



BELIEVERS CHAPEL

6420 Churchill Way | Dallas, Texas | 75230 | t 972.239.5371 | believerschapeldallas.org

The Sermons of S. Lewis Johnson

"Inconsistencies in Modified Calvinism, Part I"

TRANSCRIPT

[Message] I always think it's interesting that you arrive at a conference on Reform theology and the first hymn is a Wesley hymn. [Laughter] And in this case of course it was a good one. And we always enjoy singing that great hymn, and I think as Jim Packer has so often said, in his opinion after he had done a great deal of study of the Wesley's that he had reached the conclusion that they really were not Arminians in the truest sense, but confused Calvinists. [Laughter] And when you see in a hymn like that, "Thine eye diffuse the quickening ray," you can understand that there was a great deal of the understanding of the grace of God there.

Gary and I go back a long way, it's true. And I am really deeply indebted to him. When we were on the campus at Dallas Theological Seminary so far as I know there were no consistent Calvinists around beyond Gary and maybe someone else, but I didn't know them. And being concerned a great deal about the questions and Gary was at least a mile or two beyond me, because he had been brought up in the doctrine of sovereign grace and I was, I think, as I look back I was interested and I was growing. And my conversations with Gary had a great deal of influence on me. And Gary I'm appreciative to you for it. I read in, I think, the preface to the latest edition of your book I believe to that intent and it's true. So I have the highest of regard for him and will consider him one

of the men along the way who has had a part in my own theological and spiritual development.

I look out over the audience and I see a number of you that I've known a number of years and some of you are new friends, and I hope I'm able to meet you too. And then I look out and see Jane Ellis over there and Burt Ellis. And Jane Ellis is from Birmingham, Alabama, and when I was converted in Birmingham, Alabama her sister was one of the best friends of my first wife. And so Jane we go back a long time too, and it's great to see you and to see you here in this conference too.

I'm going to read two or three verses. I'm not going to expound the Scriptures in this series as you can probably tell from the title, but I think it's important to relate it to some of the texts in the word of God, and so I am opening up this new King James Bible, which has Scofield notes in it, so you will feel at home [Laughter] in this conference and read Romans 8:7-8 first. I dedicate that comment to John Desner and Romans 8 verse 7 and verse 8. We read, "Because the carnal mind is enmity against God: for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be. So then they that are in the flesh cannot please God." And then I'd like for you to turn over to 1 Corinthians chapter 12 and verse 3 where the apostle writes, "Therefore I make to you that no one speaking by the Spirit of God calls Jesus accursed. And no one can say that Jesus is Lord except by the Holy Spirit."

You know, when you turn to 1 Corinthians and discuss something like the grace of God you have to think about chapter 4 and verse 7, remembering that it was by this verse that Augustine came to the knowledge of the grace of God himself, and he in one of his writings, in fact more than one, has referred to it. It's chapter and verse 7, "For who makes you to differ from another? and what do you have that you did not receive? now if you did indeed receive it, why do you boast, as if you had not received it?" And then one final passage in John chapter 6, one that's familiar to all, I would imagine, in this room. The Lord Jesus speaking in the 44th verse says, "No one can come to me unless the Father

who sent me draws him. And I will raise him up at the last day." And I guess we ought to read the 65th verse also. "Therefore I have said to you that no one can come to me unless it has been granted him of my Father."

I want to apologize a little bit first of all. I do not have anything other than the outline, but we will be following the outline through. I may make some changes at one of the major divisions, but according to the present way of developing the topic I want to deal with the history of Amyraldian controversy and then secondly the theological failures of Amyraldianism instead of the exegetical failures and conclude with the exegetical failures, because it's easier to go through what we want to go through if we do that. So we'll be following the outline at least and you can get some idea of where you are if you will have one of the outlines before you and follow along with me.

There's one other thing I think I should say to you, too, aside from the fact that I was going over and reading my lecture this afternoon and almost fell asleep in the car. [Laughter] I want you to understand that what I am saying to you is the result of some study that I am doing with a view to perhaps publishing some of what we're going to go through. And you'll understand then that what I am saying here is not what I would consider the finished product. At least I hope I will be able to develop it. But this is the first of our three studies then in the "Fatal Flaws of Four Point Calvinism." Now, Gary uses the term modified, and that's all right. I don't object to that at all. It's been used by many, and so we can speak of it as Modified Calvinism, but it is in my mind to be identified with what people who understand the history of Calvinism like to call Four Point Calvinism or Hypothetical Universalism.

So let me begin with an introduction and then we will go down through our outline. Some years ago in some comments on Calvinism and Arminianism, William G.T. Shedd, one of the greatest of the theologians at least so far as clarity is concerned, pointed out that the two systems of Calvinism and Arminianism could not be harmonized. In fact he said they were immiscible. I've always liked that word, I never have forgotten it.

Everything flows in harmony for both systems depending upon the stance of the two theologies on the sin and guilt of fallen man. If one begins with human inability as Calvinists do, and I like to think that the Bible does in the light of John 6 for example, then all of the other soteriological doctrines mesh and follow in perfect harmony. If man is unable to turn of himself to God or possess spiritual inability, then divine election must be unconditional dependent upon the sovereign good pleasure of God since man is unable to respond of himself favorable to God. If election is unconditional, and if as Calvin says all our blessings are traceable to election, then the redemption must necessarily be particular. That is, for those who are elected unconditionally. And if the redemption is particular, that is for the elect, and if they are unable to come to God of themselves, then the grace that brings to Christ must be effectual. And finally, if the grace that brings us to Christ is effectual, and if we are elected to eternal life, then we must persevere by God's grace in that life.

Arminians deny each of these redemptive truths contending for ability to turn to God by the exercise of one's free will, for conditional election grounded in that human free will decision, for a universal decision and a divine universal intention to save all men, in which intent God man and has been frustrated. And lest you think that this is something that I have said, you may find in the Arminian literature statements precisely to that effect. We do believe that God may be frustrated. And further, for universal sufficient grace given to men, which they are to improve by believing in Christ and for the possibility of failure in perseverance in the faith. On the face of the matter it's evident that these two view points are diametrically opposed, and it is therefore surprising and yet puzzling that there should be attempts to modify orthodox Calvinism. And that a modification of orthodox Calvinism by professed Calvinist should have a wide following and a measure of popularity among believers is surely cause for wonder. And I must confess I do wonder at the modifications that have been suggested.

Among the attempts to modify Calvinism is a viewpoint called popularly, Four Point Calvinism. The term unfortunately is capable of at least two references. The popular use of the term is a code term, the meaning of which is "I am against the fifth point." And the fifth point is the doctrine of definite atonement. And when they say, "I am a four point Calvinist, I am against the fifth point," they don't mean the fifth point in the order in which we normally hear those points. But they mean "I am against the fifth point," that is, limited atonement as they understand limited atonement. So as such usually we all know if we have been instructed in the word of God in these areas at all, we all know that when an individual says that almost all of the times there is little understanding of the Calvinistic system to start with.

They are simply opposed to limited atonement, and it's a way of, in effect, hiding behind "I am against the fifth point, limited atonement." If you don't believe what I've just said, just wait in the conversation for a while, wait for a few minutes when the subject has perhaps changed a bit and then ask very innocently, "Do you believe in free will?" And in the great majority of cases I believe your experience will be mine, they will say, "Why yes, I believe in free will," not believing of course that if they believe in free will then they cannot believe any of the five points of Calvinism. So I'm sure if you have been in the company of those who believe in sovereign grace, and you have yourself grown in it, you understand what I'm talking about. A believer in free will cannot consistently accept any of the Calvinistic soteriological doctrines. The five points of Calvinism fail in all five points if free will is accepted.

Now there is another use or sense in which the term Four Point Calvinism might be properly used. And you might have someone wisely say, "I'm a Four Point Calvinist." That's what we're going to talk about. Historically the term has been associated with Moise Amyraut professor at the French Academy of Saumur. Amyraut was the pupil of a Scot by the name of John Cameron, and he taught a modified Calvinism. He was really a Calvinist with the exceptions that we're going to talk about and a true modified Calvinist

in that sense. Since Amyraut believed in the inability of man, it's obvious that a universal atonement which we also taught, limited by man's inability of himself to turn to the Lord, accomplishes nothing for the non-elect. If we say that God intended that Christ should die for all, but at the same time we hold that no man can turn of himself to the Lord. Why, it's obvious that the universal atonement doesn't accomplish anything of itself for the non-elect if he cannot turn.

This has therefore come to be called hypothetical universalism because it does not do anything. It hypothetically sets forth Christ as one has accomplished universal redemption. The inconsistency of Christ's death for all coupled with an election of only some should be obvious to you if you think about it for a moment. Christ's death has for the non-elect become a pointless and futile work detracting from the atoning glory of our Lord. It's not surprising that Richard Watson, I'll refer to him later on at the conclusion of the series, and I hope you won't mind my repeating. I read through my notes and I discovered two or three places where I repeated myself. But it's not surprising that Richard Watson, probably the greatest of the Arminian theologians said concerning Amyraut 's view, "It's the most inconsistent theory to which the attempts to modify Calvinism have given rise." In view of the fact that the vast majority of present day evangelicals are poorly instructed in the history of Christian doctrine (I don't think I'm playing the expert in saying that. I think that most of us know that we are poorly instructed in the history of Christian doctrine) it's not surprising that confusion exists over the use of the term Four Point Calvinism. To the common variety of evangelicals it simply means that the individual rejects particular redemption or limited atonement. A primary purpose of this paper and the papers that follow is to clarify the term Four Point Calvinism and to display the theological flaws in the system as well as the exegetical flaws and also incidentally to answer some of the exegetical questions that arise with particular texts. That we'll save for the end, because I can cut off that much easier than I can some of the other things I want to say.

So I want to say a few things about the history of the Amyraldian controversy. And in the outline it's Roman I, capital A, Reform Orthodoxy, and Arabic i, The Men. You can tell that I have taught in a theological seminary by the use of the outline. Discussion of the doctrine that have to do with the doctrine of soteriology or the doctrine salvation often begin, but almost always include a survey of the views of Augustine of Hippo. Augustine's dates are 354 AD to 430 AD, so he lived in the 4th and 5th centuries. His doctrine of the sovereign omnipotence of God seen in the creation out of nothing is not simply ability. If was effectualation, for the will of the omnipotent God is never defeated. Formed from this was his doctrine of predestination and redemption. The intent of Christ's sacrifice is measured by its results. So since all men are not finally saved, our Lord must not have intended the salvation of all by his death. I think you can see that if you really believed in the sovereignty of God and that he does rule this universe, you can tell what he intended to do by what happened. And how important that is for us to remember.

The death of Christ, for Augustine, did not accomplish the mere possibility or realizability of all, but actually saved those for whom Christ died. Augustine's views were taken up by the Benedictine theologian Gottschalk of Orbais who lived in the 9th century, who fully conferred with Augustine and his views on predestination, on free will, and on Christ's death only for the elect. And he had experience of many who believed in the doctrine of sovereign grace. He died in prison for his faith.

John Wycliffe, who lived in the 14th century, is known for his resemblance to the reformers and their attitude to Scripture, which he regarded as coming from the mouth of God. His attack on the church's wealth, power, and decadence was granted in the Bible. It's not as well known that Wycliffe, the Morning Star of the Reformation as he's often been called, was a firm believer in Augustine's exegesis of 1 Timothy chapter 2 verse 4 and verse 6. Mainly that that passage had to do with all categories of men, and that the saving will of God was from the elect for the categories, affirming God's omnipotence and

predestination in strong terms, although in scholastic style. So out of paper in our day incidentally. As his exegesis of 1 Timothy 2:4 shows, Wycliffe believed in particular redemption.

In Martin Bucer, or Buezer as his German name was called, we come for the first time to a figure whose theological influence on John Calvin was direct and personal. Calvin knew Augustine well but only through his books. His knowledge of medieval theology was adequate, for it's doubtful that he knew of Gottschalk. And we do not know if he knew Wycliffe or Haas, but Bucer he knew as a scholar, a fellow Reformer, a friend, and something of a mentor, because Calvin and Bucer were in Strasbourg at the same time over a period of about three years. In which, incidentally, Calvin finished another revision of *The Institutes*. So he knew him well. Further Strasbourg in the days of Bucer and Calvin was a hotbed of debate over the doctrine of redemption between the Reformed and the Anabaptists. And the issue was a matter of constant debate in the 1520's and 1530's between Bucer and such men as Hans Denck and Jacob Kautz of Worms. So if you lived in Strasbourg and you were interested in anything theological you would know about the debates over definite atonement or particular redemption that were being carried on in the city.

Bucer who saw the nature of redemption and its extent as bound together affirmed particular redemption and largely followed Augustine in his exegesis. John Calvin who lived in the 16th century, his dates are 1509 to 1564, who spent the years 1538 through '41 or into '41 in Strasbourg; published, as I mentioned, an expanded edition of *The Institutes* in 1539. He was strongly influenced by Bucer, and he openly acknowledged it. It would be strange indeed that Calvin differed with his mentor on limited redemption, as he did on a few other points, but never mentioned it in his writing. In the midst of all the controversy, this is an argument from silence but it has some substance to it. Incidentally, we have on our book table; I understand, Gary told me, a book by Jonathan Rainbow, a relatively recent doctoral dissertation on Calvin and the

doctrine of particular redemption. And I recommend that you read it. I'm not supporting everything in the book, I don't know enough to support everything that Dr. Rainbow has written, but it's well worth your reading. And several places I'm indebted to him. And if you look at my footnotes you would be able to see it.

But that's an important point, because it's very commonly said today by liberal Calvinists, can those two words go together? Well I'm accepting them according to the charitable interpretation and putting them together for them, for they love to say that Calvin was not really a Calvinist, that is as we understand Calvinists today. But I'll remind you of these facts, and there's more to it than just that. But Theodore Beza, who lived from 1519 to 1605 and was Calvin's successor in Geneva, was faithful to Calvin's theology, was accepted by his contemporaries. But since the 17th century many have considered him responsible for a hardening of Calvin's theology. You'll find this very frequently stated in people who are in Reformed churches, supposedly reformed though they've largely abandoned Reform theology. But still they are in the churches that inherit the position like the Presbyterian church, the Reform church. And you frequently will have them say, "We are following Calvin and not the Calvinists." There are holes in the kind of argument that they suggest.

I want to mention a couple of them, one of them is this. Like William Casey the late director of the Central Intelligence Agency of the USA and a whipping boy of political liberals today, Beza has suffered at the hands of the liberalizers of Reform theology who are unhappy with the historic Reformed orthodoxy and prefer a softer, gentler tread. Among many similarities between Calvin and Beza is their agreement that one cannot suffer twice for sin, once in the Redeemer and then once again the failure to receive in the faith the benefits of the Redeemer's death. The substitutionary satisfaction of the cross is a full and effectual payment for the sins of those for whom the Redeemer died. Beza specifically makes the point when he imagines the believer having a conversation with Satan and saying, "You say, Satan, that God is perfectly righteous and the avenger of all

iniquity? I agree, but I will join to this another property of justice which ye have left out, mainly that since God is righteous and he is content with one payment God will not be paid double."

Calvin makes the same point in his commentary on Romans chapter 8 verse 33 and verse 34, comments, incidentally, written during 1539 in the Strasbourg period of his life. And we should note one final thing about this, Calvin's earlier ministry included the years in Strasbourg with Bucer and his later ministry included the years in Geneva with Beza. Both of the men were limited redemptionists. We have no word from Calvin that he differed from them on the doctrine. And further, there is no word from Beza after as Calvin's death that he ever thought of himself as other than always completely sympathetic with Calvin in the latter's soteriology. Now, surely if these men who were so close differed on these points, on this point specifically, and were in the midst of a controversy over it in Strasbourg for years, and then later after Calvin died Beza never once gave the impression to anyone that he was anything but a follower of Calvin, we have some historical problems when we say that Beza transformed Calvin's doctrine into something else.

Now Arabic ii, the Reformed Confessions. The Synod of Dordrecht of 1618 and 1619, passing by earlier important Reform documents such as the Scottish Confession of 1560 in which particular redemption is affirmed in chapter 9; the Belgic Confession of Faith, 1561, which affirms the same thing, article 21; and the Heidelberg Catechism of 1563. There are two assemblages of Christians that require mention, the Synod of Dordrecht was an international church assembly called by the states general of the Netherlands. I think this is something that all Christians ought to at least know the facts about. Prior to the meeting in Dordrecht in the Netherlands, were pastors and elders of Dutch churches, theological professors from the Netherlands, and twenty-seven foreign delegates, who were many of them outstanding theologians. Some of them actually did not hold precisely to all of the doctrine that was later inscribed in the canon of the Synod

of Dordrecht. But there was a debate from the fall of 1618 on into the spring of 1619 when the canons were issues.

The principle problem to be discussed was the crisis that had arisen over the prevailing Calvinistic theology particularly concerning the nature of grace. The party anxious for reform of the confessional Calvinism, usually associated with James Arminius and thus called the Arminian party, had issued in 1610 a remonstrance. Now Arminius had died in 1609, but he had instructed many. He was a professor in the University of Leiden and had also been well known as a preacher and teacher in the Reform church, actually died in the Reform church as a Reform minister. And so shortly after his death as a result of the teaching this party, the Arminian party we'll call them, issued a remonstrance in which they denied that man was totally unable to save himself and other concomitant doctrines. The Remonstrants, or the Arminian party, had framed their objection under five points.

And so after a meeting that lasted from the fall of 1618 to the spring of 1619 the five points of the Remonstrants were condemned by those who had gathered at Dordrecht and their canons have come to be called the Five Points of Calvinism. The synod affirmed first, unconditional election and faith as a gift of God. Secondly, that while acknowledging the sufficiency of Christ's death for the expiation of the sins of all men, it's efficacy is limited to God's elect. It is very important to note that they affirm specifically the sufficiency of Christ's death for all sin.

This is not in my notes, but I have a friend, he teaches at a Bible college. He is a Calvinist. He teaches at a Bible College in which he is out of sympathy with the doctrinal statement. He is an example precisely of what a person should do if he's out of sympathy with the doctrinal statement but is asked to teach there. He went to the authorities and he said, "I don't agree with your statement. I don't agree with this." They were desperate for a teacher, and so they said, "We want you to teach anyway." And so he's been teaching in this institution. One of the men, a graduate of Dallas Theological Seminary,

tell it not in Gath publish it not in Ashkelon lest the uncircumcised hear, [Laughter] but a graduate of Dallas Theological Seminary with a doctorate not in New Testament but I believe in Bible of Theology. And they had a conversation, the Dallas men doesn't really want him to teach there. He's done everything he can to eliminate him. But unfortunately they're without a church history professor and so they're desperate. And what's made it worse; he's become the most popular teacher in the student body. Very embarrassing, they're already offering a position in the graduate school, which they are hoping to set up.

So he had a discussion with the man who has the doctorate from Dallas Seminary, and the discussion ranged around the idea of the sufficiency of Christ's death for all sin. The Dallas man with a doctorate said, "We don't believe that. Calvinists don't believe that." My friend was astonished. He went through Dallas Seminary. He had a ThM degree. He had a ThD degree. He's teaching in the institution, and he affirmed that Calvinist didn't believe in the sufficiency of Christ's atonement for all sins. Well, my friend has a happy kind of personality. He can talk with people who would love to stab him in the back if they could. But he just has the personality, he's able to talk with them and it doesn't get under his skin. So he went home and he xeroxed off pages from the canons of the Synod of Dordrecht. And he had said, "Why that's specifically stated by the Calvinists." And so he laid them on the man's desk. He went to his office; he wasn't there, so he laid them on his desk. And he saw him a day or two later and he said, "Did you get my Xeroxed material?" And the man said, "Yes I have." He said, "Well what do you think?" "Well I haven't had the chance to read them yet." They have not yet discussed it. Unfortunately the man has cancer and it looks like he's not going to live too much longer. He's a nice man, a good Christian man, but I think that is so typical of our evangelical world today. We have individuals who are not instructed in the history of Christian theology and are not as well instructed as we should be in theology itself.

Well the synod confirmed unconditional election. They confirmed the sufficiency of Christ's death for the expiation for the sins of all man. Its efficacy is limited to God's elect. They affirmed the corruption of all men by sin and their calling and regeneration by God's sovereign grace to faith and newness of life. And they affirm the preservation of the elect to salvation and their perseverance in the faith. Thus, the Augustinian biblical doctrines of sin and grace were confirmed as over against the claims that man has free will and sufficient grace to respond to God and that divine election is simply God's response to man's decision to believe.

The Westminster assembly deserves some comment and its confession. The Westminster assembly was called by the English parliament in 1643, the purpose being to give counsel to Parliament concerning the restructuring of the Church of England along Puritan lines. Composing the assembly were ministers, members of the house of Lords and Commons, together with some influential representatives from Scotland. While the members of the assembly had some differing views concerning church polity, although Presbyterianism was the dominant position, there were almost unanimous in their theological position, a strong Calvinistic stance. The errors of Roman Catholicism, Sectarianism and Arminianism were unequivocally rejected. The confession of faith was completed in December of 1646. A note should be made there and that was this, that here were literally the finest minds of the theological world of Great Britain and they worked for three years. In fact it may have been longer than that because of the preparation for it, and they had given us a document that is worth of the attention of every professing Christian. Even if you find it very difficult to believe the doctrine that they have propounded in the sense of the strong Calvinistic doctrine that is found there, you should read it. You'll get more theology from reading some of the creeds than you will listening for two or three years to some of us preachers.

At any rate, the errors of Roman Catholicism, Sectarianism, and Arminianism were unequivocally rejected. It's the last of the classic Reform confessions and also the most

influential, being widely adopted by British and American Presbyterian bodies as well as by congregational and Baptist churches. The Confession is a notable doctrine with a preeminent place among theological documents of Calvinist theology. Its precision, its conciseness, its truthfulness are well known. Among its principal excellencies are its mature expression of the biblical doctrine of predestination, non-committal on the debate over Supra and Infralapsarianism, although it clearly teaches that from God's being and will come all things and our salvation. It teaches reprobation as clear formulation of the doctrine of human freedom, not free will but human freedom, divine sovereignty and human responsibility underlay its exposition of the doctrine of redemption.

According to John Frame's analysis he writes, "Its Puritan doctrine of assurance, a strong affirmation yet more sensitive than other Reform confessions to the subjective difficulties believers have in maintaining a conscious assurance." Incidentally that confession is so remarkable and so significant that even Baptists bodies have practically taken it over word by word, with a few necessary changes that Baptists would like to make, a few concluding remarks. It's evident from the history to the point of the entrance of Moies Amyrault on the scene in the 17th century that to that point the position of Reformed orthodoxy was the position of the Reformed church.

Now, I'd like to look at the Amyraldian challenge and first John Cameron. Mr. Cameron, you could probably tell from his name, is a Scot. He lived in the 16th and 17th centuries. He was born in 1580 and died in 1625. And I don't know whether I put that, yes I did put it in the outline. Called by Brian Armstrong "something of an enigmatic figure" and then by George Smeaton a "learned but restless Scotchman," apparently laid the foundation for the theological system that would lead to a reaction in France against orthodox Calvinist theology. In other words, if you're a genuine Four Point Calvinist, that is an Amyraldian; your roots are in Scotland, which are not bad necessarily. That's where you are.

Cameron, as Amyraut after him, taught a three-fold covenant system, not including however a covenant of redemption as did Cocceius another orthodox man. Cameron's covenants were a covenant of works, a Mosaic covenant, and a New Testament covenant of grace, as was Amyraut's later. Cameron taught orthodox Calvinism with a few exceptions, but the exceptions were sufficient to make his theology unacceptable to the orthodox. First, while he taught an unconditional election, he also taught universal redemption. And this combination he accomplished by affirming a two fold will of God. A two fold mercy of God, one antecedent and one consequent. The antecedent will of God is the gift of Christ for the salvation of all men without exception if they believe. The consequent will of God is the will of decree to give faith to the elect. Christ is sent for all but faith is only given to the elect. And so it's from this arrangement that the term hypothetical universalism derives its name.

Second, a further Cameron contention was that faith renders efficacious the death of Christ, not by any dignity or merit which is in it, but because by it God desires to unite us to Christ our head. Saving faith does not stand in a cause/effect relationship to our Lord's atoning work. Faith is the condition of the covenant of grace, a persuasion that we are loved and accepted in Christ. Now, in the purpose of this paper it's not necessary to discuss further Cameron's views of faith, although Amyraut largely followed them. The importance of Cameron lies in the fact that Amyraut himself was deeply indebted to Cameron. And he is the only one, incidentally, of his professors that he ever mentioned in his writings. Now mind you he wrote literally scores of volumes, Moies Amyraut. In a moment I'll mention a number of them, and I'm sure you'll be astonished when you realize how much he did write.

So we turn to Moies Amyraut, sometimes called Moise, sometimes called Moysee, all of these are simply names for Moses, Moses Amyraut, 1596 to 1664. He is the popularizer in his day of a Four Point Calvinism. The man, Amyraut the man, one of his student's says, "remains largely a shadowy figure." We do know he was born in

Bourgueil near Saumur in France in September of 1596. He studied at the Academy of Saumur under Cameron. After, according to one of the scholars of him, studying law at the University of Poitiers he succeeded Jean Daille, a modified Calvinist himself, as minister at Saumur in 1626. Shortly after he began to lecture at the academy of Saumur he continued there until...

[RECORDING ENDS ABRUPTLY]