

Chapter 1 : Works | B. B. Warfield

whole by the term, "The Plan of Salvation." It does not seem necessary to pause to discuss the previous question whether God, in his saving activities, acts upon a plan.

However, there is a statement prior to the conclusion of the book that to me sounds very different from Postmillennialism. Although I agree with Warfield on most of his views, it is his eschatology that somewhat diminishes the conclusion of the book. Prior to concluding the book, Warfield writes: Redeemed by Christ, regenerated by the Holy Spirit, justified through faith, received into the very household of God as his sons, led by the Spirit into the flowering and fruiting activities of the new life, our salvation is still only in process and not yet complete. We still are the prey of temptation; we still fall into sin; we still suffer sickness, sorrow, death itself. Our redeemed bodies can hope for nothing but to wear out in weakness and to break down in decay in the grave. Our redeemed souls only slowly enter into their heritage. However, the book is really edifying. Warfield gave in In the lectures Warfield first lays out the differing plans and then he carefully examines each one. The plans are divided into two major categories: The Supernatural category is further divided into Sacerdotalism, Universalism, and finally Calvinism. Through out the lectures Warfield is careful to represent each vie The Plan of Salvation is a series of five lectures that B. Through out the lectures Warfield is careful to represent each view faithful often provide quotes and footnotes from proponents of each view. After setting the context for the rest of the lectures Warfield then begins to look at each of the major plans. In Sacerdotalism Warfield examines how grace is mediated by the church through the use of sacraments. Warfield reviews the teaching of Roman Catholicism, some Anglican writers, and Confessional Lutherans. In the Calvinism lecture Warfield examines the several different strains of Calvinism and ends showing how in Calvinism we see the definite salvation of both the individual and of the world. I enjoyed the book greatly and highly recommend it. I must warn the reader though that Warfield was lecturing and writing to an academic crowd and so the language can be a bit tough to work tough but it well repays the effort.

Chapter 2 : # Warfield: Plan of Salvation - Theocast - Reformed Theology

by Benjamin B. Warfield THE SUBJECT to which our attention is to be directed in this series of lectures is ordinarily spoken of as "The Plan of Salvation." Its more technical designation is, "The Order of Decrees."

Particularism in the processes of salvation becomes thus the mark of Calvinism. As supernaturalism is the mark of Christianity at large, and evangelicalism the mark of Protestantism, so particularism is the mark of Calvinism. The Calvinist is he who holds with full consciousness that God the Lord, in his saving operations, deals not generally with mankind at large, but particularly with the individuals who are actually saved. Thus, and thus only, he contends, can either the supernaturalism of salvation which is the mark of Christianity at large and which ascribes all salvation to God, or the immediacy of the operations of saving grace which is the mark of evangelicalism and which ascribes salvation to the direct working of God upon the soul, come to its rights and have justice accorded it. Particularism in the saving processes, he contends, is already given in the supernaturalism of salvation and in the immediacy of the operations of the divine grace; and the denial of particularism is constructively the denial of the immediacy of saving grace, that is, of evangelicalism, and of the supernaturalism of salvation, that is, of Christianity itself. It is logically the total rejection of Christianity. The particularism of the saving operations of God which is thus the mark of Calvinism, it is possible, however, to apply more or less fully or, shall we say, with more or less discernment? Thus differing varieties of Calvinism have emerged in the history of thought. As they are distinguishable from one another by the place they give to particularism in the operations of God, that is as much as to say they are distinguished from one another by the place they give to the decree of election in the order of the divine decrees. That he has any creatures at all they suppose to be in the interest of discrimination, and all that he decrees concerning his creatures they suppose he decrees only that he may discriminate between them. They are therefore called Supralapsarians, that is, those who place the decree of election in the order of thought prior to the decree of the fall. The place they give it in the order of decrees is therefore at the head of those decrees of God which look to salvation. This implies that it falls into position in the order of thought, consequently upon the decrees of creation and the fall, which refer to all men alike, since all men certainly are created and certainly have fallen; and precedently to the decrees of redemption and its application, since just as certainly all men are not redeemed and brought into the enjoyment of salvation. They are from this circumstance called Sublapsarians or Infralapsarians, that is, those who, in the arrangement of the decrees in logical order, conceive the place of the decree of election to be logically after that of the fall. There are others, however, who, affected by what they deem the Scriptural teaching concerning the universal reference of the redemption of Christ, and desirous of grounding the universal offer of salvation in an equally universal provision, conceive that they can safely postpone the introduction of the particularistic principle to a point within the saving operations of God themselves, so only they are careful to introduce it at a point sufficiently early to make it determinative of the actual issue of the saving work. They propose therefore to think of the provision of salvation in Christ as universal in its intent; but to represent it as given effect in its application to individuals by the Holy Spirit only particularistically. That is to say, they suppose that some, not all, of the divine operations looking to the salvation of men are universalistic in their reference, whereas salvation is not actually experienced unless not some but all of them are operative. As the particular saving operation to which they ascribe a universalistic reference is the redemption of Christ, their scheme is expressed by saying that it introduces the decree of election, in the order of thought, at a point subsequent to the decree of redemption in Christ. They may therefore be appropriately called Post-redemptionists, that is, those who conceive that the decree of election is logically postponed to the decree of redemption. In their view redemption has equal reference to all men, and it is only in the application of this redemption to men that God discriminates between men, and so acts, in this sense, particularistically. It is obvious that this is the lowest point in the order of decrees at which the decree of election can be introduced and the particularistic principle be retained at all. If the application of the redemption of Christ by the Holy Spirit be also made universalistic, that is to say, if the introduction of the particularistic principle be postponed to the actual issue of the saving process, then there is obviously no

particularism at all in the divine operations looking to salvation. All Calvinists must therefore be either Supralapsarians or Sub- or Infra- lapsarians, or, at least, Post-redemptionists which is also to be Anteapplicationist. Nevertheless, we do not reach in the Post-redemptionists, conceived purely from the point of view of this element of their thought, the lowest possible, or the lowest actual, variety of Calvinists. Post-redemptionists may differ among themselves, if not in the position in the order of decrees of the decree of election for still further to depress its position in that order would be to desert the whole principle of particularism and to fall out of the category of Calvinists, yet in their mode of conceiving the nature of the work of the Holy Spirit in applying redemption, under the government of the decree of election; and as to the role of the human spirit in receiving redemption. They have, therefore, invented a variety of Calvinism which supposes that it is God indeed who selects those who shall savingly be brought to Christ, and that it is the Holy Spirit who, by his grace, brings them infallibly to Christ, thus preserving the principle of particularism in the application of salvation, but which imagines that the Holy Spirit thus effectually brings them to Christ, not by an almighty, creative action on their souls, by which they are made new creatures, functioning subsequently as such, but purely by suasive operations, adapted in his infallible wisdom to the precise state of mind and heart of those whom he has selected for salvation, and so securing from their own free action, a voluntary coming to Christ and embracing of him for salvation. There is no universalism here; the particularism is express. But an expedient has been found to enable it to be said that men come voluntarily to Christ, and are joined to him by a free act of their own unrenewed wills, while only those come whom God has selected so to persuade to come he who knows the heart through and through that they certainly will come in the exercise of their own free will. The teaching of these is that God the Holy Spirit accords his suasive influences to all alike, making no distinction; but that this universalistically conceived grace of the Holy Spirit takes effect only according as it proves to be actually congruous or incongruous to the state of mind and heart of those to whom it equally is given. Here it is not the sovereign choice of God, but a native difference in men, which determines salvation, and we are on expressly autosoteric ground. It was his predecessor and teacher in the same school, Moses Amyraut, who first formulated in the Reformed Churches the Post-redemptionist scheme, of which Pajonism is a debased form. Thus the school of Saumur has the bad eminence of having originated, and furnished from the names of its professors the current designations of, the two most reduced forms of Calvinism, Amyraldianism or Hypothetical Universalism as it is otherwise called, and Pajonism, or Congruism as it is designated according to its nature. We have thus had brought before us four forms of Calvinism; and these, as we believe, exhaust the list of possible general types: Supralapsarianism, Sub- or Infra- lapsarianism, Post-redemptionism otherwise called Amyraldianism, or Hypothetical Universalism, and Pajonism otherwise called Congruism. These are all forms of Calvinism, because they give validity to the principle of particularism as ruling the divine dealings with man in the matter of salvation; and, as we have seen, the mark of Calvinism is particularism. If now, particularism were not only the mark of Calvinism but also the substance of Calvinism, all four of these types of Calvinism, preserving as they all do the principle of particularism, might claim to be not only alike Calvinistic, but equally Calvinistic, and might even demand to be arranged in the order of excellence according to the place accorded by each in its construction to the principle of particularism and the emphasis placed on it. Particularism, however, though the distinguishing mark of Calvinism, by which it may be identified as over against the other conceptions of the plan of salvation, in comparison with which we have brought it, does not constitute its substance; and indeed, although strenuously affirmed by Calvinism, is not affirmed by it altogether and solely for its own sake. The most consistent embodiment of the principle of particularism is not therefore necessarily the best form of Calvinism; and the bare affirmation of the principle of particularism though it may constitute one so far a Calvinist, does not necessarily constitute one a good Calvinist. Post-redemptionism, therefore although it is a recognizable form of Calvinism, because it gives real validity to the principle of particularism, is not therefore necessarily a good form of Calvinism, an acceptable form of Calvinism, or even a tenable form of Calvinism. For one thing, it is a logically inconsistent form of Calvinism and therefore an unstable form of Calvinism. For another and far more important thing, it turns away from the substitutive atonement, which is as precious to the Calvinist as is his particularism, and for the safeguarding of which, indeed, much of his zeal for

particularism is due. I say, Post-redemptionism is logically inconsistent Calvinism. For, how is it possible to contend that God gave his Son to die for all men, alike and equally; and at the same time to declare that when he gave his Son to die, he already fully intended that his death should not avail for all men alike and equally, but only for some which he would select which, that is, because he is God and there is no subsequence of time in his decrees, he had already selected to be its beneficiaries? But as much as God is God, who knows all things which he intends from the beginning and all at once, and intends all things which he intends from the beginning and all at once, it is impossible to contend that God intends the gift of his Son for all men alike and equally and at the same time intends that it shall not actually save all but only a select body which he himself provides for it. The schematization of the order of decrees presented by the Amyraldians, in a word, necessarily implies a chronological relation of precedence and subsequence among the decrees, the assumption of which abolishes God, and this can be escaped only by altering the nature of the atonement. And therefore the nature of the atonement is altered by them, and Christianity is wounded at its very heart. But the real hinge of their system turns on their altered doctrine of the atonement, and here they strike at the very heart of Calvinism. A conditional substitution being an absurdity, because the condition is no condition to God, if you grant him even so much as the poor attribute of foreknowledge, they necessarily turn away from a substitutive atonement altogether. But what obstacle stands in the way of the salvation of sinners, except just their sin? And if this obstacle their sin is removed, are they not saved? Some other obstacles must be invented, therefore, which Christ may be said to have removed since he cannot be said to have removed the obstacle of sin that some function may be left to him and some kind of effect be attributed to his sacrificial death. He did not remove the obstacle of sin, for then all those for whom he died must be saved, and he cannot be allowed to have saved anyone. He removed, then, let us say, all that prevented God from saving men, except sin; and so he prepared the way for God to step in and with safety to his moral government to save men. The atonement lays no foundation for this saving of men: We are now fairly on the basis of the Governmental Theory of the Atonement; and this is in very truth the highest form of doctrine of atonement to which we can on these premises attain. In other words, all the substance of the atonement is evaporated, that it may be given a universal reference. And, indeed, we may at once recognize it as an unavoidable effect of universalizing the atonement that it is by that very act eviscerated. If it does nothing for any man that it does not do for all men why, then, it is obvious that it saves no man; for clearly not all men are saved. The things that we have to choose between, are an atonement of high value, or an atonement of wide extension. The two cannot go together. And this is the real objection of Calvinism to this compromise scheme which presents itself as an improvement on its system: And as a really substitutive atonement which actually saves cannot be universal because obviously all men are not saved, in the interests of the integrity of the atonement it insists that particularism has entered into the saving process prior, in the order of thought, to the atonement. As bad Calvinism as is Amyraldianism, Pajonism is, of course, just that much worse. Of what value is it that it should be confessed that it is God who determines who shall be saved, if the salvation that is wrought goes no deeper than what I can myself work, if I can only be persuaded to do it? Here there is lacking all provision not only for release from the guilt of sin, but also for relief from its corruption and power. There is no place left for any realizing sense of either guilt or corruption; there is no salvation offered from either the outraged wrath of a righteous God or the ingrained evil of our hearts: The prospect that is held out to us is nothing less than appalling; we are to remain to all eternity fundamentally just our old selves with only such amelioration of our manners as we can be persuaded to accomplish for ourselves. The whole substance of Christianity is evaporated, and we are invited to recognize the shallow remainder as genuine Calvinism, because, forsooth, it safeguards the sovereignty of God. Let it be understood once for all that the completest recognition of the sovereignty of God does not suffice to make a good Calvinist. Otherwise we should have to recognize every Mohammedan as a good Calvinist. There can be no Calvinism without a hearty confession of the sovereignty of God; but the acknowledgement of the sovereignty of God of itself goes only a very little way toward real Calvinism. Pajon himself, the author of Calvinistic Congruism, advanced in his fundamental thought but little beyond a high variety of Deism. It seems particularly worth while to make these things explicit, because there is perhaps nothing which more prejudices Calvinism in the general mind than the current identification of it

with an abstract doctrine of sovereignty, without regard to the concrete interests which this sovereignty safeguards. It must be borne well in mind that particularism and parsimony in salvation are not equivalent conceptions; and it is a mere caricature of Calvinistic particularism to represent it as finding its center in the proclamation that there are few that are saved. Whether in dealing with the individual souls of men, he visits with his saving grace few or many, so many that in our imagination they may readily pass into all, does not lie in the question. So far as the principles of sovereignty and particularism are concerned, there is no reason why a Calvinist might not be a universalist in the most express meaning of that term, holding that each and every human soul shall be saved; and in point of fact some Calvinists forgetful of Scripture here have been universalists in this most express meaning of the term. How many, up to the whole human race in all its representatives, God has thus bought and will bring into eternal communion with himself by entering himself into personal communion with them, lies, I say, quite outside the question of particularism. Universalism in this sense of the term and particularism are so little inconsistent with one another that it is only the particularist who can logically be this kind of a universalist. And something more needs to be said-Calvinism in point of fact has as important a mission in preserving the true universalism of the gospel for there is a true universalism of the gospel as it has in preserving the true particularism of grace. The same insistence upon the supernaturalistic and the evangelical principles, that salvation is from God and from God alone, and that God saves the soul by dealing directly with it in his grace which makes the Calvinist a particularist, makes him also a universalist in the scriptural sense of the word. In other words the sovereignty of God lays the sole foundation, for a living assurance of the salvation of the world. It is but a spurious universalism which the so-called universalistic systems offer: But what assurance can a universal opportunity, or a universal chance, of salvation if we dare use such words give you that all, that many, that any indeed, will be saved? This universal opportunity, chance, of salvation has, after two thousand years, been taken advantage of only by a pitiable minority of those to whom it has been supposed to be given. What reason is there to believe that, though the world should continue in existence for ten billions of billions of years, any greater approximation to a completely saved world will be reached than meets our eyes today, when Christianity, even in its nominal form, has conquered to itself, I do not say merely a moiety of the human race, but I say merely a moiety of those to whom it has been preached? Calvinism thus is the guardian not only of the particularism which assures me that God the Lord is the Saviour of my soul, but equally of the universalism by which I am assured that he is also the true and actual Saviour of the world. On no other ground can any assurance be had either of the one or of the other. But on this ground we can be assured with an assurance which is without flaw, that not only shall there be saved the individual whom God visits with his saving grace, but also the world which he enters with his saving purpose, in all the length and breadth of it. The redemption of Christ, if it is to be worthily viewed, must be looked at not merely individualistically, but also in its social, or better in its cosmical relations. Men are not discrete particles standing off from one another as mutually isolated units. They are members of an organism, the human race; and this race itself is an element in a greater organism which is significantly termed a universe. Of course the plan of salvation as it lies in the divine mind cannot be supposed to be concerned, therefore, alone with individuals as such: We have only partially understood the redemption in Christ, therefore, when we have thought of it only in its modes of operation and effects on the individual. We must ask also how and what it works in the organism of the human race, and what its effects are in the greater organism of the universe. Jesus Christ came to save men, but he did not come to save men each as a whole in himself out of relation to all other men. In saving men, he came to save mankind; and therefore the Scriptures are insistent that he came to save the world, and ascribe to him accordingly the great title of the Saviour of the world. They go indeed further than this: It was because God loved the world, that he sent his only-begotten Son; it was for the sins of the world that Jesus Christ made propitiation; it was the world which he came to save; it is nothing less than the world that shall be saved by him. No doubt the whole salvation of the individual sinner enters into the full enjoyment of this accomplished salvation only by stages and in the course of time.

Chapter 3 : The Plan of Salvation by B.B. Warfield

*The Plan of Salvation [B. B. Warfield] on calendrierdelascience.com *FREE* shipping on qualifying offers. Does man save himself or does God alone save him, or is it somewhere in-between? The Subject to which our attention is to be directed in this series of lectures is ordinarily spoken of as The Plan of Salvation.*

Introduction In his The Plan of Salvation Warfield examines the various views offered within Christendom concerning the order and outworking of the decrees of God concerning human salvation. That God acts in salvation according to a plan is a given in theism, for purpose is essential to personhood. In the Deist conception salvation is not by chance, but neither is it by the immediate workings of a personal Deity. But if we grant the theistic conception of God "that he is a personal being who maintains immediate control over his creation" then we are forced to acknowledge that he acts according to plan in human salvation. The question here has to do with the nature of this plan. Here there are widely differing opinions within professing Christendom. Supernaturalism Fundamentally, there are two doctrines of salvation: Self-salvation is the universal teaching of heathenism, it was the explicit teaching of Pelagius, and it is the teaching of liberal Protestantism also. Still, that salvation is from God has been the professed belief of Christianity. Salvation, by definition, for Christians, is a work of God. He has within him all the necessary powers. At every moment, every man is fully able to cease from all sinning and to continue on in perfection. Additionally, God has given the law and the gospel to illumination and persuasion. Not some, but all the power exerted in saving the human soul is from God. But this triumph was only formal, for while the church officially acknowledged both the necessity and the preveniency of grace, it refused to acknowledge, and in fact denied, the efficacy of grace. Thus, the downward pull of synergism prevailed, and, despite its official condemnation by the church, semi-pelagianism dominated the church of the middle ages. Click here to listen to the audio of this summary. Pelagianism In Luther and in Calvin Augustinianism found new champions. To Luther, Pelagianism was the heresy of heresies, equal to unbelief itself. In time, even Reformed churches began to draw back, and rationalistic notions of freedom of the will and human independence began to gain precedence. God saves, but he does so merely by keeping the way of salvation open for those who exercise their free will aright. He further wonders whether a gospel that is contingent on the human will can be good news to anyone, for the will is precisely the problem "it is diseased and hostile against God. Indeed, it is dead. Warfield cites Spurgeon approvingly: Sign In Buy the books.

Chapter 4 : Reflections: B. B. Warfield "The Plan of Salvation." | books worth keeping

The Plan of Salvation is a series of five lectures originally delivered by B.B. Warfield. The topics include: Differing Conceptions, Autosoterism, Sacredotalism, Universalism, and Calvinism. If we believe in a God, we believe in the control by this God over the world he has created.

Bible[edit] During his tenure, his primary thrust and that of the seminary was an authoritative view of the Bible. This view was held in contrast to the emotionalism of the revival movements, the rationalism of higher criticism , and the heterodox teachings of various New religious movements that were emerging. The seminary held fast to the Reformed confessional tradition " that is, it faithfully followed the Westminster Confession of Faith. Warfield believed that modernist theology was problematic, since it relied upon the thoughts of the Biblical interpreter rather than upon the divine author of Scripture. The growing influence of modernist theology denied that the Bible was inspired, and alternative theories of the origin of the Christian faith were being explored. After comparing grammatical and linguistic styles found within the Bible itself, modernist scholars suggested that because the human authors had clearly contributed to the writing of the biblical text, the Bible was written by people alone, not God. This approach is essential to understanding the view of inspiration held by many Reformed and Evangelical Christians today. Studies in religious experience[edit] Warfield was a conservative critic of much religious revivalism that was popular in America at the time. He believed that the teachings and experience of this movement were too subjective and therefore too shallow for deep Christian faith. His book Counterfeit Miracles advocated cessationism over and against miracles after the time of the Apostles. Such attacks did not go unnoticed, and even today Warfield is criticized by proponents of revivalism in the Pentecostal and Charismatic movements. His book Perfectionism is a detailed critique of what he saw as false theories of sanctification. It includes an analysis of the Higher Life movement and the Keswick movement , as well as a rebuttal of earlier schools of thought, such as that of Asa Mahan and Oberlin College , and in particular the theology of Charles Grandison Finney. It is sometimes forgotten that, in his battles against modernism on the one hand, and against revivalism on the other, he was simply expressing the Reformed faith when applied to certain situations. New revelations, whether from the minds of celebrated scholars or popular revivalists, were therefore inconsistent with these confessional statements and therefore inconsistent with Scripture. Throughout his ministry, Warfield contended that modern world events and thinking could never render such confessions obsolete. Such an attitude still prevails today in many Reformed churches and Christians who embrace Calvinism. Calvinism is just religion in its purity. We have only, therefore, to conceive of religion in its purity, and that is Calvinism. Selected Shorter Writings, I, p. Livingstone and Mark A. Zaspel writes "That Warfield actually committed himself to a doctrine of evolution seems impossible to affirm simply because although there are some indications that he entertained the idea, he never admits to accepting it. Warfield writes, "Thus the doctrine of evolution once heartily adopted by him Darwin gradually undermined his faith, until he cast off the whole Christianity as an unproven delusion. But all that has come into being since- except the souls of men alone - has arisen as a modification of this original world-stuff by means of the interaction of its intrinsic forces. Not these forces apart from God, of course And this, we say, is a very pure evolutionary scheme. It was already familiar to Greek philosophy. More particularly Aristotle raised it to the rank of the leading principle of his entire system by significant distinction between potentia and actus This idea of development aroused no objection whatsoever in Christian theology and philosophy. On the contrary, it received extension and enrichment by being linked with the principle of theism. Warfield [10] [11] Church politics[edit] Unlike his contemporaries at Princeton, and perhaps due to his invalid wife, Warfield never cared much for churchmanship. Influence and legacy[edit] Along with Abraham Kuyper and Herman Bavinck , Warfield is acknowledged as one of the major influences on the thought of Cornelius Van Til. However, that influence was limited to certain areas. In apologetics , Warfield was a thoroughgoing evidentialist and the most prominent exponent of the Old Princeton school, whereas van Til, who was the most prominent figure in the Dutch wing of presuppositionalist apologetics, absolutely rejected the central tenets of Old Princeton evidentialism and protested violently against the evidentialism of

his contemporary J.

Chapter 5 : Books At a Glance : THE PLAN OF SALVATION, by B.B. Warfield - Books At a Glance

Warfield 10 / The Plan of Salvation by B.B. neither is it given. but in the exultant positive form that ability is fully competent to all obligation. the notion that salvation can be secured by man's own power and wisdom.

In particular, he discusses speaking in tongues, prophecy, and healing, and outlines the relationship between the function and purpose of prayer in relation to the other gifts of the Spirit. Faith and Life Publisher: Longmans, Green, and Co. Warfield continued this tradition during his tenure as professor. Faith and Life includes forty-one addresses and sermons from those classes in accessible and easy-to-understand language. The Canon of the New Testament: How and When Formed Author: But where did these books come from? And why does the church elevate the Bible above other books and above other forms of divine revelation? In The Canon of the New Testament: How and When Formed, B. Warfield outlines the long and winding process which produced the New Testament canon, including the paradoxical relationship between divine inspiration and human authorship, as well as the process by which the church recognized some books as authoritative and others not. Most importantly, Warfield explains why the New Testament contains the most theologically and historically reliable source of divine revelation. The Lord of Glory: He also attends to the ways in which Jesus refers to himself, the names others used to address him, and what the disciples thought of him. Part exposition, part argument, The Lord of Glory shows that the New Testament presents a unified consensus about the divinity and Lordship of Christ. The Plan of Salvation Publisher: Presbyterian Board of Publications Publication Date: The Plan of Salvation is comprised of five lectures delivered at Princeton Theological Seminary in June, on the various conceptions of the doctrine of salvation. These lectures summarize the divergent views about salvation held by various groups of Christians throughout history. Although Warfield does not endorse all of them, he masterfully explains the significant components of each and how each doctrine of salvation relates to the other central doctrines of Christianity. The Power of God unto Salvation Author: Presbyterian Board of Publication Publication Date: The Right of Systematic Theology Author:

Chapter 6 : The Plan of Salvation - Logos Bible Software

B.B. Warfield () was the renowned Reformed theologian of Princeton Seminary whose efforts in the exposition and defense of the church's historic faith were unparalleled. In this work - perhaps a bit lesser known - Warfield examines God's plan of salvation as historically understood by the various branches of professing Christendom.

The Subject to which our attention is to be directed in this series of lectures is ordinarily spoken of as "The Plan of Salvation. This may be most conveniently done by observing, in the first instance at least, only the great points of difference which separate them. I shall enumerate them in the order of significance, proceeding from the most profound and far-reaching differences which divide Christians to those of less radical effect. Kruger wrote the following of this little book Throughout the history of the church, there are have been many different perspectives on how a person is saved. So, what is the best way to help Christians understand these various approaches? And what is the most effective way to make the case for Calvinism? There are many answers to these questions, but there is one resource that I have found tremendously helpful. And it is a resource that is often overlooked and forgotten. And that resource is the five lectures delivered by B. Warfield in at Princeton Theological Seminary. These lectures are not found in the standard 10 volume collected works of Warfield"and for that reason are often missed. Instead they are found in a little book entitled The Plan of Salvation. Thus, the reader is able to see how theologians have arrived at a belief in Calvinism in a gradual, step by step fashion. Thus, it is an incredibly useful tool for convincing people of the Reformed approach Here is the outline of his decision tree: Is God personally involved in our lives Theism or does he stand back from the universe and allow it to take its course Deism? Given the reality of Theism, the next question is whether man saves himself and works his way to God Naturalism or whether God intervenes and saves man Supernaturalism. Given the reality of Supernaturalism, the next question is the specific manner in which God saves. Does God use sacraments as an intermediary or he does God operate directly on the human soul by grace? Does he apply this saving power on every person, whether they or saved or not Universalism , or does he apply it to particular individuals who are actually saved Particularism?

Chapter 7 : The Plan of Salvation

*Rev. Dr. Lane Tipton walks us through the soteriological taxonomy offered by B.B. Warfield in his book *The Plan of Salvation*. In the book, Warfield asks a series of questions designed to distinguish biblically-consistent Christianity from other accounts of salvation.*

For works about Warfield, see the Bibliography page. Edited by Samuel G. Presbyterian and Reformed, Oxford University Press, Edited by Mark A. Noll and David N. Longmans, Green, and Co. The Westminster Press, The Inspiration and Authority of the Bible. The Theological Educator, edited by W. Hodder and Stoughton, Reprint, Kessinger Publishing, The Lord of Glory: American Tract Society, Oxford University Press, " The Plan of Salvation. Presbyterian Board of Publications, Predestination in the Reformed Confessions. Logos] The Printing of the Westminster Confession. Presbyterian Board of Publication, Sermons Preached in the Chapel of Princeton Seminary. Edited by John E. Syllabus on the Special Introduction to the Catholic Epistles. Two Studies in the History of Doctrine: Detroit Free Press, Our Hope Publications, How and When Formed. The American Sunday School Union, A Testimony to the Truth, edited by R. The Bible Institute of Los Angeles, The Proposed Union with the Cumberland Presbyterians. Its Principles, by Abraham Kuyper, translated by J. Hendrik de Vries, xi"xix. The Christian Literature Company, A Commemoration of Years of Princeton Seminary, 35" Presbyterian Committee of Publication, Reprint, Solid Ground Christian Books, Warfield, edited by Robert Howie, 27" David Bryce and Son, Warfield, edited by Robert Howie, 64" Jean-Luc Rolland October 23, at 3: Do you know other editions of this book? All of the ten volumes of his works, published by Oxford, are collections of his articles. He only wrote a few books during his life. The Oxford edition of his writings on the inspiration and authority of Scripture is not identical with the volume published by Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co. Reply Daniel March 7, at 2: Warfield Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, , vol. David January 30, at 3: Thanks Reply Dave March 12, at 8:

Chapter 8 : Plan of Salvation

The Plan of Salvation is a series of five lectures that B. B. Warfield gave in It is a penetrating analysis of God's plan of salvation from sin. In the lectures Warfield first lays out the differing plans and then he carefully examines each one. The plans are divided into two major categories: Naturalistic and Supernatural.

This is a great conception, the Deist conception of law. It delivers us from chance. But it does so, only to cast us into the cogged teeth of a machine. It is, therefore, not the greatest conception. The greatest conception is the conception of Theism, which delivers us even from law, and places us in the immediate hands of a person. It is a great thing to be delivered from the inordinate realm of aimless chance. The goddess Tyche, Fortuna, was one of the most terrible divinities of the old world, quite as terrible as and scarcely distinguishable from Fate. It is a great thing to be under the control of intelligent purpose. But it makes every difference whether the purpose is executed by mere law, acting automatically, or by the ever-present personal control of the person himself. There is nothing more ordinate than the control of a person, all of whose actions are governed by intelligent purpose, directed to an end. If we believe in a personal God, then, and much more if, being Theists, we believe in the immediate control by this personal God of the world he has made, we must believe in a plan underlying all that God does, and therefore also in a plan of salvation. The only question that can arise concerns not the reality but the nature of this plan. As to its nature, however, it must be admitted that a great many differing opinions have been held. Indeed pretty nearly every possible opinion has been announced at one time or another, in one quarter or another. Even if we leave all extra-Christian opinions to one side, we need scarcely modify this statement. Lines of division have been drawn through the Church; parties have been set over against parties, and different types of belief have been developed which amount to nothing less than different systems of religion, which are at one in little more than the mere common name of Christian, claimed by them all. It is my purpose in this lecture to bring before us in a rapid survey such of these varying views as have been held by large parties in the Church, that some conception may be formed of their range and relations. This may be most conveniently done by observing, in the first instance at least, only the great points of difference which separate them. I shall enumerate them in the order of significance, proceeding from the most profound and far-reaching differences which divide Christians to those of less radical effect. The deepest cleft which separates men calling themselves Christians in their conceptions of the plan of salvation, is that which divides what we may call the Naturalistic and the Supernaturalistic views. The line of division here is whether, in the matter of the salvation of man, God has planned simply to leave men, with more or less completeness, to save themselves, or whether he has planned himself to intervene to save them. The issue between the naturalist and the supernaturalist is thus the eminently simple but quite absolute one: Does man save himself or does God save Him? The consistently naturalistic scheme is known in the history of doctrine as Pelagianism. Pelagianism in its purity, affirms that all the power exerted in saving man is native to man himself. But Pelagianism is not merely a matter of history, nor does it always exist in its purity. As the poor in earthly goods are always with us, so the poor in spiritual things are also always with us. It may indeed be thought that there never was a period in the history of the Church in which naturalistic conceptions of the process of salvation were more wide-spread or more radical than at present. A Pelagianism which out-pelagianizes Pelagus himself in the completeness of its naturalism is in fact at the moment intensely fashionable among the self-constituted leaders of Christian thought. And everywhere, in all communions alike, conceptions are current which assign to man, in the use of his native powers at least the decisive activity in the saving of the soul, that is to say, which suppose that God has planned that those shall be saved, who, at the decisive point, in one way or another save themselves. These so-called intermediate views are obviously, in principle, naturalistic views, since whatever part they permit God to play in the circumstantial of salvation when they come to the crucial point of salvation itself they cast man back upon his native powers. In so doing they separate themselves definitely from the supernaturalistic view of the plan of salvation and, with it, from the united testimony of the entire organized Church. For, however much naturalistic views have seeped into the membership of the churches, the entire organized Church-Orthodox Greek, Roman Catholic

Latin, and Protestant in all its great historical forms, Lutheran and Reformed, Calvinistic and Arminian-bears its consentient, firm and emphatic testimony to the supernaturalistic conception of salvation. We shall have to journey to the periphery of Christendom, to such sects of doubtful standing in the Christian body as, say, the Unitarians, to find an organized body of Christians with aught but a supernaturalistic confession. This confession, in direct opposition to naturalism, declares with emphasis that it is God the Lord and not man himself who saves the soul; and, that no mistake may be made, it does not shrink from the complete assertion and affirms, with full understanding of the issue, precisely that all power exerted in saving the soul is from God. Here, then, is the knife-edge which separates the two parties. The supernaturalist is not content to say that some of the power which is exerted in saving the soul; that most of the power that is exerted in saving the soul, is from God. He asserts that all the power that is exerted in saving the soul is from God, that whatever part man plays in the saving process is subsidiary, is itself the effect of the divine operation and that it is God and God alone who saves the soul. And the supernaturalist in this sense is the entire organized Church in the whole stretch of its official testimony. There exist, no doubt, differences among the Supernaturalists, and differences which are not small or unimportant. The most deeply cutting of these separates the Sacerdotalists and the Evangelicals. Both sacerdotalists and evangelicals are supernaturalists. That is to say, they agree that all the power exerted in saving the soul is from God. They differ in their conception of the manner in which the power of God, by which salvation is wrought, is brought to bear on the soul. The exact point of difference between them turns on the question whether God, by whose power alone salvation is wrought, saves men by dealing himself immediately with them as individuals, or only by establishing supernatural endowed instrumentalities in the world by means of which men may be saved. The issue concerns the immediacy of the saving operations of God: Does God save men by immediate operations of his grace upon their souls, or does he act upon them only through the medium of instrumentalities established for that purpose? The typical form of sacerdotalism is supplied by the teaching of the Church of Rome. In that teaching the church is held to be the institution of salvation, through which alone is salvation conveyed to men. Outside the church and its ordinances salvation is not supposed to be found; grace is communicated by and through the ministrations of the church, otherwise not. The two maxims are therefore in force: Where the church is, there is the Spirit; outside the church there is no salvation. The sacerdotal principle is present, however, wherever instrumentalities through which saving grace is brought to the soul are made indispensable to salvation; and it is dominant wherever this indispensability is made absolute. Thus what are called the Means of Grace are given the "necessity of means", and are made in the strict sense not merely the sine quibus non but the actual quibus of salvation. Over against this whole view evangelicalism, seeking to conserve what it conceives to be only consistent supernaturalism, sweeps away every intermediary between the soul and its God, and leaves the soul dependent for its salvation on God alone, operating upon it by his immediate grace. It is directly upon God and not the means of grace that the evangelical feels dependent for salvation; it is directly to God rather than to the means of grace that he looks for grace; and he proclaims the Holy Spirit therefore not only able to act but actually operative where and when and how he will. The Church and its ordinances he conceives rather as, instruments which the Spirit uses than as agents which employ the Holy Spirit in working salvation. In direct opposition to the maxims of consistent sacerdotalism, he takes therefore as his mottoes: Where the Spirit is, there is the church; outside the body of the saints there is no salvation. In thus describing evangelicalism, it will not escape notice that we are also describing Protestantism. In point of fact the whole body of Confessional Protestantism is evangelical in its view of the plan of salvation, inclusive alike of its Lutheran and Reformed, of its Calvinistic and Arminian branches. Protestantism and evangelicalism are accordingly conterminous, if not exactly synonymous designation. As all organized Christianity is clear and emphatic in its confession of a pure supernaturalism, so all organized Protestantism is equally clear and emphatic in its confession of evangelicalism. Evangelicalism thus comes before us as the distinctively Protestant conception of the plan of salvation, and perhaps it is not strange that, in its immediate contradiction of sacerdotalism, the more deeply lying contradiction to naturalism which it equally and indeed primarily embodies is sometimes almost lost sight of. Evangelicalism does not cease to be fundamentally antinaturalistic, however, in becoming antisacerdotal: That only is true evangelicalism therefore, in which

sounds clearly the double confession that all the power exerted in saving the soul is from God, and that God in his saving operations acts directly upon the soul. Even so, however, there remain differences, many and deep-reaching, which divide Evangelicals among themselves. All evangelicals are agreed that all the power exerted in salvation is from God, and that God works directly upon the soul in his saving operations. But upon the exact methods employed by God in bringing many sons into glory they differ much from one another. Some evangelicals have attained their evangelical position by a process of modification, in the way of correction, applied to a fundamental sacerdotalism, from which they have thus won their way out. Naturally elements of this underlying sacerdotalism have remained imbedded in their construction, and color their whole mode of conceiving evangelicalism. There are other evangelicals whose conceptions are similarly colored by an underlying naturalism, out of which they have formed their better confession by a like process of modification and correction. The former of these parties is represented by the evangelical Lutherans, who, accordingly delight to speak of themselves as adherents of a "conservative Reformation"; that is to say, as having formed their evangelicalism on the basis of the sacerdotalism of the Church of Rome, out of which they have, painfully perhaps, though not always perfectly, made their way. The other party is represented by the evangelical Arminians, whose evangelicalism is a correction in the interest of evangelical feeling of the underlying semi-pelagianism of the Dutch Remonstrants. Over against all such forms there are still other evangelicals whose evangelicalism is more the pure expression of the fundamental evangelical principle, uncolored by intruding elements from without. Amid this variety of types it is not easy to fix upon a principle of classification which will enable us to discriminate between the chief forms which evangelicalism takes by a clear line of demarcation. Such a principle, however, seems to be provided by the opposition between what we may call the Universalistic and the Particularistic conceptions of the plan of salvation. All evangelicals agree that all the power exerted in saving the soul is from God, and that this saving power is exerted immediately upon the soul. But they differ as to whether God exerts this saving power equally, or at least indiscriminately, upon all men, be they actually saved or not, or rather only upon particular men, namely upon those who are actually saved. The point of division here is whether God is conceived to have planned actually himself to save men by his almighty and certainly efficacious grace, or only so to pour out his grace upon men as to enable them to be saved, without actually securing, however, in any particular cases that they shall be saved. The specific contention of those whom I have spoken of as universalistic is that, while all the power exerted in saving the soul is from God, and this power is exerted immediately from God upon the soul, yet all that God does, looking to the salvation of men, he does for and to all men alike, without discrimination. On the face of it this looks as if it must result in a doctrine of universal salvation. If it is God the Lord who saves the soul, and not man himself; and if God the Lord saves the soul by working directly upon it in his saving grace; and then if God the Lord so works in his saving grace upon all souls alike; it would surely seem inevitably to follow that therefore all are saved. Accordingly, there have sometimes appeared earnest evangelicals who have vigorously contended precisely on these grounds that all men are saved: From this consistent universalism, however, the great mass of evangelical universalists have always drawn back, compelled by the clearness and emphasis of the Scriptural declaration that, in point of fact, all men are not saved. They have found themselves therefore face to face with a great problem; and various efforts have been made by them to construe the activities of God looking to salvation as all universalistic and the issue as nevertheless particularistic; while yet the fundamental evangelical principle is preserved that it is the grace of God alone which saves the soul. These efforts have given us especially the two great schemes of evangelical Lutheranism and evangelical Arminianism, the characteristic contention of both of which is that all salvation is in the hands of God alone, and all that God does, looking to salvation, is directed indiscriminately to all men, and yet not all but some men only are saved. Over against this inconsistent universalism, other evangelicals contend that the particularism which attaches to the issue of the saving process, must, just because it is God and God alone who saves, belong also to the process itself. In the interests of their common evangelicalism in the interests also of the underlying supernaturalism common to all Christians, neither of which comes to its rights otherwise nay, in the interests of religion itself - they plead that God deals throughout the whole process of salvation not with men in the mass but with individual men one by one, up on each of whom he lays hold with

his grace, and each o whom he by his grace brings to salvation. As it is he who saves men, and as he saves them by immediate operations on their hearts, and as his saving grace is his almighty power effecting salvation, men owe in each and every case their actual salvation, and not merely their general opportunity to be saved, to him. And therefore, to him and to him alone belongs in each instance all the glory, which none can share with him. Thus, they contend, in order that the right evangelical ascription, Soli Deo Gloria, may be true and suffer no diminution in meaning or in force, it is necessary to understand that it is of God that each one who is saved has everything that enters into salvation and, most of all, the very fact that it is he who enters into salvation. The precise issue which divides the universalists and the particularists is, accordingly, just whether the saving grace of God, in which alone is salvation, actually saves. Does its presence mean salvation, or may it be present, and yet Even the Particularists, however, have their differences. The latter view is, of course, an attempt to mediate between the particularistic and the universalistic conceptions, preserving particularism in the processes as well as in the issue of salvation sufficiently to hang salvation upon the grace of God alone and to give to him all the glory of the actual salvation; while yet yielding to universalism so much of the process of salvation as its adherents think can be made at all consistent with this fundamental particularism. The special one of the saving operations which is yielded by them to universalism is the redemption of the sinner by Christ. This is supposed to have in the plan of God, not indeed an absolute, but a hypothetical reference to all men. All men are redeemed by Christ-that is, if they believe in him. Their believing in him is, however, dependent on the working of faith in their hearts by God, the Holy Spirit, in his saving operations designed to give effect to the redemption of Christ.

Chapter 9 : B. B. Warfield - Wikipedia

The Plan of Salvation Does man save himself or does God alone save him, or is it somewhere in-between? The Subject to which our attention is to be directed in this series of lectures is ordinarily spoken of as "The Plan of Salvation."