

Spurgeon's Gospel from Three Sermons Part 3 Christ Set Forth as a Propitiation

By

Richard C. Schadle

Preface

This is the third article in this short series examining three sermons of Spurgeon's. His Gospel to the unconverted, His gospel to the saved sinners (professors) and his understanding of propitiation which is at the heart of any gospel. While he does give his own interpretation of propitiation his real goal here is to make his gospel as simple as possible. It's important for the reader to know that I chose these sermons at random based solely on the title of each one. One could say as a kind of taste test where the brand is unknown, and the value must be made on the merits of each sample tasted. The sermon under review here is titled: "Christ Set Forth As A Propitiation"¹ As I state in each essay my comments toward him are in relation to the doctrines he held and not to anything personal. I have no doubt that many have been genuinely saved by his ministry both past and present. The point here is how much harm has been done during the same time frame. When we all come to the final judgment how many will be on the wrong side of Christ? Satan is delighted to let 10 people be saved if he can deceive 1000 so they are sent to hell at the same time.

Part One: His introduction and the context of Romans 3:25a

Spurgeon's short introduction is unremarkable except for two sentences. Near the beginning he states, "Christ Jesus is to-day to be set forth." Near the end he says, "I come then now to preach Christ crucified, as God hath set him forth to be a propitiation for us through faith in his blood."

Before we can taste and see if Jesus Christ is truly set forth as promised, we must first examine the context of his chosen phrase: "Christ Jesus whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood." Secondly, we must lay a solid scriptural foundation upon which we can judge Spurgeon's doctrine. To the best of my ability, I will look at the context here and the latter in the next section.

¹ Its sermon number 373, delivered on Good Friday Morning March 29th, 1861. It was preached at the Metropolitan Tabernacle, Newington.

Romans 3:21-26

21But now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets; 22Even the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe: for there is no difference: 23For all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God; 24Being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus: **25Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood**, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God; 26To declare, I say, at this time his righteousness: that he might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus.²³

The Expositor's Bible Commentary, with reference to this section of scripture begins in this way:

IV. Justification: The Imputation of Righteousness (3:21–5:21)

A. The Description of Justification (3:21–26)

To help his readers follow his train of thought, the apostle reverts to the term he used in stating the theme of the letter in 1:17—God's righteousness. He repeats also the necessity for faith (cf. 1:16) and then summarizes the material from 1:18–3:20 by the reminder that there is no difference between Jew and Gentile so far as sin is concerned. Having done this, **he goes on to give a rich exposition of salvation through the use of various theological terms, with principal attention to justification.**⁴

Both the terms "propitiation" and "faith in his blood" (I. E. Christ's blood) are theological terms Paul used with direct reference to God's way of justification and salvation through Christ. The fact that Paul is concentrating here on justification and righteousness can be clearly seen in the Greek words he used. In this short section Paul used the word 'dikaiōsunē' (righteousness) four times, the closely connected word 'dikaiōō' (justified, justifier) three times and 'dikaiōs' (just) once.

Spurgeon has only two references to righteousness. Both are near the end of section 2 ("What is meant here by God's setting forth Christ as propitiation;" He says he is speaking "upon a duty, or rather privilege" that "WE SHOULD LOOK TO CHRIST, AND LOOK TO CHRIST ALONE AS THE PROPITIATION FOR OUR SINS"). The first is: "That man who has been washed in blood is white; his doubts and fears have not spoiled that whiteness; his powerlessness yesterday in prayer, his despondency a week ago, his all but complete unbelief last month, do not mar **the perfection of Jesus's righteousness,**" The second is: "...the same in all its splendor, the same

² All scripture passages are in the King James version unless otherwise noted.

³ All text in bold is mine unless otherwise stated.

⁴ Harrison, E. F. (1976). Romans. In F. E. Gaebelin (Ed.), *The Expositor's Bible Commentary: Romans through Galatians* (Vol. 10, pp. 40–41). Zondervan Publishing House.

undimmed, as full of glory, as full of majesty, **the righteousness and blood of Christ** abides; and we, standing before God in him; and not in ourselves, are ever complete in him;”

Coming to the words for just, justifier and justified Spurgeon has three references in this sermon: 1. “And what have all conversions been since then? Have they not been repeated seals to the testimony that Christ is the appointed Redeemer of men, and that through him **the faithful are justified and accepted?** 2. Portraying God speaking he says: “Trust in his blood, and thy sin is covered from my eyes; nay, it shall be covered from thine own eyes too; **and being justified by faith**, thou shalt have peace with God through Jesus Christ your Lord.” 3. “Him hath God the Father set forth, that by faith in his blood our sins being put away, you might enjoy **the blessing of complete justification.**” These three references are near the end of his section one (he says, “To begin at once then we shall notice first, what is meant here by God’s setting forth Christ as propitiation;” The fact is however that he makes no attempt to expand or expound upon the subjects that Paul was concerned about. As we shall see his main concern is in the phrase “his blood”.

John Gill in his masterful treatment of Romans 3:25 touches upon the subjects contained in verses 21 – 26, providing as it were a summary of Paul’s doctrine. Gill says then:

Ver. 25. Whom God had set forth to be a propitiation, &c.] Redemption by Christ is here further explained, by his being a propitiation; which word may design either Christ the propitiator, the author of peace and reconciliation; or the propitiatory sacrifice, by which he is so; and both in allusion to the mercy-seat, which was a type of him as such. The apostle here uses the same word, which the Septuagint often render *כפרת*, the mercy-seat, by; and Philo the Jew calls it by the same name, and says it was a symbol, *της ελεω του θεου δυναμεως*, of the propitious power of God. Christ is the propitiation to God for sin; which must be understood of his making satisfaction to divine justice, for the sins of his people; these were imputed to him, and being found on him, the law and justice of God made demands on him for them; which he answered to satisfaction, by his obedience and sacrifice; and which, as it could not be done by any other, nor in any other way, is expressed by reconciliation, and atonement: whence God may be said to be pacified, or made propitious; not but that he always loved his people, and never hated them; nor is there, nor can there be any change in God, from hatred to love, any more than from love to hatred: Christ has not, by his sacrifice and death, procured the love and favour of God, but has removed the obstructions which lay in the way of love’s appearing and breaking forth; there was a law broken, and justice provoked, which were to be attended to, and Christ by his sacrifice has satisfied both; so that neither the wrath of God, nor any of the effects of it, can fall upon the persons Christ is the propitiation for, even according to justice itself; so that it is not love, but justice that is made propitious: for this is all owing to the grace and goodness of God, who hath

set him forth, for this intent, in his eternal purposes and decrees; in the promises of the Old Testament, in the types, shadows, and sacrifices of the old law; by the exhibition of him in our nature, and in the ministration of the Gospel; and this is said to be through faith in his blood. The blood of Christ is that, by which Christ is the propitiation; for without the shedding of that blood, there's no redemption, no peace, no reconciliation, or remission of sin; and faith in his blood is the means by which persons become partakers of the benefits of his propitiation; such as peace, pardon, atonement, justification, and adoption: and the end of Christ's being set forth as a propitiation, on the part of God's people, is, for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God: by sins that are past, are meant, not sins before baptism, nor the sins of a man's life only, but the sins of Old-Testament saints, who lived before the incarnation of Christ, and the oblation of his sacrifice; and though this is not to be restrained to them only, for Christ's blood was shed for the remission of all his people's sins, past, present, and to come; yet the sins of the saints before the coming of Christ, seem to be particularly designed; which shews the insufficiency of legal sacrifices, sets forth the efficacy of Christ's blood and sacrifice, demonstrates him to be a perfect Saviour, and gives us reason under the present dispensation to hope for pardon, since reconciliation is completely made: remission of sin does not design that weakness which sin has brought upon, and left in human nature, whereby it is so enfeebled, that it cannot help itself, and therefore Christ was set forth, and sent forth, to be a propitiation; but rather God's passing by, or overlooking sin, and not punishing for it, under the former dispensation; or else the forgiveness of it now, and redemption from it by the blood of Christ, through the forbearance of God; in deferring the execution of justice, till he sent his son, and in expecting satisfaction of his son; which shews the grace and goodness of God to his people, and the trust and confidence he put in his son: the other end on the part of God, in setting forth Christ to be a propitiation, was to declare his righteousness; meaning either the righteousness of Christ, which was before hid, but now manifested; or rather the righteousness of God the father, his faithfulness in his promises relating to Christ, his grace and goodness in the mission of his son, the holiness and purity of his nature, and his vindictive justice, in avenging sin in his own son, as the surety of his people: the execution of this was threatened from the beginning; the types and sacrifices of the old law prefigured it; the prophecies of the Old Testament express it; and the sufferings and death of Christ openly declare it, since God spared not his own son, but sheathed the sword of justice in him.⁵

⁵ Gill, J. (1809). *An Exposition of the New Testament* (Vol. 2, pp. 438–439). Mathews and Leigh.

Because Gills comments are so concise, exact, and true to the scriptures I will be referring to them again in this essay. For now, they help to put verse 25a in context.

Part Two: Laying down a scriptural foundation of truth

My remarks here will be limited to this sermon of Spurgeon's only. He brings in several subjects or doctrines using these as a basis for his exhortations. Obviously, the primary doctrines are "propitiation" and the "blood of Christ". In addition, he speaks of the decree of God three times and what also looks like a reference to the Covenant of Redemption (the covenant of merch or of grace) more directly. This is in his section one (the doctrinal section) where he says: "**At any rate** there was this choice between the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit: The Divine wisdom conjoined with Divine Sovereignty, chose, and appointed, and determined that Christ Jesus, the second of the Mysterious Three, should be the propitiation **for our sins.**"

Section one: The Covenant of Redemption

Turing to the scriptures first, Isaiah 6:8 is of the greatest importance for my purpose here: I could do it no better justice then to quote the words of Robert Hawker in his commentary on this verse:

ISAIAH 6:8

Also I heard the voice of the Lord, saying, Whom shall I send, and who will go for us? Then said I, Here am I; send me.

Here, if I mistake not, the subject takes a different turn. Isaiah in the former part, relates what he had seen and heard in a special relation to himself, and the Church, to whom he ministered: but here he relates what he was witness to, in relation to a higher mission than that of any among the sons of men. He begins it with an also, as if to disconnect what went before from what now follows: Also, I heard the voice of the LORD, saying, whom shall I send, and who will go for us? Let the Reader consult those scriptures, where a consultation is as it were set forth between the persons of the GODHEAD, and then may the LORD enable him to determine for himself, (for far be it from me to determine for him) whether this be not a similar instance. Thus, at creation, Genesis 1:26. So again at the destruction of Babel, Genesis 11:5-7. And why may we not suppose that this vision which the prophet Isaiah was favoured with, was a representation given to the Church, through him, of the conference at redemption? And if this be the case, it is JESUS, and not Isaiah who gives the answer, here am I, send me, see Psalm 40:7-10. Reader, pray consult

those sweet scriptures, they will amply reward your attention; and may the almighty Author of them himself explain them! Isaiah 42:1-8; then 50:5-9.⁶

Let's look also at Psalm 40:7-10 as Hawker asked us to:

Then said I, Lo, I come: in the volume of the book it is written of me, I delight to do thy will, O my God: yea, thy law is within my heart. I have preached righteousness in the great congregation: lo, I have not refrained my lips, O LORD, thou knowest. I have not hid thy righteousness within my heart; I have declared thy faithfulness and thy salvation: I have not concealed thy lovingkindness and thy truth from the great congregation.

John Gills comments on verses 7 and 8 go straight to the heart of that aspect of the covenant of grace that is most important for my purposes here. I say that because it is not my purpose here to prove or expound upon the Covenant of Redemption in it entirely. I am concentrating on those aspects that relate to Spurgeon's sermon. Gill says then:

Ver. 7. Then said I &c.] **As in the council and covenant of peace, when and where he declared his willingness to come into the world, and make satisfaction for the sins of his people; so when the fulness of time was come for his appearance in human nature he repeated the same; for of the time of his coming into the world are these words interpreted, Heb. 10:5. when sacrifice and offering God would not have any longer continued, and when a body was prepared him, then he said, Lo, I come; O Father;** as Apollinarius, in his metaphrase, adds; that is, freely, and without compulsion; immediately, at once, without any delay; and he himself, and not another; and this not by change of place, but by assumption of nature; taking the body, or human nature, prepared for him, and uniting it to himself; to which the word lo is prefixed as a note of attention and admiration; the incarnation of Christ being a wonderful affair, and of the utmost moment and importance. In the volume of the book it is written of me; either in the book of divine predestination, in the purposes and decrees of God, Psal. 139:16. or in the book of the Scriptures; either in general, John 5:39; Luke 24:27, 44. or particularly in the book of the Psalms, Psal. 1:1, 2 and 2:2, 6, 7. or rather in the book of the law, the five books of Moses, since these were the only books or volumes that were composed at the writing of this psalm; and it has respect not to Deut. 18:15. nor ch. 17:18. nor Exod. 21:6. but rather Gen. 3:15 **and seeing the coming of Christ into the world was not only appointed of God, agreed unto by Christ, but was prophesied of, and penned down in the sacred writings; therefore at the appointed time he came, freely and willingly.** This book is called

⁶ Hawker, R. (n.d.). Poor Mans Commentary Old Test. Hawker.

a volume, or roll, alluding to the manner of writing formerly; when what was wrote was finished, it was rolled about a stick in the manner of a cylinder; and in this form is the book of the law with the Jews to this day; see the note on Luke 4:17.

Ver. 8. I delight to do thy will, O my God, &c.] This he came down from heaven to do, and this he did do, by preaching the Gospel, and working miracles; **and above all by obtaining eternal redemption for his people**, which he effected by fulfilling the law, becoming a sacrifice, and suffering and dying in their room; all which were the will of God, and grateful to him, and in doing which Christ took the utmost delight and pleasure, John 4:34; Luke 12:50. Yea, thy law is within my heart; either the whole moral law, under which he was, as man, and the surety of his people; and which was written upon his heart, and which he perfectly obeyed; or that particular law, injunction, and command laid upon him by his father, to offer himself a sacrifice, and lay down his life for men; which he agreed to, had it in his mind, his heart was set upon it, and he cheerfully complied with it, John 10:18 and 14:31.⁷

One concise definition of the covenant of redemption reads as follows:

The Covenant of Redemption is the holy agreement between the Persons of the Trinity in which the Father charges the Son to take on human flesh in the fullness of time to redeem His elect; and the reward purchased by the Son's willing sacrifice is the Holy Spirit Himself who establishes our communion with God for all eternity.⁸

Another speaking of the Covenant of Redemption says:

According to Covenant Theology, the CR is a covenant **made among the three Persons of the Trinity to elect, atone for, and save a select group of individuals** unto salvation and eternal life. As one popular pastor-theologian has said, in the covenant of redemption, "The Father chooses a bride for His Son." While the CR is not explicitly stated in Scripture, Scripture does explicitly state the eternal nature of the plan of salvation (Ephesians 1:3-14; 3:11; 2 Thessalonians 2:13; 2 Timothy 1:9; James 2:5; 1 Peter 1:2). Moreover, Jesus often referred to His task as carrying out the Father's will (John 5:3, 43; 6:38-40; 17:4-12). **That the salvation of the elect was God's intention from the very beginning of creation cannot be doubted**; the CR just formalizes this eternal plan in the language of covenant.⁹

⁷ Gill Vol 3, page 696,697

⁸ <https://www.thewellboise.com/wp-content/uploads/sermons/2021/03/The-Covenant-of-Redemption.The-Intra-Trinitarian-Covenant.pdf>

⁹ <https://www.gotquestions.org/covenant-theology.html>

The following quotations are taken from “The Doctrine of the Covenant in Reformed Theology by Geerhardus Vos¹⁰ He is a well know and authoritative writer on many subjects including this one.

But the covenant of redemption also has meaning for the application of salvation. It provides the guarantee that the glory of God's works of redemption shall be impressed upon the consciousness of the elect and be actively expressed through their lives. This can happen only when the application of Christ in its entirety occurs because of and in union with Christ. Only when the believer understands how he has to receive and has received everything from the Mediator and how God in no way whatever deals with him except through Christ, only then does a picture of the glorious work that God wrought through Christ emerge in his consciousness and the magnificent idea of grace begin to dominate and to form in his life. **For the Reformed, therefore, the entire ordo salutis, beginning with regeneration as its first stage, is bound to the mystical union with Christ. There is no gift that has not been earned by Him. Neither is there a gift that is not bestowed by Him that does not elevate God's glory through His bestowal.** Now the basis for this order lies in none other than in the covenant of salvation with Christ. In this covenant those chosen by the Father are given to Christ. In it He became the guarantor so that they would be planted into His body in order to live in the thought-world of grace through faith. As the application of salvation by Christ and by Christ's initiative is a fundamental principle of Reformed theology, this theology has correctly viewed this application as a covenantal requirement which fell to the Mediator and for the fulfilling of which He became the guarantor. In this way Reformed theology simply showed that here too it would be content with nothing but its one all-embracing slogan: the work of grace in the sinner as a mirror for the glory of God.

And later he says:

(a) On the basis of the accomplished work of God the covenantal relation unfolds as the essence of the riches of the ordo salutis. Here once again the working out of the glory of God in the consciousness and life of faith appears at every point to be the leading thought by which the covenant concept is explained. **In response to the question how the salvation obtained by the Mediator is appropriated by the individual, the Reformed believer answers: In such a way that it best reveals the greatness and the glory of the triune God in the work of salvation.** It is not the case that man immediately and at once comes into possession of full

¹⁰ https://www.monergism.com/thethreshold/sdg/vos_covenant.html

blessedness, for then there would not be an opportunity to see the unfolding of the wonderful plan of grace. Neither is it the case that grace as *materia medica* is poured into the sinner; for then he would fail to appreciate its divine beauty. The reality of his situation must be revealed in the consciousness of the sinner to whom God shows His grace. Hence, the Reformed Christian loves to express the work of grace in terms of conscious life. He often speaks about a powerful calling, occasionally in the sense of regeneration. He does not deny thereby that an immediate act of God is required to create spiritual life in the dead soul; rather he intends to express as strongly as possible that life first comes to its greatest fruition, its destiny, in the conscious recognition of God's grace. Hence, if the Word as the food for God's conscious working is not present, the work is not God's.

He goes on later to deal with the importance of election:

If this is indeed an essential feature of the covenantal outlook, it follows that this outlook cannot function apart from the idea of election. **The origin of the grace of God, the full benefits of which the Reformed believer enjoys by the covenant, always lies for him in election.** If consciousness of the covenant is the right expression for the consciousness of faith in its Reformed form, then there must not only be a place in it for the idea of election, but it must be permeated by that idea. Otherwise its deepest, most beautiful and precious fragrance would be lacking. We find, then, that the bloodstream of electing grace runs throughout the Christian life, even as the doctrine of the covenant pictures that life in its true freshness. At the most, one could say that it less sharply delineates the darker side of this doctrine, reprobation, because of its practical treatment of election. Yet, Reformed theology has not doubted or denied it. As for the other side, we may say that the consciousness of the covenant and consciousness of election are not divorced, and that the former is the basis of the latter. The following provides sufficient proof: It is a historical fact that the concept of the covenant lives in the consciousness of believers to express the certainty of the state of grace. It was used as a formula for the doctrine of the perseverance of the saints, a doctrine undoubtedly rooted in election.

The well-known Dutch Calvinist theologian Herman Bavinck had this to say with regard to election and the covenant of grace:

“...When the covenant of grace is separated from election, it ceases to be a covenant of grace and becomes again a covenant of works. Election implies that God grants man freely and out of grace the salvation which man has forfeited and which he can

never again achieve in his own strength. But if this salvation is not the sheer gift of grace but in some way depends upon the conduct of men, then the covenant of grace is converted into a covenant of works. Man must then satisfy some condition in order to inherit eternal life.

“So far from election and the covenant of grace forming a contrast of opposites, the election is the basis and guarantee, the heart and core, of the covenant of grace. And it is so indispensably important to cling to this close relationship because the least weakening of it [or, as he said earlier, conflating the order] not merely robs one of the true insight into the achieving and application of salvation, but also robs the believers of their only and sure comfort in the practice of their spiritual life.”¹¹

God’s glory than, lies at the heart of this and all the other acts of God: that is to God as Father, Son and Holy Spirit acting together in perfect unity and willingness. God’s love for his elect bride is the motivating force. Salvation from God’s standpoint was settled from all eternity. Salvation, from man’s point of view starts with regeneration and is bound up with the elect’s mystical union with Christ. Those who God as not chosen in election are reprobate, outside of the covenant and of salvation. The very perseverance of the saints is founded in the choice of God of whom he will save.

Section two: Propitiation

I refer here again to Dr. Gill’s comments on Romans 3:25. Speaking of propitiation he says:

Whom God had set forth to be a propitiation, &c.] **Redemption by Christ** is here further explained, by his being a propitiation; which word may design either Christ the propitiator, the author of peace and reconciliation; or the propitiatory sacrifice, by which he is so; and both in allusion to the mercy-seat, which was a type of him as such. The apostle here uses the same word, which the Septuagint often render כפרת, the mercy-seat, by; and Philo the Jew calls it by the same name, and says it was a symbol, της ελεω του θεου δυναμεως, of the propitious power of God. **Christ is the propitiation to God for sin; which must be understood of his making satisfaction to divine justice, for the sins of his people; these were imputed to him, and being found on him, the law and justice of God made demands on him for them; which he answered to satisfaction, by his obedience and sacrifice; and which, as it could not be done by any other, nor in any other way, is expressed by reconciliation, and atonement:** whence God may be said to

¹¹ These quotations were taken from an article on <https://reformedreader.wordpress.com/2009/02/02/covenant-and-election/>

be pacified, or made propitious; not but that he always loved his people, and never hated them; nor is there, nor can there be any change in God, from hatred to love, any more than from love to hatred: Christ has not, by his sacrifice and death, procured the love and favour of God, but has removed the obstructions which lay in the way of love's appearing and breaking forth; there was a law broken, and justice provoked, which were to be attended to, and Christ by his sacrifice has satisfied both; so that neither the wrath of God, nor any of the effects of it, can fall upon the persons Christ is the propitiation for, even according to justice itself; so that it is not love, but justice that is made propitious: for this is all owing to the grace and goodness of God, who hath set him forth, for this intent, in his eternal purposes and decrees; in the promises of the Old Testament, in the types, shadows, and sacrifices of the old law; by the exhibition of him in our nature, and in the ministration of the Gospel;¹²

One author shows the centrality of propitiation to God's plan of salvation. He says:

Romans 3:25 teaches:

Christ by the shedding of His blood, turned away God's wrath. Propitiation in the Bible means the same thing as Reconciliation and Atonement. In Hebrews 2:17 it is translated as Atonement in the NIV; as Reconciliation in the KJV; and as Propitiation in the NAS. So, we must understand that these words are synonyms.

Hebrews 2:17 states: "Therefore He had to be made like His brethren in all things, that He might become a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God, to make propitiation (Reconciliation KJV) for the sins of the people." NAS

In a book of sermon quotations preached by Forrest L. Keener, Bethel Baptist Church, Lawton Oklahoma, pastor Keener defines the term Propitiation as follows when he brought to light that the doctrine of limited atonement is a biblical truth when he preached this to his congregation in 1990:

"The word reconciliation in your Bible comes from exactly the same Greek word as the word atonement. The word atonement appears, in your New Testament, only in the 5th chapter of the book of Romans and verse 11 KJV. In the verses immediately surrounding it, we have the word reconciled appearing twice, and it comes from exactly the same Greek word as the word atonement, not just the same root word, but exactly the same word. Let me show you what I am talking about by reading Romans, chapter 5 and verse 10 and 11: 'For if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son,' Now, look at that. He says we

¹² Ibid Gill

were reconciled to God by the death of his Son. Is everybody reconciled to God by the death of his Son? And you must answer, 'No, there are many who are not reconciled to God by anything.' '...We were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life, and not only so, but we also joy in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom we have now received the ATONEMENT.' As we consider the word reconciled, and the word reconciliation that goes with it; be informed, the word reconciliation is exactly the same word as the word atonement in this verse." (Grace not Calvinism, Forrest L. Keener, p.181-182)¹³

The New Bible Dictionary brings out the fact that propitiation deals with turning away God's wrath from those who he saves. The appeasement of God's wrath is vital.

In the NT there are several passages where the expression 'the wrath of God' occurs, but the relevant evidence is not limited to these alone. Everywhere in the NT there is the thought that God is vigorously opposed to evil. The sinner is in no good case. He has put himself in the wrong with God. He can look for nothing other than the severity of the divine judgment. Whether we choose to call this 'the wrath of God' or not, it is there. And, while wrath is a term to which some objections may legitimately be raised, it is the biblical term and no satisfactory substitute has been suggested.

We see the force of the NT idea of propitiation from the occurrence of the term in Rom. 3:24f. We are 'justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus: whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood' (AV). The force of Paul's argument up to this point is that all, Jew and Gentile alike, are under the condemnation of God. 'The wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and wickedness of men' (Rom. 1:18). Paul shows first that the Gentile world stands under God's condemnation and then that the Jewish world is in the same plight. It is against this background that he sees the work of Christ. Christ did not save men from nothing at all. He delivered them from a very real peril. The sentence of judgment had been passed against them. The wrath of God hung over them. Paul has strongly emphasized the wrath of God throughout these opening chapters, and therefore Christ's saving work must include deliverance from this wrath. This deliverance is described by the word 'propitiation'. There is nothing else to express this thought in the critical passage Rom. 3:21ff., which sets out the way in which God has dealt with this aspect of

¹³ <https://www.monergism.com/thethreshold/articles/questions/propitiation.pdf>

man's plight. hilastērion must be held here to signify something very like 'propitiation'.¹⁴

Propitiation then is intimately connected with all aspects of divine salvation including but not limited to reconciliation and atonement. Any attempt to deal with it as a single, separate entity in Paul's gospel (Romans 3:21-26 does not do justice to the word of God. Likewise, any teaching about propitiation which fails to take into consideration the wrath of God is a false teaching. Spurgeon as I shall show limits this great doctrine to being a mere covering hiding sin.

Section three: What does Paul mean by "through faith in his blood"

What does Paul mean in verse 25 when he says: "Whom God hath set forth **to be a propitiation through faith in his blood**, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God;?" Spurgeon's answer, as I will demonstrate, is unequivocally that he means the actual blood as blood. In other words, a thing and not a person.

Going back to the context of verses 21 to 26 and especially 25a itself its clear the propitiation and Christ's blood are closely connected. John Gill, as shown above makes this connection when he says:

... and this is said to be through faith in his blood. **The blood of Christ is that, by which Christ is the propitiation; for without the shedding of that blood, there's no redemption, no peace, no reconciliation, or remission of sin; and faith in his blood is the means by which persons become partakers of the benefits of his propitiation; such as peace, pardon, atonement, justification, and adoption:** and the end of Christ's being set forth as a propitiation, on the part of God's people, is, for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God: by sins that are past, are meant, not sins before baptism, nor the sins of a man's life only, but the sins of Old-Testament saints, who lived before the incarnation of Christ, and the **oblation¹⁵ of his sacrifice**; and though this is not to be restrained to them only, for Christ's blood was shed for the remission of all his people's sins, past, present, and to come; yet the sins of the saints before the coming of Christ, seem to be particularly designed; which shews the insufficiency of legal sacrifices, sets forth **the efficacy of Christ's blood and sacrifice**, demonstrates him to be a perfect

¹⁴ Morris, L. L. (1996). Propitiation. In D. R. W. Wood, I. H. Marshall, A. R. Millard, J. I. Packer, & D. J. Wiseman (Eds.), *New Bible dictionary* (3rd ed., p. 975). InterVarsity Press.

¹⁵ i.e., Christ as a Priest offering himself to God.

Saviour, and gives us reason under the present dispensation to hope for pardon, since reconciliation is completely made:¹⁶

Therefore, not only are propitiation and blood connected but the shed blood sprinkled as a sacrifice and not the blood itself are what Paul is talking about. All God's work of salvation is bound up in the various theological terms Paul used in presenting the gospel in these verses. Taking the blood itself as a thing in and of itself is totally foreign to Paul's meaning. In fact, the phrase "through faith in his blood" is used only once in scripture. One source, using the word 'anomalous' (deviating from what is standard, normal, or expected) to both highlight and provide possible ways to rectify the translation says:

The phrase "through faith in his blood" (v. 25) poses a problem. This translation suggests that the believer's faith is to be placed in the blood of Christ, and the sequence of terms favors this. However, it has been pointed out that **there is no example of Paul's calling for faith in a thing rather than a person**, unless we allow the gospel to be included in this category. So if the translation is allowed to stand, it has to be regarded as anomalous. Furthermore, in the immediate context the idea of putting faith in is expressed without a preposition by using the genitive case (3:22, 26). The alternative suggestion is to place a comma after "faith," thus separating the clauses and making both dependent on hilastērion.¹⁷

Another example of the misuse of a term or phrase which reference Christ's death is when scripture speaks of the 'name' of Christ. In 1 John 5:13 we read "These things have I written unto you that believe on the name of the Son of God; that ye may know that ye have eternal life, and that ye may believe on the name of the Son of God." Instead of taking the name as representing all that taught in scripture about the Lord Jesus Christ (and indeed all that John teaches in his 5 chapters of 1 John) the 'name' is used as a thing as if there was some mystical power in it, itself. There are of course other examples where scripture speaks of belief in Christ's name and the same applies to in each case.

Part Three: Section One of Spurgeon's sermon

Spurgeon says, at the end of his introduction: "To begin at once then we shall notice first, what is meant here by God's setting forth Christ as propitiation;" He than takes up the phrase: "WHOM GOD HATH SET FORTH TO BE A PROPITIATION THROUGH FAITH IN HIS BLOOD." Let the reader please notice that this is where he says: "'I come then now **to preach Christ crucified**, as God hath set him forth to be a propitiation for us through faith in his blood."

¹⁶ Gill Op Cited

¹⁷ Harrison, E. F. (1976). Romans. In F. E. Gaebelin (Ed.), *The Expositor's Bible Commentary: Romans through Galatians* (Vol. 10, p. 44). Zondervan Publishing House.

After looking at the words “God has set forth” he says: “So has God the Father set forth, manifested, made conspicuous the person of the Lord Jesus **as the propitiation of sin.**” Coming to the main point he asks: “**How has he done this?**” and answers “**He has done it first by ordaining him in the divine decree as the propitiation of sin.**” Spurgeon used the word ordain (ordaining, ordained and fore ordained) four times in this sermon, all in this first section of his sermon. In addition, he uses the closely related word ‘appointed’ six times again only in this first section and nowhere else. The significance of these two words is highlighted by what he says immediately after the last quote above.

Christ did not take upon himself the office of High Priest without being chosen thereunto as was Aaron. As surely as every member of Christ’s body is elect according to the foreknowledge of God, as certainly as in God’s book all his members were written which in continuance were fashioned when as yet there was none of them, so certainly was the Head himself **ordained** the chosen of God. As our poet puts it — ‘*Christ be my first elect he said Then chose our souls in Christ our Head.*’

The two verses he quotes are from Isaac Watts hymn “Jesus, we bless thy Father’s name” Here is the hymn as found in Gadsby’s Hymns #73:

1 Jesus, we bless thy Father’s name;
Thy God and ours are both the same,
What heavenly blessings from his throne
Flow down to sinners through his Son!

2 “**Christ be my first elect,” he said;
Then chose our souls in Christ, our Head,**
Before he gave the mountains birth,
Or laid foundations for the earth.

3 Thus did eternal love begin
To raise us up from death and sin;
Our characters were then decreed,
Blameless in love, a holy seed.

4 Predestinated to be sons,
Born by degrees, but chose at once;
A new regenerated race,
To praise the glory of his grace.

5 With Christ, our Lord, we share our part
In the affections of his heart;
Nor shall our souls be thence removed,
Till he forgets his first Beloved.

The scripture reference is not given but I believe it's Isaiah 42:1 "Behold my servant, whom I uphold; mine elect, in whom my soul delighteth; I have put my spirit upon him: he shall bring forth judgment to the Gentiles."

Spurgeon next interjects an absurd question. I will return to the question shortly but for now I want to follow his thoughts on Christ being ordained and appointed. After raising this question, he goes on to say:

At any rate there was this choice between the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit: the Divine wisdom conjoined with Divine Sovereignty, chose, and appointed, and determined that Christ Jesus, the second of the Mysterious Three, should be the propitiation for our sins. When Christ cometh into the world, he comes as one of whom all eternity had spoken; he is the child born — **born from the womb of destiny**, he is the Lamb whom God had appointed from before the foundation of the world,

Instead of the scriptural covenant of grace (of peace or of redemption) as I described above Spurgeon has "the divine decree" by God to **ordain, appoint, and determine** that Christ should be the propitiation **for our sins**. Not only that but he has Christ "**born from the womb of destiny**". That phrase is not found in scripture nor is it remotely scriptural. All of these terms and all he says here implies that the Lord Jesus Christ was not involved in a covenant of grace. It was a sovereign decision of God's for Christ to be a propitiation. He tries to put a scriptural wrapper on this false doctrine by saying next:

he is the Lamb whom God had appointed from before the foundation of the world.
Long ere this world was made, or Adam fell, Christ had been set forth. In the volume of the Book it had been written of him, "I delight to do thy will, O God."

The fact that he is propagating false doctrine becomes crystal clear when we look deeper at what he says. As I showed above, he said: "Christ did not take upon himself the office of High Priest without being chosen thereunto as was Aaron." Now we know that Christ is Prophet, Priest and King. He offers the sacrifice and is at the same time the actual sacrificial lamb. Remember Spurgeon is supposed to be preaching Christ crucified. He is supposed to be explaining how Christ was made a propitiation. Instead, he zeroes in on Christ's election / ordination as a High Priest. Not only so but returning to the hypothetical question he raised he grossly minimizes the necessity of Christ being the propitiation for the elect's sin as well as for the atonement itself. Just after introducing the idea of election from the first half of Watt's second verse, he says "**Perhaps some might say there could be no election where there was no room for choice.**" Remember he is speaking directly about Christ's election. He goes on to say:

But how do we know that there was no room for choice? We can scarce imagine that angel or archangel could have been set forth as propitiation for sin; **yet who can tell whether the Almighty mind might not have devised another plan?** Who shall dare to limit the Holy One of Israel? **At any rate there was this choice between the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit: ...**

Here in his words, we have a rare glimpse deep inside Spurgeon's inner thinking and an obvious example of his covering such thinking with a pretense of respectability. While saying "Who shall dare to limit the Holy One of Israel?" he does that very thing: he limits God. Dear reader, please realize that it is Spurgeon himself who raises this objection. It is a deliberate choice, necessitated by his false doctrine. The false propitiation he sets forth is to him, just one of many possible choices God could have made. God by edict set up Christ as an example. To Spurgeon there is no need for the Bible's only way of turning aside the wrath of God from his elect and from them alone. He can make "propitiation be whatever he pleases, at least that is what he thinks.

The necessity of the death of Christ the God-man is a subject in and of itself. I have chosen to give just one quotation on this subject for several reasons. First because Professor John Murray is a well-known voice who the Banner of Truth Trust has promoted to a great extent. Many who would staunchly support Spurgeon would be very cautious to oppose Murray. Secondly because Murray is very careful to give a summary of those who appear to side with Spurgeon. I say "appear to" because, as I am showing in this essay Spurgeon rejects the Biblical view of the Atonement that godly saints like Thomas Goodwin defended. In his work "The Atonement" Professor Murray has this to say about its necessity.

II. The Necessity. The love of God is the cause of the atonement. But why did the love of God take this way of realizing its end? This is the question of the reason as distinguished from the cause. Notable theologians in the history of the church have taken the position that there was no absolute reason, that God could have saved men by other means than by the blood-shedding of His own Son, that, since God is omnipotent and sovereign, other ways of forgiving sin were available to Him. But God was pleased to adopt this method because the greatest number of advantages and blessings accrued from it. God could have redeemed men without the shedding of blood, but He freely chose not to and thereby He magnifies the glory of His grace and enhances the precise character of the salvation bestowed (e.g., Augustine, Aquinas, Thomas Goodwin, John Ball, Thomas Blake).

It might appear that this view does honor to the omnipotence, sovereignty, and grace of God and, also, that to posit more would be presumptuous on our part and beyond the warrant of Scripture. Is it not the limit of our thought to say that "without the shedding of blood" (Heb. 9:22) there is actually no remission and be satisfied

with that datum? There are, however, certain things God cannot do. "He cannot deny himself" (II Tim. 2:13) and it is "impossible for God to lie" (Heb. 6:18). The only question is: are there exigencies arising from the character and perfections of God which make it intrinsically necessary that redemption should be accomplished by the sacrifice of the Son of God? It should be understood that it was not necessary for God to redeem men. The purpose to redeem is of the free and sovereign exercise of His love. But having purposed to redeem, was the only alternative the bloodshedding of His own Son as the way of securing that redemption? There appear to be good reasons for an affirmative answer.

A. Salvation requires not only the forgiveness of sin but also justification. And justification, adequate to the situation in which lost mankind is, demands a righteousness such as belongs to no other than the incarnate Son of God, a righteousness undefiled and undefilable, a righteousness with divine property and quality (cf. Rom. 1:17; 3:21; 22; 10:3; II Cor. 5:21; Phil. 3:9). It is the righteousness of the obedience of Christ (Rom. 5:19). But only the Son of God, incarnate, fulfilling to the full extent the commitments of the Father's will, could have provided such a righteousness. A concept of salvation bereft of the justification which this righteousness imparts is an abstraction of which Scripture knows nothing.

B. Sin is the contradiction of God and he must react against it with holy wrath. Wherever sin is, the wrath of God rests upon it (cf. Rom. 1:18). Otherwise God would be denying Himself, particularly His holiness, justice, and truth. But wrath must be removed if we are to enjoy the favor of God which salvation implies. And the only provision for the removal of wrath is propitiation. This is surely the import of Romans 3:25, 26, that God set forth Christ a propitiation to declare His righteousness, that He might be just and the justifier of the ungodly.

C. The cross of Christ is the supreme demonstration of the love of God (cf. Rom. 5:8; I John 4:9, 10). But would it be a supreme demonstration of love if the end secured by it could have been achieved without it? Would it be love to secure the end by such expenditure as the agony of Gethsemane and the abandonment of Calvary for God's own well-beloved and only-begotten Son if the result could have been attained by less costly means? In that event would it not have been love without wisdom? In this we cannot suppress the significance of our Lord's prayer in Gethsemane (Matt. 26:39). If it had been possible for the cup to pass from him, his prayer would surely have been answered. It is when the indispensable exigencies fulfilled by Jesus' suffering unto death are properly assessed that we can see the marvel of God's love in the ordeal of Calvary. So great was the Father's love

to lost men that He decreed their redemption even though the cost was nought less than the accursed tree. When Calvary is viewed in this light, then the love manifested not only takes on meaning but fills us with adoring amazement. Truly this is love.¹⁸

Let me summarize Spurgeon's doctrine minus the scriptural wrapping he put around it.¹⁹ God by a bare decree (no counsel between the three persons of the trinity) knowing that there were many possible ways to accomplish the salvation of sinners, chose by a wise sovereign choice to appoint Christ as the propitiation (as he defines it) for all who would believe. No one is free to, by sheer imagination or any other means to come up with a Gospel that differs from what God the Holy Spirit has given us in the Bible.

Realizing that he needs a more scriptural basis he finishes this part like this:

Long ere this world was made, or Adam fell, Christ had been set forth. In the volume of the Book it had been written of him, "I delight to do thy will, O God." I think those who are afraid of looking back upon the great decrees of God because they say they are secrets, have a fear where no fear is. **There is never fear, my brethren, of our meddling with secret things; if they be secret, it is quite certain that we shall not meddle with them.** Only let it be announced once for all, that they are secret; and there is no one who can betray the secrets of God. But things that are revealed belong to us and to our children, and this is one of the things that are revealed, this is the decree and we will declare it, the Lord said unto Christ, "Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee, and he hath said unto him moreover, I will make him my first-born, higher than the kings of the earth." And all this that he may be the "propitiation for our sins by faith in his blood."

Ignoring what has been revealed (God's plan of salvation from Genesis to Revelation) he has chosen to imagine a very different plan, one that answers his purpose in this sermon. He imagines that this is God's plan and therefor revealed. He stresses over and over that "that God had appointed Christ to be the full propitiation for sin." Christ was not made a propitiation as he fancies but this is what **his** gospel is founded upon. He goes on to say: "And next, God had set forth Christ to be a propitiation for sins in his promises before the advent." Near the end of his thoughts on this subject he comes to the cross of Christ. This is the heart of his doctrine and the purpose he has gone to such lengths to portray Christ as the ordained or appointed propitiation. He says:

And on the cross itself, "when it pleased the Father to bruise him, and put him to grief," what an exhibition was there of Christ to the eye of Jew and Gentile, of prince and peasant, of the learned Greek, of the ruler Roman — that God had

¹⁸ The Atonement by Professor John Murray from https://www.the-highway.com/atonement_murray.html

¹⁹ I am taking the first and third of the three quotations above.

appointed Christ to be the full propitiation for sin. **I think, my dear friends, while we must always regard the cross as being the representation of Christ's love to his Church, we must also view it as being God setting forth to man the way by which he will accept man, pardon his sin, hear his prayer, and be reconciled with his erring creatures.**

I have examined Spurgeon's false views on the Atonement at some length in the first part of this series: Part 1 The Gospel for the unsaved on this page:

(<https://www.surreytabernaclepulpit.com/files/Non%20James%20Wells>) I would refer the reader to that essay. He is denuding the Atonement of all its power and glory making it an example only by Christ's suffering.

He goes on to speak of signs following and then address those already converted. This is where he most sounds like a true Calvinist giving God the glory that is his due. It is only a very short section of a few sentences. Unfortunately, what follows is, if possible, worse than what went before. Here he changes the subject and doctrine saying: "We have seen how he has done it — we turn now to what?" and then address sinners: "Sinner, listen, and if thou hast already accepted that which the Father has revealed, let thy joy become full." After correctly saying that the Greek word *ilasthrion* means mercy seat of covering he speaks for God. He puts words in God's mouth and has God say in part:

"Do you desire to meet me? would you be no longer my enemy? would you tell me your sorrows? would you receive my blessing? would you establish a commerce between your Creator and your soul? I set forth Christ to you as being the mercy seat, where I can meet with you and you can meet with me." **Or take the word as signifying a covering; as the mercy seat covered the tables of the law, and so covered that which was the cause of Divine ire, because we had broken his commandment. "Wouldst thou have anything which can cover thy sin? Cover it from me thy God, so that I need not be provoked to anger; cover it from you so that you need not be cowed with excessive fear, and tremble to approach me as thou didst when I came in thunders and lightnings upon Sinai? Wouldst thou have a shelter which shall hide altogether thy sins and thy iniquities? I set it forth to thee in the person of my bleeding Son. Trust in his blood, and thy sin is covered from my eyes; ... Oh that we may have grace to accept now what God the Father sets forth! The Romish priest sets forth this and that, our own Romish hearts set forth such-and-such-another thing, but God sets forth Christ. The preacher of doctrine sets forth a dogma; the preacher of experience sets forth a feeling; the preacher of practice often sets forth an effort; but God puts before you Christ. "Here will I meet with you." This is the place of my rest — glorious to me, safe to you. Come to Christ! "Come to Christ, and you will come to me." **The Lord****

Almighty comes to Christ, and there he comes to you. God, then, hath set forth Christ Jesus; made him conspicuous as being the mercy-seat and **the great hider of sin**.

Shortly after this he moves on to the second section of his sermon. Before looking at the remaining part of section one I must comment on his definition of propitiation. He mentions propitiation about 23 more times before the end of his sermon. The fact is, however that he nowhere defines it again. By his own words it means two things and only two things. First it is an act of God in which Christ is somehow made a propitiation. In other words, all that I reviewed about what the Bible actually teaches finds no place in his definition. Secondly all God did by this self-appointing was to provide a propitiation that hides or covers sin. Sin is not actually taken away. Christ does not actually bear the sin of his elect. His elect do not receive Christ's actual righteousness. In short his is a sacrilegious propitiation another gospel entirely. In all his 23 references that follow he is talking about this false doctrine. He puts the fig leaf of man to cover our nakedness rather than the slain Christ to clothe us with the white robe of righteousness.

Spurgeon replaces the sovereign Lord who commands and accomplishes all his desire with a God who has to plead and beg man to accept what God offers. He replaces Christ as Prophet Priest and King: The sacrificed Lamb of God with a Christ who is less than a shadow. In an instant he changes from an apparent Calvinist into something worse than an Arminian. He throws out conviction of sin, he throws out the great doctrines of grace and replaces this with a figure head: an empty Christ and his sufferings alone. He says:

What has he set forth? He has set forth Christ before every one of you, in the daily preaching of the Word, and in yon Inspired Book, as his anointed to do his work, **suffering in the stead and place of all who believe on him**. ... Him hath God the Father set forth, **that by faith in his blood** our sins being put away, you might enjoy the blessing of complete justification.

This quote may sound truthful but it's important for me to bring out the fact that Spurgeon has begun at this point to concentrate on the "blood of Christ." As I will show he continues with this theme for the rest of the sermon. Building up a false picture to a fever pitch. However, as is so often the case with Spurgeon he means something far different to what the Bible teaches. I refer the reader to my section 3 above: What does Paul mean by "through faith in his blood" In addition the Lord's supper is very important here as it speaks not only of Christ blood but of his body as well. His blood and body represent his sacrificial death on the Cross.

Then Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you. Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day. For my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed. He that eateth my flesh, and

drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him. As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father: so he that eateth me, even he shall live by me. This is that bread which came down from heaven: not as your fathers did eat manna, and are dead: he that eateth of this bread shall live forever. These things said he in the synagogue, as he taught in Capernaum.²⁰

For I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you, That the Lord Jesus the same night in which he was betrayed took bread: And when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, Take, eat: this is my body, which is broken for you: this do in remembrance of me. After the same manner also he took the cup, when he had supped, saying, This cup is the new testament in my blood: this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me. For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord's death till he come. Wherefore whosoever shall eat this bread, and drink this cup of the Lord, unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord.²¹

Without question the scriptures deal with the body **and** blood of Christ. To Christ as a person and not as a thing, to the complete work of Christ. Body and Blood not just blood only, meaning all aspects of his birth, death, resurrection, ascension etc. Spurgeon by his own words means something very different. Just on the surface, as it were, he only refers to the shed blood of Christ twice: Once in the quotation from Charlotte Elliott hymn "Just as I am, without one plea": "I Just as I am, without one plea, **but that thy blood was shed for me**, and that thou bidd'st me come to thee, O Lamb of God, I come, I come." Now its interesting to note that Dr. Billy Gram wrote that his team used this hymn in almost every one of their crusades, since it presented "the strongest possible Biblical basis for the call of Christ."²²

Another source about Spurgeon says this about the hymn "Just as I am"

Charlotte Elliott's great hymn, "Just As I Am," was included in C. H. Spurgeon's OUR OWN HYMNBOOK, #546, giving it a very unique place in Christian hymnology associated with England's most famous Baptist minister and church. It was frequently sung at the Tabernacle and apparently **was especially selected in evangelistic settings**.²³

The author of this post gives a very telling closing paragraph saying:

It is no marvel that Charlotte Elliott's inspiring and all-time favorite invitation hymn, "Just As I Am," was loved and used by Spurgeon at the Tabernacle where evangelism of the lost was the first priority of interest and endeavor. Of course, this

²⁰ John 6:53-59

²¹ 1 Corinthians 11:23-27

²² Crusader Hymns & Hymn Stories, p. 33.

²³ <http://calvinistflyswatter.blogspot.com/2009/08/spurgeon-on-just-as-i-am.html>

hymn may not be appreciated by some of our very "rigid", anti-public invitation brethren who apparently are somewhat ambivalent about its use, but the fact is, this hymn has been greatly influential, its message so convicting and inviting, and so blessed of the Spirit of God during times of public invitations when those who have heard the Gospel are urged to trust Christ and be saved. It is very likely that even many of those brethren who are like unto those whom Spurgeon once described as "doctrinal brethren" (Vol. 8, #465, page 460) may have professed faith in Christ during invitations where "Just As I Am" was used! That was of course before they apparently became so crystallized in "rigid doctrine" and "zeal for orthodoxy" that they lost some of their appreciation for the simple elements of the Gospel of Christ expressed in "Just As I Am."²⁴

This reference then clearly shows that he is not presenting the doctrines of grace.

The second reference is near the end of his section two when he says:

Still there stands the glorious truth; and nothing short of this is the full glory of Christ's atonement: that when once he shed his blood, **and when once that blood has been applied to us**, by it and it alone we stand completely pure, and are as pure one day as another day; perfect, complete accepted, made secure and safe in Christ Jesus the Lord. "Him hath God the Father set forth to be a propitiation for sin." **My soul accepts him today as it did yesterday**, and knows that the sin is put away forever.

As I will examine in more detail, even here, he is referring to the blood as a thing and not to Christ as a person. Also, propitiation, to Spurgeon is something that is only applied to a sinner when that sinner accepts Christ. For all the talk of God's grace its up to man to step forward and do his duty.

Part Four: Section Two of Spurgeon's sermon

He starts off in this way:

And now I proceed in the second place — and may the Spirit of God descend more visibly into our midst than at present — **to speak upon a duty, a privilege rather, which so naturally rises out of God's having shown forth his Son as being the propitiation through faith in his blood.** That privilege is that WE SHOULD LOOK TO CHRIST, AND LOOK TO CHRIST ALONE AS THE

²⁴ Ibid, calvinistflyswatter.blogspot.com

**PROPTIATION FOR OUR SINS, AND TAKE CARE THAT OUR FAITH BE
SIMPLE, AND FIXED SOLELY ON HIS PRECIOUS BLOOD.**

As I showed above this **duty or privilege** is based upon a particularly faulty view of what Christ being the propitiation for the sins of his elect is. Spurgeon takes only a part of the Old Testament type (the cover of the mercy seat) apart from the actual sacrifice itself. Apart in fact from the whole context of the plan of salvation that Paul lays out. He tears down the antitype and leaves only part of what the Jews themselves had under the old covenant. Coming now to part two of his sermon he diminishes even that little bit. He does this in two ways. First by speaking of his watered-down view of propitiation as a duty or privilege **as naturally stemming** from his faulty views. The Merriam-Webster online dictionary gives this definition of ‘privilege’: “: a right or immunity granted as a peculiar benefit, advantage, or favor: PREROGATIVE” To Spurgeon God has done all he needs to do. It’s up to the sinner now to do his duty, to accept the benefit God has granted. Secondly, he now simplifies his gospel message even more, telling reprobate and elect to “take care that our faith be simple and fixed solely on his precious blood.”

He explains what he means by simple faith by rejecting repentance, a sense of need of Christ, being burdened and heavy laden, deep experience and law work. He separates all these as things that cannot save a soul and says instead:

I say that our sense of need doth not take away our guilt, nor help to take it away;
but the blood, the blood, the blood alone, pure and unmixed, hath forever
washed the people of God, and made them whiter than snow.

His fraudulent gospel consists of two parts: The first as I showed above, lies in making Christ's propitiation (atonement) to be a thing that God appointed by his sovereign will and not a real propitiation. A propitiation that is just a covering over of our sin so God cannot see it anymore. Secondly to do the self-same thing with Christ's blood. Instead of it being Christ's in all the fullness of his being to Spurgeon it is just the bare blood apart from its real meaning. It becomes a thing like a talisman. Just as an African witchdoctor would have his “patient” look at fake symbols and empty words Spurgeon holds up the bare blood of Christ without the scriptural meaning of it.

Also please remember what I disclosed above about the hymn “Just as I am” and Spurgeon's use of it. The only possible way to reject all evidence and doctrine as he does and then apply the words “Just as I am, without one plea, **but that thy blood was shed for me**” to sinners in general is to reject the doctrines of grace and treat the precious blood of Christ dishonorably.²⁵

Now our Lord Jesus Christ himself said in Mark 2:17 (and Luke 5:31): “And when the scribes and Pharisees saw him eat with publicans and sinners, they said unto his disciples, How is it that he eateth and drinketh with publicans and sinners? When Jesus heard it, he saith unto them, They that

²⁵ Sadly as I have said he is more of a misbeliever than the vast majority of free-will Arminians

are whole have no need of the physician, but they that are sick: I came not to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance.” Spurgeon quotes Matthew 11:28 but he totally miss applies it. He says:

How many read that promise, “Come unto me all ye that are weary and heavy laden, and I will give you rest,” and they fondly imagine that if they could be more weary and more heavily laden then they would have rest.

Sinful men and women hate God, despise his truth and his faithful ministers. Many are perfectly happy to be a “self saviour” and proclaim themselves saved by pride, ignorance and self-will. They are totally dead until God regenerates them and puts a new heart in them. A sinner whom God is dealing with will show some or all of the evidence Spurgeon rejects. That is because regeneration always comes before conversion. A dead person cannot truly desire salvation. He is technically correct in that these things are not what actually save the sinner but the Bible and especially Christ himself stress their extreme importance.

Commenting upon Matthew 11:28 Dr. John Gill says the exact opposite of Spurgeon’s false doctrine:

Those who come to Christ aright, come as sinners, to a full, suitable, able, and willing Saviour; venture their souls upon him, and trust in him for righteousness, life, and salvation, which they are encouraged to do, by this kind invitation; which shews his willingness to save, and his readiness to give relief **to distressed minds**. The persons invited, are not all the individuals of mankind, but with a restriction, all ye that labour, and are heavy laden; meaning, **not** these who are labouring in the service of sin and Satan, are laden with iniquity, and insensible of it: these are not weary of sin, nor burdened with it; nor do they want or desire any rest for their souls; **but such who groan, being burdened with the guilt of sin upon their consciences, and are pressed down with the unsupportable yoke of the law, and the load of human traditions; and have been labouring till they are weary, in order to obtain peace of conscience, and rest for their souls, by the observance of these things, but in vain. These are encouraged to come to him, lay down their burdens at his feet, look to, and lay hold by faith on his person, blood, righteousness, and sacrifice; when they should enjoy that true spiritual consolation, which could never be attained to by the works of the law.** And I will give you rest; spiritual rest here, peace of conscience, ease of mind, tranquillity of soul, through an application of pardoning grace, a view of free justification by the righteousness of Christ, and full atonement of sin by his sacrifice; and eternal

rest hereafter, in Abraham's bosom, in the arms of Jesus, in perfect and uninterrupted communion with father, son, and spirit.²⁶

Not satisfied yet with the lengths he has gone to, Spurgeon continues with a rather long section about our evidence of salvation. He concludes this particular topic in this way:

Evidences are good as second thing, but as first things they are usurpers, and may prove anti-Christ to Christ. **Whatever my evidences may say**, if I believe in the precious blood, there is not a sin against me in God's book, and in the teeth of everything which might make me tremble.

“Just as I am, without one plea,

But that his blood was shed for me

And that he bids me come,”

As I showed above the central part of propitiation is the removing of God's wrath from those who are the objects of this propitiation. The Bible teaches that this is for his elect and them alone. All others remain under the wrath of God. How than can Spurgeon tell all sinners and especially those who give no evidence of a work of God in their hearts that his blood was shed for them? His method is to make the act of coming and excepting the actual means of salvation. To Spurgeon nothing else is needed. Such a person is from then on outside of God's wrath.

Still not satisfied he continues again:

Friends, I may surprise you by what I am about to say, but there is another fault into which we sometimes fall, namely, looking to God's promises instead of looking to Christ as the propitiation of sin.

Perhaps much more should be said here but I want concentrate on his use of “propitiation for sin” and more particularly on the “blood of Christ”. In this his section 2 he uses the word propitiation 19 times the blood 16 times. After denying all sorrow for sin and all evidence of saving grace he closes this section summarizing his doctrine in this way.

Still there stands the glorious truth; and **nothing short of this is the full glory of Christ's atonement: that when once he shed his blood, and when once that blood has been applied to us**, by it and it alone we stand completely pure, and are as pure one day as another day; perfect, complete accepted, made secure and safe in Christ Jesus the Lord. “Him hath God the Father set forth to be a propitiation for

²⁶ Gill, J. (1809). An Exposition of the New Testament (Vol. 1, p. 124). Mathews and Leigh.

sin.” My soul accepts him today as it did yesterday, and knows that the sin is put away forever.

The fact is that the only grounds of a sinner being justified in Gods sight, **in this sermon**, is though Spurgeon’s false view of the blood. This is why it is so important to look behind the curtain, as it were, to see what his words actually mean in the context of any given sermon. Many times, if we take them at face value we will be deceived. He only mentions justification three times, all in the first part of his sermon. All with reference to the blood as a thing.²⁷ Unlike Paul who sought Gods glory and righteousness Spurgeon seeks “*salvations*” at any cost.

Part Five: Section Three of Spurgeon’s sermon

This last section of Spurgeon’s sermon is rather short and for my purposes it can be divided into three sections. The first and third sections are of the utmost importance. I therefore ask that reader to pay close attention to what is written here. If there is in the readers mind any possible doubt about what I am reviewing here about Spurgeon’s beliefs his words in this section will answer those doubts.

In the first section then, he, a mere man takes God to task telling his many hears that he can guarantee salvations! God must and will respond to preaching like his! He starts off saying:

Now I shall come to my third and last point. Turn the thoughts over. We have said God sets forth Christ, and we look at it. Now, as a matter of duty and privilege, we must **SET FORTH CHRIST, AND GOD WILL LOOK AT HIM**. The preacher, standing here as he does to-day **before this immense assembly** knows that without God’s looking upon the ministry it will be vain and void. **How shall God’s eye be secured? — how shall his presence be guaranteed? If in this pulpit Christ be set forth, God will look down upon that Christ set forth, and honor and bless the Word.**

Amazingly he goes on to especially state that clear doctrine and teaching on godly living (he calls it practice) is not needed! In fact, he goes so far as to decry doctrine, he admits he is preaching doctrine that is not clear, why else would he say “I might preach clear doctrine”? Of course, he is in point of fact preaching doctrine. His own imaginary made up theology.

Brethren, I might preach clear doctrine, but God might never look down upon doctrine; for I could point you to churches with a tear in my eye, because I am able to do so, where conversions are rare things. The doctrine is high, high enough;

²⁷ “Him hath God the Father set forth, that by faith in his blood our sins being put away, you might enjoy the blessing of complete justification.” For example

perhaps so high as to have become putrid. I will not say that, but I do know some churches where there has not been an addition to the church by the stretch of ten or a dozen years together, and I have known the reason. Christ was not set forth, and therefore God did not look down on what was set forth, because it was the wrong thing. I have known, too, churches — and with equal sorrow do I mention them — where practice has been preached, but not Christ.

He is so carried away to manufacture ‘conversions’ that he forgets that all the New Testament letters and the book of Revelation, just to take that part of God’s word, were written to the saved and elect church and not primarily for evangelistic purposes. Just think of Paul’s words to Timothy when he says:

I charge thee therefore before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing and his kingdom; Preach the word; be instant in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort with all longsuffering and doctrine. For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears; And they shall turn away their ears from the truth, and shall be turned unto fables. But watch thou in all things, endure afflictions, do the work of an evangelist, make full proof of thy ministry.²⁸

Here as in the rest of the Bible we have the correct balance. The meaning of the word translated longsuffering is defined by one source in this way:

μακροθυμία [makrothumia /mak·roth·oo·mee·ah/] n f. From the same as 3116; TDNT 4:374; TDNTA 550; GK 3429; 14 occurrences; AV translates as “longsuffering” 12 times, and “patience” twice. 1 patience, endurance, constancy, steadfastness, perseverance. 2 patience, forbearance, longsuffering, slowness in avenging wrongs²⁹

Spurgeon would rather beg and plead sacrificing sound doctrine and practice.

He says in all seriousness: “It is not a question as to whether there will be conversions when Christ is set forth; **that is certain.**” And a little later:

... if there be not souls saved there **is always** some reason for it; and the reason to which I would look — leaving now the inscrutable sovereignty of God out of the question for a moment — the reason would be either that Christ is not preached, or else he is preached in such a way as he never ought to be preached.

²⁸ 2 Timothy 4:1-5

²⁹ Strong, J. (1995). In Enhanced Strong’s Lexicon. Woodside Bible Fellowship.

He then goes directly into the second part of this section. Here he pleads with people to pray in a particular way, pleading for the souls of men in wicked Edinburgh and London. This is followed by an emotional account of one Roby Flockhart.

I come now to the third and concluding part of his third heading. Spurgeon, as I have shown, has specifically preached about Romans 3:25a “Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood,” But he has done so **in a particular manner**. He has watered down Paul’s great summary of the gospel to a point that there is no gospel left. Propitiation is not at all what the bible teaches, the blood in nothing but that, plain shed blood. All is sacrificed to bring down the gospel to a point that it will serve Spurgeon’s appointed purpose. That is to manufacture conversions, pushing unregenerate sinners to a decision. It is their duty to be saved, to Spurgeon God commands it therefore the simpler the better!

As I have shown I too have a purpose in this essay, and this is to especially show how Spurgeon understands Romans 3:25a part two. In other words, “**through faith in his blood**”. My reader may still question my conclusions. For this reason, I am skipping over part of his concluding words to concentrate on what he says about Christ’s blood.

The self-proclaimed five-point Calvinist³⁰ here turns to the Methodist’s for support. He says:

But how are we to make our prayers prevail with God? Brethren, we must show forth Christ in prayer, and then God will look upon our prayers. The Methodist cry which was once heard at the prayer-meeting when a poor Methodist brother could not go on and someone at the far end of the chapel cried out, “Plead the blood, brother, plead the blood,” — that old Methodist cry has force and power in it. “Plead the blood.” **God cannot, cannot, cannot, resist the cry of the blood of Christ.** Abel’s blood demanded vengeance, and it had it; Christ’s blood demands pardons and shall have it, must have it, our God cannot be deaf to the cry of his own Son’s blood; and if you and I and all of us together can plead the precious blood of Christ for London, **a revival must come, will come, shall come**, and the face of the times shall be changed. God’s arm shall be revealed and “all flesh shall see it together, for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it. ... Come I pray you and **obey the word of God which I utter in your hearing; come and take Christ** and show Christ’s blood to God, **and he will, he must** smile upon you. If you cannot take the promise, take the blood; if you cannot come before God with any feelings, come with Christ in your hands. “May I trust Christ?” saith one. May you! **you are commanded to do it.** He that believeth not hath made God a liar because he believeth not. He that believeth hath set to his seal that God is true. Sinner, God is satisfied with Christ. Does he satisfy God and will he not satisfy you? **The eternal judge has accepted**

³⁰ Please see the appendix

Jesus, and do you refuse him? The Lord hath opened the door and standeth at it; is the door good enough for the king, and yet not good enough for a rebel like yourself?

Very shortly after this Spurgeon, pleased with how he has presented the “gospel” and wanting to make it crystal clear what he means by the blood of Christ, says:

I do not know how it is, but this **simple doctrine** is the hardest doctrine to make plain. It seems so easy and yet many will mystify and doubt. “What, no good works, no good feelings!” All these things are fruits of grace; but salvation does not depend upon them. Salvation is in Christ, wholly in Christ, in Christ alone and **the moment any of you do trust him unfeignedly to be your sole and only Savior you have accepted God’s propitiation, and God has accepted you. It is not possible for the Lord, unless he could reverse his nature, stain his honor, belie his character, make his word a farce, and the atonement of Christ a falsehood to reject any man under heaven who believes in Christ, and takes him to be his all in all.** This day is called Good Friday; may it be a good Friday to some of you. Perhaps I have some here to whom I have preached these last seven years, and yet you have remained unsaved. I am clear of your blood if you had only heard but this one morning sermon, for God witnesseth **I know not how to put the plan of salvation more plainly than I have done.** “God hath set forth Christ to be a propitiation through his blood.” **I bid you look to Christ bleeding, to Christ sweating drops of blood, Christ scourged, Christ nailed to the tree, and if you believe in Christ’s blood he is the propitiation of your sins.** But I can do no more than this; it is mine to preach, it is mine to pray, and mine to plead.

God is set aside, waiting at the door for sinners to accept what he offers. All is at their fingertips all they need to do is to plead the actual blood of Christ as a thing and not a person and they will be saved. Putting man in charge as he has done throughout this sermon he concludes with these final words:

What shall I say? Instead of pleading further with you I would plead with God in private, that many of you may now try whether Christ cannot save you. Rest yourself on him, trust yourself with him, and he will be as good as his word, and save you now, and save you even to the end. The Lord add his blessing, for Jesus’ sake. Amen.

Dear reader please refer to my appendix, especially the second quotation from Christ Crucified by C. H. Spurgeon Sermon 5 1857. There you will find that Spurgeon, in the sermon under review is condemned by his own words. He is not preaching the gospel in this sermon based upon his publicly stated beliefs!

Conclusion

I began this essay with God's truth as it is in Jesus. Now I would like to end it in the same way. Speaking of Romans 3:25 Robert Hawker expounds that gospel truthfully saying:

In the close of this paragraph, the Apostle dwells very blessedly on the greatness of Christ's sacrifice; and on the grace of GOD, in the wonderful ordination of it: and, from the union of both he shews, how Jehovah, in his threefold character of Persons, may, and indeed doth, justify the believer in JESUS, while preserving his own glory, in the full perfection of all the rights of his justice. Whom GOD (saith he) hath set forth a propitiation through faith in his blood. The Reader will perceive, that I take no notice in this passage of those words, to be, which are in Italicks, and which have no business there; for Christ was not then to be set forth; for this had been done from everlasting. The Lord possessed me in the beginning of his way, before his works of old. I was set up from everlasting, Proverbs 8:22-23. And, Christ is said to have been, the lamb slain from the foundation of the world!, Revelation 13:8. And Christ hath been, and is, and will be, the same, in the perpetual, and unceasing efficacy of his blood, to all eternity.

We do not meet with this word propitiation, but three times in all the Bible, once in this place and twice in the First Epistle of John, 1 John 2:2 and 1 John 4:10. Christ indeed is both the propitiation and the propitiatory. He is the propitiation, or sacrifice; the propitiatory, or mercy seat and altar, on which that sacrifice was offered; and he is the high priest, or sacrificer, to make the offering. The Jews were accustomed, on this account, to call the mercy-seat *Ilasterion*. For here, in allusion to all the great events connected with the Person of Christ, and his Offices, and Character; the Lord promised to come and meet his people, Exodus 25:22. And, in the Person of Christ only, can this meeting be, either in time, or eternity. Well might his Name be called WONDERFUL! For, while all the divine Attributes meet in his Person, and shine in one full constellation; all our sins meet on him, (so it is rendered in the margin of our old Bibles, Isaiah 53:6) as centering upon Christ, not in Christ; and the LORD JESUS washing them all away by his blood. So that Christ, in the fullest sense of the word, is the propitiation, and the only propitiation for sin; having by that one offering of himself once offered, perfected forever them that are sanctified, Hebrews 10:14.³¹

³¹ Hawker, R. (n.d.). Poor Mans Commentary New Test. Hawker.

What a vast contrast to Spurgeon! Finally, to summarize that gospel in a few words I quote from one of the great hymn writers:

Love of and praise to the blessed Trinity. Tit. 3. 4-6³²

J. Hart

L.M.

1

To comprehend the great THREE-ONE,
Is more than highest angels can;
Or what the Trinity has done
From death and hell to ransom man.

2

But all true Christians this may boast,
(A truth from nature never learned),
That Father, Son, and Holy Ghost,
To save our souls are all concerned.

3

[The Father's love in this we find,
He made his Son our sacrifice;
The Son in love his life resigned;
The Spirit of love his blood applies.]

4

Thus we the Trinity can praise
In Unity through Christ our King;
Our grateful hearts and voices raise
In faith and love, while thus we sing:

5

Glory to God the Father be,
Because he sent his Son to die;
Glory to God the Son, that he
Did with such willingness comply;

6

Glory to God the Holy Ghost,
Who to our hearts this love reveals;
Thus God Three-One, to sinners lost
Salvation sends, procures, and seals.

³² Joseph Hart from Gadsby's selection number 34

Appendix

Spurgeon on the five points of Calvinism

Opinions on Spurgeon being a five-point Calvinist come from two sources: What Spurgeon himself says about this matter and what others have said. Of the later the vast majority like the Banner of Truth Trust, see him as the great shining light of true Calvinism. Even many otherwise sound, knowledgeable stalwarts of the modern reformed faith raise him up as a gold standard. Either as a Baptist or as a Calvinist, usually as both. I'm giving three brief samples here of what Spurgeon said in his own words. My purpose is to give the reader food for thought.

We believe in the five great points commonly known as Calvinistic; but we do not regard these points as being barbed shafts which we are to thrust between the ribs of our fellow Christians. We look upon them as being five great lamps which help to irradiate the cross; or, rather, five bright emanations springing from the glorious covenant of our Triune God, and illustrating the great doctrine of Jesus crucified. Against all comers, especially against all lovers of Arminianism, we defend and maintain pure gospel truth. At the same time, I can make this public declaration, that I am no Antinomian. I belong not to the sect of those who are afraid to invite the sinner to Christ. I warn him, I invite him, I exhort him. Hence, then, I have contumely on either hand. Inconsistency is charged against me by some people, as if anything that God commanded could be inconsistent; **I will glory in such inconsistency even to the end. I bind myself precisely to no form of doctrine. I love those five points as being the angles of the gospel, but then I love the centre between the angles better still.**³³

Just stop for a moment and think about these words of Spurgeon's "**I will glory in such inconsistency even to the end. I bind myself precisely to no form of doctrine.**" I have seen one fact clearly and consistently in studying Spurgeon over many years. He makes himself the arbitrator of what any particular passage of scripture means regardless of how inconsistent that may be. This can be seen in the following quotation as well.

And I have my own private opinion, that there is no such thing as preaching Christ and him crucified, unless you preach what now-a-days is called Calvinism. **I have my own ideas, and those I always state boldly.** It is a nickname to call it Calvinism. Calvinism is the gospel, and nothing else. I do not believe we can preach the gospel, if we do not preach justification by faith without works; nor

³³ From C. H. Spurgeon Autobiography: Volume 2: The Full Harvest (Banner ed. 1973): p. 12. I took this directly from the following web address: <http://www.jeffriddle.net/2010/11/spurgeon-on-five-points.html>

unless we preach the sovereignty of God in his dispensation of grace; nor unless we exalt the electing, unchangeable, eternal, immutable, conquering love of Jehovah; nor, I think, can we preach the gospel, unless we base it upon the peculiar redemption which Christ made for his elect and chosen people,³⁴

I know there are some who think it necessary to their system of theology to limit the merit of the blood of Jesus—if my theological system needed such a limitation, I would cast it to the winds! I cannot, I dare not, allow the thought to find a lodging in my mind—it seems so near akin to blasphemy. In Christ's finished work, I see an ocean of merit; my plummet finds no bottom, my eye discovers no shore. There is sufficient efficacy in the blood of Christ, **if God had so willed it**, to have saved not only all in this world, but all in ten thousand worlds had they transgressed their Maker's law! Once admit infinity into the matter, and limit is out of the question! Having a divine person for an offering, **it is not consistent** to conceive of limited value; **boundaries and measure are inapplicable terms** to the divine Sacrifice! The intent of the divine purpose fixes the application of the infinite offering, but does not change it into a finite work. Think of the numbers upon whom God has bestowed His grace; think of the countless hosts in heaven—if you were introduced there today, you would find it as easy to count the stars, or the sands of the sea, as to count the multitudes that are before the throne even now! They have come from the East and from the West, from the North and from the South, and they are sitting down with Abraham and with Isaac, and with Jacob in the kingdom of God.³⁵

These last remarks of Spurgeon's are at best political theater. Not a single sinner more will be saved by it. They have no real meaning or purpose other than to give the impression that in some way the atonement is for the non-elect. Also, they give Spurgeon a cloak of respectability to hide behind. They set up human reason and what the human mind can conceive of in opposition to the clear teaching of the Scriptures. Christ's blood was shed from many not all. He prayed not for the world etc. The atonement is of no benefit to the reprobate rather it leaves those under its proclamation in greater damnation. God's glory and not evangelism as such is the message of the bible. Evangelism in its true scriptural meaning is God glorifying. Spurgeon, however, places that above all else including God's glory. His whole defense is riddled with evasions and smoke screens and loopholes. Let the reader study the scriptures and pray for grace and wisdom in these weighty matters. What the scriptures teach and not what men want it to teach must be our touchstone.

³⁴ Christ Crucified by C. H. Spurgeon Sermon 5 1857

³⁵ This is taken from Spurgeon's A Defense of Calvinism; From Vol. 1 of his Autobiography. This message is available in many formats for sale of for free on the internet.