “*Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the Word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever*” (I Peter 1:23), and, “*He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, And to thy seed, which is Christ*” (Galatians 3:16). This is perfectly consistent with all we have written thus far. Christ is the Word of God; the children of God are born again by the Word of God, and this Word is Christ, who quickeneth whom He will, and they are “begotten of God.” I add, and that without human instrumentality.**

When, therefore, we say that one is begotten, or born again, by the word of God, we mean it quite literally. Not by the words a man uses to quote the record of God’s word (rhema), but in fact, the Word (Logos) of God’s own words (rhema) spoken to a spiritually lifeless person directly, bringing that man spoken to alive spiritually. Once alive, or

“quicken by the Spirit,” he then is able to “hear God’s word” (rhema) and “believe on Him that sent Him (the Word).”

We will conclude the subject of this chapter by pointing out what Bible students should already know. That is, that one of the first great lessons, or principles, introduced in the Bible in the first three chapters of Genesis is that each created “kind” begets like kind in the animal and plant kingdoms, and each has its seed in itself. The seed of each contains all the genetics needed to reproduce that which is in itself; but does not possess the genes of other specie and kind. This locks each kind and specie into its own genetic classification. A bison cannot reproduce an equestrian; a rose, cannot reproduce wheat; a monkey cannot reproduce a man; or a man reproduce an angel or saint. Each must reproduce after its own kind. Thus it is that God, who is a Spirit, must reproduce those who are spirit, having His own Eternal Life conveyed to them. If a “Christian” is born again by a preacher, the preacher, being a man, that “Christian” is merely the child of that preacher. And as such, he is only a “Christian” in name, but not in fact. *“That which is born of the flesh is flesh.”* That is all a natural man can ever be in this life. He is never biologically or genetically changed. In the new birth experience, instead of modifying the natural man, the spiritual life is added to the man. He then possesses a *“new man,” an inward man,* or becomes *“a new creature in Christ Jesus.”* However, he still possesses the *“old man,” or “outward man,”* He can say with Paul, *“For I know that in me (that is, in my flesh,)*

dwelleth no good thing: for to will is present with me; but how to perform that which is good I find not” (Romans 7:18). He found himself a dual man: “*For I delight in the law of God after the **inward man**: But I see another law in my **members**, warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of **sin which is in my members.***” (Romans 7:22,23). Consider: 2 Cor. 4:16, “*For which cause we faint not, but though our **outward man** perish, yet the **inward man** is renewed day by day.*” In this one text, Paul, speaking of himself, list **two men**. One can perish, but the other cannot! It might sound weird, but the Christian is composed of **two men**: one of the flesh and the other of the Spirit. One is born of water, and is flesh; the other born of the Spirit and is spiritual. One is of the earth, earthy; the other is from heaven, and heavenly. Such a complex man will unerringly find a warfare, “*warring against the law of my mind,*” with the flesh lusting against the spirit and the spirit against the flesh so that one cannot do the things that they otherwise would. This strange and marvelous creature is “*born of God.*” And we conclude that men that are not so situated are not born of God, and therefore cannot by experience know anything at all about this subject. It is merely a nonsensical riddle to him. If he were prone to attempt understanding the dual nature of a spiritually born child, he would have to give up in perplexity. The warfare is an alien experience with him; loving things one hates, and hating things one loves is to him a foolish paradox. We really believe that the only one that can understand the Hardshell position is an

experimental Hardshell! No one can comprehend the Hyper-calvinist' position except a Hyper-calvinist. These precious truths are by revelation, not by education. "*If our gospel be hid, it is **hid** from them that are lost.*" (II Cor. 4:3). "*I thank Thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, because Thou hast **hid** these things from the wise and prudent, and **revealed** them unto babes. Even so, Father; for so it seemed good in Thy sight*" (Matt. 11:25-26).

While we are on this subject, and since many think that this view originated with the Old School Baptists, we insert the following article from the Philadelphia Baptist Association which was written before the introduction of Fuller's New Divinity and the consequent rise of the Missionary and Old School Baptists as separate bodies. I select it mainly because it is hard to find elsewhere. I will type in **bold** characters words I especially would like the reader to take notice:

CIRCULAR LETTER (1803)

By William White

The elders and messengers of the Philadelphia Baptist Association

To the churches they represent, send Christian salutation.

Beloved brethren,- As it has been our custom to address you annually in an epistolary way; in conforming therewith this year, we have deemed it expedient to continue an investigation of the office of the Holy Ghost. In our last year's epistle, relation is had to the work of the Spirit in

qualifying the apostles to discharge the great duties entrusted to them; but we shall confine ourselves to that part which relates to **preparing those that were given to Christ to redeem, for the fruition of happiness in the presence of God.**

When we speak of the Holy Ghost, we mean the third person in the divine essence, to whom many significant titles are applied, the consideration of which, will probably be edifying. He is called the Holy Spirit (Psalm 51:11, and Ephesians 1:13); intimating thereby, that such is the purity of His nature, being purity in the abstract, that there is an absolute necessity that those who would enjoy the fellowship of the Spirit, (Phil. 2:1), should be holy, not using the members of the body, which is the temple of the Holy Ghost, (I Cor. 6:19) in the service of sin. He is also called the Spirit of holiness, (Romans 4:1), because He implants a principle of holiness in all the elect; and forasmuch as there is not any thing amiable or lovely in God's dear children, but what is the fruit of the Spirit, (Galatians 5:22). Eternity is ascribed to Him, and, therefore, He is called the Eternal Spirit, (Hebrews 9:14), to show that He is not God by office, or in a figurative sense only; but that, as He possesses eternity, one of the attributes of the divine nature, He is truly and properly God. He is called the Spirit of grace, (Hebrews 10:29), because the holy Scriptures, given by inspiration of the Spirit of God, make known all the gracious designs of Jehovah towards His people; and because He **implants gracious affections**, and applies the blessings of grace to the subjects of it. He is

called the Comforter, (John 14:16), by reason of that support which pious men derive from Him, when under affliction. He is styled the Spirit of promise, (Ephesians 1:13), with relation to His bringing the promises to our view, applying them to us, so as exactly to suit our particular cases, and enabling us to take consolation from them: or, because the marvelous descent of the Spirit on the day of Pentecost was the fruit of promise, as well as the indwelling and aid of the Holy Spirit to believers, to whom it is promised, that He shall abide with them forever, (John 14:16). He is called the Spirit of the Lord, (2 Cor. 3:17), and the Spirit of Christ, (Romans 8:9), denoting that He comes in consequence of covenant stipulations, for which cause Christ is said to receive gifts for men, (Psalm 68:18), and to shed forth the Spirit, (Acts 2:32), and to send the Comforter to abide with the disciples, (John 16:7); and lastly, He is called the Spirit of glory, because He gives a foretaste of it – assures us of our right to it – and prepares us for the complete enjoyment of it.

In treating further on this subject, we shall show, 1st, That the children of the Lord only, are made partakers of the Holy Spirit in His operations on their hearts. And 2^{ndly}, What is effected by the Holy Ghost in such. Many well meaning persons have certainly handled this subject very injudiciously: and we are convinced, if they would but for a moment consider, they must see into what difficulties they are involved; and that if they have a system of doctrine at all, they must **systematically become Arminians**, as it is impossible to hold the precious doctrines of grace upon

such ground. It is not uncommon for many, from whom we might have expected better things, after treating upon some of the sublime doctrines of the gospel, in applying their subject and addressing *impenitent and unrenewed sinners*, to tell **them** God's most holy Spirit has been striving with **them** from their infancy up, and that hitherto *His attempts have been unsuccessful*. If such doctrine is according to godliness, brethren, you will readily discover that the sinner, and not the Spirit of God, is omnipotent; and that from henceforth, instead of saying confidently, that the dead shall **hear His voice** and live, (John 5:25), we must always add, provided men will condescend to let the Holy Spirit work, since then, and not till then, shall they be **quickenened or made alive**. Such doctrine, is evidently in **direct opposition to the Scriptures of truth**; for the sinner, **prior to regeneration, is always represented as passive**, and therefore is declared **to be dead**, (Ephesians 2:1), and is said to be **born; to be begotten**. As the creature begotten, cannot be said to be active **prior to his existence**, or be **the instrument of its own existence**, these expressions fully show, that it does not depend upon the favorable reception the divine Spirit meets with, that the work of grace is effected in the soul. The work of the Spirit is called **a creation**, (Psalm 51:10, 2 Cor. 5:17), in allusion to an **almighty agent giving existence to** the system of nature, both with respect to matter and form. As there was no pre-existing matter to form the present material world, and consequently infinite power was necessarily engaged in producing it, these phrases evidently show, that the **sinner**

is not an effectual agent to hinder the work, and that nothing can possibly frustrate that grace which creates the soul in Christ Jesus to good works. In addition to what has been said it will be sufficient to observe, that the language of holy Writ is absolute” “*They shall be My people,*” (2 Cor. 6:16); “*they shall be willing,*” (Psalm 110:3); “*which were born, not of the will of the flesh,*” (John 1:13); “*all that the Father giveth me shall come,*” (John 6:37); “*the dead shall hear My voice,*” (John 5:25).

Some urge the *striving of the Spirit*, as essential to constituting a judicial right in God to punish the finally impenitent. This may suit well enough for those that believe in *general redemption* and *universal provision*; but how it suits with the Calvinistic scheme, (which we believe to be founded on the word of God,) we cannot comprehend. Such doctrine is one of the greatest insults that can be offered to the Divine Being. It supposes that the infinite Jehovah, intends no good to the sinner, but on the contrary has determined to make him miserable; not having sufficient reason to make him so, and knowing that he has no power nor inclination to receive Christ and His benefits, yea, that God Himself does not intend that he shall, He will make him some insincere offers of salvations, and afford him, what some persons call, common operations of the Spirit, which He knows will be entirely ineffectual; and, after this pretence of trying to save him, very gravely tells him, that for his not *letting the Spirit convert him*, he must be miserable to all eternity. It would be hard to say worse of the great God, than what is said of Him in the above

sentiment; for, therein He is charged with hypocrisy and cruelty – hypocrisy, for His only making pretence to commiserate the case of the sinner and afford him relief; and of cruelty, since, on such principles, men are not punished as offenders, but simply as creatures. It makes God proceed therein, not as the moral Governor of the world, but upon the ground of arbitrary or despotic authority. You will readily perceive, brethren, that it is not merely the want of faith and repentance, that is the procuring cause of the sinner's destruction, but a want of moral rectitude, of coming up to the requirements of the divine law; and, therefore, there is no need that God should seek an occasion against him, forasmuch as there is sufficient reason that He should punish men, even if no Savior had been provided.

As for common operations of the Spirit and days of grace, these are links of the same chain, and are necessary to help the legal preacher along: but though they may be necessary to the system of the Arminian, they are equally unscriptural. As to the first, there is no mention made of them in any part of the sacred oracles – they have existed only in the fancies of men; and the latter opinion, which that much abused scripture, Luke 19:42, is used to support, is far from being substantiated thereby. The text in question, had respect simply to the treatment of Christ as the promised Messiah; for the rejection of whom, after His mission had been attested by so many miracles, the city of Jerusalem was doomed to a dreadful overthrow, and the Jewish commonwealth wholly ruined: but the text has no

relation whatever to the day of their salvation being past; for it is manifest, that many of these very persons, of whom it has been said that their day of grace was past, were afterwards converted under the preaching of Peter (Acts 2).

But let us inquire further, upon what the abettors of this doctrine build their theory. It is certain, that these sentiments have been chiefly gathered from observing a kind of legal exercise, which more or less exists in the hearts of unregenerated persons who sit under the gospel, and especially if the ministry be powerful and alarming; and also from some passages of holy Writ, which have been amazingly misunderstood.

As to the first, it may be properly called the workings of natural conscience; such is the evidence which divine truth brings with it to the mind, searching the hearts of the children of men, bringing to light their enmity against God, and their immoral conduct generally. Hence, sinners, merely by the light of reason, perceiving that God's holy law condemns them, and that the penalty of it is no less than eternal misery, are at times very uneasy. Paul says, "*the Gentiles which have not the law are a law unto themselves,*" and that "*their thoughts accuse or excuse each other, their conscience in the mean time bearing witness.*" By way of inference, he adds, "*which show the work of the law written in their heart,*" (Romans 2:15). Here the apostle plainly accounts for the above-mentioned feelings of unregenerate persons, which he intimates do not come from the **immediate operations of the Holy Ghost**, but from the law, some faint traces of which continue in the

mind: and that it is conscience, and not the Spirit of God, which bears testimony to their actions, the result of which is, that their thoughts accuse or excuse one another. Is it any wonder, therefore, that persons sitting under a gospel ministry, hearing the word and beholding the ordinances, and enjoying withal a pious education and the godly example of religious parents, (for it is unregenerate persons of that class who feel most uneasy), should sometimes, when under some qualms of conscience, enter upon some **legal duties**? The same matter is forcibly illustrated in the case of Felix, (Acts 24:25). It is said, Paul “reasoned,” (not a word about the striving of the Spirit;) that the subjects were “righteousness, temperance, and judgment,” (very suitable indeed to alarm a rapacious, rioting, and wicked governor;) that he, as is usual with such, trembled at the thought of a day of retribution: and the whole of this is attributed to Paul, and not to the Spirit! It has been a prevailing opinion that these feelings are peculiar to youth; but then it must be remembered, that it is only in such (as has been before observed) as enjoy religious instruction. And as for others, however young, they appear to be as insensible as those in mature age who live carelessly. It may be again remarked, that such as have lived all the early part of their lives without religious instruction, when, in the course of divine Providence, they are cast under a powerful ministry, become as much disturbed, at times, as persons do in youth. From all which we may infer, that these feelings are not from the Spirit of the Lord, working in persons in early life, and “trying to make them Christians,” who, not

being able to effect it, at length, when old, leaves them as persons out of reach of mercy – and, as some would tell us, because “their day of grace is past;” for we find that many, very many of that description of persons, are afterwards converted to God, and live sober and religious lives.

These texts that have been understood as countenancing the striving of the Spirit in all men, we shall consider so far as the bounds of a letter will admit. We are frequently reminded of John 16:8, as a text in point, to prove the doctrine; but, by consulting the context, it will appear, that the apostles were the subjects of the promise, and that it did not relate to the working of gracious affections in them by the Spirit, (for these they enjoyed before,) but the effusion of the Holy Ghost, which they were to wait for in Jerusalem, that they might “*be endued with power from on high,*” (Luke 24:49.) By the “world,” is primarily intended the Jewish nation, a vast multitude of whom were then at Jerusalem keeping the feast; by the fulfillment of Christ’s promise, in the outpouring of the Spirit, they were reprov’d for, or convinc’d of sin, not only in putting Christ to death, but of not believing on Him, as the Messiah – of righteousness, either His personal rectitude, being no impostor, or more especially that it was He who was the subject of Daniel’s prophecy, of whom it was foretold that He should “*bring in everlasting righteousness,*” (Daniel 9:24); and of judgment, because, by the outpouring of the Spirit, complete evidence was given that He was really risen from the dead, and consequently thereby giving

assurance of His coming to sit in judgment on them, (Acts 17:31).

Nor can Hebrews 6:4, be brought to prove the doctrine. As the being “made partakers of the Holy Ghost” there intends, not His regenerating influences, but merely gifts, or ministerial abilities. Such was the case with Balaam and Judas. Christ says, “*Rejoice not that the devils are subject to you; but rather rejoice because your names are written in heaven,*” (Luke 10:20). When Paul says, that “*the manifestation of the Spirit is given to every man to profit withal,*” (1 Cor. 12:7), he has respect to gifts, and not to grace; for by “*every man,*” is meant the gifted persons in the church of Corinth; and this design is to show, that although their gifts differed widely, yet they were given by the same Spirit for the edification of the church, and would be profitable to the body.

But it may be objected, the the Holy Spirit is said to “strive with men,” (Genesis 6:3); to be resisted, (Acts 7:51); and vexed, (Isaiah 63:10). We have no inclination to deny that the Spirit may strive, be resisted, and vexed in a certain sense; but not in the sense in which the words are commonly used. It is manifest that the Spirit in the apostles and prophets is intended, when said to strive, to be vexed, and resisted by the impenitent. As to the first, the Spirit in Noah was intended; and in this sense it is the apostle Peter affirms, (1 Peter. 3:19), that Christ preached to those antediluvians who are now in prison, because that His Spirit was in Noah as a preacher of righteousness, and they were strove with in the ministry of the word. When it is

said that the children of Israel vexed His Holy Spirit, as in the above text, it is also added, which He put in him (Moses), by whose right hand they were led. And it is also plain, that the same thing is intended in the Acts. For Stephen, in charging the Jews with resisting the Holy Ghost, observes, they did as their fathers had done before them, who persecuted and slew the prophets which showed the coming of the Just One, of whom (says he) you have been the betrayers, and murderers, thereby resisting and rejecting the testimony of the Holy Ghost as they did. A parallel passage with those mentioned is Zech. 7:12, “*Yea, they made their hearts as an adamant stone, lest they should hear the law, and the words which the Lord of hosts hath sent in His Spirit by the former prophets.*”

We have now, brethren, briefly noticed the principal places in holy Writ, which have been supposed to countenance the strivings of the Spirit in all men: and taking it for granted that what has been said is sufficient, we shall proceed to show some Scripture arguments, to prove that the Holy Ghost is **given to the elect only**.

By the good work **begun in the people of God**, (Phil. 1:6), most unquestionably must be meant, the operations of the Spirit of the Lord in their souls. But if so, how can we be assured that it will “*be performed until the day of Jesus Christ,*” if, according to the above-mentioned sentiment, this work does not always prove victorious – is not always completed – yea, is absolutely relinquished and the subjects of it suffered to perish eternally? Surely, upon this hypothesis, the apostle’s reasoning is very inconclusive,

and the argument advanced with a design to encourage, must have had quite a contrary effect for they would reply, “How can this be, when you constantly assure us that this work may be, and often is, frustrated?” All evangelical obedience, being **the fruit arising from the Holy Spirit**, is made the **evidence of adoption**; “*For as many as are led by the Spirit of God are the sons of God,*” (Romans 8:11). But in case men may possess the divine Spirit, and yet be lost, then the evidence of adoption is vague and uncertain; and it follows, that the having of this Spirit in His influence is no evidence at all, and the reasoning impertinent. The apostle to the Galatians speaks of receiving the Spirit by the hearing of faith (or the gospel which is so called), Galatians 3:2); but if God **ordinarily uses the gospel**, through which to communicate the gifts and graces of the Spirit, then every man has not the Spirit, forasmuch as the gospel is withheld from many nations of the earth. In the epistle to the Romans, the having of the Spirit is made the criterion of belonging to Christ, (Romans 8:0), “*If any man have not the Spirit of Christ he is none of His.*” But if every man has the Spirit, it is no criterion at all, or else every man is a Christian, an adopted child of God; but the apostle, making it a test by which to try our standing, supposes clearly that some have not the Spirit of Christ, and therefore are not His. The same apostle to the church of Corinth, (I Cor. 2:14,15), draws a line of distinction between the **natural man** and the **spiritual man**; but if all have the Spirit, there can be no distinction; in vain does he talk of a spirit of discernment in divine

things, wherein they differ from other men; and he must surely have been mistaken, when he said the things of the Spirit of God are foolishness to such; but if we understand him as making a clear distinction between the believer and unbeliever – the one having the Spirit of God and the other not – then there is a beauty in his reasoning, and not else.

But, brethren, it is of no use to multiply quotations in a case so plain; we shall therefore only make an observation or two on the following passages, and leave them to your meditations. Paul to the Thes. 4:8, says, “*Who also hath given unto us His Holy Spirit,*” John, in his first epistle says, “*Hereby we know that He abides in us, by the Spirit which He hath given us.*” (chapter 3:24), “*Hereby know we that we dwell in Him and He in us, because He hath given us of His Spirit,*” (chapter 4:13). You will remark, brethren, that the above are addressed to the churches of Christ and consequently to all believers composing them, and not to men of the world at all. Now, when he says, He hath given it **us**, it is clearly implied, that He has not given it to **others**; and as our bodies are the temples of the Holy Ghost, and we know, by the indwelling of the Spirit, our union to Christ; therefore, let us never part with this precious test of an interest in the favor of God. But to crown all, and to show with certainty, putting the matter beyond all doubt, that every man has not the Spirit of the Lord, in Jude 19, it is expressly said, “*These are they who separate themselves, sensual, having not the Spirit.*”

We come to show what is **effected** by the Holy Ghost in the elect, all of whom are effectually called to the

knowledge of God and finally saved. All the elect are called the mystical body of Christ, of which He is the Head; and it is not only said that the church (complete) is the fullness of Him that filleth all things; but it is also affirmed, that there is a fullness in Him, (Col. 1:19), out of which all His people receive grace for grace. Therefore, provision has been made in Christ for all that were given Him; and as they are justified by His blood and saved from wrath through Him, so also, by the Holy Ghost which Christ sheds forth, they are completely emancipated from the tyranny of the prince of darkness, and made meet for the inheritance among the saints in light.

The **first work, in order, effected by the Holy Spirit, is regeneration**, which consists in an **infusion of spiritual life** into the soul. In this work, **the creature is wholly passive; so that, instead of doing any thing** of a preparatory nature, in order to invite the Spirit to undertake and effect it, men, on the contrary, are presented as “*dead in trespasses and sins,*” (Eph. 2:1), as having hearts of “*enmity against God,*” (Romans 8:7). From this principle, **thus implanted**, flow all those holy affections, such as **faith, hope, love, and humility**, which are usually denominated “graces of the Spirit,” because they originate from Him and are all of grace. Notwithstanding the spiritual man, thus **begotten of God**, is perfect with relation to parts, he is not so in stature; for those graces become more vigorous under divine cultivation, which we shall have occasion to notice hereafter. **This work is instantaneous**; some examples of which we find in the

New Testament, as in Paul's conversion, that of the jailor, and of the three thousand under Peter's sermon.

[We apologize for interrupting this article. But we have now arrived at the point for which we selected it. We think it useful, therefore to call some specific points to the readers' attention before continuing with the next sentence. First, the writer of this article is about to move specifically into those views that are today stigmatized as "Hardshellism." Second, the writer is writing prior to the rise of Old School or Primitive Baptists/New School or Missionary Baptists/Hardshells or Hyper-calvinist. Third, this article is the Circular Letter of the first Baptist Association formed in America (Philadelphia – 1707), and as was their custom, this letter was first examined by a committee for its orthodoxy, since it is the authorized voice of the thirty-four congregations associated together in this year, with 2,898 total members, and in affiliation with the Warwick Association (NY), Charleston Association (SC), Middle District Association, New York Association, Delaware Association, Rensselaer Association, and Baltimore Association, and, Fourth, it's reception and placement in the Minutes were voted upon and approved, and Fifth, signed by the Moderator, Samuel Jones, and Clerk, William Staughton. Why are these points important? Because this doctrine was fully accepted as Baptist doctrine at the time it was written and approved. Now, to continue with the next sentence, which we shall place in **BOLD characters.**]

CONVERSION AND REGENERATION ARE DISTINCT FROM EACH OTHER, AND BY NO MEANS THE SAME THING, AND THE FORMER IS AN EFFECT OF THE LATTER; THE FORMER BEING BROUGHT ABOUT THROUGH THE GOSPEL PREACHED AS MEANS, WHEREBY THE LATTER IS IMMEDIATELY FROM THE SPIRIT OF GOD, WITHOUT ANY INSTRUMENT WHATEVER.

The divine Spirit does, by the word, effectually convince of sin, causing the regenerate soul to loathe it – makes known the amazing depths of misery into which it has been plunged by the fall – gives a discovery of divine justice as demanding the punishment of the guilty; and it is in consequence of these views, that so much alarm is created, and such dreadful apprehensions of divine wrath are felt. It is peculiarly the office-work of the Spirit to discover the Lord Jesus, in all His glory and fullness, to such; “*He shall take of Mine and show it unto you,*” (John 16:14); “*No man can call Jesus Lord, but by the Holy Ghost,*” (I Cor. 12:3). So that regenerated sinners, beholding the plentitude of grace that is in Christ, and made sensible of their extreme need of Him, by discovering more and more their spiritual poverty and weakness, being thus taught of the Spirit, they come to Jesus, (John 6:45). A soul deeply convinced of sin, and viewing the divine perfections, would not have courage sufficient to approach unto God, were it not for the gracious promises in the word to the weary and heavy laden; but in vain does the convinced sinner essay to take hold upon the promise, until the Spirit of promise

(Ephesians 1:13) make an application of them to him. How desirable is it to experience a manifestation of divine favor, and to enjoy those raptures which Jehovah sees meet to bestow on many of His people when first initiated into gospel liberty! The apostle says, "*the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given to us,*" (Romans 5:5). Many are the powerful temptations that assault us, so that by reason of contending passions for victory over us, and the prince of darkness presenting sin in its most alluring form, we feel our weakness and frequently despair of making head against them. But behold, we are "*strengthened with might by His Spirit in the inner man,*" (Ephesians 3:10). Yea, when our way seems hedged up on every side, so that there seems no way to escape, and error, like a flood, carries all before it. Yet, says the prophet, "*The Spirit of the Lord shall lift up a standard against the enemy,*" (Isa. 59:19). Mixing with the world and being necessarily engaged in temporal concerns, we often get into a lukewarm state and experience spiritual languor and the consequences, a loss of the sensible presence of God. But the divine Spirit disengages us from time-things, dissipates our coldness, invigorates our souls, and, after showing us that it is easier to lose than to regain those divine joys, transports us with a view of the unchangeable love of God. Having lost a spirit of prayer, so that the heavens seem as brass above, and the earth as iron beneath us, at the same time a preached gospel making no impression, and the holy Scriptures seeming like a sealed Book, this divine Spirit "*helps our infirmities with groanings which cannot be*

uttered,” (Romans 8:26): and giving efficacy to the word preached or read, we can once more take delight in public and secret devotions. It is by the agency of the Spirit our perception of divine things is enlarged. It is truly desirable that we should not be always children tossed to and fro by the sleight of men, but on the contrary become acquainted with the mysteries of the gospel – be built up in our most holy faith and become firmly established therein: these favors are conferred by that Spirit which leads into all truth, (John 16:13).

An assurance of faith comes from the divine Spirit. Upon this assurance our comfort much depends, and as there are different degrees of it, and each degree His work, we ought to remember with thankfulness that “*the Spirit bears witness with our spirits that we are the children of God.*”

Lastly, The work of sanctification must be carried on in us, in conformity with which the apostle prays, (I Thess. 5:23), that the believers of the church of Thessalonica might be sanctified wholly in “*spirit and soul and body,*” and “*be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ.*” This work consisteth in the mortifying of our inbred corruptions, so that our sinful affections become more and more weakened, and we are set apart, (as the signification of the term is,) to the service of God. Therefore, as this work progresses, sin loses its dominion over us, (Phil. 3:10), the “*old man is crucified with Him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin,*” (Romans 6:6) and “*changed into the*

image of the Lord from glory to glory, even as by the Spirit of the Lord,” (2 Cor. 3:18). The instrument used in sanctification is the divine word, which has a transforming effect: “*Sanctify them through the truth: Thy word is truth,*” (John 17:17); “*That He might sanctify and cleanse it (the church) with the washing of water, by the word,*” (Ephesians 5:26): the preaching and reading of which, under the influence of the divine Spirit, furnishes such powerful motives to obedience, and forsaking of sin, - setting the one in so abhorrent a point of view, and the other in such an amiable light, that the soul falls in love with and embraces the service of God, and flees from sin as the most deadly evil.

Hence it is that the word has different effects, as awaking our fears, exciting our hopes, abounding with threatenings, promises, warnings, reproofs, exhortations, tender and pathetic addresses, lively descriptions of the glory of the person and offices of Christ, and of the joys of the heavenly world; all which, set home upon the heart by the divine Spirit, produce fruit unto holiness and the end everlasting life. How comfortable must the reflection be to the Christian, that all the changes he meets with in this world, whether in spiritual or temporal things, are closely connected with his sanctification! To this we must attribute sickness and pain, poverty and disgrace, personal and relative afflictions, severe temptations, spiritual desertions, trials which faith and patience meet with; and, what seems most of all astonishing, that even their very backslidings, by being

made the instruments of their corruption, are made use of by the divine Spirit, who brings light out of darkness, order out of confusion, and causes "*all things to work together for good to them that love God,*" (Romans 8:28). **This work of sanctification is not, like regeneration, instantaneous; nor is it perfect during life, but more or less of the body of sin still remains; but so as that it does not reign over us, but disturbs our peace, and creates in us much self-abhorrence.** But the crowning work of all is the sealing of the Spirit, by which we "*are sealed to the day of redemption,*" (Ephesians 4:30). This consists in the enjoyment of a calm and tranquil mind, waiting with composure for our great change, and giving evidence to others with ourselves, that we have "*a house not made with hands eternal in the heavens,*" and having a longing desire to be at home with the Lord.

And now, dear brethren, having treated on the office-work of the Spirit, and merely touched on the most important points, to help your meditations, we close this epistle, by earnestly entreating you to labor after a greater sense of your need of His influences, and not to grieve, by an unholy life, this sanctifying and sealing Spirit. And that you may, under His influence, become exemplary for purity of doctrine, zeal in His service, and uprightness in your lives, is the sincere prayer of your brethren who represent you in this our associate capacity.

Signed in behalf of the whole.

Samuel Jones, Moderator
William Staughton, Clerk

[The above Circular Letter, although written in 1803, remains a fair statement acceptable to this author and the churches with which he is associated. We hope it is of profit to the reader. –Editor]

CHAPTER FIVE

THE COVENANT OF GRACE IS AN ABSOLUTE AND UNCONDITIONAL COVENANT

There may be some Hyper-calvinists found among the Reformed faith of Protestants. It is possible that such might deny “Covenant Theology” advocated by most Calvinists. Therefore we are not in a position to address this topic through the views of the Reformed Faith. However, there are few, if any, among the Primitive and/or Old School Baptists, that hold to “the Reformed Faith” and its “Covenant Theology.” They do hold that God made a covenant of grace with *His Son*, and the blessings of that covenant flow to *His children* as recipients and beneficiaries of it. But they do not believe that the eternal covenant was made with them and their children, nor that it embraces children of the elect merely as such. That seems to be the foundation of infant sprinkling in lieu of the Abrahamic Covenant of circumcision by Catholics and Protestants.

When we say it is not “conditional,” we do not mean that it did not contain “conditions” in it. Rather, we mean that it did not require any conditions to be performed *by the recipients* of its provisions. In other words, it did not require any works, or fruits of the Spirit, by the redeemed elect *in order to* receive the covenant blessings. The covenant was not made with Christians, or believers, but it was between the parties of the Eternal Godhead –Father, Spirit, and Word. The Father chose a particular people in Christ before the foundation of the world (Ephesians 1:4-6); He gave them to His Son for His Son to redeem and save (John 17). His Son kept the law for them and bore the penalty of their transgressions of that law that were imputed to Him; He redeemed and saved them by the suffering and sacrifice of Himself for their sins; and freely justified them by His grace through His imputed righteousness. None of all of that was to be performed by the sinner. Hence, it is **unconditional**. We cannot emphasize enough that Hardshells and many Hyper-calvinists believe that Christ saved all His people during His first advent two thousand years ago. He finished the work His Father gave Him to do. The Holy Spirit’s assigned task is to call them to life and immortality for which the Father elected and the Son redeemed. This He does by Himself, for “*it is the Spirit that quickeneth.*” Thus spiritual life is antecedent to the fruits of the Spirit, such as faith, repentance, and good works. It is the purpose of the Gospel ministry to bring this life and immortality to light, or make it manifest, to the recipients of God’s eternal life.

The Eternal Godhead is expressed in the Scriptures as a Trinity (I John). As such, the Godhead is of one mind, one will, and one eternal purpose “*and these three are one.*” While the Covenant of Grace is not set forth in any great lengthy discussion, it is expressed in many parts and places scattered throughout the Old and New Testament. In fact, if there were no such covenant, there would be little use to speak of the “Old” and “New” Testaments. It is agreed by most that the “Old Covenant” was a conditional covenant made with Israel, as the Adamic covenant was also often expressed as conditional (This, however is debatable” !). So, too, many seem to find the Abrahamic Covenant to be conditional, which it may not have been, since it was given “by promise” without “the deeds of the law.” It is much more certain, however, that the Covenant of Grace was unconditional on the part of the recipients of its blessings, in that this Covenant was not made with the elect, *per se*, but with the Son before the creation of the world. Hence, it is often referred to as “the everlasting covenant.”

Natural Israel typified the spiritual Israel of God, and much of the everlasting covenant is an extension of God’s spiritual, unconditional blessings to the elect among them. In those promises and blessings, we find such that extend unconditionally to His elect people among both Jews and Gentiles. In Isaiah we read of one such promise: “*The beast of the field shall honour Me, the dragons and the owls: because I give waters in the wilderness, and rivers in the desert, to give drink to My people, My chosen. This people have I formed for Myself, they shall shew forth My praise.*”

But thou hast not called upon Me, O Jacob, but thou hast been weary of Me, O Israel. Thou hast not brought Me the small cattle of thy burnt offerings; neither hast thou honoured Me with thy sacrifices. I have not caused thee to serve with an offer, nor wearied thee with incense. Thou hast bought Me no sweet cane with money, neither hast thou filled Me with the fat of thy sacrifices: but thou hast wearied Me with thine iniquities” (Isa. 43:20-24). Here it is clear that those who the Lord has formed for Himself, have been everything except deserving of His favors. These behaviors are inconsistent with conditionalism. But look what He says following: *“I, even I, am He that blotteth out thy transgressions for Mine own sake, and will not remember thy sins.”* (verse 25.) That is pure unconditional mercy and grace!

That the above is related to the covenant made with Christ is evident from chapters 43-50 of Isaiah. *“Thus saith the Lord, In an acceptable time have I heard Thee, and in a day of salvation have I helped Thee: and I will preserve Thee, and give Thee for a covenant of the people, to establish the earth, to cause to inherit the desolate heritages; that Thou mayest say to the prisoners, Go forth; to them that are in darkness, Shew yourselves. They shall feed in the ways, and their pastures shall be in all high places. They shall not hunger nor thirst; neither shall the heat nor sun smite them: for He that hath mercy on them shall lead them, even by the springs of water shall He guide them. And I will make all My mountains a way, and My highways shall be exalted”* (Isaiah 49: 8-11). The above

plainly sets forth Christ as the covenant of His people, and the immediately following makes it certain that His people are the beneficiaries of the blessings in Him:

“Behold, these shall come from far: and lo, these from the north and from the west; and these from the land of Sinim. Sing, O heavens, and be joyful, O earth; and break forth into singing, O mountains: for the Lord hath comforted His people, and will have mercy upon His afflicted” (verse 12,13). Again, *“Thus saith the Lord God, Behold, I will lift up Mine hand to the Gentiles, and set up My standard to the people: and they shall bring thy sons in their arms, and thy daughters shall be carried upon their shoulders. And kings shall be thy nursing fathers, and their queens thy nursing mothers: they shall bow down to thee with their face toward the earth, and lick up the dust of thy feet; and thou shalt know that I am the Lord: for they shall not be ashamed that wait for Me”* (verses 22-23).

When Paul discussed the Old Covenant made with Israel under Moses’ law, he wrote: *“For if that first covenant had been faultless, then should no place have been sought for a second. For finding fault with them, He saith, Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah: not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day when I took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt; because they continued not in My covenant, and I regarded them not, saith the Lord. For this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, saith the Lord;”* [In both the old

as well as the new, the expression is that these covenants were with the house of Israel and the house of Judah, But watch carefully the lack of any human conditions in the new covenant. The old covenant failed because it was made with the people, who did not, yea, could not keep it.] But now notice: *“I will put My laws into their mind, and write them in their hearts: and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to Me a people;”* What is there given for the people to do? What conditions are required to be performed by the recipients of this new covenant? None! Watch: *“And they shall **not teach every man his neighbor, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord: for all shall know Me, from the least to the greatest. For I will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins and iniquities will I remember no more”*** (Hebrews 8:8-12). That this covenant is unconditional on the part of the recipients is clear. They are given nothing to do in the attainment of its provisions. Instead, Christ provided all of the obedience, and they receive all of the benefits. One may conclude that this is “Hyper-calvinism” if they please, but the truth is self evident, that the Bible teaches this doctrine, and that rather clearly.

Insofar as it is most often the Calvinists, believing in Infant Sprinkling in lieu of the Jewish rite of circumcision who charges those not practicing that rite in Christian churches as “Hyper-calvinists,” we affix below another Circular Letter from the Philadelphia Association on the subject. The year of its composure and adoption by the association is 1781. We read:

CIRCULAR LETTER

By Samuel Jones

The elders and messengers of the several churches met in Association at Philadelphia, October 23d, 1781

To the several churches in union with this Association, send greetings.

Dearly beloved in the Lord, - In the connection of divine truth, and progress of our order, we come to write to you, in the next place, of what, in our Confession of faith, Chap. VII., is called God's Covenant; by which is meant the transactions of God with and towards man, respecting his duty and happiness; more especially the exertions of infinite wisdom and mercy, in the contrivance and establishment of the scheme of redemption, for the recovery and salvation of lost man, through a precious and blessed Mediator.

Passing over the prohibition to Adam, respecting the forbidden fruit, which is commonly called the covenant of works, his being the public head and representative of his posterity, as he certainly was, (Romans 5:12), we come to the intimation made to him immediately after the fall, respecting the seed of the woman, that it should bruise the serpent's head; upon which is founded the notion of the Covenant of Grace made with Adam, which was nothing else than a bare discovery, revelation, and manifestation of the eternal counsel of God, respecting man's recovery, carrying in it a promise of eternal life. No stipulations and

re-stipulations, no conditions whatever; nothing more or less to be performed on Adam's part; nothing but a glorious manifestation, as was said before, of the rich grace and mercy of God in Christ. And the further discovery of this rich grace, that was made to the patriarchs, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, was exactly of the same tenor; a promise, that their in their seed all the nations of the earth should be blessed, (Genesis 12:3; 26:4; 28:14). Not a word of a "covenant," or any "conditions." Hence, in the New Testament, where reference is had thereupon, the same language is constantly used; as for instance: "*For the promise is unto you and your children,*" (Acts 2:39). "*Of this man's seed has God, according to His promise,*" (Acts 13:23). "*For the hope of the promise made to our fathers,*" (Acts 24:6). "*Heirs according to the promise,*" (Galatians 3:21,22,39). "*The promise of eternal inheritance,*" (Hebrews 9:19). "*To perform the mercy promised,*" (Luke 1:72). "*And this is the promise that He has promised us, even eternal life,*" (I John 2:29). For all the promises of God in Him, are not yea and nay, if you will, and if not, in the strain of a "covenant," but yea and amen, (2 Cor. 1:20).

In like manner, we read of "gifts" : "*If thou knewest the gift of God,*" (John 4:10). "*Free gift,*" (Romans 4: 15-18). "*Unspeakable gift,*" (2 Cor. 9:15). "*Gave gifts unto men,*" (Ephesians 4:8). Hence, also, the administrations of grace are called the Old and New "Testament," because a testament contains free gifts and legacies made over, and insured to the heirs. It is true we read in Isaiah 59: 21, "*As for Me, this is My covenant with them.*" And in Jeremiah

31: 31-34, “*I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, after those days, saith the Lord,*” speaking of the gospel day. With respect to which we observe, First. That in these places you see nothing that looks like a “covenant.” Secondly. That the word “covenant,” in the Old Testament, sometimes means a statute, ordinance, establishment, appointment and decree, as in Jeremiah 33:2; Genesis 9: 9-11; Numbers 18:19. Thirdly. That the use of the word “covenant” might be more consonant with that legal dispensation, than that of a testament. Fourth and lastly. That it might seem odd to speak of a testament, while the testator was yet living, as the apostle hints, (Hebrews 9: 15,16). But when our Saviour was about to lay down His life, and considered Himself as already dead, He lays aside the use of the word covenant, and takes up the more proper word testament, saying, “*This is the new testament in My blood,*” (Matthew 26:28). And ever afterward, the word testament was constantly used, when reference is had to the dispensations of grace, as you may see in the margin of your Bibles. And besides, when we consider the nature of a “covenant,” we clearly see there could be no possible room for such a thing ever to exist between God and man, respecting spiritual things; for the idea of a covenant necessarily includes these things following: 1, Mutual wants in the parties covenanting. 2, Mutual benefits enjoyed by them. 3, Power in each party to perform the conditions of the covenant. 4, Each party is brought under obligations to each other, by the performance of those conditions. 5, Merit on both sides. 6,

and lastly, Neither party ought to be under prior obligations to the other, respecting the conditions of the covenant; of which particulars not one can be admitted in the present case.

As for the Abrahamic Covenant, as some call it, it only respected temporal things, and the externals of religion, though it had the promise of the Messiah tacked to it, and was therefore called “*the covenant of promise,*” (Ephesians 2:12). It was with regard to selecting Abraham and his descendants from the other nations of the earth to a national church state, and the enjoyment of the land of Canaan, the peaceable and quiet possession of which they were to enjoy, upon condition of their observing the external rituals of that dispensation, and being obedient, which they promised, and had in their power to do. And this was the covenant of which they received circumcision, an external mark or token, as a seal to confirm it, (Genesis 12:18; 17: 7,8; 26: 4; 28: 14; Exodus 29: 3-9; 24: 3-8; Leviticus 26: 3, 40; and Deuteronomy 5: 29). The word covenant seems to have been introduced into the “Christian” system of religion, because it favored of a legal strain, so acceptable to those who are fond of terms and conditions to be performed by man; while others that do not favor legalism, yet too incautiously make use of the word covenant, in bare compliance with custom; though these are generally careful to inform us, that it means a testamentary covenant, a free, absolute, unconditional covenant, which is much the same thing as to say that it is no covenant at all.

The sum, then, is this: that the glorious dispensations and manifestations of the rich grace and mercy of God in Christ, contain free, absolute, and unconditional promises of the free, rich, and unmerited gifts of God, conveyed to the heirs as legacies, in a testamentary way.

Having thus shown you, dear brethren, that there can be no such thing as a covenant between God and man, respecting spiritual blessings and services, we come now to consider what foundation there is to style the glorious transactions between the Persons of the ever blessed Trinity, respecting man's recovery, a "covenant;" and here, undoubtedly, there is some appearance of that kind. If ever there was a Covenant of Grace, this is it. If ever there was a covenant of redemption, here you will find it. And, on the part of Christ, a covenant of works, too; forasmuch as the great work of redemption, the fulfilling of the law of God, in behalf of His people, for whom He undertook as their Surety, was performed by Him. (Psalm 119: 122; Isaiah 38: 14).

The passages of Scripture that speak of this glorious transaction as a covenant, are as following: "*And My covenant shall stand fast with him,*" (Psalm 89:28): "*And give Thee for a covenant of the people,*" (Isaiah 42:6; 49:8): "*Neither shall the covenant of My peace be removed,*" (Isaiah 56: 4,6); "*As for Thee also, by the blood of Thy covenant,*" (Zech 9:11): "*Even the messenger of the covenant,*" (Malachi 3:1). But then it is spoken of under other views, in these that follow: "*According to the eternal purpose, which He purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord,*"

(Ephesians 3:11); “*And the counsel of peace shall be between them both,*” (Zechariah 6:13); “*For I have not shunned to declare unto you the whole counsel of God,*” (Acts 20: 27); “*The immutability of His counsel,*” (Hebrews 6:17); “*Being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God,*” (Acts 2:23). And besides, Christ is said to be foreordained to that work, (I Peter 1:20); sent, (John 10:35); to have received a commandment, (John 10:7,8); and was rewarded, (Psalm 2:8; Phil. 2:9). From the whole, then, we see, that there was a counsel held in eternity, even from everlasting, respecting the recovery of man; that the Triune God did then contrive, find out, adjust and settle, speaking after the manner of men, the whole plan and scheme of that great and glorious work, who should be saved, by what means, and after what manner; that the Son of God, in the Trinity, should be a Mediator, should undertake for His chosen ones as their Surety, and should assume human nature, that He might make satisfaction to divine Justice in their behalf; that all the gifts and graces necessary for the purpose should be treasured in Him, (Colossians 1:19). That the blessed Spirit should cooperate in manifesting the whole to the world His people, and applying the same to the chosen ones, namely, by enlightening their darkened understandings, working in them faith and repentance, changing their vile affections, converting them from the service of sin and Satan, to the service of the living God, carrying on the work of grace begun, and keeping them by the power of God, unto salvation; by every means making them meet for the

inheritance of the saints in light, and finally bringing them to the full possession of it.

Thus, dear brethren, we have briefly laid before you the scheme of our redemption, as concerted in eternity, and brought into effect in time. You see the glorious covenant of grace, which was well "*ordered in all things and sure.*" You see the Son of God appointed to the mediatorial work, and all grace treasured up in Him for that purpose. You see Him undertake, go through with it, and the Spirit cooperate to accomplish the whole. You see the dispensations of grace to man are free, absolute, and unconditional; the gifts of God dispersed in a testamentary way, free and firm. Nothing of works, but all of grace. Nothing of the will of man, but all of the will of God; that we might all, and at all times, cry grace, grace, and whosoever glorieth, might glory in the Lord.

O blessed and glorious scheme! What a rich display have we here of the wisdom, justice, holiness, truth, mercy, pity, compassion, and condescension of God! See the harmony of the divine attributes in this stupendous plan, that is every way worthy of a God! What shall we render unto Him for such rich, unmerited grace! Never to the endless ages of eternity, never shall we be able to render adequate compensation. O that the love of God were abundantly shed abroad in each of our hearts, that we might for ever admire, with astonishment admire, His rich grace; that we might for ever love, fear, honor, reverence, and serve Him, with all our hearts unfeignedly.

“Now, the God of peace, that brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus, that great Shepherd of the sheep, through the blood of the everlasting covenant, make you perfect in every good work to do His will, working in you that which is well pleasing in His sight, through Jesus Christ, to whom be glory for ever and ever. Amen.”

By order of the Association

Samuel Jones, Moderator

Thomas Fleeson, Clerk

[Editor: If the above is “Hyper-calvinism,” it would be correct to say that every Christian that is not of the Catholic, or of the Reformed, and Protestant faiths, and who practice “believers baptism,” is a “Hyper-calvinist”! The above clearly sets forth the position of our early Baptists forefathers. Again, it should be noted that the above was adopted and sent forth by the full Association, and signed by the moderator and clerk.]

CHAPTER SIX

HARDSHELLS AND HYPER-CALVINISTS ARE ANTINOMIANISM

Antinomianism really should be a dead issue today, since all modern “Christians” are *antinomians*. It is the heights of hypocrisy to charge Hardshells or Hyper-calvinists as being antinomians when those using this euphemism are themselves guilty of the same. Rather, it is worse, because those making the charge are thereby basing it upon a belief that one should keep Moses’ law, when they themselves make little to no effort to keep it. The Hardshell, and Hyper-calvinist, understand that Christ fulfilled the law, and imputed His righteousness to them that believe; and Jewish believers are no longer under the bondages of that law, while Gentile, were never placed under it by God. Thus, the truth of this matter is, that no one today even attempts to be nomian (those that keep the law). They are all *antinomians*.

First, it is well to define some words here. The dictionary definition of antinomian is: “A member of a religious body that believes faith alone is necessary to salvation.” By that definition, almost all modern “Christians” are fully antinomian, for they all insist upon that viewpoint. Also, by that definition, Hardshells and Hyper-calvinists stand pretty much alone in not being antinomian, for the major difference between them and evangelical “Christians” is that faith is not the cause of

salvation, but the *effect* and *evidence* of it. The Greek word for “law,” is “*nomos*”. It is from this word “*antinomian*” is derived. One who believes in keeping the law is a *nomian*. One who is against keeping the law is an *antinomian*. “Anti” meaning “against.”

Second, it appears strange that anyone would make a great issue over a Christian having a view that the Law of Moses, or a law of works, can be meritorious of grace and/or salvation. There was a time that Protestants and Catholics held to the antichristian view of a Church-State union. In those days, religious parties attempted to shackle their concepts uniformly upon the whole “Christian” community, and even taxed non-members to support the adopted religion of their state, as well as imprisoned, or executed those who did not attend the state’s religious worship services. Under that ungodly, but religious, tyranny, Old School Baptists resisted until the Great Awakening revival produced so many of them that the power of the clergy was broken. The Virginia theocracy was disfranchised in 1806, and between that date and today, the entire antichristian concept of theocracy has fallen in America. The result is that all American religions are today *antinomian*.

In two major views, the Hardshells and Hyper-calvinists are not antinomians. First, they are the only ones left that believe that neither the gift of faith nor the law of Moses are meritorious of salvation. They do not believe that one is justified by belief in Christ, but by the imputed righteousness of Christ, and that faith is an evidence of

salvation rather than its cause. Second, they stand pretty much alone in believing that every quickened child of God has the law implanted in them by the Spirit of God, and that no one of them need to be taught it by a man. Thus, they are very much *Nomians*, while their objectors fall into the category of being the real *Antinomians*. Both Calvinists and Arminians are, in the most part, Antinomians.

When a writer has in hand a far more capable author's work on a subject than he is capable to match, it seems most reasonable to present the superior work. Therefore, we present below an article written by Samuel Trott, July 15th, 1839. In this particular year, the apostasy of the New Divinity School in America was in its twenty-sixth year. The modification of the Christian faith by the followers of Andrew Fuller, was introduced into the Philadelphia Baptist Association in 1813, by none other than William Staughton, who was that Association's clerk in 1803. The New School Baptists immediately laid the charge of Antinomianism against those faithful ministers and believers of the Old Divinity of their forefathers. Both Gilbert Beebe and Samuel Trott answered a "Brother Meredith" enquiry regarding this subject. Elder Beebe spent most of his article on Arminianism. Here is Samuel Trott's answer:

ANTINOMIANISM AND ITS RELATION TO ARMINIANISM EXAMINED

Brother Beebe:- I received a letter a short time since, from Brother P. Meredith, in which he requests me also to give my views of the text, Job 28: 7,8, in reference to the enquiry *whether there is not a path which passes between the sand bars of Arminianism and the granite rocks of antinomianism.*

Your answer to this enquiry as published under the editorial head in No. 9 of present volume (Signs of the Times, 1839), he says is very explicit in reference to Arminianism, but not so full in reference to Antinomianism as he wished. He gives as a further reason for requesting my views, that he has lately heard, “that to be a thorough-going Old School Baptist, one must believe that it is not the duty of the *unregenerate*, to believe, repent, or pray.” I will therefore add my testimony to yours on this point. The one may strengthen the other.

I will first examine the subject of *Antinomianism* and see whether “the path which no fowl knoweth, and the vulture’s eye hath not seen” can be a middle track between Antinomianism and Arminianism. The signification of the term *Antinomianism* is, according to its etymology, *against law*, as shown by Brother Beebe; and the charge evidently intended to be fixed upon those to whom this term is applied is that they are opposed to the law of God, or do it away by their doctrine. This charge, if the enemies of truth were admitted to be judges, would have been fixed upon

the *Master of the house, and upon those of His household* in every age, from Paul down to Brother Meredith and myself, who preach a **finished salvation in Christ**. But I appeal from those *would be* judges to the Scriptures of truth. I would stand at the judgment seat of Christ.

Those who anciently claimed to be disciples of Moses in distinction from Christ, evidently supposed that the letter of the Sinai laws, moral and ceremonial, together with the traditions of their fathers, constituted a Code of Law which supplanted the original law under which man was created; and that this was the standard by which man's acceptance with God, or rejection, was to be decided. Because Christ and His Apostles preached a doctrine adverse to this Pharisaical law, they were denounced as opposers of the law of Moses. The modern *Nomians* or legalists also understand the original law of God to have given place to a milder law, compounded of the letter of the Ten Commandments and what they conceive to be certain requisitions and conditions of the gospel, and that the *gospel law* is the standard of righteousness, by which all men under the gospel are to be tried, and a want of conformity to it is the ground of condemnation; and according to some, a personal conformity to it is the ground of justification. But no individual who has been brought truly to love the law of God, can admit of its being supplanted by such a medley of human contrivance, and when it is opposed, either as a standard of right or as a yoke of bondage attempted to be put u[on the neck of disciples

of Christ, its opposers are at once denounced as *Antinomians*.

In making my appeal from these partial Judges, I file the following answers to their charge: 1st. That God in creating Adam a living soul, laid him and his posterity in him under obligation to love his God with all his heart, and with all his soul, and with all his strength; and to love his neighbor as himself' that this constituted the law of His creation, and the eternal standard of right, which no apostasy of man could make void. 2nd. That the revelation which God has made of His mind and will in the Scriptures, the alone standard of truth, nowhere teaches that God has ever abrogated this law of man's creation, altered its requisitions, or abated its demands to suit the weakness of fallen man. This answer is sustained by Matthew 5: 17-20 and Romans 3: 31. 3rd. That the prohibition given to Adam in the garden not to eat of the forbidden tree, was designed as a test of his subjection to God and to the law of His creation; his transgressing this prohibition was therefore the just ground of his being condemned and his posterity in him to a state of depravity or *death in sin*. And that the law of Ten Commandments given from Sinai, in its general bearing upon all men, distinct from its special reference to Israel nationally, was not designed as a *covenant of works* and to lead men to depend on their obedience to it for their final acceptance with God, either Jews or Gentiles; but it "*was added because of transgressions, till the Seed should come to whom the promise was made, &c.;*" (Galatians 3:19) it "*entered that the offence might abound.*" (Romans 5:20).

In a word, it was given in its spiritual import, in the sense in which Paul says “*the law is spiritual,*” (Romans 7:14) as a schoolmaster to teach both Jews and Gentiles their entire depravity and guilt, and the impossibility of their being justified by the deeds of the law, and their need of just such a salvation as is revealed in Christ, a salvation from sin and sovereignly free. Hence it is written, “*We know that what things soever the law saith, it saith to them that are under the law, that every mouth may be stopped and all the world become guilty before God;*” and again, “*For by the law is the knowledge of sin,*” (Romans 3: 19-20). Neither, I will I add, was this law of Ten Commands given, in itself considered, to *be a rule of life*; it was designed to teach us what sin is, and its moral precepts are sanctioned by the New Testament as illustrating that which is a proper deportment toward God and toward man in a general and moral point of view. But a *rule of life*, to be correct, must be an exact measure of all that is required of us to perform. This law was not such to ancient Israel; other laws were given them, which they were required also to obey, and which were, of course, component parts of that rule by which their lives were to be squared, such as certain positive institutions of a ceremonial nature, &c. Neither is it a perfect rule to spiritual Israel; the life of a Christian, as such, must be upon a broader scale than the letter of the Decalogue, in order to its being squared with the gospel. Repentance toward God for his daily wanderings of heart, and living daily by faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, and an establishment in the truths of the gospel must enter into the

composition of a Christian's life or walk in order to his conformity to the gospel standard; and these things are beyond the compass of the Ten Commands, "*For the law is not of faith, but the man that doeth them shall live in them*" (Galatians 3:12). There are also positive institutions belonging exclusively to the gospel to be observed by the Christian if he would "*walk uprightly according to the truth of the gospel.*" If, therefore, the legalists call us *Antinomians* for denying that the law is a rule of life to the disciples of Christ, we may well call them *Anti-gospellers*, or *Anti-New-Testamenters* for their attempts to make Moses' law a full rule to the Christian's life. Thus much for our views concerning the much insisted upon notion that the law is a *rule of life* to the Christian, and I will now return to the further consideration of the answers I have filed.

1st. Whilst these answers stand, and they must stand according to the standard of eternal truth, it is evident that we are justified in opposing *this law of conditions* of which faith and repentance and various religious ceremonies are the principle terms, being foisted into the place of that unchanging standard of right, the law under which man was created, as that by which man is to be judged before God, and consequently their charge against us of being Antinomian on this account will not stand. 2nd. So long as it is written, "*Whosoever offendeth in one point is guilty of the whole,*" it must be evident that whoever sets up anything other than the spiritual or original law of God in its exceeding broadness as the standard by which man is to

be tried before God, by which he is to be justified or condemned, opposes or makes void that law and is therefore an Antinomian in the strict import of the word. The teaching that the law will accept of anything short of *perfect obedience* to its everlasting demands, or that it will admit of any substitution in the place of this perfect obedience, such as repenting and believing the gospel and the like, is according to the above view of this subject, Antinomianism.

Having thus shown what Antinomianism is, and the characters on whom the charge properly rests, I will briefly show its position in relation to *Arminianism* by a few questions, 1st. Who are they that are opposed to enforcing the rigorous demands of the spiritual law of God? The unregenerate, whether professors or not; “*for the carnal mind is enmity against the law of God, not subject to the law of God,*”(Romans 8:7) But unregenerate professors more fully act out this opposition; they then are *practical Antinomians*. 2nd. Who are they that are fond of the Arminian, or *do and live* system? The unregenerate universally; but those of them who profess religion more openly avow this system. Hence the Arminian at heart is an Antinomian in heart, and the professed Arminian stands in his doctrine opposed to the unchangeable demands and rectitude of the original law of God, and is therefore in truth an avowed Antinomian. Or thus: Those who make void the law of God by their traditions or systems must be Antinomians. What is Arminianism, but a system that teaches that men’s acceptance with God depend on certain

conditions to be performed by them, short of a perfect obedience to the original law of God. Christ having according to some taken away the original law, and according to others, made an atonement for sin *abstractly considered*, to make room for such conditions being accepted. Hence Arminianism and Antinomianism terminate at the same point, are two different names for the same system of opposition to the original law of God. How then can the “*path which the vulture’s eye hath not seen*” pass between the two? There is no middle ground there.

But Brother Meredith is ready to ask, is there no system which opposes the obligations of the law of God, different from the systems of conditions? In answer I admit it has been said that there were those who held that the elect were never under the law, and that God never saw any sin in them &c. But such a sentiment would as completely do away redemption by Christ as it would the law. Besides this sentiment would be so irrational, so contrary to that sense of accountability which men have, that I cannot think such a sentiment ever existed in the breasts of any who believe there is a God and admitted the authenticity of the Scriptures. The sentiment also that the elect, as the children of Adam, were actually justified from all demands of the law before time began, and were then, absolved from all charge of guilt, would, if carried out in its legitimate bearing, amount to an abrogation of the law in their behalf, and therefore be Antinomianism. But I know of none who contend for this sentiment that would admit of its being carried out to what I think its full implication; therefore,

though they may be inconsistent, they are not Antinomians in the way they hold it.

Consequently, my brother, we in vain look for the “granite rock of Antinomianism” (where the charged of Antinomianism is just as implying opposition to the law of God) so severed from the “sandbars of Arminianism” as to admit of the path or *way of holiness* passing between them. Indeed I may confidently ask, how would sandbars ever be found in the sea were there not a granite rock or something like it to form an eddy or obstruct the passage of the drifting sand and thus cause it to become a deposit? And how could any conditional or Arminian system ever get foothold were there not enmity in the human breast to the government and law of God; an Antinomian principle latent there, that would overturn the sovereignty of God, and bring down His perfect law from its pure and holy demands, to a level with the capacity of depraved mortals to obey?

I will notice that *path which no fowl knoweth*, that *way of holiness* in which the child of grace is led. And my brother, if you have eyes to see, as I think you have, and do not suffer men to put their fingers or systems into them, I shall show you that this path, as Brother Beebe stated, leads directly off, alike from the ground of Antinomianism and of Arminian opposition to the truth.

The very first step in which a person is led to the Christian life takes him off from that firm standing he before had on Arminian ground; regeneration being the **implantation of that life in the soul** which love to God and to His law. Sin, instead of holiness and the divine law,

now becomes the object of his hatred. Long and hard may he struggle to regain a standing on Arminian ground, or in other words, to feel a confidence in his own doings, but in vain, every struggle but removes him farther from this confidence; he is led to an enlarged view of the law in its spirituality, sees it to be “*holy, just and good,*” and his love to it makes him loathe every thing that comes short of its righteous demands, as all his acts and thoughts do; and his confidence in his doings and exercises is therefore more and more destroyed. He finds himself at last without any standing, lying upon the absolute mercy of God, having no good prayers, repentance or reformation to hold on to, and feeling that if mercy does not hold him up he must in justice sink eternally. Hence, love and reverence for the law of God instead of making a person pleased with his own righteousness, and giving him a desire to be accepted with God on the ground of his own doings, leads him to throw aside his own doings and makes him willing to be saved as a poor sinner; just in proportion therefore an *Antinomian* opposition to the law is eradicated from his mind. Arminian confidence in creaturely performances is destroyed. Here is the mystery of the Christian’s path that the “*vulture’s eye cannot see;*” no person not taught of God can comprehend how that love and subjection to the law of God should cause one to loathe his own righteousness, nor how a person who relies entirely on the mercy of God in Christ for salvation can be *zealous of good works*. Yet such is the case. The same love to the law which leads a person to renounce all human works as the ground of his acceptance

with God, making him cling to and rely alone on the work of Christ for acceptance when that work in its completion is once revealed to him as having been wrought for such poor sinners as he. The reason is that the one would degrade the law whilst the other perfectly honors it. Hence he *who rejoices in Christ Jesus, has no confidence in the flesh* (Phil. 3:3); and he who with Paul can say, “*I delight in the law of God after the inward man,*” would also with him, “*not have his own righteousness which is of the law, but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith*” (Romans 7:22 & Phil. 3:9).

I think from what has been shown that Brother Meredith will be satisfied that the Christian’s path which is “*as a shining light, that shineth more and more unto the perfect day,*” cannot lead him in a middle way between Antinomian opposition to the law and Arminian love of human works, but it leaves both in the background.

From the *Signs of The Times*, Volume 7 (1839)
Samuel Trott.

CHAPTER SEVEN

HARDSHELLS, HYPER-CALVINISTS And INFANT SALVATION

It should first be pointed out that the Bible does not discuss infant salvation. The Bible is written to the Church and the church (ecclesia) is composed of baptized believers. As such, infants are not embraced in the visible church of God on earth. As all other persons, when an infant has an experience of grace, being born from above, and able to express their hope and faith in Christ, then only are such subject to baptism and church membership. The latter ability to make known to the church their experience, hope, faith, and repentance being missing, they, as infants, are not subjects to church discipline and ordinances.

The charge that Hardshells and/or Hyper-calvinists “preach babies in hell not a span long,” is a false charge created in colonial New England by Congregationalists and Presbyterians to prejudice their members against the Baptists’ view of “believers only baptism.” It was a false charge then, and although sanctified by time and usage by the opponents of “believer’s baptism,” is still as false today as then.

But, lets look at it more closely. Calvinists and Arminians insist that *in order to be saved* one must “believe and repent,” or, “make a decision for Christ.” Some add “baptism” to the conditions, while others still

add “*sacraments.*” And of these conditions, babies are incapacitated. To be consistent, then, they should conclude “infants dying in infancy go to hell not a span long.” Of course, for themselves, they cannot be consistent: they claim that there is an “age of accountability,” whereby the parents are accountable for the sins of the child. There is not a single verse in the Bible that teaches this inconsistency, but it is required by their “logic.”

On the other hand, Hardshells and Hyper-calvinists believe that salvation is fully of the Lord, without any conditions on the part of the creature, and if it pleases God, He “*quickeneth whom He will,*” and “when He will!” The age of the elect gives no advantage to the creature, nor does it provide any hindrance to God’s ability to reach one, as in the case of John the Baptist while yet in his mother’s womb. Nor is John the Baptist the only case in the Bible. The prophecy of Jeremiah, saying, “*In Rama was there a voice heard, lamentation, and weeping, and great mourning, Rachel weeping for her children, and would not be comforted, because they are not.*” (Matt. 2:17). Compared to Jeremiah 31:15, 100% of these infants were saved without human instrumentality! It reads, “*Thus saith the Lord; Refrain thy voice from weeping, and thine eyes from tears: for thy work shall be rewarded, saith the Lord; and they shall come again from the land of the enemy. And there is hope in thine end, saith the Lord, that thy children shall come again to their own borders*” (Jere. 31:15-17). That, we believe, is INFANT SALVATION! And it seems that only Hardshells and Hyper-calvinists can be consistent

in believing that there is only one way of salvation, and it includes all of God's elect, regardless of their age when they die.

FALSE EUPHEMISM: HARDSHELLS DO NOT BELIEVE IN EDUCATION

This, as all other euphemisms, is designed to castigate Hardshells and Hyper-calvinists, who oppose the requirements that Protestants and Catholics imposed upon the Lord's ministers to be educated in parochial or theological colleges and/or universities. The apostles, in general, were not schooled in theology. They did not study the theories of all the different pagans religions, philosophies of the Greeks and Romans, and mix the religion of the *revelation of Jesus* with the theories of human logic and empirical research. In the rise of the Modern Missionary Movement, Fullerite ministers, filled with pride and fleshly religion, began to establish theological schools, and churches under their influence quickly began to look down upon God's ministers that preached without hire, and without scholastic degrees. This writer does not know a single uneducated minister among Hardshells or Hyper-calvinists, but neither does he think it is required of God to only call ministers with college degrees! God did not call Saul of Tarsus, send him off to Alexandria to get a Doctor's degree in Philosophy, or

Divinity, and then offer him up for hire to the church making the highest bid! Rather, Saul of Tarsus was schooled in the academy with Herod, persecuted the saints, and knocked down on the road to Damascus, and was baptized by a certain disciple, to whom the Lord said, “*I shall show him what he must suffer for My name sake!*” We have never read of any “Most Reverend Doctor Paul” or any other doctor in the ministry of the New Testament. Nor have our opponents.

ANOTHER FALSE EUPHEMISM: “HARDSHELLS AND HYPER-CALVINISTS DO NOT BELIEVE IN PREACHING THE GOSPEL”

If the gospel is the “glad tidings of salvation by Jesus Christ,” the Hardshells and Hyper-calvinists stand almost alone in “preaching the gospel.” All others seem engaged in preaching an “offer of salvation” to anyone that will make a decision for Christ, and this certainly is not “the gospel of Christ”! Again, If the Gospel is the message that Jesus is the Christ, and the Savior of sinners,” the Hardshells and Hyper-calvinists are almost unique in being the ones preaching that message. All others, with but few exceptions, either preach (1) that Christ will save you *if you let Him*, or, (2) that Christ will *eventually* save His people, providing He has enough preachers to get to them, or, (3) that Christ had/has a glorious *plan* of salvation that is sufficient for all who will accept or embrace that plan, or, (4) as Calvinists, that Christ died for a certain number of

people that were elected to salvation, and they all without exception will be *eventually saved*, in this life. In all four of these positions, they deny that Christ “*saved* His people from their sins *by His active and passive obedience*, imputing His righteousness to them as their own, and finished His work of redemption on the Cross two thousand years ago. It is the Hardshells and Hyper-calvinists that preach “Christ as the Savior of sinners.” The angel said to Joseph of his wife, “*She shall have a son,*” and she did. “*Thou shalt call His name Jesus,*” and he did. “*For He shall save His people from their sins,*” and He did! (Matt. 1:21). Not, that He will do so by a glorious plan, or by a numerous horde of disciples, apostles, evangelists, pastors, teachers, deacons, soul-winners, counselors, and other “helpers” and volunteers “*compassing land and sea to make proselytes*”. He did it by Himself and this by “*laying down His life for His sheep.*”(John 10:11).

We recognize that it is difficult to identify what all is essential components of the Gospel of Christ. But there are some with which most Christians can agree. Some of these components are redemption, reconciliation, propitiation, ransoming of captives, and certainly the death of Christ and His resurrection. (Only Preterists and Nonresurrectionists will hesitate upon the last two.) So we ask: “At what point in time does the Scripture ascribe these achievements to Christ? While He was here on earth? Or, when one believes it is so? Or, perhaps, when one gives their personal assent to them? The answer to these questions separates the “Hardshell” and/or “Hyper-calvinist” from all others. The

most important point is: what is the Biblical truthful answer? For this answer, we must need go to that precious Book.

First, then, when did Christ actually “*save His people from their sins*”? Was it before they believed that He did, or after they believed that He did? While logic will correctly answer that question, we will not rely on logic for its answer. If, according to logic, He must have actually saved them *before* they believed that He did, then how long before they believed it did He save them? Was it one minute, or during His life here on earth, or “before the foundation of the world? What saith the Scriptures?

“*Who hath saved us* (in the past tense) *and called us* (Here, the “saving” is placed in order before the “calling.”) *with a holy calling* (Which calling is holy, and hence cannot mean a calling by carnal men by a perverted gospel), *not according to our works* (Any creature activity, whether by a preacher or a believer), *but according to His own purpose and grace* (Again, “purpose” is in order before “grace”), *which was given us in Christ before the world began* (all of this present part of this sentence, then, was before the world was created. Now, note the rest of the sentence), *But is now made manifest by the appearing of our Saviour Jesus Christ, who hath* (past tense again) *abolished death, and hath brought life and immortality to light through the gospel: whereunto I am appointed a preacher, and an apostle, and a teacher of the Gentiles.*” (II Timothy 1:9-11). If the reader will carefully note the emphasis we have made throughout these verses, he should

quickly detect the unique interpretation and/or concept “Hardshells” and “Hyper-calvinists” bring to view. This view is neither Arminian or Calvinist, both of whom delay salvation until it is acted upon in some manner by the creature. However, in this text, the apostle refers rightly to Jesus Christ as the “*Saviour*,” for according to this view alone is He set forth in that office. He is not “trying” to save, “going to” save, or “helping to” save. He saved! And that before the foundation of the world by His purpose, and in His first advent by His grace, and is now made manifest through the Gospel of what He has done. Also note well, that the text does not teach that “life and immortality is brought by the gospel,” as too many assume. The text says that the “life and immortality is ***brought to light*** through the gospel.” That gives a wholly different light upon the utility of the preaching of the gospel. The gospel does not bring the life or the immortality to a believing sinner – the Holy Spirit does that,- but rather, the gospel makes this existing life and immortality evident, or manifest. It does that through the effects of the gospel upon a living spiritual creature upon his hearing this joyful news. This view, while Biblical, presents a consistent view that life must ***precede*** the effects or activities of life. The effects or activities of life, such a belief, repentance, sorrow over sin, the reviving of sin under the commandments of God, and the ability to rejoice in sins forgiven, all are ***evidences*** of that divine life created in the believer by the spiritual birth from above. “*It is the Spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth*”

nothing.”(John 6:63). This verse alone is sufficient to disprove so-called “Gospel Regeneration.”

Anyone that holds to the above view that spiritual life must precede the ability to hear and believe the gospel to the saving of the soul is, in that regard, classified as a “Hardshell.” To conclude this answer, we believe that the purpose of preaching the gospel of Jesus Christ is to declare to all men that hear us, that Christ Jesus came into this world to redeem a selected and peculiar people from their sins, and in His active and passive obedience to His Father that He did, in fact, do exactly that which His Father gave Him to do. This Gospel is to be preached by God-called ministers to whomsoever He shall send them, and only God’s purpose and providence restricts the field of their labors in His vineyard. That Christ commanded His apostles, and the ministers of God after them, to **“GO YE** into all the world and preach the gospel,” and nowhere is it written in His Word, saying to them, **“SEND YE** missionaries into all nations preaching a “do this and thou shalt life” message. Merely because Hardshells and Hypercalvinists do not agree with Arminians and Calvinists, or others that would pervert the gospel of Christ, that the gospel is to be preached to regenerate lifeless sinners, does not in anywise prove that they do not preach the gospel. In fact, it proves the contrary! It demonstrates that they are the ones proclaiming the gospel of a finished and accomplished salvation by Jesus Christ the Savior of sinners. That they are the ones that ascribe all the glory of salvation to God and to Him alone!

This euphemism was set forth against the Christian church because the church did not climb on board with Andrew Fuller in establishing and maintaining a “*missionary society*” in 1782. The gospel of the sovereign grace of God had been propagated for near 1800 years previously, by the church ordaining God-called ministers, and sending them forth “whithersoever God in His Providence cast their lot.” The Holy Spirit had, for the past eighteen hundred years, successfully supported His ministers, directing them into His field of their labors, and had, up to that point, called every single one of His elected and redeemed sheep out of darkness and had translated them all into the kingdom of light and revelation. They, nor their converts, had ever heard or entertained the thought that God “wanted to save sinners who would not let Him.” They never followed the doctrine of Balaam for reward, nor were they ever guilty of Korah’s (Core) sin of teaching all God’s people were soul-winner!

The church saw no need to modify the method of propagating the gospel of Christ from the apostolic example, nor of setting up huge evangelistic business enterprises to raise money, invest in Wall Street, hire infiltrating agents to subvert the gospel churches, and divert their energies into humanistic and “benevolent societies so-called.” Because they continued in the pattern of New Testament itinerant preaching, under the sole direction of the Spirit of Almighty God, they were, and are, accused of not “preaching the gospel.” The sobering truth today is, that God has blinded the eyes of the innovators and opposers to

the true gospel of the grace of God, and they are unable themselves to preach the gospel. As the apostle said, “*If our gospel is hid, it is hid to them that are lost.*” The sovereign Providence of God has turned their false charge against His blessed church inward into their own bellies, and they have “fallen on their own sword” as Saul, King of Israel!

**ANOTHER FALSE EUPHEMISM: HARDSHELLS
AND
HYPER-CALVINISTS DO NOT BELIEVE IN
PREACHING THE GOSPEL
*TO SINNERS***

We often hear this charge in the above heading from so-called “Evangelicals,” and it is found “all over the Internet.” A Southern Baptist minister came to the knowledge of the excellency of free grace, and after endless surfing the Web met this author. One of his first questions was: “Why do you not answer these charges? How else can we determine what your views of these important issues are?” It was this minister, and his questions, that first initiated our publication of the views of those scandalously called “Hardshells” or “Hyper-Calvinists.” My first thought

was “To whom else is there to preach the gospel? Upon further reflection, a pertinent question comes to mind: Why such an often repeated false charge as this to begin with? Upon what misinformation do “Evangelicals” arrive at this conclusion? One answer may be that they have heard it all their lives and have believed it without examination. Or, perhaps it is based upon the knowledge that Hardshells and Hyper-calvinists do not organize mission societies, outreach programs, and evangelical crusades, etc., and draw this conclusion on their own. Whatever the source of their lack of knowledge, the truth is that the statement is utterly false, and totally contrary to the facts of history of these peoples. Why are they found scattered all over the planet? They must be preaching to sinners, and they must be traveling around a great deal. But this seems not to penetrate the thinking process of “Evangelicals.” They still repeat the ridiculous charge.

There is a concept, that issues from the understanding of Hardshells and Hyper-calvinists, that spiritual life is produced by the Holy Spirit quickening an elect sinner to spiritual life. That concept is that this being true, then there are individuals with spiritual life scattered throughout the world that have a felt-knowledge of their utter sinfulness, and are prepared by the Holy Spirit to hear, believe, and embrace the gospel of Jesus Christ. Their felt sinfulness is so great that repentance is brought into their experimental life by “godly sorrow,” while at the same time, they are enabled to grasp the message of the gospel that Christ “*died for the ungodly.*” It is the cardinal belief

of many of these Hardshells and Hyper-calvinists that “*He that hath begun a good work in you will perform*” it unto the day of salvation (Phil. 1:6), and hence such “*as are ordained to eternal life*” will believe. (Acts 13:48). As a result of this persuasion, the ministers of this ancient peoples travel, as *itinerate ministers without hire* everywhere God opens a “*door of utterance*” for them. They know that all men do not have a strong feeling of sinfulness; a felt-need for salvation; a desire to “depart iniquity;” and a longing for a hope of eternal salvation. All such that are devoid of this condition are not considered, to them, to be *sinner*s, but are rather classified as “the wicked,” or “reprobates,” until the Holy Spirit gives them spiritual life in the New Birth experience. Therefore these preachers address their messages to such who possess the traits that a living child of God will invariably possess. For instance, Jesus’ words, “*Come unto Me all ye that labour and are heavy laden*” identifies individuals that are subject to His divine call. They are “*laboring and are heavy laden.*” There is, for such, a “*rest that remaineth*” for such that labor under the weight of sin, guilt, and distress of soul and find that sin is a heavy laden to bear. Thus preachers do not extend offers of salvation, for they have none to give. The gospel itself is a proclamation of salvation by Jesus Christ’ finished work, and the Holy Spirit is quite sufficient to make them believe this gospel, and their heavy-laden, sin-guilt soul is sufficient to weep before a loving God over their awful sinfulness, and such godly sorrow will result in repentance and be productive of “*fruit meet for*

repentance.” They, more than their Arminian or Calvinist counterparts, preach the gospel especially, and directly *to sinners*. And none but sinners did Christ come to call to repentance. (Matt. 9:13). Others preach the gospel, or what they think is the “gospel,” “to everyone that they can get to listen to them.” They run buses up and down streets collecting as many as they can beguile, and often reward those who cooperate with parties, trips, ice cream, dances, and so-called “Christian Rock” concerts. It is blatantly false to charge Hardshells and Hyper-calvinists with failing to preach the gospel *to sinners*.

Interestingly, however, is a very unusual thing noted among these people: God, by Himself, reveals His truth to large numbers of His people scattered far apart from each other. As they grow in grace and the knowledge of the truth, their own experience teaches them the truth embraced as “Hardshellism” and/or “Hyper-calvinism.” Both these titles are affixed to individuals that *experience* these truths in their own quickening to life, and conversion to the truth as it is in Christ. It does not take a human “preacher” to make a Hardshell or Hyper-calvinist! God is perfectly able to do so, and the fact of so many of them existing where there are no gospel churches demonstrate that He does. These individual *know* that the preached word did not regenerate, or quicken, them to spiritual life. Such was not their experience! How comforting it is, to know that one’s salvation “*is of the Lord,*” (Jonah 2:9), rather than of man!

ANOTHER CHARGE IS: HARDSHELLS AND HYPER-CALVINISTS ARE MISERS; THEY DO NOT TITHE OR GIVE OFFERINGS

The sweep of this brush is too broad! Some among them are as much misers as some among “Evangelicals.” It is, however, a truth that they do not believe that the New Testament Church is under the “law of tithing” as were the Jews. When their adversaries enjoin tithing upon their religious adherents, they almost invariably turn to Matthew 23:23 (because there is no other place in the N.T. to which to quote) *“Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! For ye pay tithe of mint and anise and cumin, and have omitted the weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy, and faith: these ought ye to have done, and not to leave the other undone.”* “See,” they say, “these you ought to have done.” Yes, Christ was speaking to Jews, and the law of tithing was given to them, because *“the tithe belong to Levi.”* When the land of Palestine was divided to the tribes of Jacob, all received their inheritance in land; but the children of Levi were given the tithe from all the other tribes, and this was their maintenance for their ministration of the law and sacrifices, and the services to God in behalf of all Israel. But nowhere is tithing commanded of the Gentiles, or placed upon the New Testament Church. Freely the ministers have received, and freely they give.

A hired ministry is unknown among most all Hardshells and Hyper-calvinists. The ministry receives the gift to preach, being called of God to that office, and it is perverse to sell a “gift.” The hearers of the gospel, if they are enabled to truly hear, receive that ability as a gift of grace as well. But, we never hear of “churches” hiring the audience to which the preacher serves!

Would the reader reflect upon a renown character in the O.T. that is mentioned in the New? His name was Balaam. Balak hired Balaam to prophecy against Israel. Three times Balaam attempted to do so, and three times God turned his curses into blessings. Balaam died in battle against Israel. (Numbers 22). Now look at this hireling in the New Testament. *“The hireling fleeth, because he is an hireling, and careth not for the sheep”* (John 10:13). *“But these are natural brute beasts, made to be taken and destroyed, speak evil of the things that they understand not, and shall utterly perish in their own corruption; and shall receive the reward of unrighteousness, as they that count it pleasure to riot in the day time. Spots they are and blemishes, sporting themselves”* etc., *“which have forsaken the right way, and are gone astray, following the way of Balaam the son of Bosor, who loved the wages of unrighteousness”* (II Peter 2:13-15). And again, *“Woe unto them! For they have gone the way of Cain, and ran greedily after the error of Balaam for reward, and perished in the gainsaying of Core”* (Jude 11). And again, *“But I have a few things against thee, because thou hast there them that hold the doctrine of Balaam, who taught Balac to cast a stumbling*

block before the children of Israel, to eat things sacrificed unto idols, and to commit fornication” (Revelation 2:14). A hired ministry is the doctrine of Balaam condemned in the New Testament by the early church apostles. Few Hardshells or Hyper-calvinists commit this offense. It is not being covetous, or a miser, when one walks according to the commandment of God our Savior and His apostles to the church.

The New Testament enjoins a good stewardship of one's possessions upon the recipients of His blessings. His people are called upon liberally to support the administration of the gospel of the grace of God. They are reminded that a ox deserves his master's crib; that it is better to give than receive; that a laborer is worthy of his hire; and God blesses His real children to contribute to the spread of the gospel they love. But tithing and a hired ministry are according to the doctrine of Balaam, and condemned in the New Testament. There is one charge that can never be leveled against them: that they lie to their hearers, telling them that God will reward them, as a condition, for their contributions; that the more they give, the more God will bless them, and in this manner fleece the sheep (or goats, whichever they are).

The evangelical (so-called) world can never deny that it takes men, money, and persuasion to establish, support, increase, and spread their religious institutions and devotions. To them, salvation is by works; and we all must candidly admit that is their view and their motives. But it takes God to make a Hardshell or a Hyper-calvinist. They

are so far from the mainstream of modern-day “Christianity,” and their concepts of salvation, of God, of the finished work of Christ, of the work of the Holy Spirit, of the utility of the true gospel, and of the institutional pattern of the New Testament church, that it is certain, they could never have learned it of man! As Jonah learned by experience: *Salvation is of the Lord.*” (Jonah 2:9).

We have presented herein articles that predate the rise of the terms that designate the New School and Old School Baptists. The view presented by White in the Philadelphia Association had the following statement that we emphasized in bold letters, to prove the point that those brethren believed in Holy Spirit regeneration without the instrumentality of the ministry. It read, “Conversion and regeneration are distinct from each other, and by no means the same thing, and the former is an effect of the latter; the former being brought about through the gospel preached as a means, whereby the latter is immediately from the Spirit of God, without any instrument whatever.” That view is today branded, “Hardshellism,” and “Hyper-calvinism” by nominal “Christians.”

We offer to the read another selected article, written by Elder Thomas P. Dudley, moderator of the Licking Association of Particular Baptist in the early 1840’s. Hopefully, it may demonstrate the importance of the doctrine of **Regeneration** as understood by our Baptist’s forefathers. It is as follows, with only the salutation removed:

Is The Soul of Man the Subject Of Regeneration?

By: Tomas P. Dudley

There have been exceptions *recently taken*, to views which we entertain upon several items of the Christian faith; and denunciations of the “worst kind of heresy,” made against us, because of the avowal of those sentiments. We are entirely willing they shall be brought to *Standard*; if they shall be found to conflict therewith, we are sure, we do not wish them to prevail.

There were those in the days of the Messiah, who were “exceedingly zealous of the traditions of the fathers.” May we be allowed to suppose, that there yet remain some of the same characters in the professed church of Christ? They said to the Master, “*Why do Thy disciples transgress the traditions of the Elders? For they wash not their hands when they eat bread. But He answered and said unto them, ‘Why do ye transgress the command of God by your tradition?’*” Again, “*Howbeit, in vain do they worship Me, teaching for doctrines, the commandments of men.*” (Matt. 7:7).

Now, we have searched, closely, the Word of the Lord, for proof to sustain the *notion*; “the soul is regenerated;” “the soul, is born again;” “the soul, is quickened;” “the soul is resurrected;” “the soul, in regeneration, becomes the new man;” and we are constrained to believe, the error, is the result of carelessly reading the Scriptures, or disregard of the lessons they teach; and is consequently, nothing more

or less, than *human tradition*: and that those who are engaged in propagating that *notion*, are, emphatically, “*teaching for doctrines the commandments of men.*”

We are aware, that, because of our dissent from the notion, “the soul is born again, resurrected, and becomes the new man,” we have been denounced from Maine to Georgia; and from the Atlantic to the Pacific, as heretics; and as having “left Old Baptist ground.” But, allow us to reply, if Old Baptists leave the Word of God, we have no wish to follow them. We may be allowed to say, we regret, that Old Baptists, here and elsewhere, have suffered themselves to be imposed on by these new theorists, who disregard the authority of “*Him who speaks from heaven.*”

“*For the hurt of the daughter of My people, I am hurt.*” It will not, we presume, be denied, that man became an accountable being when God, “*breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul.*” Antecedently to which he was a lump of dead matter, incapable of vice or virtue, praise or blame. Nor will the fact be controverted that man has possessed a soul from his earliest consciousness; nor yet, that it is that soul, which exercises volition for the body. The members of the body only do the bidding of the soul, or intelligent principle which exercises volition within- “*when lust hath conceived, it bringeth forth sin; and sin, when it is finished, bringeth forth death.*” “*Sin is the transgression of the law.*” “*The soul that sinneth it shall die.*” We enquire, if that *soul*, which exercises volition for the body, and caused it to go into transgression, becomes, by regeneration, or

reformation, or by any other process, incapable of sinning; what is it that influences the members of the bodies of the saints, to rebel against God? The Apostle teaches us that, “*whosoever is born of God, doth not commit sin, for His seed remaineth in him; and he cannot sin, because he is born of God.*” (1st John, 3:9). We should not forget, that it is this soul, or intelligent, or rational, principle, which distinguishes man from the rest of God’s creatures; and makes him, justly, the subject of law, and accountable to God. If our position be correct, and we think no intelligent Bible reader will deny it; then man is entirely incapable of contracting guilt, and of subjecting himself to punishment in the absence of the soul, or intelligent principle- incapable of discriminating between good and evil- right or wrong.

It is worthy of enquiry: If the soul, by any process whatever, becomes the “new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness,” is not the proper term, “*re-formation*”? And are not the terms *regeneration* – *quicken*ed, and *born again*, inappropriate when applied to it, as the subject of Divine operation?

If the soul is incapable of contracting blame after its reformation, (for that is the appropriate term according to the theory of our opponents) whence did an apostle, under the immediate influence of the Spirit of God, pray thus: “*And I pray God your whole spirit, and soul, and body, be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ*”? (1 Thess. 5:23). It would seem, the Apostle considered the *soul* as likely to contract blame as the spirit,

or the body; and this, he knew full well, was not the case if, indeed, the soul is “*born of God.*”

If the soul is the subject of regeneration and the new birth, is man not as incapable of sinning, subsequently to the new birth, as he was antecedently to the “breathing into his nostrils the breath of life, and man becoming a living soul”? Or will our opponents have it, that this *soul*, which they say, is regenerated and born again, and resurrected; and becomes the “*new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness,*” “*blows hot, and blows cold;* or exercises wicked volition, for the “old man,” and holy volition for the “new man” ? But, our opponents have found out, that “the wicked propensities and vile affections within, compose the old man.” We do not so understand the Apostle- he says, “*The old man is corrupt, with his deeds.*” “*The old man is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts.*” Thus, drawing a distinction between the man, and the deeds, lusts, and wicked propensities; by which he is made known. Deeds, whether mental or physical, do not give *being* to the agent by whom they are performed; but only develop the nature of the agent, who performs them.

Our adversaries tell us the soul of the Adamic man, by regeneration, becomes the “new man,” and the body, remaining corrupt, is the “old man,” and “these (they say) are the parties in the Christian warfare.” If this theory be true, then, indeed, would Christians have a much easier, happier, more contented life, whilst in the body, than we have realized; or than has been claimed by the saints of ancient or modern times. The enemy they are called to

combat is a *dead enemy* – entirely harmless – incapable of contracting blame – inoffensive – can’t fight. What does the Apostle tell us on this subject? “*And if Christ be in you, the **body is dead** because of sin; but the spirit is life because of righteousness.*” (Romans 8:10). In vain might the devil tempt this *dead body*- his temptations could not reach it, in the absence of an intelligent and rational principle. It would lie in unconscious repose. “*We know that whosoever is born of God, sinneth not; but he that is begotten of God, keepeth himself, and that wicked one toucheth him not.*” (1st John, 5:18). “*Of His own will begat He us with the Word of truth.*” (James 1:18). How did the apostle Peter understand the doctrine of the new birth? “*Being born again not of **corruptible** seed, but of **incorruptible**; by the Word of God which **liveth** and **abideth forever.***” Let us inquire, were not those brethren to whom the Apostle wrote, as emphatically, *in the germ of that incorruptible seed*, before their development, as “the blade”- the ear, the full corn in the ear, was emphatically in the grain, before it was deposited in the ground, or planted? The first birth was of a *corruptible seed*; and the product will invariably be of the same nature as the seed that produces it. By what process is this corruptible substance, **conveyed into** the incorruptible seed, of which Peter’s brethren are born?

The second birth, is of an **incorruptible** seed, and, consequently the product will necessarily be as incorruptible, as that which produces it. Hence, “*whosoever is born of God cannot sin*”- cannot be corrupted. But, did

Peter consider the *souls* of his brethren, born of this “incorruptible seed”? If so, why did he say, “*seeing ye have purified your *souls* in obeying the truth through the Spirit unto unfeign love of the brethren?*” If their *souls* were born of incorruptible seed, they were, necessarily, purified by that birth; what propriety would there be then in his ascribing the work of purifying their souls, to them? Hence we see Paul, Peter, and John, concurring in their testimony; they all establish the fact that the *soul*, literally, is **not** quickened- regenerated or born again; and that the “new man,” proceeds from another source, and is no part of the Adamic man – but is of spiritual origin – “*born of God.*”

Seeing the views taken by our adversaries; ought we to wonder that they palpably contradict an inspired Apostle? They tell us, “the fallen, guilty, corrupt and polluted sons and daughters of Adam, are the *children of God.*” – “the Elect in Christ,”

We enquire, who are these corrupt and degenerate children of Adam; and of what are they composed? The answer is, “the children of the flesh” – “the literal sons and daughters of Adam, composed of soul and body” – “Adam begat a son in his own likeness; after his own image.” These, they say, are the children of God. But, what said the Apostle? “*Neither because they are the seed of Abraham, are they all children: but, in Isaac shall thy seed be called. That is, they which are the children of the flesh, these are **not the children of God**; but the children of the promise are counted for the seed.*” (Romans 9: 7,8). Let us remind you, that the name “Isaac”, is elsewhere, expressly given to

Christ; and that Christ has in all time, yea, before time began, had a seed – “*Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, and to seeds, as of many; but as of one, and to thy seed which is Christ.*” Again, “*And if ye be Christ’s, then are ye Abraham’s seed and heirs according to the promise.*” (Galatians 3: 16-29). This seed of Christ, “*His portions*” – “*His generation*” – His inheritance- is brought forward in various parts of the Bible. “*He was taken from prison and from judgment; and who shall **declare His generation.***” “*When Thou shalt make His soul an offering for sin, He shall see **His seed.***” (Isaiah 53:8,10). “*The Lord’s portion is His people.*” (Deut. 32:9). The children of God, or seed of Christ, partook of flesh and blood; and in that nature, violated the law of God, and became exposed to its curse. Hence an Apostle said, “*Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, He also Himself likewise took part of the same, that through death, He might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil, and deliver them (the children) who through fear of death, were all their lifetime subject unto bondage. For verily He took not on Him the nature of angels; but He took on Him the seed of Abraham. Wherefore in all things it behooved Him to be made like unto His brethren; that He might be a merciful and faithful High Priest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people. For in that He Himself hath suffered, being tempted, He is able to succour them that are tempted.*” (Hebrews 2:14-18).

None but a “*near kinsman,*” could make the reconciliation required – and who, but the elder Brother, so fit or so competent to accomplish the work?

The Apostle draws the following conclusions from the above premises, “*wherefore, holy brethren, partakers of the heavenly calling, consider the Apostle and High Priest of our profession, Christ Jesus; who was faithful to Him that appointed Him, as also Moses was faithful in all his house. For this man was counted worthy of more glory than Moses, inasmuch as he who hath builded the house, hath more honor than the house.*” (Hebrews 3:1-3). Who are these “holy brethren,” and whence sprang they? They are “*born of God*” – “*born of the Spirit*”- “*born of an incorruptible seed*”- “*the seed of the blessed*”- “*an holy nation*”- “*a chosen generation, a Royal Priesthood*”- “*If the root be holy; so are the branches*”- “*I am the root and offspring of David*”- “*I am the vine; ye are the branches*”- suffice to say, they are “*heirs of God, and joint heirs with Christ.*” But who is this elder brother? It is He who said, “*I will declare Thy name unto My brethren. In the midst of the church will I sing praise unto Thee. Again, I will put My trust in Him. And again, Behold I and the children which God hath given Me.*” It is He “*who loved the church and gave Himself for it.*” It is He who said, “*Because I live, ye shall live also.*” It is the Son, of whom it is said, “*who being in the brightness of His (the Father’s) glory, and the express image of His Person, upholding all things by the word of His power, when He had by Himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on High;*

being made so much better than the angels, as He hath by inheritance, obtained a more excellent name than they.” But who is He? The “*Son, whom He hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also He made the worlds*”; it is He of whom it is said, “*But unto the Son, he saith, Thy throne, O God, is forever and ever: a scepter of righteousness is the scptre of Thy kingdom; Thou hast loved righteousness and hated iniquity; therefore God, even Thy God, hath anointed Thee with the oil of gladness above Thy fellows.*” “*I will set My King on My holy hill of Zion.*” The anointed King of Zion – King of Saints. But who are His “fellows” above whom He is anointed? They are the “*heirs of God, and joint heirs with Christ.*” The citizens of the New Jerusalem- His brethren- they too, are anointed, and made kings and priest unto God. Now He that “*establisheth us with you in Christ, and hath anointed us, is God; who also hath sealed us and given the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts.*” (2 Cor. 1:21, 22). “*But the **anointing** which ye have received of Him abideth in you, and ye need not that any man teach you, but as the same **anointing** teacheth you of all things, and is truth, and is no lie, and even as it hath taught you, ye shall abide in Him.*” (1st John 2:27). The Apostle adds, “*But ye have an **unction** from the Holy One, and ye know all things.*” Here we have presented, the King and His subjects. The Husband and the Bride- the “appointed Heir of all things,” and the joint-heirs with Christ”- and, although these “joint heirs,” wade through much tribulation in this world of sorrow, yet shall they finally overcome- and “*to Him that overcometh will I grant to sit with Me in*

My throne, even as I also overcame, and am set down with My Father in His throne.” (Rev. 3:21).

Whilst the Apostles, on the one hand, maintain the real, proper, eternal, underived divinity of the Lord Jesus Christ- that “in Him dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily- that, *“This is the true God and eternal life”- “the Almighty”*- on the other hand, they, as clearly maintain the existence of His *manhood*, “ere sin was born, or Adam’s dust was fashioned to a man.”

*“For there is one God, and one mediator between God and men, the **man** Christ Jesus; who gave Himself a ransom for all, to be testified in due time.”* (1st Tim. 5:6). Again, *“Now a mediator is not a mediator of one: but God is One.”* (Galatians 3:20). If language has a meaning, we are to understand from the foregoing declarations, first, - that the One God, is not the Mediator; for God is One – secondly, the Mediator, is a mediator of two; thirdly, the parties between whom He mediates, are first, the One God; and secondly, men. But who is this Mediator? We answer in the language of the inspired Apostle – *“the **man** Christ Jesus.”*

Because we maintain what the Bible plainly declares, our adversaries are endeavoring to persuade the brethren, that we deny the Godhead of the Lord Jesus – that He is Jehovah. If He be not God, we are unable to perceive how His children, in the “new birth,” are made partakers of the Divine Nature. *“For, unto us a child is born, unto us a Son is given, and the government shall be upon His shoulder, and His name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, the*

Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace. Of the increase of His government and peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice, from henceforth even forever. The zeal of the Lord of hosts will perform this.” (Isaiah 9:6,7). This “mighty God,” sustains the relation to His children, of “*everlasting Father,*” and the children, are thus brought forward by the prophet, when personating this everlasting Father, “*I will say to the north, give up; and to the south, keep not back; bring My sons from far, and My daughters from the ends of the earth; even every one that is called by My name, for I have **created him** for My glory, I have formed’ yea, I have made him.*” (Isaiah 43: 6,7). But to return:

The position of our adversaries, if we understand them; is this: “Jesus existed in His Godhead, from eternity; but only in His manhood, from His conception in the womb of the Virgin.” Others of their party tell us, “We can go back no further than Bethlehem, for a Savior.” We invite the first, to consider, that it was not to His Godhead, but to His *manhood*, the sins of His people were charged. And the latter, to consider, that if no Savior existed in the four thousand years that preceded the conception of the babe of Bethlehem; then all who died antecedently to that event were lost without remedy. If either position be true, the world existed four thousand years without a Mediator. We beg the advocates of both, to reconsider the disastrous consequences that must result from establishing either of their theories. Not one of the millions who died in those

four thousand years, could have been saved. *“No man cometh unto the Father but by Me,”* said the Redeemer. Again, *“I am the way, and the truth, and the life.”*

We presume it will hardly be contended by those who regard the authority of the Bible, that the Godhead suffered- was made an offering for sin, or died! Yet the Lord Jesus said, *“I lay down My life for the sheep.”* Of Him it is said, *“who was delivered for our offenses; and was raised again for our justification.”* (Romans 4: 25). *“For He hath made Him to be sin for us, who knew no sin: that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him.”* (2nd Cor.5:2).

That it is in the relation He sustains to His people as man, we hear it said, *“though He were a son yet learned He obedience by the things which He suffered.”* In that relation, it is said, *“For it became Him for whom are all things, and by whom are all things, in bringing many sons unto glory, to make the captain of their salvation perfect through sufferings.”* *“And being made perfect, He became the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey Him.”* *“For every High Priest is ordained to offer gifts and sacrifices, wherefore it is of necessity that this **Man** (not this God) have somewhat also to offer.”* Hebrews 8:3).

What has this “man” to offer? *“Wherefore, when He cometh into the world He saith, sacrifices and offerings Thou wouldest not, but a body hast Thou prepared Me: in burnt offerings and sacrifices for sin, Thou hast had no pleasure. Then said I, Lo! I come (in the volume of the*

*Book it is written of Me) to do Thy will, O, God.” Whence did He come? Let Him answer. “For I came down **from heaven** not to Mine own will, but the will of Him that sent Me. And this is the Father’s will which hath sent Me, that of all which He hath given Me, I should lose nothing, but should raise it up again at the last day.” (John 6:38,39). Again, “And no **man** hath ascended up to heaven, but He that came down from heaven, even the Son of man which is in heaven.” (John 3:13). Again, “What and if ye shall see the Son of man ascend up where He was before.” (John 6: 62). “For the Son of man is come (from whence? Heaven) to seek and to save that which was lost.” “The Lord possessed Me (who? The Mediator, the Man Christ Jesus) in the beginning of His way, before His works of old, I was set up from everlasting, from the beginning; or ever the earth was.” (Proverbs 8: 22-23). In concluding this part of our subject, allow us to say, this Mediator who “was set up from everlasting,” is it He of whom it is said, “Because He hath appointed a day, in which He will judge the world in righteousness by that **man** whom He hath ordained.” (Acts 22:31). Need we multiply proofs, that the “**man** Christ Jesus,” actually existed as Mediator, “or ever the earth was”? or, that the “man Christ Jesus,” came from heaven, when He made His appearance in this world? “They have Moses and the prophets; if they believed them not, neither would they be persuaded though one arose from the dead.”*

That we may be no longer misrepresented, (unless indeed, the misrepresentation shall be willful) – allow us to say, whilst we most firmly believe the Mediator, “the **man**

Christ Jesus,” existed, “or ever the earth was.” Yet we have **never** believed, or attempted to maintain, that He existed *in flesh and blood*, before His conception in the womb of the virgin – “*a body hast Thou prepared Me*” – “*Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up. But He spake of the **temple of His body.***” (John 2:19,21). Hence it is seen, the body – the temple, was designed as a *dwelling place for the man Christ Jesus.*” The apostle Paul; under Divine inspiration, conceived the existence of “*a man, in the body, as well, the existence of a man “out of the body,”*” (2nd Cor. 12:2), and shall we be charged with heresy, because we believe, “*The Man, Christ Jesus,*” existed antecedently to the body, being prepared for Him? “*Jesus Christ the same yesterday, and today, and forever,*” (Hebrews 13:8). He is the same Mediator in the Patriarchal, Prophetic and Gospel dispensations – “*He, that is, and was, and is to come.*”

Having maintained the doctrine of the lineal descent of the children of God, from their spiritual Father – that they are “*born not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man; but of God.*” Allow us to inquire, if the children of the flesh, the seed of the first Adam were capable, by virtue of their oneness in and with him, of violating the law, and falling under its curse 5850 years since, and forfeiting the one life, that was common to all that family; is it a matter entirely unworthy of our consideration, whether the seed of the last Adam were not as capable, in their oneness with Him, of meeting all the claims of the law and suffering the entire penalty due their transgressions, when *that life was laid down*, to which the

law was given; when Jesus said, “*It is finished, and bowed His head and gave up the Ghost?*”

You will learn, then, as our settled conviction, (the representations of our adversaries to the contrary, notwithstanding) that regeneration, quickening, and to be born of God, in their order, are as indispensably necessary to our seeing, and entering into the Kingdom of God, and enjoying “*the things which God hath prepared for them that love Him,*” as generation, quickening, and the natural birth, are indispensable to our enjoying this natural world. And that each birth is alike brought about **without the agency of the being that is born;** that the two men are fed and sustained upon different elements. The “new man” with spiritual food, is sustained. The “old man,” now, as formerly, is sustained upon corrupted elements.

But, it is said that, we deny that any thing is done for the “old man.” Allow us to say, the Adamic man, is he who has violated the law and incurred the penalty – and that the whole sufferings, agonies, and death of the Lord Jesus, was **for the Adamic man** – the sinner. The spiritual seed of Christ did no sin in their spiritual relation to Him, and hence, they, in that relation, needed no redemption.

In conclusion, we propose dropping a few thoughts on the subject of ***adoption***. The intelligent reader, need not be told, that to adopt one’s own child – the fruit of his own body, will not advance his interest. He is an heir – an inheritor, by lineal descent. Adoption pertains to the child of another – a stranger – his interests may be greatly promoted by observing the statute regulating adoption. The

child of a stranger, may, by adoption – legal adoption, be raised from penury to affluence – from poverty to plenty.

The “inward man,” or “new man,” is an heir of God by birth p “begotten of God,” and a joint heir with the Lord Jesus Christ. But the “outward man,” – the Adamic man, is the son of a stranger – he is the child of “the first Adam, who is of the earth, earthy.” Hence, adoption into the heavenly family, will greatly improve his fortune; he will, thereby, be brought into possession of a heavenly inheritance.

Here, he receives the “*spirit of adoption,*” but when “*this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality,*” then will he receive adoption itself. The Apostle said, “*For ye have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear; but ye have received the spirit of adoption, whereby we cry Abba Father.*” (Romans 8:15). Adoption is in the future – hence Paul said, “*Ad not only they, but ourselves also, which have the first fruits of the Spirit; even we ourselves groan within ourselves, **waiting for the adoption,** to wit: the redemption of our body.*” (Romans 8:23).

“*Who shall change our **vile body,** that it may be fashioned like unto His glorious body.*” Then will mortality have been swallowed up of life, and the heavenly family “*enter in through the gates into the city.*” That which is the subject of adoption, will be raised to glory, honor, immortality, and eternal life; whilst the finally impenitent will be raised to shame and everlasting contempt.

The personality of the saint, will **not be changed** by possessing two whole and distinct natures; but he “*shall see Jesus and be like Him, for we shall see Him as He is.*”

It is now more than four years since the Circular on the “Origin, Nature, and Effects of the Christian Warfare” was published by its author, on his own personal responsibility; we then hoped, as we have since, that if its principles were antagonistical to the Bible, some one capable of showing that antagonism, would come to the rescue. But as yet it remains unrefuted; as we believe it is irrefutable, from the Bible. It is true we have seen some attempts to *caricature* it- to make a “man of straw,” and fight it, but those puerile attempts prove that their authors look at it as unanswerable.

Dear brethren, we invite you to a critical comparison of the doctrine maintained on the foregoing pages, with the Standard of Truth, the unerring Word of God – if found to accord, strictly, with that Standard; surrender it not but with your natural life. If at war with the Bible, reject it. God grant that you may be able to pronounce righteous judgment in the premises.

And now, dear Brethren, we commend you to God, and to the Word of His grace, which is able to build you up, and give you an inheritance among them that are sanctified.

Done by order of the Licking Association of Particular
Baptists, and signed in her behalf.

Moderator: Thomas P. Dudley

Clerk: J. S. Peak

CAPACITY OF DISCERNMENT BY THE OLD AND NEW MAN

Paul laid a definitive foundation for this subject when he wrote: “*But the **natural man** receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they (the spiritual things) are foolishness unto him: neither **can he know them**, for they are spiritually discerned.*” (1 Cor. 2:14). Thus, he draws a distinction between the old man of the flesh, and the new man of the spiritual birth. In Romans, he touched upon this subject, saying, “*For they that are after the flesh (the natural man, or old man, the Adamic man) do mind the things **of the flesh**; but they that are after the Spirit (the spiritual man, the new man, or he that is born of God) things of the Spirit.*” (Romans 8:5). Here he clearly distinguishes the capacities of the two men, or the compound man: natural, or outward man and the spiritual, or inward man. He did not rest his case with merely demonstrating that there was this difference. But he continued by pointing out, “*For to be carnally minded is death; but to be spiritually minded is life and peace.*” What a difference in the effects of the two conditions! Then he reveals why this is so: “*Because the carnal mind (the mind of the natural, or outward, or old man) is enmity against God.*” The native innate attitude of the fleshly, or outward man is against God. His first response toward God in all encounters is overtly negative. It is never positive. In fact, as Paul continues to show, it cannot be otherwise: “*for it is not subject to the law of God, **neither indeed can be.***” And

thus Paul concludes with a stroke of finality: “*So then they that are in the flesh cannot please God.*” (Romans 8:6-8).

We must pause here for a moment before continuing, to make an important application. Here we find the descendents of Adam, the natural, carnal, or outward fleshly man to be actively opposed to God. We did not say he was actively opposed to religion. Indeed, he is very religious – to the point of fanaticism. He has by inbred and created nature, a “*zeal of God, but not according to knowledge.*” Again, as Paul taught: “*For they being ignorant of God’s righteousness, and going about to establish their own righteousness, have not submitted themselves unto the righteousness of God.*” (Roman 10:2,3). One can never miss this inevitable conclusion, that man is religious by nature, and can be extremely violent in his proselyting zeal. Paul is not denying that. He is establishing the fact that natural man being void of discernment in **spiritual things**, and being at enmity against God, he can never do anything that can please God. “*So then they that are in the flesh cannot please God.*” If an unregenerate man goes to a religious meeting and is persuaded to “give his heart to God,” or “accept Christ as his Savior,” or “believe in the Lord,” would one not say this would please God? Most surely will. But would Paul conclude that one with such activity, God would be pleased? No, in no wise! For “*without faith it is impossible to please God,*” and “*whatsoever is not of faith is sin.*” (We must be rather dogmatic here: faith and belief are not the same thing! The whole religious world thinks so! But that

doesn't make it so.) The truth of what Paul here teaches is that everything, whether of a religious nature or otherwise, *“cannot please God”*. The very first prerequisite to doing anything acceptable to God is *“ye must be born from above,”* or *“born of God.”* The faith of Christ is only from this source. But even then, it is not motivated, or performed, by the natural man, the old man, the carnal man, or that which is *“of the flesh.”* They that are in the flesh mind the things that are of the flesh, and have no concern for spiritual things, of which they have no capacity of discernment.

When that great and magnificent work of grace is brought to a natural man, begetting spiritual life in him, he is thus *“born of God.”* *“It is the Spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing.”* (John 6:63). By this experience commences the spiritual life and walk of a child of God. *“Now we have received, not the spirit of the world, but the Spirit which is of God; that we might know the things that are freely given to us of God.”* (1 Cor. 2:12). Hence, Paul concluded: *“But he that is spiritual judgeth (discerns) all things, yet he himself is judged (discerned) of no man.”* (1 Cor. 2:15).

As it stands now, the natural, old, or outward man cannot discern anything at all that is of a spiritual nature. The renewed man, the new, spiritual, or born again man can discern both spiritual as well as natural things. Being first, of nature, of the earth, or fleshly, he can discern that which all other unregenerate men can discern. He knows what it is to *“think as a natural man,”* feel as a natural man,

understand natural things. He has a great advantage over the natural man, in that he has added to himself a “new,” or “spiritual man.” He can discern spiritual things, comprehend the truth, and love the things of God and of righteousness, and enter into the natural things of his experience with a spiritual understanding of his corruption and native deceit. He can clearly see himself a sinner.

The unrenewed man is at a total disadvantage, but having not the Spirit, he is also totally ignorant of his condition relative to spiritual things. He cannot help but equate “religious” things as being “spiritual” things. How often do we hear of classical or religious music, art and/or musicians and painters as “being so *spiritual!*” He cannot “see the kingdom of God,” nor can “he enter it,” yet he can boast that he *knows* that he is saved and heaven bound! When he describes heaven, he describes it as he would a glorified earth! His view of God is as a mere superman, but less than a deity! He has no foreknowledge of future events; so neither does his God. He has a freewill, but not absolute power; so too, is his God. His religion, his concept of God, and of heaven is less than spiritual, for he “*cannot discern the things of the Spirit of God, neither can he know them.*”

Every spiritually born child of God reading this can comprehend what we next write: If you are among free grace believers that love the truth of God’s absolute sovereignty, you can delight with a real refreshment in a discussion on the various subjects of what the Eternal Godhead has done for sinners; and you can feel at ease

expressing your unworthiness of the least of God's goodness and grace towards you. But, try that in the middle of a congregation of nonbelievers! Try it at a family gathering! There will be all manner of discussions about church-related matters, what each and all are doing for the Lord, and of what all God "wants" you to do. But, you best keep your mouth closed! You can understand them, far better than they can understand themselves; but the moment you put your two-bits in, civility may be immediately exploded! They cannot understand **anything** of what you speak. To them, you are *insane – mad*. You are losing your mind! You have become tangled up with some mystics or cults! That is one of the great lessons Paul is teaching in the passages we have presented. "*So then they that are in the flesh cannot please God.*"

Those catering to the fleshly religion of "*the Old Man and his deeds*" are active in attempting to seduce all men, including you, to their man-made religion. They prize it because they have so much invested in it. The Apostle wrote on this matter, saying, "*These things have I written unto you concerning them that seduce you. But **the anointing which ye have received of Him abideth in you, and ye need not that any man teach you:*** (although there is no shortage of gurus wanting to!) *but as the same anointing teacheth you of all things, and is truth, and is no lie, and even as it hath taught you, ye shall abide in Him.*" (I John 2:26,27). The same Apostle wrote of those that are born of the Spirit, and thus possess the "new man:" "*Whosoever is born of God do not commit sin: for his seed* (which is

Christ) *remaineth in him: and he cannot sin, because he is born of God.*” (verse 9).

That “seed,” that Paul said was “Christ,” is the procreator of the spiritual, inward, renewed, and new man in the natural, fleshly, carnal, outward, and “old man.” It is implanted by the Word of God and of Him we read: “*Being born again, not of corruptible seed, (as is the outward, or old man) but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever.*” (I Peter 1:23). Being produced by an *incorruptible seed*, then it cannot possibly sin, and thus the new man is “*renewed in the spirit of your mind; and that ye put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness.*” (Ephesians 4:23,24). Every child of God can witness with the apostle here: “*For ye were sometimes darkness, but now are ye light in the Lord: walk as children of light.*” (Eph. 5: 8).

In conclusion, we have pointed out the dual nature of the begotten children of God. Their Old Man is produced by the natural flesh, by a corruptible seed, and their understanding is limited to their own realm of nature. Those that are begotten of God, are produced by an incorruptible seed, and these have both knowledge of that which is natural by their first birth, and that which is spiritual by their second birth. Needless, then, is it to write more on the Christian warfare, for the new man be begotten in the very soul of the old man – in the middle of the enmity against God – and the battle will ever rage until that day that “*He that is in you is greater than all,*” and shall triumph in the resurrection of the dead.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	1
Definition of Hyper-calvinism	15
The Sovereignty Of The Holy Spirit in The New Birth	26
Scriptures for Holy Spirit Regeneration	32
Circular Letter on Holy Spirit Regeneration (1803)	42
Covenant of Grace Absolute & Unconditional	62
Circular Letter on the Covenant of Grace	68
Hardshells and Hyper-calvinists not Antinomians	76
Antinomianism and Arminianism Examined	79
Hardshells and Hyper-calvinists and Infant Salvation	89
Euphemism: Hardshells and Education	91
Euphemism: Preaching the Gospel	92
Euphemism: Preaching the Gospel <i>to sinners</i>	98
Euphemism: Hardshells and Tithing and Offerings	102
Is The Soul Subject to Regeneration?	106
Capacity of Discernment of Old and New Man	123

