



**A  
CALM  
REPLY**

ELDER JAMES P. POOLE

ELDER C. C. MORRIS

**September, 1996**



This e-book has been republished electronically by Tom Adams for “A Sweet Savor” web-site. It is being distributed free of charge for the edification of those that are of like precious faith. My hope is that it will prove a blessing to you as much as it has been to me!

When I first read this several years ago, I was excited to post it to the site. Elder Poole asked me not to at that time for personal reasons but has since given me permission to add it.

Tom Adams

July 2017

[www.asweetsavor.info](http://www.asweetsavor.info)

***“Whoso boasteth himself of a false gift is like clouds and wind  
without rain (Proverbs 25:14).”***

# Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION.....	5
SECTION 1.....	7
WORDS AND EXPRESSIONS.....	7
SECTION 2.....	14
NOT SO!.....	14
SECTION 3.....	29
MOLINA.....	29
SECTION 4.....	42
ABSOLUTE PREDETERMINATION.....	42
SECTION 5.....	54
CONDITIONAL TIME SALVATION.....	54
SECTION 6.....	68
REPROBATION, SUPRALAPSARIANISM, AND “OF THE SAME LUMP”.....	68
SECTION 7.....	78
I. ANSWER OF ELDER C. C. MORRIS TO ELDER CONRAD JARRELL II’S COMMENTS.....	78
II. ANSWER TO ELDER CONRAD JARRELL II’S COMMENTS.....	82

# INTRODUCTION

“Surely the serpent will bite without enchantment; and a babbler is no better. The words of a wise man’s mouth are gracious; but the lips of a fool will swallow up himself. The beginning of the words of his mouth is foolishness: and the end of his talk is mischievous madness (Ecclesiastes 10.11-13).”

With no prior enchantments, Conrad Owen Jarrell, H launched a series of 14 lectures on November 11th, 1995. The lectures were tape recorded, each lasting from 45 minutes to an hour and a half. After their completion the notes from which the lectures were apparently taken were printed and made available to me. The title assigned to the notes was, **Absolute Predetermination versus Absolute Predstination**. It is to those notes that Elder C. C. Morris and I make A CALM REPLY. To Elder Morris I owe a debt of thanks for his valuable assistance. Elder R. N. Lackey was also gracious in providing much research.

Much of what was recorded on those 14 tapes was no better than utterances of a babbler. Some remarks were of such crude substance that even the common religions of the world would be offended by their being made public. But my purpose here is not to assail Conrad Owen Jarrell, II, to whom I shall refer hereafter as C.O.J.II. It is my purpose, and that of Elder Morris as well, to leave on record for those following, evidence that the lectures of C.O.J.II, which began as words of foolishness and swiftly degenerated into mischievous madness, were challenged and refuted. Had the lectures been only a personal attack on Elder Morris and me they could easily be passed over and forgotten. However, when that which we hold sacred is impugned, viciously trampled under foot, and maliciously ridiculed, we dare not hold our peace. Our calm reply will follow in the next seven sections.

In a letter to me dated April 29, 1996, C.O.J.II writes:

“The only important question is, ‘Can you *refute*...successfully...what I have said?’”

Does C.O.J.II mean by this that it is not important if what he published is truth or not; that all that matters is, “Can you refute...successfully...what I have said?” So it appears. The readers of these following pages must make that determination for themselves. Sadly, C.O.J.II has not even established what it was he says I cannot successfully refute. And that failure of his shall be very successfully established.

In that same letter C O.J.II also writes:

“I am not trying to be sarcastic, nor smart-alecky, James. I am trying to emphasize a very important point – you have a tendency to use words and not really know what they mean. This is a problem endemic to all Strict Predestinarians. Indeed, as I have shown, the whole heresy came into existence, and continues to thrive, on the basis of Error in the Meaning of Words. Do you seriously intend to refute a quotation from a dictionary or a lexicon?”

Thus, the kettle called the pot black. C.O.J.II also has “a tendency” when it comes to words. He uses words that do not mean what he says they mean. Moreover, he does it frequently.

From his letter of April 29, 1996, again:

“James, let me make a serious suggestion. Give careful attention to what I have written, especially in Section I and II of the booklet. Do all the cross-checking you want of dictionaries and lexicons. *Look for the differences*, not just the similarities, of the words. ‘It’s the differences that make the difference,’ as the saying

goes. I hope you will come to the conclusion that the prudent thing to do is simply let the matter rest as is. If, however, you still feel you must publicly display, then do whatever you believe most cogent. ”

The “humble” admonitions C.O.J.II so freely gives could almost make a hardened sinner weep. He hoped I would be “prudent” and slip off to the corner wearing a dunce hat. I thought, however, that I should look at some of the books C.O.J.II recommended. He suggested dictionaries so I sought out the best and oldest one I could find. Happily, C.O.J.II gave us the author of the first dictionary produced in America.

“1. The lack of Dictionaries made precise word study incredibly more difficult than most modems can even imagine. The first dictionaries resembling the modern sort were produced in England by Dr. Samuel Johnson (1755) and in America by Daniel Webster (1828).” Page 27, C.O.J.II notes.

What is this? **Daniel** Webster got up the first dictionary in America? Back in Oklahoma I had learned by about the 5th grade that **Noah** Webster was responsible for the first dictionary in America. But C.O.J.II informs us otherwise. **Daniel** Webster, says he.

Did C.O.J.II know better? Did he know that it was Noah, and not Daniel that compiled the first dictionary in America? Certainly he did; if he didn’t know better then he should never publish another sentence. But – If he did know better and could make such a mistake regarding a fundamental piece of history, *how can we trust him?* If he is that careless he is unfit to instruct us poor mortals.

The pitiful thing is, C.O.J.II has issued 47 pages of error far more serious than giving Daniel Webster credit for compiling a dictionary. His promised documentation is missing, his inaccuracy is appalling, his reasoning is askew, and his integrity is certainly open to question.

The reader will find 7 sections in this Calm Reply. In the first section I have cleared away the major word and phrase problems from the C.O.J.II notes. In the second section I refute 30 statements submitted by him that were totally erroneous. These first two sections were *preliminary* to refuting the major **assumptions** of C.O.J.II. Those *assumptions* will be found in Molinism, Section 3; Absolute Predeterminism, Section 4; Conditional Time Salvation, Section 5; Reprobation, Section 6. Section 7 by Elder C.C.Morris refutes certain errors by C.O.J.II on Romans 8.28 and the word “of.”

It is regrettable-that valuable time must be spent on what amounts to free-will tripe. Nevertheless, we feel we have done what must be done. If these pages are-of any use to the saints of God, may He be praised.

James F. Poole

# SECTION 1.

## WORDS AND EXPRESSIONS

Before refuting some (30) of the numerous statements found in the C.O.J.II notes it seems necessary to examine some few (12) of the terms, words and expressions found scattered throughout his 47 pages. Most deserve repudiation. However, my brief examination of each of them will be as fair as possible, despite an outright rejection of some of them.

### 1. ABSOLUTE PREDETERMINATION

I have no particular objection to the term, *absolute predetermination*. There is, however, much to object to as C.O.J.II variously defines it. I simply had never heard the expression *absolute predetermination* used as an identity before C.O.J.II introduced it to me recently in a phone conversation. My eyes have never come across it in 40 years of research and study, at least that I can recall. I have seen and heard the term absolute predestination used many, many times, both by friend and foe; but absolute predetermination? Never.

I have had contact in various ways with many bodies of Baptists over the years but never once have I met a person, or group of persons, that used this term to describe themselves, or others, with the exception of C.O.J.II.

Do these people, other than C.O.J.II and the Several assemblies with which he fellowships (whom he calls Absolute Predeterminists) exist today? If they do, why have we not gotten wind of them?

In publishing and editing since 1977 I have had rather extensive correspondence and paper exchanges with every variety of Primitive and Old School Baptists in America. This includes those known as Absoluters, Old Line, and Progressives, and a few that would not fit with any of those three groups. Neither are our lines of communication confined to Primitive Baptists alone; they have reached five continents without once coming into contact with any of these Absolute Predeterminists about whom C.O.J.II so freely effuses.

Where are some of the churches of this unique order?

If they exist, what are some of their publications? \

I ask not for information on some thought by C.O.J.II to be Absolute Predeterminists; let C.O.J.II give us information on those that do claim, out in the open, no holds barred, to be so identified.

### 2. STRICT PREDESTINARIANS

We Predestinarians are often referred to as Strict Predestinarians by C.O.J.II in his 47 pages of notes. Again, as applied to Predestinarians, this is a new term to me, as I have never before seen it in print nor heard it spoken except by C.O.J.II. I personally reject the term for several reasons; not the least of

which is, we are sufficiently identified now without C.O.J.II tagging us with his new nomenclature. Whatever other Predestinarians may feel about this novel title shall be regarded by me as their business.”

### **3. AMERICAN SOVEREIGN GRACE BAPTISTS**

This misleading term is found in the following quote, section V. D. 4., page 29, by C.O.J.II:

“Elder Gilbert Beebe (1800-1881) – was the most responsible American Baptist in *promulgating* the Terminological Confusion among American Sovereign Grace Baptists.” (C.O.J.II also uses a variation of this term on page 20.)

Nowhere, and at no time, did Beebe or the Old School Baptists, as a body, ever identify themselves as Sovereign Grace Baptists. Why C.O.J.II insists on branding us with new titles is somewhat puzzling, unless in this instance he would like to link us with the modern brand of Baptists that run under the banner of Sovereign Grace while denying most of what the expression means.

### **4. DOOFUS**

I am at a loss to discover what “doofus” means. C.O.J.II utilizes the word on page 16. It was not in any of our dictionaries. Accordingly, I feel compelled to reject it as well. Perhaps C.O.J.II intended to use the slang word *dufus*, as found in the Thesaurus of American Slang, Robert L. Chapman, Ph. D., Harper & Row, Publishers, Copyright 1989. If so he cannot even spell his own slang, though the meaning there seems to be what he was “fumbling” for.

### **5. SUPRALAPSARIAN**

I am not personally a Supralapsarian, especially as they are described in the C.O.J.II notes, so all he said in that regard on his pages 16, 17, and elsewhere, as it may apply to me, was just so much wasted effort. What other Predestinarians may hold respecting this term has no bearing on my views, nor am I offended if they differ with me. What I do believe in respect to supralapsarianism, reprobation, and “of the same lump” will be covered in Section 6.

### **6. AUTHOR OF SIN**

C.O.J.II has liberally applied this putrid scare phrase throughout his notes, thus sadly following the trail of the Serpent. I have never liked the phrase, no matter who used it or how. Whenever I must discuss the subject of sin and God’s relation to it, I insist on using my own terminology, not that which is contrived by the enemies of predestination who know not what we believe.

### **7. MORAL EVIL; MORAL IMPERATIVE; MORAL RESPONSIBILITY**

The word, “moral” is not a Bible word. It is not found there even once though many have sought nevertheless to interject it. C.O.J.II employs “moral evil” on page 4 to prove that Predestinarians teach

a doctrine that involves God as “the Author and Efficient Cause of Moral Evil.” Not only have we *not done so*, we do not grasp what C.O.J.II means by “Moral Evil.” It appears to me that the word evil can stand alone without the assistance of “moral.” I say the same for “moral imperative,” page 21, and “moral responsibility,” page 23.

## 8. ROW OF DOMINOES

On page 4 of the C.O.J.II notes the following is found:

- “1. **predestine** – To fix or cause to stand in order beforehand; to fix or set the end.

ILLUSTRATION: A row of dominoes, push the first one over and they all fall down in an unalterable sequence. Absolute Predestination views all the events of time – good, evil, or natural – as like such a row of dominoes, meandering about in a pattern fixed unalterably by God, and stretching away to whatever final end He is pleased to appoint.”

Thus with a few bold strokes on his keyboard C.O.J.II has determined for his audience what “Absolute Predestination views.” For several pages following C.O.J.II then proceeds to topple the row of dominoes, using, we may add, some rather crude language while doing it.

C.O.J.II may somehow think we believe the order of God’s government is little different than a row of dominoes, but I fully reject the simplistic illustration as being nothing more than a straw man. By the grace of God I hold what surely must be a more suitable view of the unfolding of the predestinated events than a row of dominoes. This again is one more example of how C.O.J.II attempts to dictate terms and words for both sides of his dispute. The dominoes are his, not mine. Fuller treatment of this absurdity will be given in my Section 4.

## 9. COW LOTS

Again on page 4 of the C.O.J.II notes we have an illustration of the government of God, this time one which C.O.J.II endorses; and we suppose he should since it appears to be original with him.

It will be seen that C.O.J.II closes both his domino and his cow lot illustrations with exactly the same language, “*meandering about in a pattern fixed unalterably by God, and stretching away to whatever final end He is pleased to appoint.*” The obvious question then, is what is the difference if in both cases we have an unalterably fixed pattern by God?

- “2. **predetermine** – To set bounds or limits to beforehand; to put or set an end to.

ILLUSTRATION: A cow in a fenced lot, which may wander about *within* the lot as it pleases, but is unable to cross the boundary of the fence except thru a gate. Absolute Predetermination views all the events of time – good, evil, or natural – as like a row of such cow lots, joined one to another on a common side with gates therein, meandering about in a pattern fixed unalterably by God, and stretching away to whatever final end He is pleased to appoint.”

This crude illustration deserves much more response than we shall give it at this time. Why cow lots? Why not sheep lots or goat lots? It would certainly be more in harmony with scriptural language. Is there something about cows or cow lots that can better illustrate the movement, motion and final end of God’s creatures than the objects used in the Bible?

I ask: How did the cows get in the lots C.O.J.II conceived? Did they simply drift in or were they born there? If they were born there, were they born sinful cows or innocent little calves? How long have they been there? Where did the cow come from in the first place if not born there? Are all the cows elect or are some non-elect? Are all the cows of the same disposition, or do some of them act different under the same circumstances? What happens to the cow or cows that “decide” not to wander about at all but simply stand still? Can they be moved by the lot Superintendent without destroying their free-will? Can they be “milked” without violating their freedom? Can a cattle prod be used to stir them to activity? Is there a possibility of a stampede? If any come down with hoof and mouth disease would that be the same as losing the joy of Conditional Time Salvation? Do the row of lots have fixed boundaries at all times or does the Lot Superintendent sometimes move the fences “on the spur of the moment?” Are the gates open or shut? Do the cows have power or brains to open the gates if they are shut? If the gates are open, why have them at all?

Countless other questions come to mind while pondering this unique effort at illustrating, but we shall let them pass for now. There is one, however, worthy of serious investigation. Follow carefully the quote we give from page 4. C. 4. wherein C.O.J.II turns a very sharp corner without giving a signal:

“4. Note the **Difference**.

- a) The evil events within The Row of Dominoes occur exactly when and how God has unalterably fixed and there is no slightest possibility of any deviation. Thus, it is *inescapable* that God is thereby the Author and Efficient Cause of Moral Evil.”

Observe carefully the sharp turn: “The evil events...” C.O.J.II has now turned from the whole concept of “good, evil, or natural” he initiated and zeroes in on **EVIL**. From this point on he no longer discusses the so-called differences between predetermine and predestine. May we suppose then the cows in his imagined meandering cow pens are evil only? Are we informed by C.O.J.II of the “good or natural events” transpiring within the confines of his cow lots? **No we are not!** Can it be that he has not thought this illustration out as sufficiently as he might have us think? This cow lot business appears a lot more like a *cunningly devised fable* than a Bible illustration. “Do they not err that devise evil? but mercy and truth shall be to them that devise good (Proverbs 14.22).”

## **10. SPUR OF THE MOMENT ADDITIONS TO GOD’S ETERNAL PLAN THAT WERE NEVER ETERNALLY PLANNED**

Lest the reader may question this item, we give it exactly as it is found, italics included, in the C.O.J.II notes:

“Spur of the moment additions to God’s Eternal Plan *that were never eternally planned!*” Page 8.

Only one question need to be asked concerning this startling statement: If God **adds** to His **eternal plan on the spur of the moment**, can the plan then **still be eternal**? C.O.J.II then cites Isaiah 48.3-8 as his only proof text. Whatever that scripture may or may not mean to the reader, it does not, and cannot support the notion that God’s **eternal plan** can be supplemented from time to time as different situations arise. If Satan could grin, this business of amending the eternal plan should make him “bust loose” in laughter.

On page 9 of the C.O.J.II notes he gives a completely erroneous rendering of Isaiah 48.3-8 as follows:

“God tells the Strict Predestinarian Absoluters that there are some things He brings to pass, from time to time, *on the spur of the moment and not from the beginning!* He says this is done to refute their claim that they know *all things* happen according to inevitable, eternal predestination.”

Wrong! What God said was, “...lest thou shouldest say, Behold, I knew them.” That is a huge difference.

## 11. THREE PHASES OF SALVATION

This expression can be found on page 20 of the C.O.J.II notes under B. 2. The text used by C.O.J.II to develop this argument is II Corinthians 1.9,10. On page 21, (4) C.O.J.II defines his matter thusly:

“These three deliverances, or salvations, are actually three phases (i.e., ‘distinct stages of development’) of the salvation that Christ wrought for His elect on the Cross. ..”

I do not deny for a moment that there are three deliverances or salvations contained in the text from H Corinthians. They are, as C.O.J.II later points out, past, present, and future. In fact, I have never known of an Absolute Predestinarian that at any time disputed the tenses of this deliverance or salvation. But, if the *second* deliverance, (present tense) or salvation is *conditional* as C.O.J.II affirms, then they are not three *phases* of one salvation; they are *two distinct* deliverances or salvations: one having a past tense and a future tense, and all of grace. The other, a present tense deliverance or salvation, cannot be a phase with the other two at all; it is of a different nature. It is not all of grace; it is part grace and part works; part the obedience of Christ and part the obedience of a free willer, that according to the interpretation of C.O.J.II. According to C.O.J.II’s view, it was not finished on the cross; it is finished when the sinner *wills to obey*. The past tense and the future tense deliverance or salvation has one Saviour, and He saves by grace. The present tense deliverance or salvation of C.O.J.II must have two saviours; one, the Lord from heaven, and the other the decided-to-be-obedient free willer. This is nothing more than an attempt to create a conglomeration of free grace with a dose of free will creature effort thrown in. This is NOT three phases! It is two distinct operations, made so by one being of a totally different substance: conditionalism.

More will be said on this at the appropriate place.

## 12. EXACT SYNONYMS; PARTIAL SYNONYMS

C.O.J.II says on page 3, II. WORD DEFINITIONS that this is “Where the action is!” I agree! If one follows the “meandering”(page 4) path C.O.J.II takes in his notes it becomes clear that his unique “Exact Synonyms; Partial Synonyms” contrivance is the cornerstone of all he attempts to prove. Observe again on page 3, II. A.:

“A. Two important points to remember –

1. Absolute Predetermination and Absolute Predestination are *alike* in that both believe **that** the absolute government of God controls all events and creatures, good or evil. The two doctrines *differ* greatly, however, when explaining how God so governs.
2. **The Key words**, ‘determine’ and ‘destinate,’ together with their related forms, are very similar in meaning. In virtually every English dictionary, the two are used to define each other. *However, the two words are not exact synonyms, and it is in the difference between the definitions that the truth is found.*”

Had C.O.J.II stopped after the word alike under item 1 above, or had he stopped after finishing the entire sentence, there would be no problem. It is his attempt in the second sentence to explain that absolute predetermination and absolute predestination *differ*, and **how**, that he must invent his “exact and partial synonym” scheme.

I cannot say if C.O.J.II has consulted a dictionary that uses the words exact and partial in defining a synonym or not. It would still make no difference if he has found such; the problem he has created for himself remains.

C.O.J.II has provided us ample proof that he puts a lot of stock in dictionary meanings for words he uses. I am reasonably sure that if I used a newly minted word, such as “doofus,” he would call my hand. But we do not want to make C.O.J.II an offender for a word; we merely call his attention to considerable confusion regarding his “exact synonym-partial synonym” business.

To avoid seeming partiality to any one source for the meaning of this key word, SYNONYM, I have consulted three dictionaries (none of them Daniel’s). I give two of them here:

1. A word whose meaning is identical or almost identical to that of another word in the same language. Webster’s 3rd Office Edition

According to this definition, synonymous words are identical or almost identical. Thus they can be used interchangeably.

1. One of two or more words or expressions of the same language that have the same or nearly the same essential meaning in some or all senses. Webster’s 7th Collegiate Edition (Webster’s 2nd Collegiate Edition differs only in the arrangement of the sentence.)

According to this definition synonymous words have the same or nearly the same essential meanings. Thus they can be used interchangeably.

It should be clear to anyone having at least a fifth grade education that if words are identical or nearly identical they may be used as synonyms without doing any violence to language. The same holds true for words being the same or nearly the same. It is a violation of no known rule of our language to use them as synonyms. Yet C.O.J.II says it creates a great difference between the doctrines of absolute predetermination and absolute predestination if they are used as synonyms, no matter if, according to C.O.J.II, the words determine and destinate are alike; and, “In virtually every English dictionary, the two are used to define each other. (page 3. II. A. 2.)”

We are tempted to dismiss the whole controversy by asking, what difference does it make which words, absolute predestination or absolute predetermination, we use if they are synonyms? Words either are, or are not, synonyms, and C.O.J.II has already confessed the words *determine* and *destinate* are recognized almost universally as exchangeable or interchangeable words since they are synonymous. Is not the end result the same whichever word we use? Will matters fall out differently if we use the word predestination rather than predetermine?

As for the lack of *exactness* in the two words C.O.J.II emphasizes, I would point out the words would not really be synonyms if they were exact in every respect. The list of exact synonyms would be relatively short if someone desired to sit down and compile such a list.

Let it be noted that C.O.J.II has admitted that practically all the old Bible scholars have used the words under consideration as if they were synonymous and ***he has not a single writer, author or minister of the gospel that has employed his distinctions. NOT A SINGLE ONE!*** We do not wonder why.

C.O.J.II boasts the following:

“FACT. As we shall see, the history of the 15 and 1600s is replete with ‘sermons, tracts, letters, and accounts’ of the doctrine of Absolute Predetermination; not the least of which are the Presbyterian Westminster Confession (1646) and the Baptist confessions of Midland (1655) and the various London Confessions of 1640 to 1689. The ignorance of the Strict Predestinarians on this point is pitiful.” Page 20.

Well, *we did not see* what C.O.J.II said we shall see. Yes, he did quote frequently from these documents but not once did a single quote come anywhere near supporting this wild boast. In every instance the *best* C.O.J.II could do was say that the authors *meant what they did not say*. The *worst* he could do, and did, was offer a few suppositions mingled with speculation and an ample dose of distortion.

Let the reader examine carefully all documents or quotations put forth by C.O.J.II. Where can one identify a single statement that will establish what C.O.J.II calls FACT? We cannot see what he said, “we shall see,” for it is not there to be seen. “TEKEL; Thou art weighed in the balances, and found wanting (Daniel 5.27).”

## SECTION 2.

### NOT SO!

In this section, which I have named NOT SO!, I shall examine only a few (30) of the many statements of C.O.J.II found in his 47 pages of notes that warrant comment. To examine all his wild statements would only be a duplication of effort since he trudges back and forth over the same ground continually. It is truly astounding that C.O.J.II could publish so much in so little space that is completely erroneous. He is either often mistaken or often dishonest or possibly both. We leave it for others to make that determination. Since C.O.J.II only mentions two living Predestinarians by name, Elder C. C. Morris at least 10 times and Elder Jim Poole at least 23 times, I shall take the liberty of assuming, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, that C.O.J.II generally has Elder Morris and me in mind when he refers to Absolute or Strict Predestinarians.

1. “Some Absolute Predestinarians will answer, ‘We do not believe that God is the Author of Moral Evil,’ and then attempt to avoid the conclusion of their damnable heresy by claiming, ‘It is a mystery.’ **This is the ultimate error upon which Absolute Predestination rests** – an Error in Correct Reasoning, predestinated-unpredestinated evil. This is no mystery at all, merely a butt-dumb contradiction in terms. A few Absoluters, rather than give up their foolish doctrine in the face of this unanswerable rebuttal, actually argue that God is the Author of Evil as well as Good. According to Scripture, this is Blasphemy, as I will prove later.” Page 5, 4. a), C.O.J.II notes.

Who are these “Some Absolute Predestinarians” of which C.O.J.II writes? Elder Morris and I are certainly not among them, as we have never said or written anything such as C.O.J.II claims. Nor have we ever said, relating to the subject, “It is a mystery.” If C.O.J.II wants to quote those he so despises, those he calls “butt-dumb” and heretics, let him be clear as to whom he refers. We reject this generality as nothing more than a poorly aimed scatter-shot.

2. “c) CONCLUSION: These Scriptures showing **how** God governs – by bounding and limiting and restraining the options for evil acts to just those which will accomplish His purpose and none others – drives the last nail into the coffin of the Strict Predestinarians’ theory of a chain of inevitably predestinated events. As pointed out above, the only ways to avoid this conclusion are 1) Ignore word definitions, 2) Ignore grammar, and 3) Ignore parallel passages – *and that is exactly how the Strict Predestinarians do it.*” Page 8, C.O.J.II notes.

As I have before pointed out in Section 1, C.O.J.II has, with some few exceptions, reduced his futile objective to an argument centered only on evil events or acts. Is this a sample of the correct reasoning he demands of others? I regard the doctrine, not theory as described by C.O.J.II, of predestinated events as being a most sacred and God-honoring truth. It is the manner described in the Bible by which God is pleased to conform His children to the image of Christ, and it surely involves more than evil acts. If C.O.J.II wishes to hammer away at this “coffin” with his last nail then let him hammer away. He will toil in vain.

3. “(2) Another claim the Strict Predestinarians frequently make is that it is things that are predestinated in this passage, not people. They must claim this in order to get the ‘all things’ predestinated. Here is an example of how they squeeze the text:  
“Not ‘what’ but ‘whom’” cannot stand the test. It... does not harmonize with the Scriptures. Romans 8.29, the text used to contrive this view, is so constructed to assign the ‘whom’ to those God did foreknow, and then, he also did predestinate, followed as the method of God to conform the

foreknown. Bradley, nor any other expositor, can successfully deny that predestination regards the “what” of the text and foreknow regards the “whom”. (Elder Jim Poole; The Remnant, May-June 95, p18)”

- (a) Again, watch closely while I do what Elder Jim Poole imagines cannot be done.
- (b) First, look at the first thought paragraph in the text. Read it carefully, noting the double-underlined pronouns “them” and “whom”. Note that all of the main verbs of the clauses have only those pronouns as their direct objects.
- (c) Second, notice precisely vs. 29-30: For **whom** he did foreknow, he also did predestinate...30 Moreover **whom** he did predestinate, **them** he also called...”

Please observe what Elder Jim Poole apparently cannot see with his two looking eyes – the passage says plainly that *whom* was predestinated, not *what*. This is a pitiful Error in Correct Reasoning. The man apparently cannot read fifth grade sentences and understand them!” Page 11, C.O.J.II notes.

It is of little consequence to me that C.O.J.II left out five whole lines of copy between the word “It...” in my first sentence and the word “does.” I doubt he even blushed. Under (a) C.O.J.II sets out to do what he said I imagined cannot be done. Notice that I did not say that it could not be done. ,I said it could not be *successfully denied*. And, I may add, I did not *imagine* it either.

If C.O.J.II had not been in such seeming haste to pronounce me blind he might have noticed that never have I denied that the foreknown, or “whom” Was predestinated. What I have said is that there was also a “what” that God *did* for the “whom.” Observe: “...he also **did** predestinate.” With my two looking eyes I have discovered a word C.O.J.II apparently considers insignificant. God *did* something! I have stated in clear terms “what” God *did*; He *did predestinate* the foreknown to be conformed to the image of His Son. That is “what” the text says He *did*! **“What” He did was predestinate!** I cannot believe that it should require much more than a fifth grade education to see in Roman 8.29 that God *did* something, and “what” it was He did. The word *did* requires no vast learning to comprehend. It does require, however, an act of grace to discern “what” God did.

4. “(1) The question is, ‘How shall God ‘cause’ them to walk?’

- (a) The Strict Predestinarian answers, ‘By an *efficient* cause, he makes them do it.’ But, this leads inescapably to God being the efficient cause of any evil act so performed.” Page 13, C.O.J.II notes.

The question C.O.J.II asks relates to the text as follows: “And I will put my spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes, and ye shall keep my judgments, and do them (Ezekiel 36.27).” C.O.J.II then presumes to answer for his fancied Strict Predestinarians that God causes His children to walk by an *efficient* cause. If I may so say, I cannot conceive that God would cause us to walk by an *inefficient* cause. But that is exactly what C.O.J.II proposes for us in his prop for predeterminism.

- “(b) The Absolute Predeterminist answers, ‘Use the rule of Bible Study that says to ‘compare spiritual things with spiritual,’ and compare Eze 11:19-20. It is evident to everyone, except a Strict Predestinarian blinded by the Devil (2 Co 4:4), that God puts His spirit in us as Creator and *endows* us with the ability to walk. Thus, He is the *enabling* cause of our actions. Any sin following from misuse of our ability is totally our own, and God remains holy.” Page 13, C.O.J.II notes.

Put in clear terms, C.O.J.II says God renders us capable of action but that we may or may not act, and if we do, we may or may not act sinfully. But – that is not what the text said. It said God would *cause us to walk in my statutes*. “My Statutes.” There is nothing here, nothing at all, about misuse of a supposed enabling ability. This is a sweet promise; a pronouncement from God that the putting His Spirit in us

would cause us to keep His statutes. C.O.J.II may want to write *enabling cause* into this verse and then suggest that we may misuse his imagined *endowed ability*, but he cannot deceive the very elect.

I do not, and have not, used the expression, “By an efficient cause, he makes them do it.” C.O.J.II may speak for those he supposes are Strict Predestinarians, but this Absolute Predestinarian has no particular need for the expression, *efficient cause* since all God’s causes are efficient. As for *enabling cause*, C.O.J.II will be hard pressed to fit it into the Scriptures.

5. “(1) The Strict Predestinarian argues vehemently that this text proves that God works our willing and doing in us, and therefore everything that we can possibly do is absolutely predestinated. He insists on the gerund use of the infinitive, ‘willing’ and ‘doing’; that is, the verb actions themselves, and not merely the ability to perform the actions.” Page 13, C.O.J.II notes.

I have neither argued vehemently, nor have I insisted on anything C.O.J.II affirms here. This text, Philippians 2.12,13, is a blessed comfort to me that God’s good pleasure is accomplished in the saints by His working in us both to will and to do of the same. As proof of this we need look no further than the portion of this text C.O.J.II never mentions: “Wherefore, my beloved, *as ye have always obeyed...*” Surely, *as ye have always obeyed* means something more than an enabling possibility of the performance of actions.

6. “(ii) He must ignore the syntax of Phi 2:12-13, and focus exclusively on the infinitives ‘to will’ and ‘to do’”. Page 14, C.O.J.II notes.

Not so! In fact, if “both to will and to do” were completely removed from the text the meaning would remain essentially the same. Observe: “For it is God which worketh in you of his good pleasure.” 1. Who? It is God. 2. What? He works. 3. Where? In you. 4. Why? It is His good pleasure. “To will and to do” certainly supplement the syntax, but sufficient is given without “both to will and to do” to instruct the living saints that God reigns in their lives. Nevertheless, the text stands beautifully and forcefully as written. I sternly deny the odious charge that the syntax has been ignored or that exclusive focus is placed on the infinitives.

7. “(b) Isa 26:12 is the prime verse in the OT appealed to by Strict Predestinarians arguing the absolute predestination of all our actions. There is a parallel passage in Psalms that explains this verse completely.” Page 14, C.O.J.II notes.

Never once have I ever *appealed* to this passage to argue absolute predestination, but it would certainly be acceptable if I had, since it surely enforces the predestinarian doctrine.

C.O.J.II champions the use of primary meanings, but in his usage here of *appealed* he has employed, not – the primary or secondary meaning, but the third meaning. I mention this simply to show that even the “would be” wise and learned of this world fall short of the standards they demand of others.

Although many other predestinarians have done so, I have never used this text, Isaiah 26.12, to argue the absolute predestination of all our actions.

8. “(b) The question to be answered is, “How has God ‘wrought all our works in us?’” The Strict Predestinarian answers, ‘God is the *efficient* cause of all our actions.’ But, this would make God the efficient cause of our evil actions, and thus logically the Author of Sin. The quibble of most Strict Predestinarians, that they don’t believe that, doesn’t change the logic of their stupid and damnable doctrine one iota.” Page 15, C.O.J.II notes.

This is truly amazing! C.O.J.II asks all the questions; C.O.J.II gives all the answers! His problem is – he gives the wrong answers and all too often to the wrong questions. Again, I repeat, *efficient cause* is not used by me, nor any other Predestinarians that I know of.

To answer the question, “How has God ‘wrought all our works in us?’” the following text will show: “And he shall be like a tree planted by the rivers of water, that bringeth forth his fruit in his season; his leaf also shall not wither; and whatsoever he doeth shall prosper (Psalm 1.3).” The child of God is likened unto a tree. God is the husbandman who has planted the tree. The tree bringeth forth his fruit. The fruit is contained in the tree long before it is brought forth. It brings forth after its kind. What kind of a tree is it? Since God planted it, then we can safely assume it is a good tree and shall bring forth good fruit or *works*. That is how God has wrought all our works in us. And it is all of grace.

C.O.J.II has not shown us that he has any knowledge of works beyond sinful ones. That clearly is his whole argument. The texts under consideration are a most blessed pronouncement of how God has fashioned us to bring forth acceptable works. Yet all C.O.J.II looks for is another by-path of the Serpent wherein to charge Predestinarians with making God the Author of Sin.

9. “C. God makes people do whatever He wants by turning their hearts as He pleases.  
Pro 21:1 The **king’s heart** is in the hand of the LORD, as the rivers of water: he turneth it whithersoever he will.
  - a) The argument here involves again the idea that God is the *efficient* cause of our actions, because He turns our hearts as He pleases to induce us to perform. Once more, this leads unavoidably to God being the Author of Sin.”
  - “b) As before, in so many similar passages, the question to be answered is, “**How** does God turn our hearts?’ The verse answers the question, ‘as the rivers of water.’ The following passages make God’s method abundantly clear:” [Job 26.10, and Job 38.8 were quoted. JFP] Page 15, C.O.J.II notes.

C.O.J.II may construe our views to say “God *makes* people do.” I have never believed or said God *makes people do*. C.O.J.II may also, without the slightest evidence, decipher our views to say “God *wants*.” I deny this also. I do not understand the Bible to teach that God *wants*. Again, C.O.J.II *thinks* he knows what Absolute Predestinarians believe, but again he has forced us to say, NOT SO!

Under a), C.O.J.II involves the *idea* that God is the efficient cause of our actions. This is his idea, not mine.

I shall resist the urge to address the many weak arguments C.O.J.II has offered on this text, and only mention that in his haste to once again grease the Old Paths with that oft-used saliva of the Serpent, “God is the author of Sin,” he has completely overlooked the closing expression in Proverbs 21.1, “He turneth it whithersoever He will.” Whatever C.O.J.II may say about his bounds and limits, it still stands that the turning emanates from the will of God.

10. “D. God makes people sin by hardening their hearts.  
Exo 4:21 And the LORD said unto Moses, When thou goest to return into Egypt, see that thou do all those wonders before Pharaoh, which I have put in thine hand: **but I will harden his heart, that he shall not let the people go.** (similarly, about 19 other verses, COJ)
  - a) This verse is usually offered with the explanation that God *efficiently* hardens peoples’ hearts, which has the inevitable result of making them do some action. Once more, if an evil action results, that logically makes God the Author of Sin.” Page 16, C.O.J.II notes.

Once again, I say, NOT SO! I do not believe or say, “God makes people sin” either by hardening their hearts or by other means.

C.O.J.II either has not thought about anything regarding predestination other than sin, or he conveniently avoids the same. God, by inspiring Paul to write, has given us a much more lofty answer to why He hardened Pharaoh's heart than "logically making God the Author of Sin." "For the scripture saith unto Pharaoh, Even for this same purpose have I raised thee up, that I might shew my power in thee, and that my name might be declared throughout all the earth. Therefore hath he mercy on whom he will have mercy, and whom he will he hardeneth (Romans 9.17,18)." Why did God raise up Pharaoh? Why did God harden Pharaoh? Answer: that He might show His power! Is that sin? Again, why did God raise up and harden Pharaoh? Answer: that His good, holy, pure and blessed Name might be declared throughout all the earth! Is that sin? Heaven forbid!

C.O.J.II greatly reminds me of a poor soul suffering from dementia and shuffling through a beautiful flower garden resplendent with displays of magnificence. And what intrigues this poor soul while in the garden? Does he joyfully bathe his mind with wonderous views of God's handiwork? Never! Never! Instead, he, with sinister anticipation, looks not at the splendid flowers, but under every rock or clod to see if he can find a snake or possibly the dung that fertilizes the garden. I do not envy his disposition.

11. "E. God elects some people to sin and damnation – **The Doctrine of Reprobation.**" Page 16, C.O.J.II notes.

This is the next of C.O.J.II's IV. ARGUMENTS & TEXTS USED BY STRICT PREDESTINARIANS beginning on page 9. It is certainly difficult to believe that C.O.J.II actually thinks there are those beings in the religious world that preach about a God that elects people to sin. I certainly do not, and I know of no one else, of any persuasion, that does either. Possibly, C.O.J.II has a completely different definition of election than the one we Predestinarians find in the Bible. Peter gives as good a definition of election as can be found in the following: "Peter, an apostle of Jesus Christ, to the strangers scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia, Elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ: Grace unto you, and peace, be multiplied (I Peter 1.1,2)." This is the election of the Bible and there in not a trace of sin or damnation found therein. Once more, C.O.J.II, it is just NOT SO!

The Lord willing, we shall give a fuller treatment to the sub-headings under E. in the appropriate place.

12. "F. God creates evil.

Isa 45:7 I form the light, and create darkness: **I make peace, and create evil:** I the LORD do all these things.

Lam 3:38 Out of the mouth of the most High **proceedeth not evil and good?**

1. These two are the most used verses in an attempt to prove God creates evil. Again, most Strict Predestinarians will deny believing God directly creates moral evil, but some of them will use these texts unashamedly to insist that God creates all kind of evil, including moral evil. The misinterpretation here involves an Error in correct Reasoning (failure to follow the Bible Study rule of parallel passages) together with Errors in Word Definition. The following passage clears up any question about any passage that seems to teach that God creates moral evil:" [C.O.J.II here quotes James 1:13-16] Page 18, C.O.J.II notes.

The use of Lamentation 3.38 with Isaiah 45.7 to prove the point at which C.O.J.II aims is, at best, deceiving. The *creation* of evil attributed to God in Isaiah and the evil that *proceeds out of His mouth* according to Jeremiah the prophet are certainly two distinctly different things. The mangling them together by C.O.J.II reminds me of a sign over a blacksmith shop I once heard of. It read, "All sorts of twisting and turning done here."

If I were to attempt to prove that God created evil, I could think of no better text than Isaiah 45.7, where it is said He did just that.

Without becoming involved in a lengthy attempt to fully discover what the word, evil, means in some, or every case, I will say that as it is found in Isaiah 45.7, it does not mean that God brings sin into existence by a creative act as he brought the world into existence by a creative act. On the other hand, I cannot believe that the *evil* here spoken of can be identified as holy or pure. The purpose and end for which it was brought into existence is certainly holy and pure, but not the bringing about of the evil itself. Neither could it exist had God willed otherwise.

13. “a) Elder Beebe gained fame, as one of the prime movers in the opposition to the then new invention of mission systems coupled with freewill doctrine, in the early 1800s. He is credited with drafting the essentials of the Black Rock Address, which was delivered in 1832, and resulted in the separation of the ages-old sovereign grace Baptists from the ‘freewill’ faction, whose rise dates back to the early 1600s, among some Baptist congregations in and around London.  
b) But, alas, like many old men whose star is fading, he sought to champion a cause in his senility, in order to save a reputation earned in his virility. In so doing, he became the self-appointed apostle of Absolute Predestination.” Page 20, C.O.J.II notes.

We have no desire to heap ridicule upon the head of C.O.J.II but this is just another example of his exceeding ignorance of history; for if not ignorance, it must be deliberate falsification. What are the facts?

First; Beebe was a *young man* of only 31 years of age when the Black Rock Address was drafted. He was born in 1801. Beebe certainly was not an “old man whose star is fading” but rather was a young man whose star was rising. Second; anyone that has read the numerous writings of Elder Samuel Trott will at once recognize his unique style throughout the Black Rock Address. Elder Beebe was only one of seven members of the committee appointed to draft the resolutions, the others being, Elder Samuel Trott, Elder John Healy, Elder Thomas Poteet, Elder Thomas Barton, Elder William Gilmore, and Elder Gabriel Conklin. C.O.J.II has not informed us who it is that has “credited” Elder Beebe with drafting the Black Rock address, and we doubt that he can find the guilty party. Who would want to be caught promoting such historical ignorance?

How could Beebe champion absolute predestination “in his senility,” as C.O.J.II flagrantly charges? As mentioned above, he was only 31 years of age in 1832. It will not do to say that Beebe began his championship endeavor for predestination in later years, for the predestination of all things was a major tenant of his faith at the time of the Black Rock Convention. I offer the following lines in support of this fact:

“We beg leave to recommend to the patronage of our brethren a paper published by our brother, Gilbert Beebe, entitled “The Signs of the Times.”

As some have misunderstood certain expressions in the latter part of his prospectus relative to the popular institutions of the day, we would say that the views of the editor are such as are expressed in the address published by us.” (From the closing resolutions, Black Rock Address; Page 38, Feast of Fat Things.)

Contained in that original issuance of his prospectus, Beebe affirmed the following in item 2: *The Absolute Predestination of all things*.

Elder Beebe continued to issue his prospectus annually for the next 49 years, and each year it contained item 2 relative to predestination. The many thousands of Old School Baptists subscribing to Beebe's paper knew exactly where Beebe had stood on absolute predestination in 1832 and where he continued to stand until his death in 1881. **The Baptists endorsed Beebe in 1832 and still endorsed him in 1881.** If Beebe was a senile old man in 1832 then surely we must say that the whole committee at Black Rock was also senile as were all others in attendance, for they fully accepted his prospectus containing an affirmation of absolute predestination.

C.O.J.II has again shown an awful lack of historical integrity in his statements concerning Beebe and the Black Rock Address. The records of history do not support his scurrility towards Beebe. Once more, it must be protested, **Not So!**

14. "...In fact, many of the Strict Predestinarian interpretations we have refuted above derive originally from Eld. Beebe's writings, in almost the same words as given herein..." Page 20, C.O.J.II notes.

From this statement I can safely conclude that C.O.J.II has read very little of Beebe. ***Let him supply the world with the writings of Beebe containing those interpretations he claims to have refuted.*** Beyond his heaping wrath on Beebe for using the words, predetermination and predestination interchangeably (pages 29, 30; C.O.J.II notes) in his article found in Hassell's History, C.O.J.II shows no evidence that he has even a slight knowledge of what Elder Beebe wrote.

15. "a) The Strict Predestinarian Problem. If passages can be shown that clearly distinguish between Eternal Salvation and Time Salvation (as the above passages obviously do), the Strict Predestinarian is exposed as an heretic for denying the distinction. The problem is an Error in Correct Reasoning, resulting from failure to follow the Biblical Rule of Bible Study that instructs us to 'compare spiritual things with spiritual,' i.e., compare parallel passages." Page 21, C.O.J.II notes.

While I do not use the expression "time salvation" I *do not deny* that there is salvation in time, as distinct from what is called "eternal salvation." In fact, I have never met an Absolute Predestinarian that did not believe in salvation in time. We simply do not believe in *conditional* salvation in time. Once again in his red-hot zeal to label us as heretics, C.O.J.II has not taken the time to discover what we believe. The subject of "Conditional Time Salvation" will be covered in Section 5 of this refutation. Again C.O.J.II , Not So!

16. "5. SUMMARY – As can be plainly seen from the above, a Strict Predestinarian Absoluter (Bañez) is having his onion peeled by an Absolute Predeterminist (Molina)...way back in the 1500s...in Europe. What was that Elder Poole said (p.19), and some of our excluded unrepentant sinners believe so joyously? "*Only* in the United States...*Nowhere* in history." Oh, my! Golly gee! Stepped in it, up to their knees!" Page 26, C.O.J.II notes.

Of all the ludicrous statements in the notes of C.O.J.II this one has to rank among the worst. Let it be noted that while Bañez held a form of predestinarian views, by no consideration could he be classified as an Absolute Predestinarian as we know them today. Bañez was, after all, first and foremost, a Roman Catholic and was a champion of Thomism as laid out in the *Suma Theologica* of Thomas Aquinas years earlier. As for having his "onion peeled" by an Absolute Predeterminist (Molina) we shall see that, first, Molina was not a Predeterminist, and second, the opposite was really true; Bañez did the "peeling." This will be covered fully in my Section 3 on Molinism. C.O.J.II has once again either shown a woeful ignorance of history, poorly did his research, or willfully distorted the record, or all three.

As for "What was that Elder Poole said (p.19)," C.O.J.II could raise the Witch of Endor, make her prophesy against my remarks, and return her to the grave sooner than he could link them to his Catholic

friends of the 1500s. This too shall be covered fully in my Section 3 on Molina and elsewhere. NOT SO, C.O.J.II!

17. “3. **Jerome Zanchius** (1516-1590) – most responsible Reformer for *instigating* the Confusion of word meanings among European Protestants and Baptists. In 1562, in partial defense of his teaching position at Strasburgh University, he published a short paper on **Absolute Predestination**, which was to become one of the great classics of Reformation Literature. Despite some erroneous points of doctrine resulting from his muddled use of terms, it remains one of the best brief works on the subject of God’s government ever written. Though he never referred in his paper to Molina or Bañez, who were his contemporaries, it is obvious from his arguments that he can fairly be called a molinist, or Absolute Predeterminist. All quotes are taken from Jerome Zanchius’ **Absolute Predestination**; Delaware, The National Foundation for Christian Education, 1970.” Page 27, C.O.J.II notes.

One would think that if Zanchius wanted to be known as an Absolute Predeterminist he would have so stated clearly, but he did not. If Zanchius was comfortable with the term, Absolute Predestination, as have been all others until C.O.J.II introduced his unique Absolute Predeterminism, then why is C.O.J.II so insistent on informing us what Zanchius was and was not when Zanchius has already told us what he was and was not?

But notice: Zanchius wrote his book on predestination in 1562, yet C.O.J.II says he was a molinist. However, Molina did not put his *Concordia*, the massive volume containing his “personally begotten” *scientia media*, into the hands of a printer until 1588, and it was not released to the public until 1589. How then could Zanchius be a molinist in 1562 since it would not be until 26 years later that Molina introduced his views, which he admitted were *unique to himself*? Furthermore, C.O.J.II claims the following on page 24 of his notes:

“*Luiz de Molina* (1535-1600), a Jesuit priest, and the first concise Absolute Predeterminist of the modern sort. His doctrine became known as *molinism*, and is followed by most Jesuits.” Page 24, C.O.J.II notes.

How can Molina be the first to advocate a doctrine which came to be known as molinism if Zanchius can “fairly be called a molinist” from what he wrote 26 years earlier? Either all or some of the conclusions of C.O.J.II cannot be correct. If C.O.J.II can be this far off on recorded history, how then can we trust him to instruct us on the immensely more important matters relating to salvation?

Is this a sample of the correct reasoning C.O.J.II would have us emulate?

18. “5. Bottom line: The Reformers (and following their example, the Puritans and English Baptists) incorrectly used the words ‘predestine’ and ‘predetermine’ as *exact* synonyms, but generally applied to both the correct definition of “predetermine.’ The Strict Predestinarians also used the two words as *exact* synonyms, but generally applied the correct definition of ‘predestine’ to both. Thus, the Reformers, etc. had the correct Bible doctrine of Absolute Predetermination, but used muddled terminology to express it. ‘ The Absolute Predestinarians (or, Strict Predestinarians) had, then and now, an heretical doctrine of fatalism, *not* significantly different from religious pagans, and used *the same* muddled terminology of the Reformers to express it. Put another way, the Reformers, Puritans, English Baptists, early and modern Absoluters, (Strict Predestinarians) all *shared* a common but muddled and erroneous terminology; which masked an underlying *contradiction* in doctrine. What happened in the Absoluter-Conditional battles of the late 1800s and early 1900s was the *adaptation* of new terminology by the Conditionalists, to accurately express the Biblical doctrine of Absolute Predetermination; and the *maintenance* by the Absoluters of the old and muddled terminology and their fatalistic heresy, masked thereby.” Page 30, C.O.J.II notes.

In one paragraph C.O.J.II has charged everyone on earth since the time of the reformation with incorrect word usage and muddled and erroneous terminology except for himself. Whom has he left out? We confess we know not who! Moreover, has he given us *one single example* of whom he believes, other than himself, and possibly his beloved Molina, Who has extricated himself from this muddling? No, he surely has not. From what he has told us, C.O.J.II stands like a sentinel alone, defending his unique “Absolute Predetermination.” Surely the words of Job to his miserable comforters suit this situation. “And Job answered and said, No doubt but ye are the people, and wisdom shall die with you (Job 12.2,3).”

We are informed by C.O.J.II that Absolute Predestinarians have “an heretical doctrine of fatalism, not significantly different from religious pagans...” Sad and pitiful as this statement is, C.O.J.II has also gored himself with the other horn of the dilemma on which he would impale us.

“1. Absolute Predetermination and Absolute Predestination are *alike* in that both believe **that** the absolute government of God controls all events and creatures, good or evil. The two doctrines *differ* greatly, however, when explaining how God so governs.” Page 3, C.O.J.II notes.

The inevitable conclusion cannot be escaped; to the *extent* that Absolute Predetermination and Absolute Predestination are alike, they *both are fatalistic*, according to C.O.J.II. Is it fatalistic and pagan for Predestinarians to say God absolutely controls all events and creatures, good and evil? Even so, then, it must be fatalistic and pagan for the world’s only known Predeterminist to say the same thing.

It is to be supposed that any other conclusion than this one would mean that C.O.J.II only believes we are fatalists when we explain **how** God governs. According to him, we are not fatalists when we say **that** God governs, for so too then would C.O.J.II be a fatalist; we become fatalists only when we explain **how** God governs. If then, we differ greatly when explaining **how** God governs, I would think it proper for C.O.J.II to let us explain for ourselves how we believe God governs, and not invent our explanations himself.

C.O.J.II then proceeds to tell us “What happened in the Absoluter-Conditionalist battles of the late 18003.” Is it not strange though, that he does not tell us anything about *any* battles until *after* the War Between the States? The reason why is clear to those that have even casually studied the period. There were no conflicts because the Old School, Primitive, or Particular Baptists were, with the exception of a few closet Conditionalists, Absolute Predestinarians. And – the Conditionalists did not simply adapt a new terminology; they concocted a whole new doctrine! It was not Absolute Predetermination, either. I expect to amplify this in Section 5. One more time, I am obliged to say, NOT SO!

19. “13) The Confession of 1846.

(1) Strict Predestinarians imagine they have an Absoluter confession here. Some of their churches have even adopted this confession as an articles of faith. Bad move. The confession is clearly molinist, or Absolute Predeterminist; as is crystal clear when we consider the following articles.” Page 31, C.O.J.II notes.

Once again, C.O.J.II *imagines* what his fancied Strict Predestinarians *imagine*. What the Absolute Predestinarians *know* is, that they have a *good*, if imperfect, confession here. If C.O.J.II desires to interpret the confession as molinist, that is fine with us. It is, in my opinion, highly unlikely that our Baptist brethren of 1646 would have viewed their work as “clearly molinist” which would have meant that it was “clearly Catholic,” “clearly Arminian,” “clearly free will,” and “clearly not Baptist.” In fact, if their confession was “clearly molinist” it would have been “clearly, not clear” at all. If those brethren were Predeterminists as stated by C.O.J.II then why did they not say so? And – why did we

have to wait until 1996, to find out that the Baptists of 1646 were so *clearly* ignorant of their own language that. they could not say *clearly* what C.O.J.II says they *clearly* said?

I shall state that any honest child of God would flatly deny being a molinist if they knew what the Jesuit priest actually wrote and taught. Considerably more attention will be given to what molinism really is in my Section 3.

20. “(b) Article three is the great flag waved by the Strict Predestinarians, who understand neither what they say, nor whereof they affirm. The article is a gold mine for Predeterminists.” Page 31, C.O.J.II notes.

This is in reference to the third article of the Confession of 1646. It certainly is an excellent article, but who is it that is waving it around as “the great flag”? Certainly I have not. Once again C.O.J.II has dug into his bag of suppositions and tossed out another unsubstantiated claim. Had C.O.J.II known what little confidence most Predestinarians put in various articles of faith, other than those declared by their local assemblies, he may well have spent a lot less time in this field.

But C.O.J.II says that in this field he has found a gold mine for Predeterminists. I humbly suggest that all that glitters is not gold, and may actually be “fool’s gold.” NOT SO, C.O.J.II

21. “(a) The Strict Predestinarian might argue that the phrasing ‘all the power of the creature to act be from the Creator, and there is a providence of God always extended to every creature, and to every action of the creature,’ does not forbid the bannesian interpretation of *efficient causation* and *premonition...*” Page 34, C.O.J.II notes.

What is this but *another* conjecture from C.O.J.II to characterize Predestinarians to suit himself? How does C.O.J.II know what I, or any other Predestinarian, *might argue*? I am positive he possesses none of that *scientia media* he borrowed from Molina and pawned off on the prescience of God; thus his continued speculation as to what others might argue is worthless and useless unless, or until, he can produce evidence of such arguments.

The idea of *bannesian interpretations* of any sort is repulsive to me. As shall be shortly proved, Bañez was just another Catholic priest, who, while claiming some affinity for predestination, was, after all, a free willer doctrinally and a dutiful subject of the Pope of Rome.

22. “(vi) Lastly, blessings in obedience – a concept bitterly opposed by Strict Predestinarians, many of whom are unrepentant sinners excluded from other communions, and who do not intend to publicly repent.” Page 36, C.O.J.II notes.

I will not here accuse C.O.J.II of lying, but he is terribly mistaken and has thus fully disqualified himself as a credible opponent of Predestinarians. Rather than “bitterly opposing” blessings in obedience, **it is the very position I hold as truth.** And, I may add, I do not consider it a concept; it is a Biblical fact of doctrine.

Let it be clearly stated, however, that while I positively do believe in “blessings in obedience,” I emphatically deny blessings *for* obedience. It should not require much more than a fifth grade education to see the difference between *in* and *for*. Blessings *for* obedience would be nothing more than a reward or payment for services rendered. This is simply a half-breed offspring of the works system. Blessings flow from the good will of Him who blesses and are not based on merit or *for* anything done by the one blessed. The question must be asked: does C.O.J.II believe in blessings in obedience, a

position he falsely accuses Predestinarians of opposing, or does he believe in blessing *for* obedience? Let him come to terms.

The word *blessings* is found only once in the New Testament. I shall here quote the text where it is used:

“Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ (Ephesians 1.3).”

In common English the expression *hath blessed* is in the past tense, and so has it been understood by Baptists for centuries. Therefore, it is accomplished already. “All spiritual blessings” means the sum of every blessing; there are no more for whatever purpose or whatever reason. Additionally, they are spiritual in character; nothing about them is carnal or lacking in Divine quality. Finally, but by no means exhaustively, they are disseminated in heavenly places in Christ. That is where you will find all blessings: in heavenly places in Christ. They are not, as C.O.J.II affirms, “goody points.”

I cannot understand what C.O.J.II means by “...who do not intend to publicly repent.” I have yet to meet a sinner that *intended* to repent. It is fully contrary to fallen nature to *intend* to repent. God alone can grant repentance. The only character in the Bible that I know of that “repented himself” was Judas (Matthew 27.3), and what did it avail him? He hanged himself! So much for intending to repent.

23. “See above (I.V.F.1, p18) where it was shown how this verse in context (vs.13-16) not only proves God is not the author of sin; but shows how sin arises from our evil natures. Observe how this passage destroys Bañez’s theory of *premotion* and *efficient causation*, the absolutely essential concepts for all Strict Predestinarians. Observe also, how this passage justifies Molina’s argument for *scientia media* (God’s knowledge of all possibles) together *with simultaneous concurrence* (enabling creatures to act *physically* while choosing moral alternatives). This is pure Predeterminism.” Page 37, C.O.J.II notes.

When C.O.J.II says this is “the absolutely essential concepts for all Strict Predestinarians” he has obviously included me. Once again I am compelled to say, NOT SO! C.O.J.II has labored strenuously to link us to the old Dominican priest but I for one reject his charge and feel sure all other Predestinarians would mu when informed of the matter. The reader can clearly see that C.O.J.II snakes in and out over the same well-trod paths, point after point. And why? In sales parlance one would say, “Knock on enough doors, and somebody will answer.”

Pure Predeterminism, as *defined by C.O.J.II*, is nothing more than a twin sister to pure Arminianism, or worse. It reeks of Semi-Pelagianism. Predeterminism, as found in the Bible, is entirely different from the *various* definitions given it by C.O.J.II in his notes. I shall explain the difference in my Section 4 on the subject.

24. “(b) For a thorough review of Bannesianism/Strict Predestinarianism contrasted with Molinism/Absolute Predeterminism, see above, V.C.4., pp24-26. Remember, the Strict Predestinarian will babble insistently about, ‘All things come about *infallibly* through *premotion* (or *efficient causation*) inducing second causes to act *necessarily, contingently, or freely.*’” Page 39, C.O.J.II notes.

The reader will readily see here that C.O.J.II completely aligns himself with his beloved molinism thusly: “Bannesianism/Strict Predestinarianism contrasted with Molinism/Absolute Predeterminism.” This relationship will be discussed in our Section 3 on Molinism.

I would insist again that C.O.J.II should let us know just who these Strict Predestinarians are who “babble insistently” about *infallibly* and *premotion*. I surely never have, nor do I know of any others

that “babble insistently” over such. Does the man never weary of wild charges? Again, NOT SO, C.O.J.II

25 “(d) What kind of answer can we expect from a Strict Predestinarian? Well, here’s the way Eld Jim Poole laid his groundwork for this kind of situation (see quote on p19).

‘A few of the proponents of this system [i.e., Absolute Predeterminists, CO.J.] have, however, loosely gleaned a number of passages from the Old Testament accounts of God’s governmental dealings with Israel. These they have saddled on the backs of those confused about the distinguishing differences between law and grace.” Page 41. C.O.J.II notes.

The quote given here by C.O.J.II was extracted from an article written by me and published in “The Remnant,” January-February, 1993. The title was Definitions. Let it be positively noted – at that time I had never heard that a single soul on this earth identified themselves by the term, Absolute Predeterminists. The *system* to which I referred was not predeterminism, but *rather* Conditional Time Salvation. But once again, C.O.J.II attempts to link his brain-child, Absolute Predeterminism, with my remarks on Conditional Time Salvation. This he does with the insertion of “[i.e., Absolute Predeterminists, COJ]” into a statement concerning something completely different; the novel doctrine of works for rewards also known as Conditional Time Salvation.

It matters not how much C.O.J.II puffs about my clear statements; he can never make Conditional Time Salvation and his use of “absolute predeterminism” be the same thing. NOT SO! This will be treated extensively in Section 4 and 5.

26. “And it was upon this confession the Welsh Tract Church [sic] was founded, and which it continues to hold forth as its articles of faith. Strange, isn’t it, for a church to profess something it admits it doesn’t believe? I guess they’re just absolutely predestinated to be strange and can’t help it.” Page 42, C.O.J.II notes, under (2).

What is *really strange* is C.O.J.II’s continuing to put forth as fact what is not so. Welsh Tract Church was *not* founded upon the Confession of 1689, as any serious student of Baptist history could tell him. Then what was the profession upon which they were founded? The following, taken from the original Welsh records of the church and translated into English by Morgan Edwards, makes it perfectly clear:

“In the year 1701, some of us, who were members of the churches of Jesus Christ in the counties of Pembroke and Carmarthen, South Wales, in Great Britain, (professing believers in baptism, laying on of hands, election, and final perseverance in grace), were moved and encouraged in our minds, to come to these parts, namely, Pennsylvania. And after obtaining leave of the churches, it seemed good to the Lord, and to us, that we should be formed into church order, as we were a sufficient number, and as one of us was a minister, that was accomplished, and withal letters commendatory were given us, that if we should meet with any congregations or christian people, who held the same faith with us, we might be received with them as brethren in Christ. Our number was sixteen, and after bidding farewell to our brethren in Wales we sailed from Milford Haven in June, 1701, in the ship James and Mary, and landed in Philadelphia on September 8th following.”

The original profession of the Welsh Tract Baptist Church is just what they said it was: believers in baptism, laying on of hands, election, and final perseverance in grace. There is not even a hint that the Confession of 1689 was adopted by them as a constituting article. Besides, if they adopted the Confession when they were founded, why then would they adopt it again several years later, which they did?

I do not argue here that Welsh Tract Church has not held the Confession of 1689 for nearly 290 years. They have. What I am saying, with considerable emphasis, is that C.O.J.II has once again distorted history. This is the man that will split hairs on the difference between *exact* and *partial* synonyms, as if the world turned on the differences, and yet throw around totally false statements relative to history. Why would he say that Welsh Tract was founded upon a confession, in addition to the one they were founded upon, when it simply is not so? It would probably take the gift of *scientia media* to figure that one out. NOT SO!

27. “Remember, the London Confession of 1689 is the Articles of Faith of old Welsh Tract Church in Maryland, the mother church of all Absolute Predestinarian churches in the United States.” Page 42, C.O.J.II notes.

C.O.J.II here repeats his error pertaining to the Confession and then compounds it with additional and more inexcusable ignorance. Welsh Tract Church is not in Maryland. Welsh Tract Church is located in Delaware and has been for over 280 years. The church was for the first several years of its existence temporarily in Pennsylvania and then settled at Iron Hill, just South of what is now the City of Newark, Delaware.

Can we trust C.O.J.II to tell us the way to truth when he cannot even tell us what state Welsh Tract Church is located in?

All this from a man that boasts of tireless hours of research in these matters. “Jesus answered and said unto him, Art thou a master of Israel and knowest not these things (John 3.10)?”

We are informed as well by C.O.J.II that Welsh Tract Church is “the mother of all Absolute Predestinarian churches in the United States.” If that is so, and if, as C.O.J.II informs us, Elder Beebe is the father of absolute predestination among the same churches, then where did Mother Welsh Tract Church get her Absolutism for the first 130 years of her motherhood until Father Beebe introduced it in 1832? Can these things be? A prolific mother, bearing many children, and all of them Absoluters, yet having no father until Beebe came along. Is this C.O.J.II’s version of the virgin birth? Merciful God, deliver us from such confusion! We also would forthrightly flee from the concept of the “Mother Church” heresy which is as Romish as is C.O.J.II’s molinism.

28. “Remember that Benjamin Cox is so despised by the Strict Predestinarians, because he was an Absolute Predeterminist, that when their churches adopt the London Confession of 1646 as articles of faith, they refuse Cox’s Appendix. So you know the Midland Confession will be sweet.” Page 44, C.O.J.II notes.

Who told C.O.J.II that Benjamin Cox is “so despised” by the Strict Predestinarians? I do not despise the man, nor do I believe other Predestinarians despise him. On the contrary, I strongly feel Cox was one of the more able Baptists of that period. I have found his writings to be useful and sounder than most. Moreover, I have also found that Cox never said anything that could possibly be construed as C.O.J.II’s Predeterminism as opposed to Predestinarianism. C.O.J.II has put much effort into attempting to make a Predeterminist out of every author he encounters, but strangely, none of them seemed to be seized with the same fits brought on by this hair-splitting distinction. Cox was certainly spared such fits.

I am personally aware of one church that adopted the Confession of 1646 and they declined using the Cox Appendix for just that reason; it was an appendix. However, C.O.J.II says there are churches, plural, that have done so. If there are more I cannot say what they did and why. I doubt C.O.J.II can either!

29. “(c) One more time, what was it that Elder Jim Poole, the Strict Predestinarian pastor of old Welsh Tract Church, said about Time Salvation? Let’s hear it again:

‘Conditional time salvation is a very new document and can be traced back only to the latter part of the last century, and only in the United States. It has no identity in early history anywhere, and the New Testament is totally silent in its support.’” Page 46, C.O.J.II notes.

“One more time,” he says. C.O.J.II has found a tune to play frequently, but it shall soon be all flat notes. As before stated, I do‘ believe in salvation in time, or as C.O.J.II likes to call it, Time Salvation. It is distinct from eternal salvation or the work of regeneration commonly called the new birth. But it is *all of grace*, just as regeneration is all of grace. It is not the same as “Conditional Time Salvation” which is an entirely different concept having its roots in free-willism. Note well! *Conditional Time Salvation* and *time salvation* are two different doctrines based on vastly different foundations. This will be treated extensively in my Section 5. **C.O.J.II has not offered a shred of evidence to refute my statement which he has underlined.** All he has given is weak, sickly opinions wrested from statements that have positively no bearing on the subject. My reasons for so stating will also be forthcoming.

30. “I think it both a fair and accurate statement to say that I have demonstrated that Elder Poole is about as wrong as it is possible for a man to be. 300 years of doctrinal controversy over the doctrine of Absolute Predetermination vs. Absolute Predestination before the American Civil War, and, apparently, Eld. Poole is ignorant of every ticking minute of it. Not only him, but every person who would subscribe to the sentiments of his specious statement. The one cant that is heard unceasingly, from Absoluters of all stripes, even the Predeterminists (who should know better), is that Conditional Time Salvation was never heard of before the Civil War. I feel confident that I have put that fantasy to rest (by the grace of God, if so be). As I have said in many ways before, so I repeat now: **The single most prominent ingredient in the heresy of Absolute Predestination of All Things is IGNORANCE.** Ignorance of Word Meanings, ignorance of Grammar, ignorance of Correct Reasoning, ignorance of parallel Bible texts, ignorance of history. Repeated, manifold, relentless, amazing, incredible, mind-numbing, butt-dumb *IGNORANCE.*” Page 47, C.O.J.II notes.

This quote is a continuation of (c) by C.O.J.II in my item 29. The statement C.O.J.II says is “fair and accurate” is neither. What it amounts to is pure deceit. There has not been a 300 year controversy over the “doctrine of Absolute Predetermination vs Absolute Predestination.” What C.O.J.II has attempted to do is lure us into his shell game that there was such a controversy. True enough, he has quoted from a number of sources on a number of subjects, but what single quote has contained a hint of controversy over these two synonyms? **None of them.** C.O.J.II has admitted that the terms were used interchangeably by those he quoted, so how then could it be a controversy, except between C.O.J.II and those he has falsely dragged into his harangue?

C.O.J.II really shows his sleight of hand when he says it was a doctrinal controversy over “Absolute Predetermination vs. Absolute Predestination *before* the American Civil War.” Was not the *before the American Civil War* a reference by C.O.J.II to my statement regarding Conditional Time Salvation? Is he not then attempting to make any controversy or discussion about Conditional Time Salvation to be one and the same as a controversy over Predetermination vs. Predestination? That is just what he has done!

They are not the same. They are poles apart.

For the record, I have never used the expression, Civil War in any of my statements. C.O.J.II may not know the difference between a civil war and the War Between the States, but some of us do know the difference. If C.O.J.II is going to quote me, it would be well if he would quote me correctly.

This fittingly brings this section to a close. C.O.J.II has unrelentingly abused us with all manner of charges, concluding with ignorance. It may well be that I am the most ignorant of all those professing a hope in Christ. But – be it noted, I have not dealt deceitfully. I have not cited any historical records with contempt for the facts and I have not tossed around quotes from others to prove a point when the quote had no relationship to the subject.

## SECTION 3.

### MOLINA

#### WHY MOLINA?

“*Luiz de Molina* (1535-1600), a Jesuit priest, and the first concise Absolute Predeterminist of the modern sort. His doctrine became known as molinism, and is followed by most Jesuits.” Page 24, C.O.J.II notes.

For a Baptist (or at least one who claims to be a Baptist) to resort to the dusty archives of Catholic history from Europe 300 years ago to establish his doctrinal position is strange indeed, especially since his doctrinal position is critical to his objective. But that is exactly what C.O.J.II has done. C.O.J.II wrote the following:

“2. There are two other points of importance Eld. Jim Poole argues: a) **US. Only.** ‘Conditional time salvation is a very new doctrine, and can be traced back only to the latter part of the last century, and only in the United States. ...Not a single sermon, tract, letter, or account of this doctrine can be produced dating back before the close of the War Between the States.’

(1) Eld. Poole, like virtually all Strict Predestinarians, is sadly ignorant on this point. The major points of controversy between Predeterminism and Predestination, which underlie the Conditional Time Salvation dispute, were argued out over *300 years before* the American Civil War *by Europeans*.” Pages 19, 20, C.O.J.II notes.

Thus, C.O.J.II marches back, not through the voluminous records of Baptist history in the United States for the last 300 years where scores of capable writers labored, but directly to the Iberian Peninsula, shrouded under the sable influence of the Mother of Harlots, where he finds Molina, the Jesuit priest toiling away for 30 years to render to the world an *Hypotheses* of the wildest proportions, *Scientia Media*. Identified falsely by CO] .11 as a Predeterminist, Molina now becomes his answer to all the perceived heresies of the Absolute Predestinarians.

It is clear as can be that my quotation above (From 2. a), C.O.J. .11 notes) regarded specifically the *new doctrine* of Conditional Time Salvation, but C.O.J.II has seen fit to put a very tortured spin on it and attempts to make my statement be a controversy over, not the difference between salvation in time verses salvation in eternity, but Absolute Predetermination verses Absolute Predestination. And to reinforce his twisted spin he calls a Catholic heretic to his aid.

#### *Why Molina?*

CO.J.II has no other place to go than his Catholic friend from the dark period of the Inquisition. It cannot be believed, even for a moment, that if C.O.J.II had one scrap of Baptist writings, or even Protestant writings, that he would not have readily set them before us. But there were no writings for C.O.J.II to turn to except the writings of a Pope-serving Jesuit priest.

Let it be positively stated once more. **C.O.J.II has not turned up even one verb and noun comprising a sentence to buttress his boasting.**

Is the man ignorant of where to find these letters, sermons, tracts and other writings I said did not exist, or am I correct in saying they do not exist? His failure to produce such documents surely weighs heavily in my favor.

### *Why Molina?*

Because C.O.J.II embraces much of the free-will concoctions from the twisted Philosophical/Theological views of Molina, as we shall see.

The question I now ask, and now answer, is not whether or not Molina was “the first concise Absolute Predeterminist of the modern sort” as stated by C.O.J.II, but, *was he an Absolute Predeterminist at all?* The answer is an emphatic NO! The proofs come from the records of history. Many could be provided but I shall give only 4.

### **The record speaks**

1. **“The Charge of Bañezianism.** Molina’s central doctrinal assertion was that God’s graces are rendered efficacious (*see* GRACE, EFFICACIOUS) by the actual consent of the human will. God’s infallible foreknowledge is safeguarded by recourse to a hypothesis, admittedly original with himself, namely, that there is in God a scientia media, or intermediate knowledge whereby God foreknows what every man will choose in varying circumstances, before the will determines itself and independently of any divine predetermination. Primary among the conclusions flowing from this is that God predestines those whom He foresees as consenting to His grace.” W.J. Hill, BAÑEZ AND BAÑEZIANISM, Page 49, New Catholic Encyclopedia.

If Hill was not saying that Molina attempted to distance himself from predetermination I confess I know not what he said. The language is clear: “. . . *independently of any divine predetermination.*”

I suggest that any dear old Baptists that want to follow C.O.J.II in his beloved Molinism ponder that paragraph carefully. “*God’s graces are rendered efficacious by the actual consent of the human will.*” Is this the doctrine found in our KIV Bible? “*God’s infallible foreknowledge is safeguarded by recourse to a hypotheses, admittedly original with himself..*” How comforting to learn that it is safe for God to foreknow since Molina originated his hypotheses. We predestinarians have been called, among other things, blasphemers by C.O.J.II, and yet he would represent to the world that this Romish rot is the doctrine of himself, the Reformers, the intent of the flammers of all the old creeds, the Welsh Baptists and that it is traceable even to the Apostle Paul:

“G. The Absoluters argue in effect that, because they have the old words, they are the original Baptists. The Predeterminists argue that *correct doctrine*, expressed by whatever words are found useful, more accurately demonstrates who are the original Baptists. In addition to that compelling logic, they are able to demonstrate a doctrinal identity (if not always a terminological one) with the oldest group of identifiable Baptists on earth, the Welsh Baptists, whose origins date back to the first century and are coincident with the Apostle Paul.” C.O.J.II, Page 47.

### **The record speaks again**

2. “When the Thomists propound the subtler question through what agency does the will. under the influence and impulse of grace, cease to be a mere natural faculty (actus primus) and produce a salutary act (actus secundus), or (according to Aristotelean terminology) pass from potency into act, the Molinists answer without hesitation that it is no way due to the Thomistic predetermination (prædeterminatio sive premotio physica) of the will of God. For such a causal predetermination, coming from a will other than

our own is a denial of self-determination on the part of our own will and destroys its freedom.” I. Pohle; Molina, Page 438, Catholic Encyclopedia, Old Edition.

Do Molinists deny “without hesitation” predetermination of the will of God? According to Pohle they do. Then how can any Molinist be a Predeterminist? The simple answer is, they can’t! But they can be, and are, decided free-willers. “For such a causal predetermination, coming from a will [God’s] other than our own is *a denial of self-determination on the part of our own will* and destroys its freedom.”

### The record speaks a third time

3. “With the same absolute certainty with which He knows His own will, He also foresees clearly and distinctly in the decrees of His will all future acts of man. However, the Molinists maintain that, since, as we remarked above, the predetermining decrees of the Divine Will must logically and necessarily destroy freedom and lead to Determinism, they cannot possibly be the medium in which God infallibly foresees future free acts. Rather these decrees must presuppose a special knowledge (*scientia media*) in the light of which God infallibly foresees from all eternity what attitude man’s will would in any conceivable combination of circumstances assume if this or that particular grace were offered it.” Pohle; Molina, Page 438.

Two things are of special importance here. First, Molina and his adherents could not be Predeterminists, for to embrace such would “necessarily destroy freedom and lead to Determinism.” Obviously they did not want to be led to Determinism, so, equally obvious, they were not Determinists. Second, Molina must invent a scheme (*scientia media*) to extricate himself (and to some extent the God he said he was defending) from the dreaded doctrine of predetermination, which incidentally, Molina equated with predestination.

### The record speaks a fourth time

4. “But, from the time that such eminent theologians as Alvarez, Gonet, Gotti, and Billuart succeeded in harmonizing the infallibility of this Divine knowledge with the fundamental tenets of Thomism by the subtle theory of hypothetical Divine decrees, there has been no Thomist who does not uphold the omniscience of God also with regard to conditioned events. But have they not then become supporters of the *scientia media*? By no means. For it is precisely the Molinists who most sternly repudiate these Divine predetermining decrees, be they absolute or conditioned, as the deathknell of man’s freedom.” Pohle; Molina, Page 440.

C.O.J.II has unrelentingly condemned the Absolute Predestinarians for not being Predeterminists and yet the brilliant stars of his house of cards, the Molinists, “*most sternly repudiate these Divine predetermining decrees, be they absolute or conditioned, as the deathknell of man’s freedom.*” Molinists argue *for* free will and against predetermination. Is then C.O.J.II a Molinist in doctrine? Let the reader be the judge. If he is a Molinist, then to be consistent, he must “*sternly repudiate these Divine predetermining decrees.*” If C.O.J.II is not a Molinist then:

*Why Molina?*

Whatever the reason for C.O.J.II’s appeal to a son of old Mother Babylon, Molina was not a Predeterminist; he was just another dutiful Catholic priest of the Jesuit order defending the cardinal doctrine of Roman Catholic Theology, the free will of man, albeit with a dazzling array of *unique* speculative nonsense he called *scientia media*. And yet, for all this, C.O.J.II calls himself a Baptist. But, if somehow he is indeed a rare variety of Baptist, then, *Why Molina?*

## C.O.J.II'S GREAT DEBATE.

Our modern Molinist, C.O.J.II, has devoted pages 24-26 of his notes to what he calls “THE KEY HISTORICAL DEBATE: Bañez vs. Molina.” And how much of that 3 pages of space did he devote to the debate itself? None! What C.O.J.II did was give us 3 pages of nothing more than personal opinion, much of which was either bogus or outright error. Did he quote from either Bañez or Molina? Not once! Did he quote from any historical reference works on the subject of Bannesianism or Molinism? Never! Did he lay before us a single scrap of evidence that he is an authority, or even accurately informed, on the subject? Once again, nothing! What he gave us was 3 pages of totally unsubstantiated personal opinion.

C.O.J.II did refer to one work of philosophy we expect to examine in due time, but even that small morsel tells us next to nothing about Molinism.

I shall examine only a few of the glaring errors contained in the 3 pages. To give a warrantable response to simple opinion would only be a waste of time.

### The History of the debate

If the reader had only the C.O.J.II notes relative to Molinism they would be hard pressed to comprehend what precipitated the issues. Accordingly, I shall give some background information our modern Molinist failed to give.

“1. *HISTORY OF THE CONTROVERSY*. – In the 13th cent. St. Thomas Aquinas, a Dominican synthesized the sum of human knowledge with regard to God as the First Cause and Final End of all things in a work called the *Summa Theologica*. Herein is contained all that the human mind, aided by revelation, can know concerning God’s providence, universal causality, grace, etc. So great became the renown of St. Thomas for the solidity and sublimity of his doctrine that at the Council of Trent the *Summa Theologica*, alone of all theological treatises, was thought fit to be used in consultation with the sacred Scriptures. The Order of St. Dominic is sworn to love and defend the doctrines of St. Thomas as by hereditary right; and it is their loyalty to these doctrines that has earned them the well-merited name of Thomists. At the close of the 16th cent. the Jesuit Luis de Molina (1535-1600) published a new doctrine on predestination, grace, free will, etc. The basis of the whole system is the so-called *scientia media*, a theory borrowed by Molina from his master, Pedro da Fonseca, who, knowing it to be entirely new and against the traditional doctrine, had not dared to publish it. Molina’s book was published at Lisbon in 1588 and is entitled: *Concordia liberi arbitrii cum gratiæ donis, divina præscientia, providentia, prædestinatione et reprobatione*. Had this theory been known, says Molina, Pelagianism would never have existed, Luther would not have denied free will, and Semi-Pelagianism would easily have been stamped out. Molina further adds that St. Augustine and the other Fathers would have unanimously approved of this theory of predestination and this manner of conciliating free will with the foreknowledge and providence of God, if it had been propounded to them (*Concordia*, ed. Paris, 1876, p. 548).” Ælfred Whitacre; MOLINISM, Page 774, Hastings Dictionary of Religion and Ethics.

What is this Whitacre says Molina published in 1588? “...a new doctrine on predestination, grace, free will, etc.” Not predeterminism? No; without “fumbling” (C.O.J.II, page 12) for a word, he said *predestination!* And what did he quote directly from Molina as saying? “...that St. Augustine and the other Fathers would have unanimously approved of this theory of *predestination* and this manner of conciliating free will with the foreknowledge and providence of God, if it had been propounded to them. Imagine, Molina, the “first concise Absolute Predeterminist of the modern sort” (C.O.J.II, Page

24.) not knowing the difference between “exact” (C.O.J.II, page 3) and partial synonyms. Did the “poor dufus” (“doofus”, C.O.J.II, page 16) not understand that predetermination and predestination are not to be used interchangeably? Perhaps he “followed the muddled terminology of Zanchius, [26 years earlier] as did the Puritans and Baptists of England” (C.O.J.II, page 29). This, be it known, is the man and his writing C.O.J.II writes of so effusively as if he were the standard for all orthodoxy.

The reader need not be a student of Latin to figure out what some of the words comprising the title of Molina’s writings mean, which I have underlined. *Concordia liberi arbitrii cum gratiæ donis, divina præscientia, providentia, prædestinatione et reprobatione*. They are, in their order, Prescience, (Foreknowledge) Providence, Predestination, and Reprobation. The reader will observe that Molina uses the word predestination but he omits the word predetermination. Why would the “first concise Absolute Predeterminist of the modern sort” do that? If it tells us nothing else it tells us C.O.J.II either knows nothing of what he writes on the subject or he has attempted to mislead his audience.

### **The other Catholic priest; Bañez**

Since all good (and bad) debates require opposing parties, and since C.O.J.II has a debate in progress, himself being the Absolute Predeterminist on the one side, and the Absolute Predestinarians on the other side, then to establish an historical precedent to keep the fires roaring he must find opposing historical figures as counterparts for the great debate. Molina, as we have already seen, answers to our current champion of predetermination, CO] .11. Who, then, will be the other protagonist, the guardian of the gates of Absolute Predestination? Domingo Bañez, according to C.O.J.II.

“*Domingo Bañez* (1528-1604), a Dominican priest, and the first die-hard Strict Predestinarian of the modern sort. His doctrine became known as *bannesianism*, and is followed by most Dominicans and Thomists (those adhering to the teachings of Thomas Aquinas, though not necessarily Aquinas himself.” Page 24, C.O.J.II notes.

I shall have little to do with Bañez since I dare not call him Father, and runner, since he has no real bearing on this response to Molinism. Only two responses regarding Bañez are necessary: the first pertaining to the above quotation from C.O.J.II, and the second relating to the history of Bañez, which, not surprisingly, C.O.J.II failed to give.

Was Bañez “the first die-hard Strict Predestinarian of the modern sort” as C.O.J.II claims? The historic record speaks:

“Bañez took immediate exception to this, seeing therein a rejection of the traditional teaching, founded in St. Augustine and St. Thomas, wherein grace is intrinsically efficacious as itself effecting the will’s free consent, so that predestination is ultimately gratuitous rather than dependent upon foreseen merits.” W.J.Hill; page 49, BAÑEZ AND BAÑEZIANISM, New Catholic Encyclopedia.

“It has been contended that Bañez was at least virtually the founder of present-day Thomism, especially in so far as it includes the theories of physical premotion, the intrinsic efficacy ‘of grace, and predestination irrespective of foreseen merit. To any reader of Bañez it is evident that he would have met such a declaration with a strenuous denial. Fidelity to St. Thomas was his strongest characteristic.

‘By not so much as a finger-nail’s breadth, even in lesser things’, he was wont to say, ‘have I ever departed from the teaching of St. Thomas.’ John R. Volz; Page 248, BAÑEZ, Catholic Encyclopedia, Old Edition.

I ask again: was Bañez “...the first die-hard Strict Predestinarian of the modern sort,” as is claimed by C.O.J.II? According to the historic records given above, just the opposite was the case. Bañez, zealously following Augustine and Thomas from centuries earlier, was a Predestinarian of the *ancient* sort. He followed the ancient positions on predestination held by Augustine and Thomas which were, when cleared of all the dressing, an accommodation towards the doctrine of free will held sacred by the Catholic Church. While Bañez certainly espoused better views on predestination than did Molina (and certain of his current followers) he in no way could be considered an Absolute Predestinarian of the *modern* sort. Once again, C.O.J.II has attempted to distort the record. This is the man that calls Absolute Predestinarians “devil-blinded,” “God-hardened,” “butt-dumb” ignorant sinners (among other things).

It is devious, to say the least, to hold up Bañez as the “first die-hard Strict Predestinarian of the modern sort” for a protagonist in the great debate between Absolute Predeterminists and Absolute Predestinarians.

For another brief review of the “key historical debate” C.O.J.II mentioned, but told us nothing of, I offer the following:

**“Disputes on Grace.** The late 15th and the 16th centuries saw a revival of scholasticism, especially in Spain, where Renaissance culture and the religious ferment of the Reformation were not strongly felt. The revival was dominated for the most part by illustrious Dominican theologians such as F. de Vitoria, M. Cano, D. de Soto, B. de Medina, and finally Bañez; it received further impetus from the Council of Trent, summoned in 1545. In 1540 the Society of Jesus was founded, and, officially adopting the theological system of St. Thomas, the society soon entered into the academic life of the period. In Salamanca in 1582 the first phase in an unrivaled theological controversy occurred. In a public disputation conducted by the Mercederian priest Francisco Zumel, Prudentius Montemayor, a Jesuit, defended the proposition that Christ, acting in obedience to His Father’s command, died neither freely nor meritoriously. (See MANDATE, PROBLEM OF.) Supporting him on this was an Augustinian, Louis of León. This occasioned a strong reaction from the faculty at Salamanca, in particular from Bañez. Further debate resulted, culminating in the matter’s being brought before the Inquisition, where on Feb. 3, 1584, judgment was pronounced against Montemayor and Leon. By this time the area of disagreement had broadened and 16 distinct propositions were condemned, among which were the following:

6. ‘God is not the cause of the free operation but only causes the cause to be.’
9. ‘The providence of God does not determine the human will or any other particular cause to operate well, but rather the particular cause determines the act of divine providence.’
13. ‘The impious man in his justification determines the sufficient help of God to actual use by his own will.’

The second phase of the controversy occurred in 1588 with the publication in Lisbon of the first edition of the *Concordia liberi arbitrii cum gratiæ donis, divina præscientia, providentia, prædestinatione et reprobatione* of Luis de Molina, SJ. The Inquisitor General of Portugal, Cardinal Albert of Austria, withheld distribution of the book pending the theological evaluation

of Banez, whom he had appointed as censor. It was the latter's opinion that Molina was giving restatement to six of the already condemned propositions of the pre-Molinists. Presented with these objections, Molina wrote a defense of himself, and in August 1589 the *Concordia* was given an imprimatur and published with the defense as an appendix. The resulting agitation grew to alarming proportions, especially in the public debates between the Jesuits and Dominicans in March and May of 1594 in Valladolid, until in August of that year the papal nuncio at Madrid imposed silence on the disputants and delayed the matter to Rome.

Molina sought to defend himself by denouncing Bañez to the Inquisition at Castile. Bañez replied with the publication in 1595 of *Apologia fratrum praedicatorum in provincia hispaniae sacrae theologiae professorum, adversus novas quasdam assertiones cuiusdam doctoris Ludovici Molinae nuncupati*, in joint authorship with P. Herrera and D. Alvarez both Dominicans. This was followed by the *Libellus supplex* in October 1597, a letter (for text see De Meyer) addressed by Bañez to Pope Clement VIII seeking dissolution of the silence imposed in 1594. This was granted in February 1598 in a letter of Cardinal C. Madruzzi writing in behalf of the Pope to the nuncio. Bañez's active participation ceased at this point." W. J. Hill; BAÑEZ AND BAÑEZIANISM, Pages 48,49, New Catholic Encyclopedia.

For those who have heard C.O.J.II's 14 tapes, or have the notes pertaining thereto, by C.O.J.II containing "THE KEY HISTORICAL DEBATE: Bañez vs. Molina," ask yourself this pertinent question: Do the notes and the tapes bear any resemblance to the record of history given above? I offer here the summary of C.O.J.II to his 3 pages of unabashed opinions as a classic example of his distortion of facts:

"5. SUMMARY – As can be plainly seen from the above, a Strict Predestinarian Absoluter (Bañez) is having his onion peeled by an Absolute Predeterminist (Molina)...way back in the 1500s...in Europe. What was that Elder Poole said (p.19), and some of our excluded unrepentant sinners believe so joyously? 'Only in the United States...Nowhere in history.' Oh, my! Golly gee! Stepped in it, up to their knees!" Page 26, C.O.J.II notes.

Even if the base little ditty with which C.O.J.II closes his summary was dismissed from the quote it would still be extrinsic. As for Bañez "having his onion peeled" it is nothing more than bar-room language to prop up error, and whatever our views of Bañez and Molina may be, they deserve more courtesy than this. But worse yet, C.O.J.II has falsified the issue. Bañez, as we have seen, was not truly a "Strict Predestinarian Absoluter" as claimed by C.O.J.II; Molina was not anywhere near being an "Absolute Predeterminist," and Molina certainly did not best Bañez in the controversy. Neither was there ever a formal debate between the two as it has been made to appear. The record speaks otherwise.

### **C.O.J.II, Molina, and Concurrence**

The 2 following quotes, taken from the 3 pages of C.O.J.II's opinions regarding Molinism, are a classic example of incorrect reasoning, not to mention a distortion of history by today's champion of molinism, C.O.J.II. When examined, the readers should refrain from laughing long enough to ask themselves if any portion of the record resembles good, solid Baptist doctrine, or is it only another close of Catholic nonsense thrown together as a pretense at research.

"b) CONCURRENCE – That power of God by which He enables creatures to act.

Whatever moves, is moved by another; and the ultimate Unmoved Mover is God. Creatures must be both moved into existence and kept there by God in order to exist. Likewise, they must be moved by God from Potency (the bare capacity to move or act) into Act (motion or action itself) and sustained

there for the duration. Therefore, God must *concur* in order for there to be any action by creatures. NOTE – When God restrains creatures from acting, it is not so much by holding them back to prevent them from acting when they otherwise would, as by *refusing to concur* so they cannot act at all.” Page 24, C.O.J.II notes.

Note well, when C.O.J.II was “fumbling” for a word to define concurrence he described it with one of the attributes of God, *power*. When C.O.J.II illustrates what he “fumbled” for he described concurrence as an act of God: “Therefore, God must concur. . . .” It will be seen that he moves back and forth between these inconsistencies frequently.

If C.O.J.II were to respond that he is here simply giving a view of what the protagonists held to pertaining to the subject then it would be our duty to ask him to show us from history where he got this definition. What the protagonists, as C.O.J.II calls them, held was *an entirely different* view of concurrence from that which C.O.J.II gives us. Why, we ask, would C.O.J.II do this?

In the second quote C.O.J.II offers us more error to refute than time and space will allow; nevertheless, certain points certainly shall be contested.

“a) **The MODE of God’s Concurrence is the point of controversy.**

As noted above (III.B.1., p.7-8), the key question in the whole debate between Strict Predestinarians and Absolute Predeterminists is *not* whether God absolutely governs the evil acts of creatures, [sic] but rather how He governs them. So it was when the debate arose among the philosophers in the 1500s. The question was *not* **Whether that**, but **How** God governs the acts of rational creatures. A well-known Catholic philosopher of the recent past writes

With very few exceptions... scholastic philosophers agree in maintaining the necessity of God’s immediate physical concurrence in creatural actions. It is in the discussion of the particular *mode of divine concurrence* that agreement ceases. A heated controversy arose in the sixteenth century concerning the ‘mode’ of divine concurrence, and the controversy is still very much alive in our day. This discussion gave rise to two main schools of thought – *bannesianism and molinism*... The chief point of the controversy thus resides in the answer to the question: How reconcile the *absolute dominion of God* over all creatural actions (including the free acts of man’s will) with the *self-determination of man’s free will*?... (Bittle, Celestine N.; *God and His Creatures*. Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co., 1953, p.332) [My underlines, COJ].” Pages 24,25, C.O.J.II notes.

I might well have not bothered with C.O.J.II’s a) above had he not said it was the “key question in the whole debate between Strict Predestinarians and Absolute Predeterminists...,” but I cannot let it pass as stated. The “key question” is purely a fabrication of his OWI hatching, for Predestinarians neither argue *for* or *against* his “key question.” Who ever heard of any Baptist, except those beguiled by Molinism, disputing over a term belonging to a Catholic’s vocabulary, unless, as in this case, to refute error? As shall be shown, concurrence, divine concurrence, simultaneous concurrence, simultaneous concourse, and simultaneous concursus, all synonymous, each derive from the Roman Catholic dispute over the (futile) attempt at reconciling God’s foreknowledge with man’s free will. To state my feelings on the issue with a current expression, “We have no dog in this fight!”

Nor can we let pass the absurdity that this was a debate in the 1500s among *philosophers* distinctly. This is only one bill of goods, among many, C.O.J.II has attempted to peddle off on the unsuspecting. There is an abundance of positive evidence to the contrary. I offer only 2 items, as they should suffice:

“Molina’s chief contribution to the science of theology is the “Concordia”, on which he spent thirty years of the most assiduous labour.” J. Pohle; Molina, Page 436, Catholic Encyclopedia, Old Edition.

The reader will remember that *scientia media*, and all that goes with it, is the heart and soul of the “Concordia.” Any part Molina had in the debate of the 1500s was primarily as a *theologian*.

“The question which both schools set themselves to answer is this: Whence does efficacious grace (*gratia efficax*), which includes in its very concept the actual free consent of the will, derive its infallible efficacy of grace, the freedom of the will is not impaired? It is evident that, in every attempt to solve this difficult problem, Catholic theologians must safeguard two principles: first, the supremacy and causality of grace (against Pelagianism and Semipelagianism) and second, the unimpaired freedom of consent in the will (against early Protestantism and Jansenism). For both these principles are dogmas of the Church, clearly and emphatically defined by the Council of Trent. Now, whilst Thomism lays chief stress on the infallible efficacy of grace, without denying the existence and necessity of the free cooperation of the will, Molinism emphasizes the unrestrained freedom of the will, without detracting in any way from the efficacy, priority, and dignity of grace.” J. Pohle; Molinism, Page 437, Catholic Encyclopedia, Old Edition.

Note well! Catholic Theologians, not Philosophers. The reason why C.O.J.II has made a distinction between Philosophers and Theologians is simple. It affords him an opportunity to be selective in his use of the term, free will ! Hear him:

- b) Remember the distinction the Catholic scholars make between Philosophy and Religion (V.C.I., p.24). When a Catholic *Philosopher* speaks of “free will,” he means the creature’s choice to act or not act, and to choose between alternative courses of action. He is *not* talking about choosing to go to Heaven or Hell. Philosophy is the study of “Nature, and Nature knows nothing about Heaven or Hell – these are questions of Revelation and Religion. On the other hand, when a *Catholic Theologian* speaks of “free will” he generally means the creature’s choice to accept God’s offer of Grace and be saved to Heaven, or fail to accept and be damned to Hell. *Do not confuse these two meanings of “freewill”...in their controversy, Bañez and Molina never did.*” Page 25, C.O.J.II notes.

(V .01., p. 24) mentioned in the above quote is the same thing as b) above, stated somewhat differently. They are both absolutely wrong as regards “the debate” of the 1500s.

*Bittle*, the *Catholic philosopher* quoted by C.O.J.II tells us of “immediate physical concurrence” in creatural actions, but neither he nor C.O.J.II tell us with what or whom God concurs. *Bittle* comes a little closer with his last sentence “How reconcile the absolute dominion of God over all creatural actions (including the free acts of man’s will) with the self-determination of man’s free will?” Put in plain language he says God is sovereign, but man has a self-determining free will and a method must be found to reconcile them without doing violence to either. So then, they must agree, or come together: hence, *simultaneous concurrence* is invented to solve the dilemma.

Some definitions relating to concurrence. The word, *concourse*, from the Latin *concursum* is included because it is a word often used in place of *concurrence* by the Catholics.

**concur** 1. to occur at the same time; happen together; coincide 2. to combine in having an effect; Webster’s New World Dictionary, Second College Edition, 1984.

**concurrence** 1. a happening together in time or place; Webster’s; Second College Edition.

**concourse** 1. A large open space for the gathering or passage of crowds, as in an airport. 2. A broad thoroughfare. 3. A great crowd; a throng. 4. The act of coming, moving, or flowing together.

[Middle English *concoirs*, assembly, throng, from Old French, from Latin *concursum*, from past participle of *concurrere*, to assemble: com-, com-+ *currere*, to run] The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language, 3rd Ed Copyright 1992.

With these definitions before us the Catholic usage of simultaneous concurrence may be compared with the definition C.O.J.II has given us.

“According to pure Molinism, the divine influx does not precede the action of the free will, but simultaneously co-operates with it, helping, as a partial cause, to produce the same action and the same effect. This divine action, called ‘simultaneous concurrence,’ is, therefore, not received into the will, but is rather alongside of it, and is received immediately into the action and effect of the will. In order to safeguard the universal causality of God, it is said that, although God and the free will are partial causes of the free act, nevertheless the effect is wholly produced by God as the First Cause, and wholly by the will as the secondary cause. The simultaneous concurrence is not efficacious, but is, of its very nature, indifferent, and is modified or determined by the free will, and hence can be used for volition or nolition, for this act or that act, indiscriminately, according to the determination of the free will. Other Molinists reject this simultaneous concurrence, and admit a kind of premotion, *i.e.* a physical influx received into the faculty of the will previous to the determination (action) of the will. By this influx the will is moved and determined to general or universal good, but of itself the influx is indifferent and inefficacious for this or that particular good: without any further influx from God, the will determines itself to act, not to act, to do this, or to do that. ÆLRED WHITACRE; MOLINISM, Pages 775,776, Hastings, Dictionary of Religion and Ethics.

According to Whitacre “this is pure Molinism.” It is also the *pure* Catholic heresy of an inviolable free will and has no place among the Baptists. *Pure* Molinism says the “free act” is wholly by the will of God (as the first cause) and wholly by the will of man (as the secondary cause). C.O.J.II says “...*the key question in the whole debate between Strict Predestz'narians and Absolute Predetenninists is not whether God absolutely governs the evil acts of creatures, but rather how He governs them.*” But this is not what Molinists say and they did not restrict the discussion to evil acts only. They say it is an accommodation on the part of God towards free will. God and the will of man co-operate. Simultaneous with the free act is the concurrence (to occur at the same time; Webster) of God with the act. **God and the will of man concur!** But C.O.J.II says “b) CONCURRENCE – That *power* of God by which He *enables* creatures to act.” Here is a classic case of 1) errors in word definitions and 2) errors in correct reasoning.

In the following quotation the Molinists do take up the problem of sin, but what they say will certainly not lend any support to the views of C.O.J.II.

“Thomists are accused of making God the cause of sin by the physical premotion which is efficacious, but the difficulty of sin has to be solved by Molinists also. Physical premotion effects, it is true, that the will cannot but infallibly do that to which it is premoved, but no Thomist allows that G66 predetermines to sin *qua* sin (see THOMISM): the simultaneous concurrence of the Molinists is a co-operation of God with the will, not indeed to produce the sinful action as sinful, but to produce the physical reality of the action. It is a lesser evil to co-operate than to make another commit a sin; Molinists have chosen a lesser evil, but have not solved the difficulty.” ÆLRED WHITACRE; MOLINISM, Page 776, Hastings.

Molinists know they cannot get around what C.O.J.II says they have gotten around. They cannot solve the “difficulty” C.O.J.II affirms they have solved. What they do is “*choose the lesser of the evils.*”

Having shown the complete absurdity of the Molinists *Simultaneous Concurrence* I shall quote some of the passages C.O.J.II offers in his futile attempt to prove the old Baptist and Protestant writers embraced this bizarre doctrine.

### Jerome Zanchius

“Grant him the use of terms *as he defined them*, and the molinist nature of his arguments cannot be successfully denied. Page 27, C.O.J.II notes.

### The London Confession of 1646

“The confession is clearly molinist, or Absolute Predeterminist; as is crystal clear when we consider the following articles.

(a) In the very first article, we [sic] wording that unmistakably calls to mind the molinist principles of *simultaneous concurrence and enabling cause:*” Page 31, C.O.J.II notes.

“ii) This phrase, recalling the molinist *simultaneous concurrence* and *enabling causation*, clenches my argument. Such juxtaposing of terms with those just discussed in i) cannot fail to establish the molinist, or Predeterminist, nature of this article.” Page 32, C.O.J.II notes.

“iii) Fortunately, the very next article tells us definitively. ‘The saints are enabled to encounter’ through ‘strength’ by Jesus Christ. Here we have a clear statement of *enabling causation*. reinforced by the word ‘strength’ which is an amount of *ability*. In addition, we are told that Christ will ‘assist them’ and ‘uphold them,’ which are none other than our old molinist friends, *simultaneous concurrence* and *scientia media* (knowledge of the possibles), found in Eph 1:11, Act 2:23, and Act 15:18.” Pages 33,34, C.O.J.II notes.

### The Baptist London Confession of 1689

“Observe how this passage destroys Banez’s theory of *premotion* and *efficient causation*, the absolutely essential concepts for all Strict Predestinarians. Observe also, how this passage justifies Molina’s argument for *scientia media* (God’s knowledge of all possibles) together with *simultaneous concurrence* (enabling creatures to act *physically* while choosing *moral* alternatives). This is pure Predeterminism.” Page 37, C.O.J.II notes.

“(a) The first tip-off is the use of the phrases, ‘God the first cause,’ and ‘fall out according to the nature of second causes.’ This is classic Molinism, the First Cause providing enabling causation according to *scientia media*; and the nature of second causes acting by *simultaneous concurrence* in a manner either *necessary, contingent, or free.*” Page 39, C.O.J.II notes.

“(c) Finally, see how the Authors insist that, ‘the sinfulness of their acts proceedeth only from the creatures, and not from God.’ Bañez insisted that sinful actions resulted *infallibly* from God’s *premotion* and *efficient causation*. Molina demonstrated that, logically, this made God the author of sin. Instead, he explained how *scientia media, enabling causation* and *simultaneous concurrence* left God in complete governmental control, yet demonstrated that the sinfulness of the creatures’ actions arose from their own evil natures. These words of the Authors of this Confession, phrased in just this way, show these men to have been philosophical molinists and theological Absolute Predeterminists, and definitely not Strict Predestinarians.” Page 40, C.O.J.II notes.

“(a) Notice the emphasis upon *natural* liberty of will. As noted before (V .C.I., p24), this has no reference whatsoever to choosing Christ and getting regenerated thereby. It is a purely natural ability to choose between alternatives, also possessed by most animals. Who can fail to see here Molina’s *scientia media* and *simultaneous concurrence*? Almost the very words were used by Jerome Zanchius and the Reformers.” Page 41, C.O.J.II notes.

“First, observe that natural life and blessings are referred to, which is all that is here contended for. Next, notice that God *has given them the ability to choose natural alternatives*. Again we see Molina’s *scientia media* and *simultaneous concurrence*, together with the concept of enabling cause. In other words, clearly Absolute Predetermination.” Page 41, C.O.J.II notes.

## Benjamin Cox

“(a) The Strict Predestinarian might argue that the phrasing ‘all the power of the creature to act be from the Creator, and there is a providence of God always extended to every creature, and to every action of the creature,’ does not forbid the bannesian interpretation of *efficient causation* and *premotion*. Taken alone, the argument might carry some weight; however it is not alone. Cox’s next point puts it out of their reach: ‘the final corruption of the creature, and the sinfulness of the creature’s action, is from the creature and not from God.’ This clearly implies the molinist arguments of *enabling cause*, *simultaneous concurrence*, and *scientia media* (knowledge of all possibles).” Page 34, 35, C.O.J.II notes.

“(3) Though not using the express words, Cox obviously advocates the molinist arguments of *simultaneous concurrence* and enabling cause in article seven.” Page 35, C.O.J.II notes.

“‘True obedience’ excludes the bannesian (Strict Predestinarian) concept of *premotion*, which assumes the motion thus initiated must infallibly and unalterably come to pass. The molinist (Absolute Predeterminist) concepts of God’s *scientia media* (knowledge of all possibles), enabling causation, and *simultaneous concurrence* produce true, not merely apparent, obedience. Observe how Cox cites Eph.2:10 in support, with its clearly conditional ‘should’.” Page 35, C.O.J.II notes.

Thus, C.O.J.II offers us numerous quotes from the old writers and randomly applies to each of them his Catholic *enabling cause*, *simultaneous concurrence*, and *scientia media* and then tells us that is just what the writers meant, even though that is not what they said (or intended). The pitiful thing is C.O.J.II did not even give the correct meaning of much the Molinist writers contended for; rather, he applies his personal definitions to their terminology and passes them off as good currency. The man knows no shame!

## Molina and free will

In concluding this section it seems necessary to further emphasize the emphatic position Molina held on the free will of man, as did all Catholics. Having shown that, the absurdity of appealing to Molinism for authoritative proof of Absolute Predeterminism will be evident beyond measure. It will also expose the preposterous idea of calling on Molina to prop up the doctrine of *conditional time salvation* C.O.J.II holds dear. This will become fully evident in our last quote from Molinist sources.

“The *Concordia* is Molina’s solution of the problem of free will and God’s foreknowledge, providence, predestination, reprobation, efficacious grace, by *scientia media*. Comparison of both *Concordia* editions and the *Commentaria* (which contains some of the *Concordia* material) shows differences of expression, but none of doctrine.” F. L. SHEERIN; MOLINA, LUIS DE Pages 1010, 1011, New Catholic Encyclopedia.

Molina's problem was not Bañez, nor was it with Absolute Predestinarians, nor even how best to promote conditional time salvation. Molina had no problem either with how to promote Absolute Predetermination. These-none of these – were the problem for Molina. Molina's problem, and the problem for all Molinists, C.O.J.II included, was how to “dodge” the odium of God toward *any holding to free will in the face of God's complete sovereignty*. In the words of Sheerin, Molina had a problem with God's foreknowledge, providence, predestination, reprobation, and efficacious grace. And that, it may be fairly said, is a problem of major proportions.

“Molinism ascribes the efficacy of grace to the free co-operation of the will and consequently admits a grace which is merely extrinsically efficacious (*gratia efficax ab extrinseco*). It is the free will that by the extrinsic circumstance of its consent makes efficacious the grace offered by God. If the will gives its consent, the grace which in itself is sufficient becomes efficacious; if it withholds its consent, the grace remains inefficacious (*gratia inefficax*) and it is due – not to God, but – solely to the will that the grace it reduced to one which is merely sufficient (*gratia mere sufficiens*).

This explanation gave the Molinists an advantage over the Thomists, not only in that they safeguarded thereby the freedom of the will under the influence of grace, but especially because they offered a clearer account of the important truth that the grace, which is merely sufficient and therefore remains inefficacious, is nevertheless always really sufficient (*gratia vere sufficiens*), so that it would undoubtedly produce the salutary act for which it was given, if only the will would give its consent....If then, when possessed of absolutely the same grace, one sinner is converted and another can remain obdurate, the inefficacy of the grace in the case of the obdurate sinner is due, not to the nature of the grace given, but to the sinful resistance of his free will, which refuses to avail itself of God's assistance.” J. Pohle: MOLINISM, Page 438, Catholic Encyclopedia, Old Edition.

Nothing more needs to be said here except to repeat the last few words concerning free will: “...**which refuses to avail itself of God's assistance.**”

Finally, a quote which will present Molinist C.O.J.II a problem of considerable magnitude.

“A modification of Molinism of minor importance arose with regard to the so-called predefinition of good works (pnedefinitio bonorum operum). By predefim'tion, in contradistinction to predestination to glory, theologians understand the absolute, positive, and efficacious decree of God from all eternity, that certain persons shall at some time in the future perform certain good works (cf. Franzelin, 'De Deo Uno', Rome, 1883, pp444 sqq.). This predefinition to good works is either formal or virtual, according as God's decree governing these works and the bestowal of efficacious grace is either formal or merely virtual: Molina, Vasquez, and Gregory de Valentia defended virtual, while Suarez, Tanner, Silvester Maurus, and others upheld formal predefinition.” J. Pohle; MOLINISM, Page 441, Catholic Encyclopedia, Old Edition.

Observe – these good works are in *contradistinction to predestination to glory*. They come by the **absolute, positive, and efficacious decree of God** from all eternity. The question is then, does this harmonize with the weird spin C.O.J.II puts on his fancied Absolute Predeterminism/Molinism to support Conditional Time Qalvnrinn') This, may I say again, is the system C.O.J.II appeals to that he may attack my factual assertion that *conditional time salvation* is a *new doctrine*. It is *new* and C.O.J.II *has not* fulfilled his boast to prove it otherwise.

## SECTION 4.

### ABSOLUTE PREDETERMINATION

In my Section 1, item 1, the fact was expressed that Absolute Predetermination, affirmed as a doctrinal position, is rare. So rare, in fact, that, other than C.O.J.II, I have never known of it being affirmed by any person or group with the possible exception of a few of his cronies. The strongest proof of my assertion being correct is the failure of C.O.J.II to produce even one article, sermon, pamphlet, tract, book, or any other shred of documentation wherein this doctrine is spelled out as a specific position or belief. ***Not one single statement has been produced by him to show definitively who, other than himself, cherishes this novelty – now or in the past.***

No one familiar with our subject can possibly doubt where the Absolute Predestinarians stand or what they believe. Predestinarians have stated continuously in the past and even to this day in unmistakable language that their doctrinal position is the absolute predestination of all things. Volumes abound to establish without controversy where they stand. Predestinarians have a strong, visible, and vocal heritage, and their legions of opponents, tormentors, and detractors give evidence beyond dispute that they have *elucidated without equivocation* precisely where they stand. To illustrate this we need look no further than C.O.J.II himself for proof. His 47 pages of diatribe against us, and against those among us gone before, amply prove he has discovered in our clear pronouncements that we indeed do believe in Absolute Predestination.

Absolute Predeterminism? Where is it advocated? Who are they that promote it? Where can we find their sermons, tracts, articles, books and other documentation? It must be asked again, where is the clear evidence from history that others held the position now known as Absolute Predeterminism? Let it be stated forthrightly: history is silent as the tomb, for not a single voice from the past speaks out in defense of the wild assertions of C.O.J.II that Absolute Predeterminism is the doctrine of general acceptance. Nor even isolated acceptance! Silence is consent! Absolute Predetermination is a fabrication of C.O.J.II. It is his novelty alone. He has no ancestry in his drudgery, and he toils alone today. What is worse than that – he knows it and yet persists.

Having absolutely no historical support, C.O.J.II must resort to two somewhat devious methods to fill his Trojan horse with an arsenal to haul into the gates of Zion where predestination is held as sacred truth. One of his methods is an attempt to make those historical figures that were so prominent in promulgating the truth (predestination) to say what they did not say nor intend to say. This we have already examined. His other method is to create an hypothesis from word studies (and word distortions) and build his case by taking meanings and definitions from various sources, shredding them up, throwing them in the pot, and thus poisoning the pottage with his wild gourds. It is this latter endeavor by C.O.J.II we expose now.

One thing should be made perfectly clear at the outset; Absolute Predestinarians are not opposed to predetermination. While *predetermination* is not a Bible word, it is a Bible concept derived from various Scriptures and other words that are found in the Bible. What we vehemently oppose is the

*fanatical and flawed definition* put on the word by C.O.J.II. In fact, probably the vast majority of Predestinarians could call themselves Predeterminists if allowed to use the words predestination and predetermination as synonyms.

To proceed now with the flawed rendering of predetermination as submitted by C.O.J.II, I shall again examine his notes.

In his section **II. WORD DEFINITIONS – Where the action is!** and his section **III. KEY PROOF TEXTS FOR PREDETERMINATION**, pp. 3-9, C.O.J.II has labored extensively to establish his hypothesis, Absolute Predetermination, and at the same time verbally bludgeon Absolute Predestination out of existence. But – I detect a serious flaw in his efforts; one of his own making, I add.

We shall examine the closing statement of C.O.J.II in his section I to get a clear view of his flaw.

“5. So – That’s HOW YOU GET TO BE AN ABSOLUTER. Simply apply the 3 Crucial Errors of Absolute Predestination. 1) Ignore all words and definitions that don’t suit your doctrine; 2) Ignore or twist the grammar as needed to produce your doctrine; and 3) Ignore any parts of the verse or any parallel passages that contrary your doctrine. Finally: Never, ever let any of the principles or rules of Bible study get in your way, just ignore them. That’s all there is to it. *It’s real easy – any unrepentant sinner can do it!*” Page 3, C.O.J.II notes.

Numerous times in his 47 pages of notes, C.O.J.II has informed us that Absolute Predestinarians are “God-deluded” and “Devil-blinded.” Here he avers that we got to be Absoluters by “applying” his 3 crucial errors. I am, therefore, made to wonder – did we become *God-deluded* and *Devil-blinded* because we applied the 3 errors – or did we apply the 3 errors because we were *God-deluded* and *Devil-blinded*? Further, I earnestly desire to know, does C.O.J.II think God and the Devil worked in concert to blind and delude us, or did it just chance to happen that they both desired the same end for us?

Can it be, can it possibly be, that the Devil has joined league with God to restrict the faculties of Absolute Predestinarians? Did the Devil unite with God to blind us because we were Absoluters? Or did he blind us so we would become Absoluters with the intent that God would then delude us? We ask, too, relating to the God-sent delusion: was it in order to delude us, or because the Devil previously blinded us?

If the Devil lit in on us with the intention of blinding us, and thus making us Absoluters, and God deluded us because we were Absoluters, then would not the work of Absoluter-making by the Devil precede the work of God in deluding us? Would not also the work of the Devil to make us Absoluters cause the work of God in deluding us to be contingent on the Devil’s success? And yet for all this intrigue we really became Absoluters through **ignorance**. Pure, “butt-dumb ignorance” as C.O.J.II puts it. We became Absoluters by applying 3 crucial errors.

Paul, the Apostle, was “before a blasphemer, and a persecutor, and injurious: but I [he] obtained mercy (I Timothy 1.13).” And why did he, Paul, obtain mercy? Because he did it *ignorantly in unbelief!* May the merciful God of heaven and earth swiftly dispatch an angel from heaven or at least a knowledgeable sage possessing sufficient wisdom to unveil this great mystery for us. How can it be that Paul’s blasphemy, persecutions and injuries were absolved in mercy since they were done ignorantly, and yet we poor Absoluters, made such by *ignorance* of C.O.J.II’s 3 crucial errors, become, God-deluded and Devil-blinded? “*That’s all there is to it. It’s real easy!*” So says C.O.J.II. It would appear that C.O.J.II considers our (perceived) sin of Absolutism is far more grim, and far more heinous,

than the sins of blasphemies, persecutions and injuries committed by Paul, who believed himself the chief of sinners. Paul committed his sins in *ignorance*; the same *ignorance* that C.O.J.II says Absolute Predestinarians are guilty of.

More now concerning the flaw of C.O.J.II.

If there is one thing, possibly the only thing, clear in the 47 pages of the C.O.J.II notes it is this: C.O.J.II puts much stock in word meanings, definitions, etymology, grammar and so on and on. In fact, it is clear that he would rather have us believe he has full understanding of the words he employs than for us to understand how the Bible words are used or even *if* the Bible contains the words under consideration. Example:

“**ABSOLUTE PRE-DERMI-NATION versus ABSOLUTE PRE-DESTI-NATION** by Conrad Owen Jarrell,II” Cover title, C.O.J.II notes.

If the reader has even a meager knowledge of the Word of God he will recognize that of all the words found on the cover page of “Daniel Webster” Jarrell’s notes only *by* is a Bible word. **Conclusion:** *his whole erroneous thesis is flawed.*

*Absolute* is not a Bible word; *Predetermination* is not a Bible word; *Predestination* is not a Bible word; only *by* is a Bible word and C.O.J.II has, mercifully, spared us an exhaustive interpretation of *by*.

I have not taken exception to the use of these words by C.O.J.II. I do take exception to his flawed methods. The words *predetermination* and *predestination* are simply words of accommodation. They are words that are fully acceptable when properly used. We all use them as *concepts*. C.O.J.II expressed himself exactly that way when cementing on the word *predetermine* in the following:

“**Note** (COJ) – Compare Acts 4:28, ‘For to do whatsoever thy hand and thy counsel **determined** before to be done.’ 1611 The concept of ‘predetermine’ was used in the KJV, although the English word did not come into usage until 1625.” Page 4, C.O.J.II notes.

The flawed method I Object to is C.O.J.II defining Bible issues with concepts rather than the original words (or texts) as found in the Word of God. C.O.J.II has launched his war on *Absolute Predestination* (a concept derived from numerous Scriptures and Bible words and used by believers for centuries) with *Absolute Predetermination*, a *concept* unheard of until recently, derived from practically no Bible words and, moreover, no conceptual basis. No writings from which C.O.J.II quotes has any hint of the *concept* of Absolute Predetermination (as defined by C.O.J.II) in them, even when C.O.J.II supplies contrived meanings to words, and interpretations not dreamed of by the authors quoted. This can only be considered a serious flaw, and probably worse than a flaw when all the veneer is stripped away.

## The Key Words

According to C.O.J.II there are 2 key words – “Where the action is!” as he puts it.

“2. **The Key Words**, ‘determine’ and ‘destinate,’ together with their related forms, are very similar in meaning. In virtually every English dictionary, the two are used to define each other.

*However, the two words are not exact synonyms, and it is in the difference between the definitions that the truth is found.*” Page 3, C.O.J.II notes.

As we have pointed out before, if the words *determine* and *destinate* **define each other in virtually every English dictionary, and are very similar in meaning**, then why does C.O.J.II “fumble” around for related forms of them, as found in the title of his 47 pages of notes and often elsewhere? The answer? A paraphrase of C.O.J.II from page 3:

“Never, ever let any of the principle words of the Bible get in your way, just ignore them. Fumble around in the Greek lexicons; assorted Latin and English dictionaries for related forms. That’s all there is to it. *It’s real easy – any unrepentant sinner can do it!*”

Another serious flaw in the C.O.J.II method of defining words is the use of the two key words he supplies us (page 3). He says they are “**determine**” and “**destinate**,” together with their related forms. We have indeed found the word *determine* in our several dictionaries, but *destinate* could not be found. Those having access to the Oxford English Dictionary can find *destinate* listed there as being “Now rare.” Perhaps C.O.J.II feels that a *rare* word is better than *no* word. *Destinate* should then only be considered a related form of *destine* or some other related word, but this washes out half of C.O.J.II’s key words. Is this a flawed construction of argument by C.O.J.II or not? An honest assessment of matters forces one to acknowledge that the argument of C.O.J.II is flawed, but if C.O.J.II {was attempting to CON(rad) his readers, then possibly it makes some sense.

The fact remains, C.O.J.II is guilty of picking and choosing whatever words (or words related to words, or words invented to appear to be related to other words) will best suit his purpose *to make it appear* that there is some great difference between predestination and predetermination, both words of accommodation used to identify concepts found in other words in the Bible.

The definitions of the key words supplied by C.O.J.II turn out to have at least two very different meanings. Some of the meanings come from dictionaries; others come straight out of whatever vague sources of meanings C.O.J.II borrows from to amply fuzz over the issue.

### Examples:

First example.

“**predestine** [from Lat. *predestinare*]

1. *trans.* To destine beforehand; to appoint, ordain, or decree previously, a. Theol., etc. To foreordain by an eternal purpose, in the way of a Divine decree or of fate; to appoint beforehand by destiny, or to some destiny, (Mostly in *passive*. Also *absol.*.) **c.1380**” Page 4, C.O.J.II notes.

“1. **predestine** – To fix or cause to stand in order beforehand; to fix or set the end.

ILLUSTRATION: A row of dominoes, push the first one over and they all fall down in an unalterable sequence. Absolute Predestination views all the events of time – good, evil, or natural – as like such a row of dominoes, meandering about in a pattern fixed unalterably by God, and stretching away to whatever final end He is pleased to appoint.” Page 4, C.O.J.II notes.

The first definition of *predestine* given above is attributed by C.O.J.II to the Oxford English Dictionary. The second can only be understood as a creation of the author of the 47 pages of notes. I ask: why does C.O.J.II bother to give us the Oxford Dictionary definition if he has no intention of abiding by it? I ask again: why does C.O.J.II give us his invented, conglomerated definition of *predestine* and then supplement it with an illustration he asserts is the view of Absolute Predestination, a view which no Absolute Predestinarian on earth would accept? I had always thought that in Las Vegas they did not allow dealing from the bottom of the deck.

The “row of dominoes” theory is as far removed from my understanding of *predestine* as the East is from the West. C.O.J.II says, “push the first one over and they all fall down...” He does not tell us who it is that pushes over the first domino, he only says, “push the first one over.” If this were children at play then we may agree that the illustration has some substance, but if he intends that God pushes over the first domino (first event that ever transpired) and the falling weight of each in turn must topple the remainder, then his illustration more nearly belongs with the fates and not with a definition of predestination. Predestinarians believe that God controls all events, not just the first. We also hold a much higher view of how our sovereign God brings to pass the myriad events of time than simply pushing an inanimate “bone of chance” over and leaving the rest to stand or fall on their own.

There is another colossal problem with the C.O.J.II domino theory that has seemingly escaped his mind as he set sail to promote the lie that Predestinarians make God the “Author and Efficient Cause of Moral Evil (C.O.J.II, page 4).” If all the dominoes in his brummagem theory represent all the events of all time then would not the good events as well as the evil events be included? They must be included or C.O.J.II would not have said, “*Absolute Predestination* views all the events of time – good, evil, or natural – as like such a row of dominoes, meandering about in a pattern fixed unalterably by God...” Possibly, though more likely probably, C.O.J.II believed he could pass this off without objection from Predestinarians; however, I do object. According to his falling domino scheme there are good, evil, and natural dominoes in this meandering chain. So what must happen when God tips over the first one, of which we have not been informed as to its classification (good, evil, natural)? If the first domino is an evil one, and the second one is a good domino then did not an evil event bring to pass a good event? This sounds much like what Paul abhors in Romans 3.8, regarding *doing evil that good may come*. However, if the first domino is a good one, and the second one is an evil one then we have a new and greater marvel than anything we have yet found in our Bible: **doing good that evil may come**.

As for the classification, *natural* events, we leave CO] .11 the unenviable task of informing us what these might be, and how they could not fall into either the good or evil classifications.

Much, much more could be said regarding this first of the related words of the C.O.J.II “key words” but the reader can easily see by now the manifest folly we have exposed.

Second example.

“**predetermine** [ad. Chr. L., *praedeterminare* (Augustine). *pre* + *detenninare*. *trans*. To determine beforehand (in various senses: Cf. DETERMINE)

1. *trans*. To fix, settle, or decide beforehand; to ordain or decree beforehand, to predestine. 1625” Page 4, C.O.J.II notes.

“2. **predetermine** – To set bounds or limits to beforehand; to put or set an end to.

ILLUSTRATION: A cow in a fenced lot, which may wander about *within* the lot as it pleases, but is unable to cross the boundary of the fence except thru a gate. *Absolute Predestination* views all the events of time – good, evil, or natural – as like a row of such cow lots, joined one to another on a common side with gates therein, meandering about in a pattern fixed unalterably by God, and stretching away to whatever final end He is pleased to appoint.” Page 4, C.O.J.II notes.

Again, as with our first example of how C.O.J.II uses two distinct definitions for his assault on the English language, not to mention the intelligence of all that read him, he gives, first, the rendering from the Oxford Dictionary, and second, the mangling from his own storehouse of handy word meanings. The Oxford Dictionary gives a completely satisfactory meaning to the word *predetermine*; one that most Absolute Predestinarians would consider in harmony with what is expressed in the Bible on the

subject. But, Lo, and Behold! C.O.J.II cannot use that definition! In the primary meaning the Oxford English Dictionary gives us the word *predestine*. Thus, C.O.J.II hauls out the Latin definition for *determino*. Is this scholasticism or subterfuge? Whatever it is, C.O.J.II cannot escape the obvious: predetermine and predestine are interchangeable words.

Again, C.O.J.II has given us what he calls an illustration of the word under consideration. COW LOTS, he calls it.

Consideration has already been given by me to this cow lot business, but it warrants additional scrutiny. “A cow in a fenced lot...” is how the illustration begins. Does our master illustrator want us to believe his infantile illustration is about a cow (cows?) or about a fenced lot (lots of lots?)? What is it? Cow(s) or Lot(s) or possibly both? The second sentence of his illustration forces me to believe that he primarily has lots, not cows, in mind. “Absolute Predetermination views all the events of time – good, evil, or natural – as like a row of such cow lots...” *All events of time* surely refers to things that occur or take place. *Like a row of such cow lots* surely refers to the all events of time.

This establishes the *fact* that C.O.J.II is illustrating all *events* of time, good, evil, or natural, with meandering *cow lots* and not the cows themselves. This, says C.O.J.II, is what Absolute Predeterminism is all about. All events of time as illustrated by cow lots! Let us now examine the illustration as C.O.J.II obviously laid it out.

First, can cow lots be properly considered, even by way of illustration, all events of all time, good, evil, or natural? If God has put the cow lots in place, as is obviously intended by C.O.J.II, then can they be classified as *good, evil, or natural* cow lots? What is this? Here a good cow lot; there an evil cow lot; another simply a natural cow lot, and, on and on they go, all mixed and thrown together, meandering all over the place, joined one to another, *in a pattern fixed unalterably by God*. Pity then the poor cow that gets thrOWN into the evil cow lot. Pity even more the cow that winds up in the natural cow lot. Poor thing! It will, like Adam and Eve in the garden, know neither good or evil until a snake slithers by and tells it to become as gods.

Second, if the cow lots are *fixed unalterably by God* as C.O.J.II informs us, did God do this by decree? By ordination? The Oxford Dictionary says He did. That is the definition it gives of predetermine. Moreover, did God *predestine* these cow lots? The Oxford Dictionary says He did. See the dictionary definition of *predetermine* above, as quoted by C.O.J.II. If then all events of all time, good, evil, or natural are to be illustrated by cow lots, they have been decreed, ordained, and predestined by God from all eternity. They are fixed, settled, and decided beforehand, every one of them, and thus are certain. That, according to the definition C.O.J.II quotes from the Oxford English Dictionary. No Absolute Predestinarian could render a better exposition if he wrote volumes about it.

Third, if these cow lots are what we believe them to be, fences or pens put in place to corral the cows, then they are not properly objects of activity, or as C.O.J.II terms them, all events of all time. The fences do not move. They have no living being. They neither think, choose, reject, lust, pine or pant. They are inanimate, lifeless. Cow lots do not “wander about within the lot as it pleases.” The cow lots are not going anywhere. Hear C.O.J.II again! “Absolute Predetermination views all the events of time – good, evil, or natural – *as like a row of such cow lots...*” To put it in plain language – C.O.J.II is badly mixed up. He gives us an illustration, supposedly to show how dumb cows wander about within the lot as they please, but he assigns the force of his illustration, the wandering about, to the cow lots, not the

cows. I say this respectfully; a cow could give us a better illustration of the predetermining work of God than this repugnant sample C.O.J.II has pawned off on us.

### One More Trip to the Cow Lots

“b) The evil events within The Row of Cow Lots occur *exactly* within the bounds and limits God has unalterably fixed and there is no slightest possibility of any transgression [sic] of those limits, and though the cows pass thru the evil or the good gate into the next lot, there is no slightest possibility of them arriving anywhere else. Thus, God is in *absolute control* of all events, yet in such a way that only the creature is responsible for Moral Evil, and so it is *impossible* to charge God with even the slightest guilt therein.” Page 5, C.O.J.II notes.

The cow lot episode takes another twist. Before, C.O.J.II had informed us that the cow lots themselves were representative of all the event of time. Now we are supposed to accept this new dispatch: the evil events occur *within* the row of cow lots. Which is it, events *within* the cow lots or the actual cow lots? Besides that, we are now told that these cow lots have gates, some good and some evil. I wonder, will a good gate be put on an evil lot, or will an evil gate be put on a good lot? Can they be mixed without a mixed-up affair resulting? Did God create the evil gates or only the good gates?

Further, why has C.O.J.II not told us of the *good* or *natural* events he before informed us were part of the *all events of all time*? Are we to suppose that good or natural events need none of God’s attention and so none of ours either? But, I shall still ask, if a natural event (cow?) passes through an evil gate, will it remain natural or will it become evil? If a good event (cow?) passes through an evil gate, Will it then be transformed into an evil event (cow?)? Moreover, if an evil event (cow?) passes through a good gate will it be the same as passing from law to grace or death to life? Where would all this nonsense end but in delusion if pursued?

C.O.J.II may plead in behalf of God’s holiness all he wants and until the world shall pass, but he can never convince a child of God that, 1) the cow (evil event) *is free* to wander about, *and* 2) God is in absolute control. Both cannot be correct and there is not a trace of doubt which is error. This is nothing more than split vision, or holding to two diametrically opposed positions.

Having now examined the “key words” and their related meanings, as produced and defined by C.O.J.II, along with his lackluster illustration, I shall now examine the Bible words the subject of predetermination is related to. It should be kept in mind that C.O.J.II, in giving his personal definition of predetermine, says, “*To set bounds or limits to beforehand; to put or set an end to.*” whereas the Oxford Dictionary definition he gave us is “*To fix, settle, or decide beforehand; to ordain or decree beforehand, to predestine.*”

### Determine

The word is found once in the Word of God and has no particular bearing upon this subject.

“If men strive, and hurt a woman with child, so that her fruit depart from her, and yet no mischief follow: he shall be surely punished, according as the woman’s husband will lay upon him; and he shall pay as the judges **determine** (Exodus 21.22).”

## Determination

The word is found *once* in the Word of God and relates to God's purpose (predestination, decree, will) to execute evil upon the nations. God's **determination** here is clearly related to that which is evil.

“Therefore wait ye upon me, saith the LORD, until the day that I rise up to the prey: for my **determination** is to gather the nations, that I may assemble the kingdoms, to pour upon them mine indignation, even all my fierce anger: for all the earth shall be devoured with the fire of my jealousy (Zephaniah 3.8).”

## Determinate

The word is found once in the Word of God and relates to the combined counsel and foreknowledge of God whereby He, God the Father, delivered His Son up to tabernacle among flesh, live, suffer, and die for all the sins of all His elect. *Delivered* in this text goes far beyond the single event of Christ being delivered to the cross. To restrict the meaning to that one incident would give rise to this question: If the expression, *determinate counsel and foreknowledge* of God relates only to the method of Christ's death, then what expression must be used to cover every other of the infinite events that led up to that single deliverance? Obviously, everything necessary to bring Christ to the cross is included in “the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God.”

“Him, being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, ye have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain (Acts 2.23).”

## Determined

The word is found sixteen times in the Old Testament and fourteen times in the New Testament and is applied to both God and man. Of the sixteen times it is used in the Old Testament all but two times **determined** is used in connection with bringing evil upon persons or nations. In one of the exceptions, II Chronicles 2.1, reference is made to Solomon's having **determined** to build a house for the Lord. The other text relates to Job and God's dealings with him.

“Seeing his days are determined, the number of his months are with thee, thou hast appointed his bounds that he cannot pass (Job 14.5).”

If **determined** should be understood to mean *bounds* and *limits*, as C.O.J.II insists, then why, in this one brief text, is the expression *his days are determined* used regarding Job's duration of life and the expression *thou hast appointed his bounds* is used to delineate his habitation? Does this not tell us that there is at least some difference in the words?

Of the fourteen times the word **determined** is found in the New Testament only three times does it refer to the work of God. The first of these concerns the wicked betrayal of Christ by Judas.

“And truly the Son of man goeth, as it was **determined**: but woe unto that man by whom he is betrayed (Luke 22.22)!”

The second of these, Acts 4.28, is in regard to the gathering together of Herod, Pontius Pilate, the Gentiles, and the people of Israel to carry out the wicked devices which God had **determined** for them to do.

“For to do whatsoever thy hand and thy counsel determined [predestined] before to be done (Acts 4.28).”

The third text is remarkably similar to Job 14.5 quoted above.

“And hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth, and hath determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation (Acts 17.26).”

As with Job specifically, God has for all nations of men generally, **determined** their time of duration in life as He had *before appointed*. Furthermore, God had set the bounds pertaining to where they would carry out that existence. Once again in the Space of a single brief text the Holy Spirit directed the use of **determined** for one circumstance and *bounds* for another. Had this occurred in only one text we may have thought our understanding was dim, but here we have two texts, treating exactly the same subjects, using the same three words, **determined**, *appointed*, and *bounds*. And yet for all this profound evidence to distinguish the meanings and usage of these words by the Holy Spirit, C.O.J.II would have us believe that determined must mean *bounds* and limits. Were that so, then what would *bounds* mean since **determined** has already appropriated that definition? In the area of the country where C.O.J. .11 was raised, they have a saying for such profundity: “Ignorance – run up to seed!”

What inescapable conclusion does all this lead to? C.O.J.II has given us two “key words” *determine* and *destinate* to prove his unique doctrine of Absolute Predetermination, and one of them, *destinate*, is not even found in the Bible. The other, *determine*, is found only once. Of course, this makes no difference to C.O.J.II for he will implement *related* words, which would not be so terrible had he used the dictionary definitions he gave us rather than his fabricated definitions. I have examined the one “key word” found in the Bible, together with those related words, and have plainly shown that the vast majority of those words recount evil events. **Conclusion:** *Absolute Predetermination, formulated by one of two “key words” and “their related forms” is, by C.O.J.II’s own logic and deductions, the doctrine of God’s government of evil events.* And for a good dose of irony, without realizing it, C.O.J.II admits as much, as shall be shown by his own writings.

On the other hand, the words *predestinate*, and *predestinated*, related forms of the *rare* “key word” *destinate*, offered us by C.O.J.II, are, by his own admission, only used four times (*predestinate*, Romans, Chapter 8; *predestinated*, Ephesians, Chapter 1) in the Scriptures, and each time to describe God’s blessings upon the elect.

“b) In fact, the English word ‘predestine’ can only be considered a correct translation of *proorizo* if both are taken in their *secondary* meaning of, ‘To set apart for a particular end (compare *destine* 3 with *horizo* 2).’ Indeed, this is the exact intent of the KJV Translators (see 1 above). ‘To be conformed to the image of His Son,’ and ‘The adoption of children by Jesus Christ to Himself,’ are two blessings which will not be fully possessed until the Resurrection and Glorification of the body (Rom 8:29-30 with Psa 17:15; Eph 15,11 with Rom 8:23).” Pages 5, 6, C.O.J.II notes.

**Conclusion:** *Absolute Predestination, formulated by one of two “key words” and “their related forms,” is, by C.O.J.II’s own logic and deductions, the doctrine of God’s government of good events.*

Has C.O.J.II “fumbled” around and come up with something, or is this one more of his “errors in correct reasoning” he speaks so much of?

So there we have it: Absolute Predetermination, the doctrine of God’s government of evil things, and Absolute Predestination, the doctrine of God’s government of good things. The problem is, C.O.J.II will not consent to his own inevitable deductions, for he would have us believe Absolute Predetermination involves “all events in time – good, evil, and natural (Page 4, C.O.J.II notes).”

“It is evident from our study of the word definitions, and from the fact that here the Translators used ‘determined before’ to render *proorizo*, that the evil actions of evil men were bounded and limited by God – like the cow lots, and *not* like the dominoes. Observe that events are Absolutely Predetermined, they are not Absolutely Predestinated. In the Bible, only two end results for the Elect are said to be ‘predestinated.’ In all other places, when describing God’s government of events, the Bible uses the words ‘determine’ or ‘determined before,’ or synonymous words like ‘bounded,’ ‘limited,’ ‘restrained,’ etc.” Page 6, C.O.J.II notes.

Those “*evil actions of evil men were bounded and limited by God – like the cow lots...*” C.O.J.II says are evident to him are certainly not evident to Predestinarians, nor should they be since they have no basis for evidence. “*Observe that events are Absolutely Predetermined, they are not Absolutely Predestinated.*” If compelled to use the meanings of both doctrines, as given by C.O.J.II, I would observe no such thing. Moreover, if C.O.J.II would look over what a tower of confusion he has constructed with *cow lots, dominoes, key words*, and an abundance of other untempered mortar, neither could he observe such.

A copious amount of other untempered mortar has been spread across the 47 pages of C.O.J.II’s house of confusion, but since it all came out of the same slime pit as that I have previously examined, I see no need for redundancy. Accordingly I shall conclude this section with

### **A final Word on Cow Lots: The Case of Adam**

The whole of C.O.J.II’s thesis is that Absolute Predeterminism is the truth and Absolute Predestination is heresy. He illustrates his thesis with a scenario of cow lots, which represent “all the events of time – good, evil, or natural (Page 4)”. Since Adam was a creature of time, having been created on the *sixth* day, then the cow lot illustration must include Adam as well as all other creatures. However, from other statements of C.O.J.II we are compelled to conclude that» either the illustration is not worth the paper it is written on, or else the deck which our Las Vegas double dealer is using has several jokers in it. Several “cow lot” quotes will show what is meant.

“b) The evil events within The Row of Cow Lots occur *exactly* within the bounds and limits God has unalterably fixed and there is no slightest possibility of any u'angression [sic] of those limits, and though the cows pass thru the evil or the good gate into the next lot, there is no slightest, possibility of them arriving anywhere else. Thus, God is in *absolute control* of all events, yet in such a way that only the creature is responsible for Moral Evil, and so it is *impossible* to charge God with even the slightest guilt therein.” Page 5, C.O.J.II notes.

It has been established that the cow lot illustration embraces “all the events of time,” and since what Adam did in time when he ate of the forbidden fruit must be considered evil, then, according to C.O.J.II, it occurred “*exactly* within the bounds and limits God has unalterably fixed...” Now, since God only fixed one “bounds and limits” on Adam, that of forbidding him to eat of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil (Genesis 2.17), then the cow lot Adam found himself in was extremely small; so small, in fact, that he was completely shut up from any of that “wandering” business C.O.J.II mentions when first giving his illustration. But the problem with this illustration goes even deeper.

“It is evident from our study of the word definitions, and from the fact that here the Translators used ‘determined before’ to render *proorizo*, that the evil action of evil men were bounded and limited by God – like the cow lots, and not like the dominoes.” Page 6, C.O.J.II notes.

Now C.O.J.II gives us another slant on the cow lots. Before, he would have us to believe he was illustrating “all the events of time – good, evil, and natural,” but here it is limited to *evil actions of evil men*. What of Adam, then? Well, he must be left out of the cow lot, for Adam was not an evil man, at

least not until he violated the commandment. From this it is certain that C.O.J.II has given us a very uncertain illustration of Absolute Predetermination. Will he clear it up with additional pronouncements? No; but he will expose himself considerably.

**“B. THE SPECIFIC METHOD** of Government by Bounds and Limits.

1. What the Scripture says about how God governs evil acts scatters the Strict Predestinarian dominoes beyond recovery.

a) The KEY VERSE showing how God governs evil acts:

Psa 76:10 Surely the wrath of man shall praise thee: the remainder of wrath shalt thou restrain [2296].

(1) **CHaGaR 2296** = To gird on (as a belt, armor, etc.) [Gesenius, ‘To gird.’].

(2) God simply withholds or limits the options of evil men and fallen angels to the one or few which will accomplish His will. Their own depraved natures impel them to act upon those remaining options, even though they could do nothing.

Act 2:23 Him, being delivered by **the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God**, ye have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain:

Observe how God’s determinate counsel limited them to one *single means* of slaying Christ, crucifixion; and how their evil natures impelled them to act. a Page 7, C.O.J.II notes.

We have here what C.O.J.II calls the KEY VERSE showing how God governs evil acts. We can only assume he intends Adam’s evil act as well, for, after all, this is the *key verse* on the subject, at least as far as C.O.J.II see matters. And, remember, this illustration of cow lots involves “all events of time – good, evil, and natural.” But C.O.J.II says all this about *evil men* and *fallen angels*. So now Adam must be left out, for until he sinned he was neither an evil man or a fallen angel. Moreover, C.O.J.II says “Their own depraved natures impel them.” Once again, Adam is left out; he cannot be in the cow lot, at least based on what C.O.J.II said here.

Before looking at a final quote from C.O.J.II concerning cow lots, predetermining, bounding and limiting, and so on, it seems necessary to inspect his *key verse*, as he calls it.

“Surely the wrath of man shall praise thee: the remainder of wrath shalt thou restrain (Psalm 76.10).” This key verse cannot unlock the dilemma that C.O.J.II has created. Either Adam’s sin is included in the cow lot illustration or it is not. If it is not included then C.O.J.II must either revise or repudiate his illustration or quit the contest. If Adam’s sin is included then how can this *key verse* apply? It seems an awful stretch of imagination to consider Adam’s sin as wrath. Worse – how can there be any wrath to restrain after he sinned? After all, Adam had only one commandment, and when he broke it there was nothing left. Furthermore, the text says that the wrath of man shall praise God. This is just what Predestinarians have been saying all along.

“All events of time – good, evil, and natural.” That must include Adam. “Evil actions of evil men.” That must leave Adam out for he was not an evil man until after he transgressed. “Depraved nature.” That too must leave out Adam. No cow lot bounding and limiting for him until after the fall.

“(3) THE GREAT QUESTION is how God can govern the evil acts of creatures either without cancelling their moral responsibility or without becoming the efficient cause of their sin. Restraining [sic] options solves this problem, both by leaving the creature morally responsible for its fallen nature choosing to act rather than refrain, and by leaving God without reproach, for all He did was keep them from performing other evil acts, which was merciful. The good acts of godly creatures present no problem, since all good acts work to the glory and purpose of God.” Pages 7,8, C.O.J.II notes.

Here C.O.J.II tells us of the good acts of godly creatures. “No problem,” says he. But the problem does still persist; what of Adam? Good acts of godly creatures will not answer the problem, for what Adam did was not good, but very evil. We have looked at all the other possibilities C.O.J.II has given us, and none of them fit Adam’s case. All events; good, evil, and natural. Evil events by evil men. Natural events. None of these can possibly fit Adam’s case. We are left with one positive conclusion: C.O.J.II is way out on a limb and looks very foolish.

If C.O.J.II has given us the *genuine* doctrine of Absolute Predetermination in his 47 pages of notes then we surely must praise God that it has spread no farther than it has, for it most certainly is a pestilence that affects the brain.

## SECTION 5.

### CONDITIONAL TIME SALVATION

The purpose of this section is to review my statements on Conditional Time Salvation found in an article titled, Definitions, as published in “The Remnant,” January-February, 1993, Volume 7, No.1. C.O.J.II boasted he would disprove the statement; a claim which he utterly failed to accomplish. Space will first be given herein to examine his rendition of Conditional Time Salvation. Consideration will also be given to the subject of Conditionalism as distinct from Conditional Time Salvation.

#### C.O.J.II ON CONDITIONAL TIME SALVATION

“B. The Conditional Time Salvation Issue.

1. The purpose here is not to get into an exposition and defense of Time Salvation.
  - a) Absolute Predestination has been Biblically proven false, and Absolute Predetermination has been proven the doctrine of the Bible. In the process, the ‘divine *efficient* cause of good and evil actions’ argument has been refuted, and the ‘divine *enabling* cause of good and evil actions’ argument has been established. Thereby, the logical foundation of the concept of Conditional Time Salvation has been laid – that God is the enabling cause of all our actions, and therefore, we are to some degree morally responsible for the good or evil that we do.” Page 20, C.O.J.II notes.

There is so much wrong in this statement that the limits of this section will not allow us to expose it all. However, sufficient will be laid bare so that all may see the absurdities it contains.

C.O.J.II first informs us he has no purpose to give an exposition and defense of *Time Salvation*. Of course the controversy is not about *Time Salvation*, it is about Conditional Time Salvation. Attention will be given to the continued interchanging of terms to suit C.O.J.II. And it is well enough that C.O.J.II would not desire to be found expositing and defending Conditional Time Salvation, for either effort would further expose him as the real interloper among the Baptists. Yet he does feebly attempt to do just that: exposit and defend, with no more success than he had with his attempt to exposit and defend his beloved Molinism. Follow then from his quote the series of efforts to make his hopeless case.

1. We are informed that C.O.J.II has taken the Bible and proved Absolute Predestination to be false. He could as soon prove there is no God. We did see that he took his best shot at Absolute Predestination, using a *new* shaft called Absolute Predeterminism. Yet for all that, his arrow fell much short of the mark for the shaft was crooked and was not a proper Bible weapon.
2. Moreover, C.O.J.II claims he has proven his new shaft, Absolute Predetermination, to be the doctrine of the Bible. If the reader will go back over our Section 4 on that subject, it will be positively clear that his spurious claim has been driven far hence.
3. C.O.J.II refuted efficient cause, supposedly.
4. The argument of enabling cause was established by C.O.J.II, at least in his opinion.
5. The previous four items are a *logical* foundation laid by C.O.J.II himself.
6. The *concept* of Conditional Time Salvation will be built by C.O.J.II on this sand foundation.

7. The conclusion – according to C.O.J.II – we are to *some degree* morally responsible.

In our opinion (which is as good as his), C.O.J.II has established none of the above items, and, what is more, he admits the foundation he built was only his logic, nothing more. And too, the best he could call Conditional Time Salvation was a *concept*. Worse yet, his “we are morally responsible” was only to *some degree*. Is *some degree* more, or is it less? Is *some degree* a tiny part or the major part? What of that which is not to some degree? Can we conclude from this that C.O.J.II believes we are to *all other degrees* not responsible? Where I came from they would say that C.O.J.II was skating on thin ice.

Item four above relates to C.O.J.II’s doctrine of *enabling cause*, being, we suppose, God enabling a saved sinner to do what he otherwise could not do, good or evil. Regenerated sinners must be those under consideration, for his doctrine of Conditional Time Salvation applies to none but those born of the Spirit. What difference then could it possibly make, if the saved sinner was responsible or not, if, in fact, he was unable? God must do for him what he cannot do for himself, whether good or evil, responsible or otherwise. Are these a few wild deductions on my part simply to assail C.O.J.II and his views? No sir, they are not; they are the views of C.O.J.II and also expressed elsewhere in his notes.

“c) Note – just because the creature is morally *responsible*, it does not follow that it is morally able. Only elect angels and elect and regenerate humans are actually able to obey God’s righteous commands:”  
Page 23, C.O.J.II notes.

In this statement C.O.J.II allows that the elect are able to *obey* but that other creatures, though responsible, are not able. Notice – he says they are able to obey, whereas in the quote from page twenty C.O.J.II says God is the *enabling cause of all our actions*, and therefore, we are to *some degree* morally responsible for the good or evil that we do. Unless C.O.J.II wishes to retract some or all of these statements he must be guilty of espousing several contradictory and erroneous views.

If God is *the enabling cause of all our actions*, which must also include His enabling us to obey His righteous commands, then do not His righteous commands *include the evil we do*? Could it be otherwise? He says *all* we do is by God’s enabling us. He says we do *evil* as well as good. And all this, says C.O.J.II, proves we are to *some degree* morally responsible for the good or evil that we do.

If this is not a befuddlement of what Conditional Time Salvation is all about, then what is it? Pity those other poor souls that would attempt to defend Conditional Time Salvation. They have a hard enough time in their futile effort without the perplexing additions C.O.J.II has put to it.

## **WHAT IS CONDITIONALISM?**

Conditionalism by its simplest definition is works.

Conditionalism is *not to be confused* with Conditional Time Salvation. While they both grow from the same rotten root, Conditional Time Salvation produces a fruit far more poison than plain Conditionalism, for it is peddled to us as the “duty” of the saint, not the “duty” of the lost. Conditionalism has been around as long as the first revelation from God to sinners regarding His purposes to deliver sinners from their sins. We see Conditionalism in one of its plainest forms when the Legalists harangued the Galatians to be circumcised as a necessary addition to their faith in Christ. We see it gaining the ascendancy in the several centuries after the Apostles as the necessity of baptism, good works, oblations, mental assents, and untold other appendages to the grace of God. Chief among the exponents of Conditionalism were the apostate Jews, Catholics, Reformers, and assorted other

religionists, hungry to satisfy their own conception of things needful for salvation and a fulfilling of their personal capabilities before God.

Today, Conditionalism appears among all the creeds, confessions, and utterances of every offspring of Mother Babylon. Who has not seen tracts that supply the depraved with “What you must do to be saved”? The key there is *you must do*. Practically all of us have heard, more times than we would care to, some simple-minded so-called minister tell us, “God will save you – if you will take the first step.” This, and countless other religious bribes, is Conditionalism. It is the attempt to add something else to the free grace of God to accomplish personal deliverance, no matter what that addition is.

Paul announced that God had called out a remnant and described the carnal effort to make the calling out to be works (Conditionalism) rather than grace in this way: “And if by grace, then is it no more of works: otherwise grace is no more grace. But if it be of works, then is it no more grace: otherwise work is no more work (Romans 11.6). ”

Conditionalism is the harlot mother – Conditional Time Salvation is the daughter by incest (Satan is the father of both), and although close kin,“ they are not the same. The mother was around long before the daughter. They are alike, however, in that both deny that grace alone will save a sinner; the mother denies grace alone will save you for *eternity*, and the daughter denies grace alone will save you in *time*. Both would cry up “duty” and “works” to obtain sufficient favor with God to be delivered, the former for eternal blessings and the latter for timely blessings. This strange woman and her contemptible offspring answer well to Solomon’s observations in Proverbs 7.4,5ff.

## CONDITIONAL TIME SALVATION

The following is the quote from my article titled Definitions which C.O.J.II often assailed and attempted to refute.

“Without attempting an exhaustive tracing out of the early history of this new doctrine, (a task that is not at all difficult) we will assert that the denial of the doctrine of absolute predestination is the foundational source of conditional time salvation with all its vagarious tenets.

Conditional time salvation is a very new doctrine, and can be traced back only to the latter part of the last century, and only in the United States. It has no identity in early history anywhere, and the New Testament is totally silent in its support. A few of the proponents of this system have, however, loosely gleaned a number of passages from the Old Testament accounts of God’s governmental dealings with Israel. These they have saddled on the backs of those confused about the distinguishing differences between law and grace. Not a single sermon, tract, letter, or account of this doctrine can be produced dating back before the close of the War Between the States. Dissenters from this statement will search history’s vaults and libraries in vain to produce contrary evidence. It simply does not exist.” Page 11, “The Remnant, ” January-February, 1993.

Did C.O.J.II have any success at all in attempting to overthrow the clear statement above? He said he would, but did he? I shall examine his efforts.

“b) This controversy is much, much older than most American Absoluters imagine. The *overwhelming majority* of them, even many of the Absolute Predeterminists among them (whose doctrine of God’s Government is sound) think that this controversy is only an American phenomena, [sic] arising since the

Civil War. In reality, the controversy arose among theologians and philosophers in Europe in the mid to late 1500s, during the maturing decades of the Protestant Reformation.” Page 19, C.O.J.II notes.

“Much, much older than most American Absoluters imagine.” Well, *we have not imagined* that it goes back no further than the War Between the States (not a so-called Civil War) for we know it goes back no further. But C.O.J.II does not need to trudge back all the great distance to the 1500s in an attempt to prove us in error. All he needs do is work back, say, from about 1861, and find something, *anything*, dating *anytime* before the War Between the States and then he can put us blushing to shame. Why go back 300 years to prove our error when it is necessary to only go back *one day*? Did he? No, he did not! Why did C.O.J.II not dig out of countless thousands of writings in this land since the first white man came here *at least some small, minor hint that someone, anyone, few or many, knew of a controversy about Conditional Time Salvation*? Surely, if the controversy began 300 years ago in Europe, as C.O.J.II claims, it would have been known here by 1861 or before. C.O.J.II says “The controversy arose among theologians and philosophers in Europe in the mid to late 1500s.” Then why did it never reach our shores? If it be claimed that it did reach here, then we again insist that C.O.J.II *prove* it. We are not asking for a library full of evidence; a few brief scraps will do. One sermon, one letter, one book, one record that there was a controversy between the Absolute Predestinarians and those that are now commonly known as adherents of Conditional Time Salvation is all we ask for. But what has C.O.J.II given us? **Total silence.**

I will tell you in unmistakable terms why C.O.J.II has not given us a single line of proof that Conditional Time Salvation existed in this country before the War Between the States: Because it does not exist. Well, C.O.J.II proposes, however, that he has an out to slip through here, but does he?

“(2) 11:19 half-truth that Eld. Poole has crucified himself upon is *terminology*. The *terminology* used today to describe the points of difference between Predeterminism and Predestination *did* arise only in America, and only after the Civil War. However, the concepts debated, and the doctrines they developed, were centuries old by that time.” Page 20, C.O.J.II notes.

“Were centuries old by that time.” Prove it, C.O.J.II! If, as he claims, the doctrines were developed, and had brewed for three whole centuries, then why did he not give something of them from America? After all, C.O.J.II has blasted Elder Gilbert Beebe, here in America, as the father of Absolute Predestination. He has maligned Welsh Tract Church, here in America, as the “mother of Absoluters,” so at least *our half of the controversy exists* here in the United States before the War Between the States. But where, where, where is *any* proof his little parcel of the controversy existed, using *any* terminology of *any sort*, before that time? Was the issue confined to Europe? Had it never invaded our coasts? If Conditional Time Salvation existed, in any form of terminology, here in the United States before the War, who promoted it? Answer: Not a soul! C.O.J.II passed by all the works of every sort in the United States for the most obvious reason; **there was nothing for him to lay his hand on.**

So off goes C.O.J.II, sneaking back 300 years, passing over every theological writing that exists in America. His mission of subterfuge lands him among the dung-hills of Catholic superstitions, heresies, blasphemies and Satanic influences where he drags out Molina and his *Scientia Media*. He gives it *new terminology*; he calls it *Absolute Predetermination* and exclaims, “These be your gods which will deliver you from the Absolute Predestinarians.” In the likeness and image of *Conditional Time Salvation* made he it. And he *thought* he saw that it was good and very good.

Desperation often breeds deceit and this contrived controversy is no exception. I have already pointed out that we Predestinarians are not opposed to salvation in time; we believe in salvation in time. It is

*Conditional* salvation in time we oppose. So then, C.O.J.II, desperate to defend his *cow lot* full of sacred cows, Molinism, Predeterminism, and Conditional Time Salvation, would crucify me with what he calls a *half-truth*: terminology. What terminology does he use to carry out this crucifixion? Why, any words but those contained in my quote. It will be remembered that the article under consideration was titled Definitions. I defined Conditional Time Salvation as a new doctrine that did not exist prior to the War Between the States. So then, when C.O.J.II frequently quotes me, rather than following the honest course, he interchanges *his own terminology* to define *my issues*. He does it in a rather glaring fashion, I may add. Observe:

- “1. THE KEY POINT is Eld. Poole’s claim that Conditional Time Salvation arose out of opposition to the doctrine of Absolute Predestination.  
a) More correctly, the *controversy* between the advocates of Absolute Predetermination and Absolute Predestination gave rise to many *clarifications* the Predeterminists had never needed to make before the controversy arose.” C.O.J.II, Page 19.

Notice well that no sooner has C.O.J.II identified my *claim* regarding Conditional Time Salvation under his item 1, he changes it to a *controversy* between the advocates of Absolute Predetermination and Absolute Predestination under his item a). This gives rise to several questions. First, why did he switch the term Conditional Time Salvation to Absolute Predeterminism? Answer: because he has absolutely no documentation to sustain a controversy before the War Between the States about Conditional Time Salvation. Second, if the controversy was at the time of the War already 300 years old, why did the proponents of Predeterminism/Conditional Time Salvation wait so long to develop many clarifications? C.O.J.II says the clarifications were not needed until the controversy arose, and yet the clarifications were 300 years in coming. Strange! As has been suggested previously, if *any writings* containing these clarifications had existed in the United States before the War, it is more than astounding that C.O.J. .11 did not swiftly produce them. More on this later.

- “(1) Eld. Poole, like virtually all Strict Predestinarians, is sadly ignorant on this point. The major points of controversy between Predeterminism and Predestination, which underlie the Conditional Time Salvation dispute, were argued out over *300 years before* the American Civil War by *Europeans*. Page 20, C.O.J.II notes.

Again C.O.J.II switches the terms and inserts his favorite word, Predeterminism, for my remarks on Conditional Time Salvation. Next, he tells us that the “major points of controversy...*underlie* the Conditional Time Salvation dispute.” If he had told us that the Flood in the days of Noah *underlies* the subject of baptism because both involve much water it would make as much sense. Even a casual reading of my Section 3 on Molinism will satisfy the honest reader that the point of controversy with Molina was how to reconcile free will with the foreknowledge of God and the point of controversy with Bañez and the other Dominican priests was how to reconcile Molina with the Council of Trent.

“FACT. As we shall see, the history of the 15 and 1600s is replete with ‘sermons, tracts, letters, and accounts’ of the doctrine of Absolute Predetermination; not the least of which are the Presbyterian Westminster Confession (1646) and the Baptist confessions of Midland (1655) and the various London Confessions of 1640 to 1689. The ignorance of the Strict Predestinarians on this point is pitiful.” Page 20, C.O.J.II notes.

FACT? Or FABRICATION? Let the reader judge.

Once again, C.O.J.II has extracted my term, Conditional Time Salvation, from the dispute and replaced it with his doctrinal concoction, Absolute Predetermination. Is this simply another slip on his part? We shall see all right, but not what C.O.J.II would want us to see.

What C.O.J.II said “we shall see,” we never saw. None of the Confessions he held up for proof contain a single sentence to suggest his Absolute Predeterminism or his Conditional Time Salvation either. I have read them all, as have countless others, and there is not one sentence in any of them that would support the tortured interpretation he put on them. If I should concede that the Confessions *may* have, directly or indirectly, alluded to, in a half-way manner, either of C.O.J.II’s theories, a concession *I do not make*, it still must be asked why, after the London Confession of 1689, the last confession he quotes from, there is not a fragment of evidence submitted? What did C.O.J.II offer us from 1689, correct or incorrect, until 1861? Nothing. ZERO. Did the controversy close 'm 1689, or more to the point, *did it ever exist?*

“5. SUMMARY – As can be seen from the above, a Strict Predestinarian Absoluter (Bañez) is having his onion peeled by an Absolute Predeterminist (Molina)...way back in the 1500s...in Europe. What was that Elder Poole said (p.19), and some of our excluded unrepentant sinners believe so joyously? ‘Only in the United States...Nowhere in history.’ Oh, my! Golly gee! Stepped in it, up to their knees!” Page 26, C.O.J.II notes.

We repeat this vulgar quote once again only to show that C.O.J.II persists in changing the wording from Conditional Time Salvation to Absolute Predeterminism. His pattern is evident.

“What happened in the Absoluter-Conditionalist battles of the late 1800s and early 1900s was the *adaptation* of new terminology by the Conditionalists, to accurately express the Biblical doctrine of Absolute Predetermination; and the *maintenance* by the Absoluter: of the old and muttered terminology and their fatalistic heresy, masked thereby.” Page 30, C.O.J.II notes.

That the Conditionalists did come up with some *new terminology* as well as a *new doctrine* is totally correct on both counts. That it was to “express the Biblical doctrine of Absolute Predetermination” is totally false. What document, tract, sermon, letter, scribble, or anything else has C.O.J.II given us, *before* or *after* the late 1800s and early 1900s to prove he is not a deceiver? Nothing! Let it be stated clearly, there is *nothing in existence* for anyone to lay their hands on that will show there were any Predeterminists, in the late 1800s or early 1900s, contending for Predetermination against Predestination. There were indeed some few rabble-rousers contending *against* Predestination, but they were contending *for* Conditional Time Salvation, not Predetermination. Leaving Europeans to C.O.J.II for the moment, I ask: can one single adherent to, or defender of, Absolute Predetermination, as defined by C.O.J.II, be found here in the United States before the War Between the States?

“(c) Finally, in article sixteen, Cox dwells upon preaching the Gospel to encourage repentance and baptism for eternally saved people, which he calls ‘obedience by true believers,’ which are means to bring benefits to the believer:

**XVI.** Although a true believer, whether baptized, or unbaptized, be in the state of salvation and shall certainly be saved: Yet in obedience to the command of Christ every believer ought to desire baptism and to yield himself to be baptized according to the rule of Christ in His word: And where this obedience is in faith performed, there Christ makes this His ordinance a means of unspeakable benefit to the believing soul, Acts 2:38, 22:16; Rom. 6:3,4; I Pet. 3:21. And a true believer that here sees the command of Christ lying upon him, cannot allow himself in disobedience thereunto, Acts 24:16.

(d) It is impossible to successfully deny *either* that Benjamin Cox was a doctrinal molinist, or Absolute Predeterminist; or that he believed and taught Conditional Time Salvation; although he did not use the terminology developed over 200 years later in America.” Page 36, C.O.J.II notes.

Having read article XVI through a number of times I find that contrary to C.O.J.II, *it is possible to deny* that B. Cox was a doctrinal molinist, an Absolute Predeterminist, or taught Conditional Time Salvation.

Let each examine it for themselves. Is there a hint of any kind of Conditionalism in Cox's article? Does he sound like Molina, toiling over reconciling free will and God's foreknowledge? Did Cox pen anything that could be associated with "cow lot" Predeterminism? Certainly not! Read the article as many times as you will and Cox simply sounds like a Baptist. In fact, Cox sounds much like a Predestinarian where he says that "...a true believer that here sees the command of Christ lying upon him, *cannot allow* himself in disobedience thereunto." "Where the word of a king is, there is power; and who may say unto him, What doest thou (Ecclesiastes 8.4)?" Christ is King; He lays His command upon a believer; there is power; the believer *cannot allow* himself in disobedience thereunto. This doctrine all Absolute Predestinarians believe.

Again C.O.J.II has sought to align Conditional Time Salvation with Predeterminism.

While there are a number of other instances of C.O.J.II switching the term Absolute Predetermination for Conditional Time Salvation, I shall only examine two more.

"I think it both a fair and accurate statement to say that I have demonstrated that Elder Poole is about as wrong as it is possible for a man to be. 300 years of doctrinal controversy over the doctrine of Absolute Predetermination vs. Absolute Predestination *before* the American Civil War, and, apparently, Eld. Poole is ignorant of every ticking minute of it. Not only him, but every person who would subscribe to the sentiments of his specious statement. The one cant that is heard unceasingly, from Absoluters of all stripes, even the Predeterminists (who should know better), is that Conditional Time Salvation was never heard of before the Civil War. I feel confident that I have put that fantasy to rest (by the grace of God, if so be). As I have said in many ways before, so I repeat now: **The single most prominent ingredient in the heresy of Absolute Predestination of All Things is IGNORANCE.** Ignorance of 'Word Meanings, ignorance of Grammar, ignorance of Correct Reasoning, ignorance of parallel Bible texts, ignorance of history. Repeated, manifold, relentless, amazing, incredible, mind-numbing, butt-dumb *IGNORANCE.*" Page 47, C.O.J.II notes.

300 years of controversy – over what? Conditional Time Salvation was what he was contending for against my statement, but once again he twists it into a controversy between Absolute Predetermination vs. Absolute Predestination. We have plainly shown that Predeterminism is not even a good step-neighbor-in-law to Conditional Time Salvation. It is not even as near as 92nd cousins, yet C.O.J.II persists. To compound his futility, C.O.J.II could not even make a decent case for Predeterminism after he had substituted it for Conditional Time Salvation.

"F. In the United States after the Civil War, because of the Absoluter rantings of Eld. Gilbert Beebe, a controversy arose among the Sovereign Grace Baptists. The Old Line Baptists (so called), to better avoid the boo-boos of Beebe, developed a new terminology, expressing more accurately the distinctions between 'predetermination' and 'predestination.' They maintained the ideas of Molina, the Reformers, the Puritans, and the early Baptist theologians as to God governing by predetermination, but began to distinguish that word from 'predestinate;' more correctly emphasizing the binding, limiting, and restraining implied by the definition of 'predetermine.' New terminology was devised, such as 'Conditional Time Salvation,' '3 phases of Salvation,' and 'Absolute Predetermination,' to express the old concepts retained and defended from the 1500s." Page 47, C.O.J.II notes.

If the "old concepts" were retained and defended from the 1500s as is claimed by C.O.J.II I must ask again, who were these people, here in the United States that C.O.J.II calls the Old Line, that did all this retaining and defending? We have not heard from them yet. Beebe began his "Absoluter rantings" in 1832 and spread them throughout every State and Territory through his "Signs of the Times" until his death in 1881. Were the "Old Liners" so retarded, stupid, and inert that it took them nearly 30 years, from 1832 to the outset of the War, to discover this tragedy Beebe had enacted on them with his Absolute Predestination? Was there no one among them who had blessedly digested Molina's *Concordia*, replete with Predetermination, *Scientia Media*, limits, bounds, Conditional Time Salvation,

and the three unclean frogs called “3 phases of salvation”? Surely, if this was the doctrine of the Old Line, and this lone barbarian, Beebe, had launched warfare on the sacred truths of Predetermination, the multitudes of Molinist adherents would have not waited 30 years to invent new terminology to combat him. Why was this? Answer: the Baptists in the United States were not divided. The Church of Jesus Christ, known as the Old School, or Primitive Baptists were Predestinarians. There were no Baptist Molinists. There were no Predeterminism. Conditional Time Salvation did not exist. As with practically all errors that invade the church, Conditional Time Salvation crept in slowly, insidiously, a seed here, a denial there, a question or suggestion about predestination with due caution that the fingerprints of Satan were not easily detected. After all the original signers of the Black Rock Address had been called home, Beebe being the last, then open warfare was launched. The churches had been sorely tried by the War Between the States. Many of the able and sound defenders of the faith had been slaughtered on the field of battle”. The time was right. As for Predeterminism, it appears the Serpent would wait until a much later time, this century, to find a suitable vessel in which to deposit that hatchling.

Conditional Time Salvation is a modern heresy. It is not the same as Absolute Predeterminism. It developed after the War Between the States as an instrument of war against the Absolute Predestination of All Things, but, “No weapon that is formed against thee shall prosper (Isaiah 54.17).”

## **ANOTHER PLOY BY C.O.J.II**

Just as C.O.J.II attempted to ' change the wording of the controversy from Conditional Time Salvation to Absolute Predetermination, he also frequently dropped the word *Conditional* and referred to the issue as Time Salvation. I have in these pages often expressed my belief in time salvation, or salvation which takes place in time, so long as it is not Conditional Time Salvation. The Predestinarian doctrine of *all* or *any* salvation is one of free grace, first, last, and always; no conditions for eternal salvation and no conditions for time salvation.

Again, there are many examples of C.O.J.II’s continued duplicity but only a few shall be noticed, as they all have the same purpose, that of clouding the issue. To avoid unnecessary commentary after each citation I will add **bold face highlight** to those pertinent words in C.O.J.II’s quotes. This is not to distort his meaning, which is distorted enough, but to avoid repetition.

“B. The **Conditional Time Salvation** Issue.

1. The purpose here is not to get into an exposition and defense of **Time Salvation.**” Page 20, C.O.J.II notes.

**Conditional** Time Salvation – changed to Time Salvation.

- “a) The Strict Predestinarian Problem. If passages can be shown that clearly distinguish between Eternal Salvation and **Time Salvation** (as the above passages obviously do), the Strict Predestinarian is exposed as an heretic for denying the distinction.” Page 21, C.O.J.II notes.

**Conditional** Time Salvation – changed to Time Salvation.

“(1) Note eternal salvation: ‘Thou has delivered my soul from death.’

- (2) Note **time salvation**: “Wilt not thou deliver my feet from falling, that I may walk before God?” Page 22, C.O.J.II notes.

**Conditional** Time Salvation – changed to Time Salvation.

“c) The Strict Predestinarian Heresy: Since there are obviously passages that clearly distinguish between Eternal Salvation and **Time Salvation**; and since the Strict Predestinarian emphatically denies this fact, committing demonstrable Errors in Grammar and Correct Reasoning in order to do so: the conclusion is unavoidable that *the Strict Predestinarian denial of a conditional time salvation, distinct from eternal salvation, is a heresy.*” Page 22, C.O.J.II notes.

**Conditional** Time Salvation – changed to Time Salvation.

**Note:** it must be stressed here again that I *do not* “emphatically deny” a distinction between eternal and time salvation. What I do *emphatically affirm* is that C.O.J.II is either not telling the truth or does not know what the truth is. In either case he should remain silent until he has the facts.

“(4) Benjamin Cox on **TIME SALVATION**.

(a) There are three articles that clerally teach the doctrine of **Time** (or Gospel, or Fellowship) **Salvation**. Remember that creatures have a genuine moral responsibility (refer back to and review, V.B.3., p23). In article eight, Cox clearly makes this argument.” Page 35, C.O.J.II notes.

**Conditional** Time Salvation – changed to Time Salvation.

“(b) Article fourteen, though it does not use the post-Civil War terminology, is the strongest statement in the Appendix concerning **Time Salvation**. It contains almost all the elements of the doctrine.” Page 35, C.O.J.II notes.

**Conditional** Time Salvation – changed to Time Salvation.

“(3) Next, observe the 3rd Article, and perceive how comprehensive an exposition it gives of the doctrine of **Tim Salvation** (although the terminology is not used, the concepts are clearly evident)? Page 46, C.O.J.II notes.

**Conditional** Time Salvation – changed to Time Salvation.

“.. .In other words, there is the obvious inferring of a salvation *following* eternal salvation, for only the eternally saved. This is nothing other than what we now call **Time Salvation** (because it happens here in time, Mk 10:30), or Gospel Salvation (because faith in the Gospel message is prerequisite, I Co 15:1 2-), or Fellowship Salvation (because fellowship with God results, 1 Jo 1:3). The specific modern words are not used, but it cannot be successfully denied that the ideas are obviously inferred” Page 46, C.O.J.II notes.

**Conditional** Time Salvation – changed to Time Salvation.

It is regrettable that it was necessary to submit all the above redundant quotes from C.O.J.II but they are given to show an unmistakable pattern. Each of them manifest the same duplicity; C.O.J.II would have his readers believe that *Conditional Time Salvation* and Time Salvation are the same thing, just as he would have the reader believe that *Absolute Predeterminism* and Conditional Time Salvation are the same. As I have abundantly shown, in neither case are they anywhere near the same. So, then, let it be stated once more: if the doctrine of Conditional Time Salvation, or the doctrine of Absolute Predetermination has ever been promoted in this land before the War Between the States C.O.J.II totally failed to prove it. He did not submit one single piece of evidence, and that lack of evidence coming from him says to me that it positively did not exist. Why did he go all the way to *Europe* in 1588, there to dredge up the views of a gang of Catholic priests, and then wander around mm 1689 for evidence of what surely must have found its way here by 1861. Again, if the controversy *did not* find its way to our shores until after 1861, then it is a fact beyond dispute that the doctrine of the Old School Baptists, as declared by Beebe and countless others, was Absolute Predestination. In the absence of the controversy what else could it be?

## A BRIEF HISTORY OF CONDITIONAL TIME SALVATION

A portion of the history of this new doctrine has already been incorporated into my remarks, in this section and elsewhere, but it is yet needful to trace out what took place, and why.

The Old Order of Baptists were rallied together in the early 1800s by the Black Rock Address and other declarations which were made necessary due to the spread of new doctrines and practices creeping into the assemblies of the saints. Among the more alarming of the *new* doctrines facing the Baptists was missionism frequently referred to then as *Fullerism*. Of course, missionism was just another *conditional* system spun from the bowels of Satan, but it was especially onerous because it appealed to the exceeding generosity and affection of loving believers. It was soon exposed, however, as the fraud it was: just another *conditional* contrivance.

When the Black Rock Convention convened in 1832, among the committee to draft a resolution for consideration was Elder Gilbert Beebe, then only 31 years of age. During the proceedings his Prospectus for a new paper was introduced and accepted by the entire assembly. Item two of the Prospectus read as follows: “**The Absolute Predestination of all things.**” The paper, to be called the “Signs of the Times,” was launched shortly thereafter, and for a number of years was the only paper circulating among the Old School Baptists. For 49 years after, until his death in 1881, Beebe annually incorporated the original Prospectus in the pages of the “Signs” as it had become known. Make no mistake; the Baptists knew what Beebe was publishing, and moreover, it was generously and *enthusiastically* received and supported.

Beebe was no small-time drummer, beating out an uncertain sound in the loft of a mule barn nestled in the back sides of a wilderness. He boldly sounded the gospel trumpet to the farthest reaches of our Nation. Let the record speak:

“No one who justly appreciates the intelligence of the Old school Baptists, can believe that they could read our paper for twenty-six years, and not know what are our religious sentiments. It is presumed there is not a person in the ranks of the Old School, or Primitive Baptist communion, whose doctrinal views are better understood by the Old School Baptists generally throughout the United States, than are those of the editor and publisher of this paper; and it is arrogant and presuming in persons of but ordinary intelligence, to assume that they know more than all the church of God, are better able to judge and detect heresy, and that they are competent to search the hearts and try the reins of men, and to affirm that men do hold doctrines which they constantly disavow.

But we leave all this to be considered by our brethren, and disposed of as our God may see fit, and our assailants to enjoy all that distinction and notoriety which their efforts to injure us may entitle them to, or cam for them.

Our circulation is now between six and seven thousand, and constantly increasing; and we have the assurance of many thousands of the scattered flock that they are edified and comforted by the perusal of the communications which have appeared in the Signs.” Elder Gilbert Beebe, Signs of the Times; December 15, 1858.

A circulation of between **six and seven thousand** – in 1858. And, be a remembered, this was a paper that began with Absolute Predestination and continued to maintain it uncompromisingly. The amount of circulation is even more staggering when consideration is given to the difficulty of sending out mail to the distant States and territories. At that time many of the copies of the Signs were bought by one

individual and then spread among the church or their family, thus making the number that read the six or seven thousand copies much more than that. Although the circulation was greatly reduced during the War years it was estimated at one time that the actual circulation reached nearly *fourteen thousand*.

All this makes it very plain that Conditional Time Salvation was not the doctrine of the Old Order of Baptists, and Absolute Predestination of all Things was the doctrine of the Old Order of Baptists, no matter what terminology might have been used.

I offer one final quote from Beebe relative to the wide-spread knowledge and appreciation of the Signs and all it stood for:

“In regard to the prospective character of our journal, little more need to be said by us than that to the best ability our gracious God may bestow on us we shall exert to make it profitable and edifying to our readers. Thirty-four years of constant labor on our part, in which we have published about one thousand issues, averaging about five thousand copies to each issue, and making an aggregate of nearly five millions of copies, which have been sent out into every state and territory of our wide spread country, cannot have failed to give our readers a sufficient opportunity to judge of our sentiments, and of the character and usefulness of our publication. Our record is before our brethren, and if we would we cannot recall it. The sentiments and design to which this periodical was pledged in our Prospectus of September, 1831, have ever since been strictly adhered to by us; and to this hour, we see no cause to change, modify or recede from anything therein enunciated.” Elder Gilbert Beebe, *Signs of the Times*, January 1, 1867.

There are several things of great interest here. *Five millions* of copies of the paper, by Beebe’s conservative estimate, had circulated across the country to untold thousands of hungry and eager readers. And all the while the paper maintained the doctrine of Absolute Predestination as opposed to any and all forms of Conditionalism. It would take the combined audacity of a million imps to fly in the face of this historical record and contend that *Absolute Predetermination* was the doctrine of these Baptists; that as soon as the last puff of smoke cleared from the raging battlefields of the War they seized upon new terminology to finally show their Molinist character.

Finally, notice that Beebe said he had strictly adhered to his original Prospectus, including item 2 affirming the Absolute Predestination of all things.

I shall here examine several of the absurd remarks made by C.O.J.II relative to Beebe and his influence:

- “b) But, alas, like many old men whose star is fading, he sought to champion a cause in his senility, in order to save a reputation earned in his virility. In so doing, he became the self-appointed apostle of Absolute Predestination.” Page 20, C.O.J.II notes.
- “4. Elder Gilbert Beebe (1800-1881) – was the most responsible American Baptist in *promulgating*, the Terminological Confusion among American Sovereign Grace Baptists. Briefly, he followed the muddled terminology of Zanchius, as did the Puritans and Baptists of England...” Page 29, C.O.J.II notes.
- “F. In the United States after the Civil War, because of the Absoluter rantings of Eld. Gilbert Beebe, a controversy arose among the Sovereign Grace Baptists. The Old Line Baptists: (so called), to better avoid the boo-boos of Beebe, developed a new terminology, expressing more accurately the distinctions between ‘predetermination’ and ‘predestination.’ They maintained the *ideas* of Molina, the Reformers, the Puritans, and the early Baptist theologians as to God? governing by predetermination, but began to distinguish that word from ‘predestinate;’ more correctly emphasizing the binding, limiting, and

restraining implied by the definition of ‘predetermine.’ New terminology was devised, such as ‘Conditional Time Salvation,’ ‘**3 Phases of Salvation**,’ and ‘Absolute Predetermination,’ to express the old concepts retained and defended from the 1500s.” Page 47, C.O.J.II notes.

Notice the slanders – Beebe is ridiculed as “an old man whose star is fading” who “sought to champion a cause in his senility” who was the “self-appointed apostle of Absolute Predestination.” He *promulgated terminological confusion* among American Sovereign Grace Baptists and *followed the muddled terminology* of Zanchius. This is what C.O.J.II has thrown out for us as his learned assessment of what took place, even in the overwhelming light of recorded history.

“Absoluter rantings of Eld. Gilbert Beebe;” “The boo-boos of Beebe.” Does this sound like the view of a humble student of our history, or does it sound more like the very rantings and boo-boos he accuses Beebe of?

I shall pass by the other remarks in the three above quotes and come to a decided point. Does C.O.J.II believe that for 30 years, from 1831 when Beebe published his Prospectus containing the Absolute Predestination of all things until 1861 when the War broke out, that the Church was so ignorant, so lacking in wisdom, or so beguiled, that a young preacher, only 31 years old, and already a senile madman ranting unchecked about a heresy called Absolute Predestination, could not be challenged? Was there not a single soul, aided by C.O.J.II’s *enabling cause*, endowed with sufficient Molinistic free will to stand up and say that Absolute Predestination was heresy and Conditional Time Salvation was the truth? Was the church so void of men of understanding in the Scriptures and the history of the Baptists in 1831 that the *boo-boos* of Beebe could terrorize the assembly of the saints for the next 30 years? If so, the low opinion CO] .H has of the church that Jesus built upon a Rock is warranted.

Imagine; Beebe had sent out over five million copies of the *Signs* throughout our nation. Absolute Predestination was constantly promoted and not a copy had a trace of Conditional Time Salvation, under any terminology, within them. Can it be that C.O.J.II has not given us a proper assessment of matters? That is exactly what has happened. This from a man that derides us for a failure to employ his *Correct Reasoning*.

## **OBSERVATIONS FROM HISTORY**

Since C.O.J.II did not give us *anything* documented from history, because he obviously had *nothing*, I shall offer a few remarks from several well-respected Baptists showing how they viewed Conditional Time Salvation, and especially how they understood it to be a *new* doctrine.

“To me it is a new and strange thing to find Old Baptists claiming praise for works of obedience, and insisting that the favor of God is conditional, depending upon their will and choice, and therefore uncertain, and that when it comes to them it comes as a reward for their obedience. I have heard that kind of talk all my life from Arminians, but never before from Old Baptists.” Elder Silas Durand; Letter to J.H. Oliphant, October 6, 1899.

Elder Durand served among the Old Order of Baptists for over 50 years, beginning his ministry in September 1864. He should have been in a position to know what was *new* and what was *strange*. I will mention that Elder Durand wrote more for the pages of the Signs than any other writer, excepting Elder Beebe. His writings appeared in numerous other publications as well. It was well known that even those soft-shells that did not agree with Durand after the Conditional Time Salvation troop marched in still held him in the highest respect as a man of integrity and humility.

“Elder F.A.Chick--Dear Brother: I lay down the Signs of the Times, to take my pen at once, to write to you for the purpose of endorsing your editorial upon predestination, in the number for the first of December. It is encouraging to read the same gospel truths, written in this editorial that I was accustomed to read and believe as published in the Signs of the Times fifty years ago. When I read this article, and thought it over, it brought very vividly to my mind, the words recorded in 1 Kings 19:18, ‘Yet I have left me seven thousand in Israel, all the knees which have not bowed unto Baal, and every mouth which hath not kissed him.’

I remember the time when I had never met nor heard of one among Predestinarian Baptists, who did not believe the doctrine of God’s sovereignty and predestination of all things. It was an understood fact, that the denial of this Bible doctrine was alone by professed Arminians.” Elder James M. True; Letter to Signs of the Times, December 4, 1897.

If we accept Elder True’s observations, then there must not have been any around him for fifty years that hawked Conditional Time Salvation, and he never saw it in the Signs; not even after *five million* copies.

“BELOVED: The Old Baptist people have long been troubled with the confusing doctrines of ‘means of salvation,’ ‘means of grace’ and such like; but not until the present young generation rose up, who assume to be wise above all the fathers, has the confusing and uncertain sound of ‘conditional time salvation’ been trumpeted forth in almost all the camps of Israel. The last ten years this strange and startling blast of trumpets has echoed and reechoed with exciting and bewildering effect, and great has been the widespread confusion and division, where peace and good-will prevailed before. This dividing of salvation, and subdividing it into fragments and parts, partly eternal salvation, and partly time salvation, (as the teachers of this yea and nay gospel call it,) they boastingly claim, is ‘rightly dividing the word.’ It certainly has a dividing quality, for it has scattered the flock. Yea, it has brought bitter strife and alienation into the rank and file of the conditional Baptists themselves. Thus has God confounded their language, and they cannot understand one another.” Elder David Bartley; April 1, 1905, Letter to the Signs of the Times.

Elder Bartley was one of the most respected Old School Baptists of his period. Even those among the Conditional Time Salvation camp appreciate his writings sufficiently that they have republished a number of his books. Several thousands of his Priesthood of the Son of God have been sold in the last fifteen years alone and his The Christ-Man in Type is still being distributed by us. Bartley was not just another back-woods preacher grumbling about incidental errors. He was without question a well-qualified leader. He swiftly detected the insidious influx of leaven among the churches and saw that Conditional Time Salvation was indeed not only a *new* but “bewildering” doctrine pestering the saints.

It will be seen that the few quotes I have given are from the turn of the century and not immediately after the War. The reason for this is simple. While the division was *beginning* to take place after the War in some few areas of the land, most notably in the mid-west, the division between Conditional Time Salvation and Absolute Predestination was years in the making. I have affirmed that the Conditional Time Salvation novelty did not arise until after the War Simply because there is positively no documentation to prove its existence prior to that time. It was really a numbers of years before the division became widespread. It is worth mention that there was never a division in the Northeast part of the country. The churches remained solid defenders of Absolute Predestination except for some

associations in Virginia which had previously divided from the “Signs” Baptists in the 1850s over the issue of Eternal Vital Union.

The last major division resulting from the introduction of Conditional Time Salvation took place in the Georgia-North Carolina area in the mid-1920s, over 50 years after the War Between the States. I give here some very brief personal knowledge of what took place in Georgia.

Despite constant attacks on predestination, the churches generally stayed together until around 1926 when an Elder (baptized and ordained among the Absolute Predestinarians) introduced new articles of faith in the East Atlanta Primitive Baptist Church; a church of the Yellow River Association. The Elder’s *new* articles were accordingly rejected. The Elder then rounded up approximately 25 members and sought dismissal for himself and the others so that they might constitute a church to the South of Atlanta. Having gained their end, they moved South – about *one mile* South – and constituted Bethany Primitive Baptist Church on September 18, 1926, on doctrines much more ambiguous in tone from those of the Predestinarians. From that period on they were identified with those of the new Conditional Time Salvation theory.

After the duplicitous Elder retired from Bethany, around 1960, the congregation called a young minister up from South Georgia. He had little knowledge of the history of the division, having never heard of Primitive Baptists until just a few years earlier. However, he soon got a crash course in what took place. It seems the young minister was preaching the very same doctrine Bethany Church left behind when they and their Conditional Elder withdrew from the Yellow River Association. The young minister was advocating the predestination of all things, although not using that particular expression at the time. I was that young minister.

In 1962, when I was called as pastor to Bethany, there were yet there six charter members that had come out of the Predestinarians. There were also many others in the area that had a first-hand knowledge of what took place. I learned in no uncertain terms that the Baptists were yet one body there until around 1926 when Conditional Time Salvation-struck its telling blow. I can testify from eye-witness accounts of that period, from both sides of the fence, that the Old School Baptists of that area were identified as Predestinarian Baptists until the 1926 division.

What took place there in Georgia in the 1920s is essentially what took place all around this nation beginning sometime after the War Between the States. There are few left today that were there when the divisions occurred, but it can be said with certainty that the many records of history bear out what I have recounted.

I was excluded from Bethany Church several years later for confessing I believed in Unlimited Predestination. It remains to me a great irony that Bethany Church was constituted out of an Absolute Predestinarian Church so they could worship the god of Conditional Time Salvation, and then called as its pastor, only 36 years later, an Elder they would exclude for professing exactly what they professed to believe when they were originally baptized years before.

Such has been the disposition of the adherents of Conditional Time Salvation since the new doctrine was first openly promoted sometime after the War Between the States.

## SECTION 6.

### REPROBATION, SUPRALAPSARIANISM, AND “OF THE SAME LUMP”

The subject matter here has only indirect bearing on the general dispute over Absolute Predetermination and Absolute Predestination. Perhaps C.O.J.II feels that the more mud he can throw at us the more will stick. Augustus M. Toplady once remarked that if one first let their enemy's mud dry then it would wipe off easily enough without smearing. We have waited sufficiently.

“E. God elects some people to sin and damnation – **The Doctrine of Reprobation**

1. The Doctrine of Reprobation, sometimes known as Double Election, teaches that God decreed that some men be created to be eternally saved and that all others be created to be eternally damned. A controversy arose over this idea around the time of the Protestant Reformation. The opposing camps became known as Supralapsarians and Sublapsarians, as they differed over God's decree of Election relative to His decree to permit the Fall of Adam and Eve.” Page 16, C.O.J.II notes.

#### Reprobation

Little shall be said here relative to reprobation. C.O.J.II says that we Absolute Predestinarians believe there are two elections. This is nonsense and simply not true. The misrepresentation has been sufficiently covered in Section 2, Item 11. Accordingly, only a few additional comments are now necessary.

The solemn Bible truth of reprobation, that some, more or less, of the human race shall “go to Hell when they die” is rejected by many. This is especially true of those that have no hope of eternal life in Christ our Lord but yet want to be religious. The idea of a final rejection by God is to them so repulsive that an outright denial of many passages of Scripture is common. This is particularly true of religionists giddily contending that “God is love.” It seems to them that love is all that can be known of God. Universalism (God will save all; damn none) is extremely common among many religious movements. It is interesting that among those Primitive Baptists coddling Conditional Time Salvation, there is also an obvious bent towards universal salvation. Some go so far as to advocate that Esau, Pharaoh, and even Judas the devil (John 6.70) are children of God.

To come now to a swift conclusion on reprobation, it needs to be asked firstly, “Are there any to be saved by God's electing love?” If it is answered, yes, there are those to be saved in heaven by God having chosen them to salvation, then ask secondly, did God choose all, or only some, of the human race? If the answer is *only some* of the human race then the *doctrine of reprobation is a certainty*. All that is left now is to define what method or form reprobation takes.

Concerning the final outcome, it makes absolutely no difference if God *decreed* (not the proper word, but commonly used) or simply *passed* by those not chosen to eternal life. Either way, and using any terminology related to the subject, any not elected to eternal life are doomed to an eternal banishment from the presence of God. Could it really "matter then to that soul, languishing forever in the flames of awful vengeance, an eternity of misery beyond description, if he got there by a *decreed reprobation* or by *preterition*, the Calvinist term for God's passing by those not elected to eternal life? It is difficult to

imagine that theological niceties or the order of decrees will occupy the conscience of those groaning among the damned in torment.

C.O.J.II says we Predestinarians teach that *God decreed that some men be created to be eternally saved and that all others be created to be eternally damned.* Well, to be sure, we *do* advocate that God predestinated some of the human family (the elect, chosen in Christ before they were ever in the human family) “be created to be eternally saved.” It matters not if the election consisted of one person of the human race, or all but one person of the human race, or some unknown number of persons between one and all but one; God has, in His infinite wisdom, for purposes worthy of Himself, answering to none in heaven or earth, made an eternal distinction between some of the whole number making up the entire human family and the others. To admit to an election that ultimately leads to the salvation of any of that number, great or small, many or few, is to admit of *a distinction that ultimately leads to damnation* of those not elected. This is reprobation, whether considered positively or negatively.

Just as sure as God created His elect, to whatever end they would enjoy, He also created all others of the race of men to their final end. If it was not to be eternally saved then it must have been for them to be eternally damned; what else is there in the Bible as an option? All who admit of an election must also admit of a reprobation of some sort. For the reprobate, one sort is as bad as the other sort. Sadly, it appears that for C.O.J.II one sort of reprobation is worse, far worse than the other. He cannot be content with the Sovereign God doing with His own such as He will.

### **The Decrees**

Before examining the so-called order of decrees in C.O.J.II’s Supralapsarianism and Sublapsarianism it must first be determined how the word *decree* is used in the Bible. It is of little importance to believers how Dr. Gill, John Calvin, C.O.J.II, Charles Taze Russell, or others may have used the expression, “The decrees of God.” If it is not used that way in the Scriptures, then believers have the right, even the imperative, to reject it.

The word *decree* is found 49 times in the Scriptures, all in the Old Testament but one. The word *decrees* is found three times: two of them in the New Testament. Thus there is a total of 52 times that the words are used. However, it is most interesting to see in those 52 uses of *decree* or *decrees*, not once are they used in relation to matters of an eternal nature. Not once are they used to describe any supposed order of God’s eternal business, the priorities of election, creation, or the fall of mankind. If those that have contrived the systems of Supralapsarianism and Sublapsarianism had searched their Bible they would have found t *decrees* here is no order of God’s decrees; or, at least if there is, the Bible is totally silent on it.

The following brief statement from the last century gives an excellent view of *decree* or *decrees* as used in the Word of God:

“Decree signifies an edict, or established ordinance; and to decree is to make known an ordinance by command or proclamation, Of course when the decree refers to intelligent beings, it is what they are required to observe; and when it refers to inanimate things, it points out the order which God has established for them. So it is evidently used in the scriptures. The term decree is used, denoting an act of God, in reference to the rain, &c. Job 28.26; in reference to the sea, Job’38.8-11; and Proverbs 8.29; in relation to the heavens, Psalm 148.6; The term is used to denote that order, &c., which should be established and made known for Zion by her King, ‘I will declare the decree,’ Psalm 2.7; to inform Nebuchadnezzar that he must submit to

the humiliation which God had appointed for him, Daniel 4.17, 25. So the resolution adopted by the apostles under the guidance of the Holy Ghost, for the rule of the Gentiles (Acts 15:28,29) is called their decrees. Acts 16.4. We find the word repeatedly used in the scriptures, to denote the edicts and commands issued by the kings and rulers of the earth to their subjects..." Elder Samuel Trott, AN EXAMINATION, "Signs of the Times", November 15, 1845.

C.O.J.II is guilty of errors in word meanings. He attempts to reckon with Predestinarians over the decrees of God, but he is not even aware of how the contested words are used in the Scriptures or by Baptists. This, however, does not hinder him from dragging up useless contentions from the early days of the Reformation regarding the supposed order of decrees. Think of it! Shortly after these reformers came out of Mother Babylon, still influenced by centuries of darkness, they set in order for us all the mind of God that could be considered known. Then they promptly declared to us that "This is how God worked things out." The problem is, they could not agree on how God worked these things out. Thus, the opposing camps each contrived an "order of decrees" as if God must be bound to, and work by, a chronological sequence of eternal events (as described by the various opposing parties). Here is how it is seen by C.O.J.II:

- "a) **Supralapsarian.** Supra (before) + lapse (the fall), hence 'before the Fall.' Has the order of decrees as follows:
  - (1) Elect some men to be eternally saved and all others to be eternally damned.
  - (2) Create mankind.
  - (3) Allow mankind to fall in Adam.
- b) **Sublapsarian.** Sub (after) + lapse (the fall), hence 'after the Fall.' Has the order of decrees as follows:
  - (1) Create mankind.
  - (2) Allow mankind to fall in Adam.
  - (3) From Adam's fallen race, elect some men to be eternally saved and leave all others in their sins to be eternally damned." Page 16, C.O.J.II notes.

I fully disagree with item (1) and (3) under a) **Supralapsarian** above. Either C.O.J.II has given a faulty assessment of what Supralapsarians believe, or I am not one of their number. Both are correct: I am not a Supralapsarian; and C.O.J.II gave, as usual, an incorrect version of what someone else believes.

Did C.O.J.II supply any documentation about these Supralapsarians? No. As with everything else he has contended for in his 47 pages of notes, we got exactly zero documentation. ZERO! Other than possibly Twisse and Beza, I feel safe in saying C.O.J.II cannot name a half-dozen other Supralapsarians from recorded history. Of course, Sublapsarians are another matter, for these Semi-Arminians are legion.

I do not believe, nor do Predestinarians in general believe, that God elected men to damnation. Election is to eternal life, not eternal death. Reprobation is one of the acceptable words relating to the condemnation of the non-elect. Therefore, item (1) must be rejected. I also reject the expression "allow mankind to fall in Adam" as found in item (3). Few, if any, Predestinarians admit the use of *allow* as respects God's will or purpose.

Both Supralapsarianism and Sublapsarianism are useless. First, they wrongly use the word *decrees* in contending for an order of God's mind. Second, there is no such order revealed in the Word of God. Third, anything that could be considered chronological belongs in time, not eternity with God.

That God has revealed much of His eternal mind to us is admitted. That God has revealed His mind to us in sequences of events is denied. Consider: when God revealed to us the outworking of His plan of

creation He divided it into a seven day period, clearly chronological. But He tells us nothing of any chronological sequence in *planning* that creation.

There are many texts that show there is no such thing with God as an *order of decrees*. Two will suffice.

“Many, O Lord my God, are thy wonderful works which thou hast done, and thy thoughts which are to us-ward: they cannot be reckoned up in order unto thee: if I would declare and speak of them, they are more than can be numbered (Psalm 40.5).”

David speaks of two activities of God: His works and His thoughts. Within these must be found whatever purposes or will God had relative to the election, creation, the fall, and finally redemption. But David affirms that so wonderful are God’s works and thoughts that *they cannot be reckoned up in order*. But what is this? Have C.O.J.II and a gang of reformers somehow done what David said could not be done? “Here it is,” say they; “*First*, God thought to do this; *next*, God thought to do that; *finally* God wound it all up. Simple as *one, two, three*.” Behold, the *order* of God’s decrees is born.

The problem for C.O.J.II’s gang of decree-solving reformers was, when it came time to issue to the world the order of God’s decrees; they could not agree on the order. Some said “One, Two, Three,” while others said “No! Two, One, Three.” Thus, the declaration of David in Psalm 40.5 is fulfilled perfectly; these things cannot be reckoned up *in order*.

“These things hast thou done, and I kept silence; thou thoughtest that I was altogether such an one as thyself: but I will reprove thee, and set them in order before thine eyes (Psalm 50.21).”

This perfectly sums up the ignorance of those that would unfold the mind of God to an awed world of beholders. They think God is no different than they. “Surely,” they falsely assume, “when God got up His plan He first sat down and sorted out the options *in order*.” “Why, yes!” say they and C.O.J.II, “God said, ‘I will first think up something called the family of Adam. Next I will decide if I want Adam to be a good boy or a bad boy. Then I will plan out when to choose some of Adam’s good or bad offspring. It may be I will choose them first, but on the other hand I may *allow* them to become had first, and then I will pick up the pieces.’” This is the mind of God as seen by those that *thoughtest* God works and thinks like they do. There is in this text an irony. Those that think they can set God’s Holy business in order shall find that God shall set their sins in order – before their eyes.

If forced to believe in an order of decrees, I suppose that by default I would have be a Supralapsarian. However, since our God is the same yesterday, today, and forever and changes not, I can but rejoice in Him as our great I AM. With Him all is ever present, perfect, and everlasting. With Him all things are possible; even His determining all the events of all time and eternity at once without having to line them up like a row *dominoes*. Surely we must join with Job and say “He is in one mind.”

## Of the same lump

The following is the unique commentary of C.O.J.II on Romans 9.21-24:

“2. The most popular passage among Strict Predestinarians to teach Supralapsarianism:

Rom 9:21-24 Hath not the potter power over the clay, **OF THE SAME LUMP** to make one vessel unto honour, and another unto dishonour? 22 What if God, willing to shew his wrath, and to make his power known, endured with much longsuffering **the vessels of wrath fitted to destruction:** 23 And that he might make known the riches of his glory on **the vessels of mercy, which HE HAD AFORE PREPARED unto glory.** 24 Even us whom he hath called, not of the Jews only, but also of the Gentiles?

a) The Strict Predestinarian (who is almost always a supralapsarian) argues from this text that God fits some to eternal damnation just as He prepares some for eternal glory.

b) Suffering as he does from demonically-induced doctrinal dyslexia (2C0 4:4), the poor doofus [sic] is unable to notice either the presence of the words ‘of the same lump’ in v.21, or the *absence* of the words ‘He had’ in v.22.

(1) The text plainly states that ‘He had afore prepared’ the vessels of mercy unto glory.

(2) The text plainly does *not* state that ‘He had fitted to destruction’ the vessels of wrath. ‘Fitted to destruction’ indeed they were, *but not by God*. Adam was the culprit, as may be clearly seen from the parallel passage in Rom 5:12-19, which begins, ‘Wherefore, **as by one man** sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned.’ Failure to notice the *absence* of the words ‘He had’ indicates an Error in Grammar in being unable to read fifth grade writing. Failure to compare the parallel passage is an Error in Correct Reasoning, resulting from not following the Bible’s own rule for Bible Study.

(3) However, the Biggie is failure to notice the *presence* of the words ‘of the same lump’ in V. 12. Here are the facts, which completely destroy the basic concept of supralapsarianism (which assumes that God decreed to elect all men to their eternal destinies *before* He either decreed to create them or decreed to permit their fall).” Pages 16, 17, C.O.J.II notes.

Romans 9.21-24 is certainly a popular passage among the Predestinarians, as C.O.J.II says. However, when using it, we consider the context from whence it came. Verses 14-24 should be viewed as Paul’s commentary on his exposition of election and reprobation in verses 6-13. These two destinies are illustrated by Jacob and Esau; “As it is written, Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated (Romans 9.13).”

According to Paul the two boys had done neither good or evil to influence God in determining their ultimate ends. God’s sovereign will in loving one and hating the other manifested His purpose according to election. Paul then anticipated an objection to this in verse 14: “What shall we say then? Is there unrighteousness with God? God forbid.” What follows then from verse 15 to verse 24 is his response.

The reason God shows mercy and compassion, as in the example of Jacob, is found solely in God’s will. Four times in verse 15, Paul quotes God saying, “I will.” “So then it is not of him [neither Jacob or Esau, nor us today] that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that sheweth mercy (verse 16).” Neither the will nor efforts of either son of Isaac were determining factors in their final end.

The reason God reprobated Esau is found in the example of Pharaoh: “...and whom he will he hardeneth (verse 18).” Paul stated in verse 17 that it was “Even for this same purpose” that God had

raised up Pharaoh. That *same purpose* refers back to the *purpose of God* according to election, verse 11. Election secured Jacob. The election of Jacob, and the absence of any election of Esau was one purpose, and the same purpose of God for all the race, illustrated in the twin sons. So, as sure as God chose Jacob, Esau was *simultaneously* reprobated. It required no *sequential* decrees.

Paul anticipated a second retort with “Thou wilt say then unto me, Why doth he yet find fault? For who hath resisted his will (verse 19)?” Certainly those like Jacob, embraced in the everlasting love of God, are not the objectors here, for their blissful lot is secured in God’s purpose according to election. No, the objectors are those election has not embraced. They are those like the hated (Esau) and hardened (Pharaoh). This brings us to the explanation by Paul to the bitter complaint of verse 19.

It will be shown from verses 20-24 (using correct reasoning and parallel passages) that C.O.J.II once again failed in his objective(s). His incorrect reasoning in blaming Adam for reprobation is positive evidence he should not be trusted to show us the way of salvation, either for time or eternity.

### **Paul’s explanation of Romans 9.19 with Romans 9.20-24**

“Nay but, O man, who art thou that repliest against God? Shall the thing formed say to him that formed it, Why hast thou made me thus (Romans 9.20)?”

This is not one of the elect that repliest against God for they do not complain against their own redemption. No, the one here that repliest against God is the reprobate who is not reconciled to the good pleasure of God. His bitter interrogation is, “Why hast thou made me thus?” At least this particular reprobate has a better understanding of God’s sovereignty than C.O.J.II, for he knew his situation was attributable only to God’s will and the execution of it.

Paul describes this man as “**the thing formed**” and God as “**the One Who formed**” the man. This is a vital point; *God Himself formed* the replier.

“Hath not the potter power over the clay...” God is likened to a potter, and mankind to clay in Isaiah 45.9,10; Jeremiah 18.1-6 and elsewhere. It requires little wisdom to know *power over the clay* means God is sovereign respecting anything and everything relating to the clay. Its creation, existence, and end rests in the eternal will of the Potter. The Potter is all power; the clay is all passive and pliable.

“Hath not the potter power over the clay, of the same lump to make one vessel unto honour, and another unto dishonour?” C.O.J.II says that I am suffering from demonically-induced doctrinal dyslexia; I am unable to notice the presence of the words “of the same lump” in verse 21. I certainly *do* notice the words *of the same lump*; I certainly do not notice the same things in the words C.O.J.II notices. “Of the same lump” *does* represent the mass of humanity, both foreseen and actual. Had it not been foreseen it surely could not have subsequently existed. And too, it must have been viewed as *fallen humanity* for a number of reasons. Paul had covered the subject of election previously, verses 7-13, so this treatise cannot concern election. Reprobation was covered in verses 13-18, so neither is reprobation being considered. What the apostle unfolds from *of the same lump* is the end for which each *fitting* is intended. It was to be the fitting of vessels of mercy and vessels of wrath. *Vessels* are what the Potter forms, makes, fits, and prepares from this lump of clay. The word *vessels* will be examined in due time.

Notice now a brief quote from C.O.J.II which cannot be reconciled with others he has made regarding the lump.

- (a) Please note carefully in v. 12 that it was from ‘*the same lump*’ that God made *both* the vessels of honour *and* of dishonour. This signal fact, invisible to the demon-blinded Strict Predestinarian, is of supreme importance because of
- (b) The meaning of the word ‘lump.’” Page 17, 00-111 notes

Remember the part of his quotation *that God made both the vessels of honour and of dishonour*, taken with this following:

- “(2) It is shapeless – therefore it *must* be fallen mankind, *after they lost the image of God in which they were created.* (Gen 5: 1-3)” Page 17, C.O.J.II notes.

Notice now again the words Paul uses to illustrate the work of God as Potter over the clay: **formed**, two times, verse 20; **made**, once, verse 20; **make**, once, verse 21; **make**, implied again, verse 21; **fitted**, once, verse 22; **prepared**, once, verse 23. “But wait. Hold on.” says C.O.J.II. “God is not responsible for the **fitted** in verse 22; Adam was the culprit.”

“‘Fitted to destruction’ indeed they were, *but not by God.* Adam was the culprit, as may be clearly seen from the parallel passage in Rom 5:12-19...” Page 16, C.O.J.II notes.

If this is not an extravagant play on words it would be hard to determine what it is. Paul used the words, **formed**, **made**, **make**, **fitted**, and **prepared** in describing God’s work with the lump of clay, but C.O.J.II demands that we dare not understand Paul’s consistent use of terms. No, we must abandon reason, good and proper word meanings, sentence constructions, and everything we know from the Bible of God and man. Adam must be the culprit. C.O.J.II says *Adam fitted the vessels of wrath* to destruction when he sinned, thus both Adam and God are at work on the lump of clay: God to form, make and prepare vessels and Adam to fit vessels of wrath to destruction.

True – all mankind fell in Adam. From the transgression mankind was seen as a common lump. It was a sinful lump. But sinning and fitting are certainly different acts. Sinning makes *unfit*, not fit or fitting.

In reviewing then the contradictory offerings of C.O.J.II, it shall be seen once again that he cannot be trusted to instruct the children of God.

### **The statements of C.O.J.II concerning the lump**

1. God made *both* the vessels of honour and of dishonour.
2. The lump from which God made the vessels was *fallen* mankind.
3. God *did not fit* the vessels of wrath to destruction – Adam did.
4. Adam fitted the vessels of wrath to destruction when he first sinned; Romans 5.12-19.

Will all this square with the record in Romans 9.20-24? It will not. Worse yet, items 1-4 will not even square with each other.

In verse '20 a question was asked. *The thing formed* asked the one *that formed it*, “Why hast thou made me thus?” Surely this was not Adam talking to himself. But it would have to be Adam if he fitted the vessels of wrath to destruction. C.O.J.II has managed to carry absurdity to the wildest reaches.

What was said in verse 21? That God as Potter had power over the clay. Out of that same lump of clay He made one vessel unto honour. What then did God do? Did He simply leave the rest of the clay like He found it, a fallen, sinful lump? No! Out of that fallen, sinful lump He **also made other Vessels**. These Paul called another (vessels) unto dishonour.

The words with which Paul described God’s work:

- Verse 20 – God **formed**.
- Verse 21 – God **made**.
- Verse 22 – God **fitted**.
- Verse 23 – God **prepared**.

The explanations:

- Verse 20 explains what God did; He *formed* vessels.
- Verse 21 explains God had a perfect right (power) to form vessels. He *made* them.
- Verse 22 explains why God *fitted* the vessels of wrath to destruction, those He had *made* or *formed*: It was to show His wrath and to make His power known.
- Verse 23 explains why God *prepared* unto glory the vessels of honour He had *made* and *formed*: It was to make known the riches of His glory.

It is perfectly clear to ordinary Bible readers that there is a harmony of expression in these verses. God formed, made, fitted, and prepared vessels, those of honour and those of dishonour, out of the same lump, to their respective ends. This is consistent and obvious, unless, like C.O.J.II, you want to somehow make Adam “the culprit.”

If we accept the view of C.O.J.II that Adam was the culprit, that Adam fitted the vessels of wrath to destruction then we are faced with the following dilemma:

- God **formed** vessels.
- God **made** vessels.
- God **prepared** vessels.
- Adam **fitted** vessels.

This is *wildly* incongruous. Were both God and Adam in the vessel-producing business? Did God form, make, and prepare vessels while Adam also fitted vessels?

Now this would raise some very serious questions. First, if original sin is what fitted the vessels of wrath to destruction (that is what C.O.J.II. says; Adam was the culprit) then what did original sin do to the vessels of mercy, the vessels of honour? What Adam did *affected equally the whole lump*. C.O.J.II placed stress on “as by one man sin entered into the world...for that all have sinned.” It cannot be denied that the construction placed on *fitted to destruction* by C.O.J.II would fit to destruction all alike, for all were involved.

If fitted to destruction is to mean Adam’s sin, then every human is a vessel fitted to destruction. So then, when God formed, made, and prepared the vessels unto honour, why did He bother with the rest of the lump? He did not simply leave them in their sins as C.O.J.II told us. If the honest reader will go back over verses 20-23 it will be clear that God did more than pass by or leave the rest in their sins. Why else would the one in verse 20 that God had formed say to Him, “Why hast thou made me thus?” Why would Paul say in verSe 21 that of the same lump God had the power to make one vessel unto honour and [make] another unto dishonour? Was not the fitted to destruction Adam did sufficient to dishonour the remainder of the lump?

If *Adam fitted* some vessels of wrath to destruction and *God formed* the same vessels unto dishonour then are they two vessels at once? Are they doubly damned, first by *Adam fitting* them and then by *God forming* them? What did God do in forming them vessels of dishonour that Adam had not already done in *fitting them*? Is there an end of all this? Blessedly, yes. Discard the insane notion of C.O.J.II that Adam was “the culprit” that fitted the vessels of wrath to destruction. Adam sinned. All his posterity fell in him. That is it for Adam. Romans 9.20-24 is a commentary on what God did with that which is called the same lump, the lump that fell (not got fitted) in Adam.

What God did in Romans 9.20 – 24 is form, make, fit, or prepare vessels for a specific end. They all came from existing stock, of the same fallen lump. For some vessels, honour was their lot. For other vessels, dishonour was their lot. But they were all vessels. It is this word *vessels* that makes very simple what C.O.J.II has attempted to make complex.

As mentioned previously, these vessels were not being configured for either election or reprobation. That was done in eternity. In Romans 9.20-24 they were being formed, made, fitted, and prepared for a specific honour or a specific dishonour.

It is not at all difficult to see how the word vessel is used here or what is intended by it. It is the same use as when Peter spoke of the woman being the weaker vessel (1 Peter 3.7); when Paul instructed the Thessalonians that every one should know how to possess his vessel in sanctification and honour (1 Thessalonians 4.4); and when Paul told Timothy that “If a man therefore purge himself from these, he shall be a vessel unto honour, sanctified, and meet for the master’s use, and prepared unto every good work (11 Timothy 2.21).”

And finally, the text that so perfectly parallels our subject that it cannot be overlooked: “But we have this treasure in earthen vessels, that the excellency of the power may be of God, and not of us (1 Corinthians 4.7).” Those that have the treasure within (Christ in us, the hope of glory) are but earthen vessels; that is, they are formed, made, fitted, and prepared for honour from the lump of clay. That is why they are called earthen vessels. Their end was to possess this treasure in their earthen vessel, the outward, fleshly man. Make no mistake; God fitted these vessels to house the treasure He would place within. That is why they are called vessels of honour. What greater honour could any be fitted for than to know Christ within?

The vessels of wrath were fitted to destruction just as the vessels of honour were fitted for their place. The great distinction is, the vessels of wrath, fitted for destruction, will ever remain empty. Like the foolish virgins they have no oil in their vessels. Unlike the vessels of honour, they have no treasure placed in them. And finally, their end is to be broken to shivers, much like the vessels in the following: “And he shall rule them with a rod of iron; as the vessels of a potter shall they be broken to shivers: even as I received of my Father (Revelation 2.27).”

C.O.J.II does not see what it was that God did in the Romans 9.20-24 account, thus he feels a need to contrive a system of decrees and a supposed fitting of vessels by Adam, so that he could overthrow what he mistakenly thought I believed.

The conclusion of this matter fittingly turns on the meaning and usage of the word, *fitted*. In his 47 pages of notes, C.O.J.II constantly bombarded the Absolute Predestinarians with fifth grade lessons in our language. He has lectured us copiously on participles, verb forms, adjectives to modify pronouns, grammar of the clause, transitive verbs, exact and partial synonyms, primary meanings, secondary meanings, perfectly synonymous concepts, main verbs, clauses, direct objects, partitive meanings,

genitives, verb actions, infinitives, infinitive forms, key words, and syntax. All of this was in just the first 15 pages of his notes.

So what has C.O.J.II revealed to us concerning this word *fitted*, around which he built a major theological position? You guessed it; **nothing!**

C.O.J.II attempted to palm this off on us exactly like every other subject he treats. ***We got zero documentation from him.***

### **Fitted**

The word is used *once* in the New Testament. It is found twice in the Old Testament but in neither place is there any relationship to what took place in Romans 9.22. That is it.

Let the reader search for themselves what Strong or Webster have to say regarding the word *fitted*. Of one thing you may be sure; they both say what you probably thought before looking it up, and it is not what C.O.J.II says about it. He said nothing!

A final quote from C.O.J.II.

“iv) This of course nails it. Rom 9:21-24 is a proof text passage for Sublapsarianism – if it is taken grammatically correct [sic], with an accurate definition of key words, with no words read in or left out, and with proper comparison to parallel passages. Page 17, C.O.J.II notes.

According to C.O.J.II in his conclusion, page 8, notes, he used his last nail in the Strict Predestinarian’s coffin. Somehow, he has come up with one more nail; this time to nail down Sublapsarianism. Let’s see how well he nailed it down.

The rendering of Romans 9.21 – 24 (here he would leave out verse 20) by C.O.J.II is both grammatically *incorrect* and doctrinally *rotten*. Did we get an *accurate definition of key words*? We got no definition at all. Other than the word lump, what did we get on a single other “key” word? Listed below are some of the “key” words that got *no accurate definition*:

Potter; Power; Clay; Formed; Made; Prepared; Vessels; Fitted.

For what we got from C.O.J.II, these words might just as well been left out altogether.

What did we get for parallel passages? Somehow C.O.J.II sought to make a parallel out of God’s fitting vessels of wrath to destruction with the account of Adam’s sinning, Romans 5.12-19. That is it.

Sublapsarianism may be dumped – along with Conditional Time Salvation, Absolute Predeterminism, Molinism, and all the rest of the C.O.J.II novelties – in the nearest trash can. He has given us no reason to believe any of them can be found in history, and the Bible offers him no trace of support. All of C.O.J.II’s documentation – the whole of it – could be placed on a postage stamp with room left for a picture of P. T. Barnum.

## SECTION 7.

### I. ANSWER OF ELDER C. C. MORRIS TO ELDER CONRAD JARRELL II'S COMMENTS

(ABSOLUTE PRE-DETERMI-NATION  
VERSUS  
ABSOLUTE PRE-DESTI-NATION  
by Conrad Owen Jarrell, II, pp. 9-11)  
ON REMARKS BY ELDER MORRIS  
ON ROMANS 8.28-39 IN THE REMNANT,  
JAN-FEB 1993, PAGES 7-8

Under his heading “IV. ARGUMENTS & TEXTS USED BY STRICT PREDESTINARIAN S,” on page 9 Elder Jarrell tackles

A. ‘All things’ that happen to anything or anybody are absolutely predestinated. 1. ‘All things’ in general are absolutely predestinated.

intending to disprove the Absolute Predestinarian position. Then, after quoting Romans 8:28-39, he says,

( 1) This is most probably the most beloved of all Strict Predestinarian imagined proof texts. Most will infallibly cite this passage as ‘proof’ that all imagined things in the universe ‘work together’ by absolute predestination, gleefully pointing out the word ‘predestinate’ therein. Here is a more cautious example, limiting ‘all things’ to God’s children: (C.O.J.II’s notes, page 10)

First, I am glad Elder Jarrell admits that when Absolute Predestinarians (those he prefers to call Strict Predestinarians) cite this passage in Romans 8 as proof, they do so infallibly. Infallibility is something no Absoluter I know of claims for himself, but it is nice when a Conditionalist concedes our infallibility on this point. Elder Jarrell is not so infallible, however; Predestinarians do not talk of “all *imagined* things in the universe,” because imagined is not in the text. We speak of *all things*, as Paul did.

Second, Elder Jarrell fails to understand that I was not “limiting ‘all things’ to God’s children” as he said. The “all things” of Romans 8.28 are not limited in any way, nor did I ever say they were. I said, as the text says, “...all things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are the called according to his purpose.” Them that love God are one and the same with them who are the called

according to His purpose, and these are indeed God's children. This has nothing to do with limiting "all things" to God's children.

Elder Jarrell then gives an extended quote from my article entitled, "All Things" (The REMNANT of Jan-Feb 1993), in which I said: "...no one and nothing can separate the 'all things' of verse 28, the 'all things' of verse 32, and the 'all these things' of verse 37. " To this statement he took specific exception:

(a) Notice...how Strict Predestinarians like to lump 'all thing' [sic] in the passage together. Do you know why they do that? So you won't notice what I am going to show you next...I am going to *separate* the text into *three groups* of 'all things,' each distinct from the others – something Elder Morris and his Strict Predestinarian cohorts imagine is impossible!

(b) First, note that there are *three distinct paragraphs* of thought the Strict Predestinarians almost always miss. This is an Error of Correct Reasoning.

1st Vs. 28-31. 'All things work together.'

2nd Vs. 32-34. 'Freely give us all things.'

3rd Vs. 35-39. 'Who shall separate us from the love of Christ?'

To suit his own purpose, Elder Jarrell suggests arbitrary paragraphing, proposing divisions which simply are not there (and, in so doing, he inadvertently admits this is a *passage*, not *passages*). His two divisions, between verses 31-32 and between verses 34-35, both interrupt a series of seven questions which begin in verse 31 ("What shall we then say to these things?") and end in verse 35 ("Shall tribulation...or sword?"). Breaking seven questions into three paragraphs is hardly what one should try to pass off as "Correct Reasoning"; all the more so since they are threaded together with the subject at hand, the "all things" of verses 28, 32, and 37.

He then says,

(c) Second, observe that the first paragraph begins with the phrase "all things," then mentions *8 specific things* (which I have numbered, so even the most devil-blinded Strict Predestinarian can't miss them), and ends with the phrase "these things." Neither all things in the universe, nor all things whatsoever concerning the children of God, are in this paragraph; but *only* the 8 things specifically mentioned having to do with salvation. To fail to see this is an Error of Grammar in paragraphing at the fifth grade level! (Computer readability tests show the Bible is written at an average reading level of fifth grade.)

Elder Jarrell fails to understand the plain language of Paul. In the disputed passage (Romans 8.28-39), Paul referred to "all things" twice and "all these things" once. Paul did not say, as Elder Jarrell would have it,

And we know that all these eight things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are the called according to His purpose: (1) calling, (2) purpose, (3) foreknowledge, (4) predestinated to be (5) conformed..., (6) calling, (7) justification, (8) glorification.

which he would have had to do for Elder Jarrell to have his way. What Paul said is, "And we know that all things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are the called according to His purpose." Nor did Paul qualify the term, "all things." It means, simply, *all things*.

Elder Jarrell continues:

(d) Third, check that the second paragraph begins, "...How shall He not with him also freely give us all things?" Who, except a Strict Predestinarian, doesn't know that "also" means "besides; in addition to"? It is irrefutable from the meaning of the word "also" that the "all things" of the second paragraph are **different from because added to** the eight "all things" of the first paragraph. Here we clearly have an Error in Word Definition.

No, here we clearly have another Error of Elder Jarrell. In verse 32 the Apostle said, “He that spared not his own Son, but delivered Him up for us all, how shall He not with Him also freely give us all things?” Elder Jarrell, in his fanatical attempt to avoid simple fifth-grade-level English, grasps the word “also” and tries to make it mean that God, with the resurrected Christ, is going to freely give us some more “all things” which are not included in the eight “all things” of Romans 8.28-30, but are, according to him, in addition to them.

Since these additional “all things” of verse 32 are not included in his original “all [eight] things” of Romans 8.28-30 [*8 specific things* – COJ II. Emphasis his, CCM], could Elder Jarrell possibly mean that the “all things” which God with Christ gives us (Romans 8.32) do NOT work together for good to them that love God?

After all, that is exactly his argument against the “all these [seventeen] things” of verses 35-39, none of which, according to Elder Jarrell, works together for good to those who love God. Since he says they do not, then obviously, to him, the *all things* God freely gives us (which he thinks is a second group of “all things”) do not work together for the good of God’s children either. For him to say they do would be for him to commit a major blunder of which he accuses all Predestinarians: an error in Correct Reasoning, which is a privilege he earnestly reserves for himself.

No, Elder Jarrell completely misses the simple truth of verse 32: The “all things” God “also” gives His people is not “also” in addition to the “all things” of verse 28.

In verse 32, Paul says God gave, first more specifically, His Son (cf. John 3.16); He gave His Son by sparing Him not, “but delivered Him up for us all.” Second, along with His specifically-given Son, He also freely gives us, more generally, “all things.” The “also” is not in addition to the “all things” of verse 28 (it is the exact same “all things” in both verses). The “also” is in addition to the specific gift of His Son, mentioned here.

Suppose a man says,

(1) “I have given my child all things I own,”

and a moment later he says,

(2) “If I spared not giving my child my house, how shall I not also with the house freely give him all things I own?”

It does not take a fifth-grade education to see, within the context in which the man is speaking, that in both cases “all things” means *all things*. There is neither a contradiction between statements (1) and (2), nor is the “all things” in sentence (2) some group of things in addition to the “all things” of sentence (1). Elder Jarrell has committed an error in Correct Grammar – not in that he misunderstood me, but in that he misunderstands the King James Version’s fifth-grade-level English. This is so plain that the only alternative would be to conclude that, if he did not misunderstand the text, then he deliberately misrepresented it.

Elder Jarrell concludes his remarks on my article as follows:

(e) Fourth, the third paragraph mentions yet a third distinct group, “all these things,” and proceeds to list things that cannot separate us from the love of Christ. Who, besides a Strict Predestinarian trying desperately to save a butt-dumb doctrine, cannot see that things that *cannot separate us from* the love of Christ are

*different from* the other two groups of things that *put us into* the love of Christ? This is an Error of Correct Reasoning which is a perfect example of 2C0 [sic] 4:4 [text quoted here by C.O.J.II].

In the immediate context of verse 37, Paul enumerates sixteen specific things from among the all things that work together for good to them that love God...(verse 28) and which are freely given unto them (verse 32): (1) Tribulation, (2) Distress, (3) Persecution, (4) Famine, (5) Nakedness, (6) Peril, (7) Sword, (8) Death, (9) Life, (10) Angels, (11) Principalities, (12) Powers, (13) Things present, (14) Things to come, (15) Height, and (16) Depth.

Paul extracts these sixteen things from the “all things” of verses 28 and 32, no doubt anticipating that some, like Elder Jarrell, would question whether many of these very things – tribulation, distress, persecution, peril, death, etc. – truly are included among the “all things” that work together for the good of God’s elect. Yes, Paul is saying, *all these things* are included in the *all things* of verses 28 and 32.

To cinch it, Paul then adds a seventeenth category, *any other creature* (Greek *ktisis*, original formation – Strong’s, #2937), *i.e.*, any other created thing, as if he is saying:

All things (including the above-mentioned sixteen things) quite well covers it; but, if anyone yet doubts I mean *all things* when I say “all things,” I say in conclusion that *any other created thing* can be and is hereby included in this list. In all these sixteen (seventeen) specific things, singled out of the all things of verses 28 and 32, we are still more than conquerors through Him that loved us.

Obviously, Elder Jarrell has either never heard the Old Baptist’s saying, “It may not be good TO them, but it is good FOR them”; or, having heard it, he simply does not believe it.

I stand by my earlier statement (in the REMNANT, Jan-Feb 1993, pp. 7-8), which the above vindicates: No one and nothing can separate the “all things” of verse 28, the “all things” of verse 32, and the “all these things” of verse 37.

## II. ANSWER TO ELDER CONRAD JARRELL II'S COMMENTS

(ABSOLUTE PRE-DETERMI-NATION VERSUS  
ABSOLUTE PRE-DESTI-NATION  
by Conrad Owen Jarrell, II, pp. 11-13)  
ON REMARKS OF ELDER C. C. MORRIS  
CONCERNING ACTS 22.10  
IN THE REMNANT, JAN-FEB 1993, PAGE 7

In the above-cited article I referred at length to Acts 22.10: “And I said, What shall I do, Lord? And the Lord said unto me, Arise, and go into Damascus; and there it shall be told thee *of all things which are appointed for thee to do.*” Ignoring almost a page of my support texts and arguments, Elder Jarrell attacks my closing comments on the text as follows, stating that the text was “ – explained with this kind of drivel – ”:

Oh, but we are not quite yet through with the quote from Paul. He said the Lord had told him, “...it shall be told thee of all things which are appointed for thee to do (Acts 22.10).” The word “of” shows that only a person “of” all things which were appointed for Paul to do would be told to him. ALL things appointed for him to do probably could not have been told to him, because all things appointed for him to do would include every breath he would draw, every beat of his heart, every thought, every word he would say, every action, every blink of his eye, and every other detail of his life. But certain things out OF the “ALL things were appointed for thee [Paul] to do” would be shown to him. They were indeed, and not by Ananias, either, but by the Lord Himself. The Lord had appeared to Ananias and had told him, “I will show him [Paul] how great things he must suffer for my name’s sake (Acts 9:16).” The things the Lord Jesus showed Paul that he must suffer were only that part exactly, “OF” all things that were appointed for Paul, which Christ had said would he showed to him. [emphases mine, COJ] (Elder C. C. Morris; The Remnant, Jan-Feb 1993, p.7) (as quoted in Elder Jarrell’s PREDETERMINATION VS. PREDESTINATION, pages 11-12.)

Briefly, Elder Jarrell said of the above:

What Elder Morris is fumbling for here is called the punitive meaning of the preposition “of”, definition number XIII in the **Shorter Oxford English Dictionary**, “Indicating things or a thing of which a part is expressed by the preceding words,” Examples are given such as, “any of his predecessors [sic],” “fairest of her daughters,” “a false step of the general’s,” “what I desire of all things,” and so forth. Notice how the words before “of” help define *expressly* what the part is “of”. If the verse had said, “out of” or “that part of,” then we would be justified in assuming, as Elder Morris imagines, that “part of all things appointed” is what Paul would be told. However, the verse does not say that, so the verse does not utilize the partitive meaning. . .at least, not according to the meaning of the word as defined in a dictionary.

We are well acquainted with the partitive meaning of the preposition *of*, which is exactly what is expressed in Acts 22.10. It is Elder Jarrell who cannot detect the partitive use of *of* when he sees it. He continues:

What Elder Morris missed entirely is definition number VIII in the **Shorter OED**, “indicating the subject matter of thought...i.e., – Concerning, about, with regard to, in reference to.” Paul is simply going to be told *about* “all things which are appointed for him. (COJ II, page 12)

If a word is longer than one letter, then, like the complicated word *of*, and you do not own the **Oxford English Dictionary (OED)**, then you had better give up trying to understand plain English, according to Elder, Jarrell.

I do deplore turning a Bible verse into a grammar lesson; but, since Elder Jarrell started it, here goes.

The OED is without doubt the ultimate appeal for our determining English word origins, usages, and definitions. Where else could you find a dictionary larger than many encyclopedia sets? The OED devotes over six pages to the word *of*, giving seventeen major usages of that little two-letter word. These seventeen usages of *of*, supported by hundreds of examples, are briefly summarized as follows, that our readers might the better judge for themselves about this discussion (representative OED examples are in the accompanying parentheses):

I. Of *motion, direction, distance* (be lighted down of his horse.) II. Of *liberation and privation* (What little town...is emptied of its folks...?) III. Of *origin or source* (...of English parents...The force born of strong womanly instinct) IV. Of the *source or starting-point of action*, emotion, etc.; *motive, cause, ground, reason* (...laboured as if of set purpose) V. Indicating the *agent or doer* (A wretch forsaken of God and man) VI. Indicating *means or instrument* (they live of bread...) VII. Indicating the *material or substance* of which anything is made or consists (a floor of wood) VIII. Indicating the *subject-matter of thought, feeling, or action, i.e.* that about which it is exercised (...news of the travellers) IX. Representing an original *genitive dependent or a verb or adjective* ([They] bethought themselves of trying to catch a little slumber.) X. Expressing the relation of the *objective genitive* (...questioning of the hindrances.) XI. Indicating that *in respect of* which a quality is attributed or a fact is predicated (of able body, sound of limb) XII. Indicating a quality or other distinguishing mark by which a person or thing is characterized (a man of tact, a work of authority) XIII. In *partitive* expressions; indicating things or a thing of which a part is expressed by the preceding words (the rest of the world, five of us, more than twice as many of them) XIV. In the sense *belonging or pertaining to*; expressing possession and its converse: ‘the owner of the house’, ‘the house of the owner’. XV. Indicating *a point or space of time* (persons whom we have not seen of a long time) XVI. In *Locative* and other obsolete uses (she might send him of an errand) XVII. Phrases (*of age, of course, of a truth, of old, because of, for fear of, in case of, in lieu of*)

Is it not amazing that, of all the XVII usages defined in the OED for the word *of*, Elder Jarrell somehow deduced I used the XIIIth when I was really fumbling for the VIIIth? When all else fails him, we would expect Elder Jarrell to dredge about in the fine print of the OED’s Volume X, not to clarify, but to confuse what Paul said and meant.

Examples he takes (to suit his purpose) from the **Shorter Oxford English Dictionary** are: “any of his predecessors, [sic]” “fairest of her daughters,” “a false step of the general’s,” and “what I desire of all things,” none of which is a complete sentence. In order to do justice to the subject at hand by analyzing these sentence fragments, we need them incorporated into sentence-forms.

The *Oxford English Dictionary*, Second edition, Volume X (not Elder Jarrell’s shorter version), devotes pages 711-717 to the word *of*. The examples given therein, as roughly cited by Elder Jarrell, were:

1. “1523 Ld. Berners *Froiss.* I. cccxxii 501 More than any of his predecessours.”

This is still not a complete sentence. Without doing violence to the example, one might complete the sentence as: “He was more [successful] than any of his predecessours.”

2. “1667 Milton, *FL*, iv. 324 The fairest of her daughters Eve.”

This could be made into a complete sentence by simply adding a verb: “The fairest of her daughters [was] Eve.”

3. “1724 De Foe *Mem. Cavalier* (1840) 255 This was..a false step of the..general’s.” This is a complete sentence as given in the OED.

4. 1732 Berkeley *Alciph.* 1. Sec. 5 It is what I desire of all things.” This is also a complete sentence.

These are by no means the only sentences that could be developed from Elder Jarrell’s choice of examples, but they will more than suffice. Had we selected them, he might have accused us of picking and choosing to suit our own purpose. Since he picked them for us, he has no one to blame but himself.

Whatever sentence may be composed, for the partitive use of the word *of* to apply, the sentence will have to (a) define a general group, called, in mathematical terms (set theory), a *set*; and (b) separate out from that set a more specific *part*, or a *proper* subset – or else there is no partitive use. To illustrate, Elder Jarrell may have a herd of cattle, with Jerseys among them, in his cow-lots. The herd would constitute the major set, and the Jerseys would be a proper subset of the herd. Jersey bulls would be a proper subset of the set Jerseys. Mindful of these distinctions, which are relevant to the partitive use of *of*, let us see exactly what the four OED examples (graciously and freely selected by Elder Jarrell) might say and/or imply:

1. “[He was] more [successful] than *any of his predecessours*.” This example is from the OED article on *Of*,

“XIII. In *partitive* expressions; indicating things or a thing of which a part is expressed by the preceding words. 42. a. Preceded by a word of number or quantity.” (OED, page 715.)

In this example, “he” and “his predecessours” form the group or set; “he” is the part who was *more than any* – the word of number or quantity – successful than *any of* the rest of the group.

2. “Eve was *the fairest of her daughters*.” Or, “*The fairest of her daughters* was Eve.” This example comes from the same,

XIII, Section “43. c. *of (all) other*, and the like, in which *other* after a superlative is illogical (unless of orig. had the notion of ‘singled out from’, ‘taken from’).” (*ibid.*)

Her daughters constitute the set; Eve is the part that is fairest *of* all that set of daughters.

3. “A *false step of the general’s* [steps] led to his defeat.” This is from XIII. Section 44. Followed by a possessive case or an absolute possessive pronoun. (*ibid.*)

The general’s steps make up the group; “a false step” is that part *of* this group which led to his defeat.

4. “*It is what I desire of all things*.” Or, “*What I desire of all things is it*.” This is from

XIII. Section “43. b. ellipt. *of all (of any)* = most of all; especially. Freq. in phrases expressing surprise at something or someone unexpected.” (*ibid.*)

All things comprise this set; the part which I desire out of the group of all things is “it.” Isn’t it nice that Elder Jarrell cites this fine OED example referring to “all things”? By the way, is this “all things” qualified or limited in any way? No, it is not. Out of the set of all things, everything in the created universe, of all things (the *universal set*), there is *one thing I desire* – and there is where the qualification and quantification comes in: It is not quantifying *all things*, but it is what *I desire* [out] of all things. The proper subset in this example is whatever the pronoun it represents.

Now consider Acts 22.10. The latter part of the text is the sentence Elder Jarrell controverts:

“And I said, What shall I do, Lord? And the Lord said unto me, Arise, and go into Damascus; and *there it shall be told thee of all things which are appointed for thee to do.*”

The group is comprised of “all things which are appointed for thee to do”; the partitive part is the “it [which] shall be told thee there.” This is in perfect harmony with the partitive use of the word *of*.

“All things which are appointed for thee to do” constitute the **general set**. The group of things which Paul was told is a **proper subset** of “All things which are appointed for thee to do.” The specific things which were told to Paul (at the time referred to in Acts 22.10), were elements of this latter subset. These elements were what he was told about, or concerning, in detail.

Does Elder Jarrell think Paul was told “all things” that were appointed for him to do? No, nor do I, but he and I have vastly different reasons. He seems to believe Paul was only told vaguely *about or concerning* “all things which are appointed” (“for thee to do,” the text says, but Elder Jarrell omits this important phrase).

We are at a loss to understand how he thinks Paul could be told *about* all things appointed for him to do without his expressly being told *some* of those very things appointed for him to do. While “of all things appointed for him to do” may sound vague, it is not. If someone tells you of, about, or concerning a dinner he attended, how could he not in so doing tell you of, about, or concerning where it was held, who attended, what was the occasion, and what meats, vegetables, drinks, and desserts were served?

The text says of, obviously meaning a part of; i. e., the partitive use. A part of what? A part of “*all things which are appointed for thee to do.*” Elder Jarrell ignored my cross-reference to Acts 9.16 (thus also ignoring his own sage counsel to compare spiritual things with spiritual – 1 Corinthians 2.13). Acts 9.16, to which Paul is referring in Acts 22.10, elaborates. There, the Lord Himself said, “For I will shew him how great things he must suffer for my name’s sake.” This, the “how great *things* which he must suffer...,” was the part of the *all things* which were appointed for Paul to do, of which Paul was told after his going to Damascus. Did Elder Jarrell ignore Acts 9.16 because therein *the doctrine of necessity* is expressed? Paul *must* suffer – not wander desultorily around in cow-lots, only suffering if he wants to of his own free will.

But Elder Jarrell also wants to discuss the Greek text:

<i>kakei</i> and there	<i>soi</i> thee	<i>laletesetai</i> shall be told	<i>peri</i> concerning	<i>panton</i> all	<i>on</i> which
<i>tetaktai</i> it has been appointed	<i>soi</i> thee	<i>poinsai</i> to do.			

-Berry's *Interlinear Literal Translation of the Greek New Testament*

It is kind but unnecessary for Elder Jarrell to point out that *panton* is in the genitive case, and that *peri*, when used with *laleo*, means about or concerning, all of which is readily granted. Neither need he remind us that the great confessions of faith tell us we should refer to the original languages in cases of controversy; we are conversant with the confessions. It still comes down to the same thing: "All things which are appointed for thee to do" is the group which composes the major set; the "it [which] shall be told thee," *i.e.*, *the told part, is the proper punitive subset*, the part of the group of "all things which are appointed for thee to do" OF which Paul was told.

In closing this reply, there are two final thoughts concerning the languages, both Greek and English, of this text:

1. Elder Jarrell pointed out that, in the Greek text, *panton* is in the genitive case.

What is the genitive case? I quote from the definitive text on Koine Greek, **A Manual Grammar of the Greek New Testament**, by H. E. Dana and Julius R. Mantey (MACMILLAN, 1927, 1955):

The genitive is the case of definition or description. It "is in function adjectival" (R-S, 98 [*i.e.*, D&M's quote is from Robertson, another authority – CCMD, and usually limits a substantive or substantival construction, though its use is not infrequent with verbs, adjectives, and adverbs. Its adjectival nature is very pronounced and quite obvious. To say "a flower of beauty" is not very different from saying "a beautiful flower." So *kardia apistias*, *a heart of unbelief*, is practically the same in sense as *apistos kardia*, *an unbelieving heart*. But the qualifying force of the genitive is more emphatic than that of the adjective. (Page 72, Sec. 85)

...the genitive "is employed to qualify the meaning of a preceding noun, and to show in what more definite sense it is to be taken"...the basal function of the genitive is to define...the genitive limits as to kind, while the accusative limits as to extent. (Page 73, Sec. 86)

In our text, *panton* (all) is indeed in the genitive case. The "substantival construction," which precedes it and which it qualifies, is, "(there) [it] shall be told thee" – that is, what would be told to the apostle. *Peri panton* and what follows (on *tezaktai soi poinsai*, "which it has been appointed thee to do") qualifies and limits what would be told him, showing "in what more definite sense it is to be taken." (D&M, above.) *Peri* means about or concerning. About what? About *all*. All of what? This is where the genitive case of *panton* is important in this sentence: Not "about all," and not "about all which has been appointed," but "about all which it has been appointed for thee to do."

2. From the OED Elder Jarrell mentioned that to be a true partitive meaning of *of*, it must indicate "things or a thing of which a part is expressed by the preceding words." Do the words "told thee" precede "of all which it has been appointed thee to do"? Yes, they do. And do the words "all which it

has been appointed for thee to do” indicate “things of which a part is expressed by the preceding words (“told thee”)”? Why, yes, they do, in both the Greek and the English texts. The defense rests.

In summary, Elder Jarrell clouds the real issue, the reason I quoted Acts 22.10 in my REMNANT article, which is: *God had unalterably appointed certain things for Paul to do*. If Paul did not do those very things appointed for him to do, then to what avail was God’s appointment? And, on the other hand, if, as Elder Jarrell says, God based His decrees upon His foreknowledge, and if God foreknew Paul would do these certain things, then to what purpose was His decree added, since God foreknew that it would happen anyway, before He decreed? But again: If God foreknew that Paul would do something and Paul did not later do it, then God’s foreknowledge would be faulty, either with or without His decrees or appointments!

Job said, “For He performeth the thing that is appointed for me: and many such things are with Him (Job 23.14).” Since God performed the thing appointed for Job, not leaving it for Job, chance, free will, and second causes to perform, we trust that He also performed the things appointed for Paul and for everyone else.

If Elder Jarrell’s readers and hearers have lost sight of these precious things, then Elder Jarrell has succeeded in his blasphemous purpose.

Elder C. C. Morris