

A [Commentary] on R.C. Sproul's "Double" Predestination Teaching

"A horrible decree" "Most ruthless statement. . . ." "A terrible theological theory. . . ." "An illegitimate inference of logic. . ." These and other similar epithets have been used frequently to articulate displeasure and revulsion at the Reformed doctrine of double predestination. Particularly abhorrent to many is the notion that God would predestinate (in any sense) the doom of the reprobate. **[Many self-identifying Calvinists do not admit "double predestination" even enters into their beliefs. Here though, Sproul does identify the "Reform doctrine of double predestination," claiming it is wrongly libeled.]**

The "Double" of Predestination

The goal of this essay is not to provide a comprehensive analysis, exposition, or defense of the doctrine of election or predestination. Rather, the essay is limited to a concern for the "double" aspect of predestination with particular reference to the question of the relationship of God's sovereignty to reprobation or preterition. **[Google definition of "preterition:" (in Calvinist theology) omission from God's elect; nonelection to salvation. Where is/are the Scripture(s) that affirm nonelection?]**

The use of the qualifying term "double" has been somewhat confusing in discussions concerning predestination. The term apparently means one thing within the circle of Reformed theology and quite another outside that circle and at a popular level of theological discourse. The term "double" has been set in contrast with a notion of "single" predestination. It has also been used as a synonym for a symmetrical view of predestination which sees election and reprobation being worked out in a parallel mode of divine operation. Both usages involve a serious distortion of the Reformed view of double predestination. **[The need is not to determine if refutations of double predestination fail to concur with the Reform view but rather what view(s) of election concur with Scripture.]**

Viewing double predestination as a distinction from single predestination may be seen in the work of Emil Brunner. Brunner argues that it is impossible to deduce the doctrine of double predestination from the Bible. **[This writer agrees with the straight forward assertion that the doctrine is not demonstrated by Scripture —whether it is the caricature Sproul denies or the Reform version he affirms. Brunner does not identify the term as Reform in origin and Sproul does not clarify here. This writer does not qualify Brunner's arguments except to agree with him that all predestination is to heaven. Clearly, there are those who exist in eternity separate from their Maker but no Scripture indicates this eternal damnation for particular souls was divine intention for that soul.]**

(He, Brunner says):

The Bible does not contain the doctrine of double predestination, although in a few isolated passages it seems to come close to it. The Bible teaches that all salvation is based on the eternal Election of God in Jesus Christ, and that this eternal Election springs wholly and entirely from God's sovereign freedom. But wherever this happens, there is no mention of a decree of rejection. The Bible teaches that alongside of the elect there are those who are not elect, who are "reprobate," and indeed that the former are the minority and the latter the majority; but in these passages the point at issue is not eternal election but "separation" or "selection" in judgment. Thus the Bible teaches that there will be a double outcome of world history, salvation and ruin, Heaven and hell. But while salvation is explicitly taught as derived from the eternal election, the further conclusion is not drawn that destruction is also based upon a

corresponding decree of doom.¹ **[Notice this signifies *result* or *effect* of one's response to the gospel, not its *cause*.]**

Here Brunner argues passionately, though not coherently, for "single" predestination. There is a decree of election, but not of reprobation. Predestination has only one side — election. In this context, double predestination is "avoided" (or evaded) by the dialectical method. The dialectical method which sidesteps logical consistency **[against what Sproul claims is Reform logical consistency]** has had a pervasive influence on contemporary discussions of double predestination. A growing antipathy to logic in theology is manifesting itself widely. **[Somewhere in cyberspace there must be a posted work that lists the evidences in Scripture of God's utter disregard for man's insistence on philosophic logic.]** Even G. C. Berkouwer seems allergic to the notion that logic should play a role in developing our understanding of election. **[But according to <http://www.biblicaltraining.org/library/dialectical-theology>, "Dialectical Theology sought its method and principles in the theology of the Reformation, and especially in John Calvin... The influence of Dialectical Theology has been extensive, especially in the Reformed Churches..." Sproul does not seem to recognize that dialectic method permits rather than avoids embrace of double predestination, Reform or otherwise.]**

It is one thing to construct a theology of election (or any other kind of theology) purely on the basis of rational speculation. It is quite another to utilize logic in seeking a coherent understanding of biblical revelation. Brunner seems to abhor both. **[Sproul successfully argues against Brunner's failure to apply philosophic coherence principles more than he does Scripture's teaching of one way election to heaven.]**

Let us examine the "logic" of Brunner's position. He maintains that (1) there is a divine decree of election that is eternal; (2) that divine decree is particular in scope ("There are those who are not elect"); (3) yet there is no decree of reprobation. Consider the implications. If God has predestined some but not all to election, does it not follow by what Luther called a "resistless logic" that some are not predestined to election? **[With Luther, this "logic" is common to this day. Fellow Calvinist Charles Ryrie writes, "Obviously the very idea of election has to include the idea of the greater number out of which they (the redeemed) were chosen, and those who were not chosen were certainly passed by" (*Basic Theology*, p. 361). But because of the noted abhorrence to actually claim God plays favorites —it is not uncommon for Calvinists/Monergists to be conflicted in their handling of the topic. Ryrie, in essence, revokes his statement from the prior page. He asserts that double predestination is in error, p. 362.]** If, as Brunner maintains, *all* salvation is based upon the eternal election of God and not all men are elect from eternity, does that not mean that from eternity there are non-elect who most certainly will not be saved? Has not God chosen from eternity not to elect some people? If so, then we have an eternal choice of non-election which we call reprobation. The inference is clear and necessary, yet some shrink from drawing it. **[Thank God, many shrink from it. My interest is pointing out that while Sproul, et al, reject characterizing double predestination as "a terrible theological theory..." here he affirms the fact of that double predestination —"...we have an eternal choice of non-election..."]**

I once heard the case for "single" predestination articulated by a prominent Lutheran theologian in the above manner. He admitted to me that the conclusion of reprobation was logically inescapable, but he refused to draw the inference, holding steadfastly to "single" predestination. Such a notion of predestination is manifest nonsense. **[If I assessed a position as "...manifest nonsense" it would be deemed unscholarly, emotional. Further "...logically inescapable..." is not a biblical argument, but rather, it is evidence of seminarian strategy that has philosophy placed above Scripture.]**

Theoretically there are four possible kinds of consistent single predestination. (1) Universal predestination to election (which Brunner does not hold); (2) universal predestination to reprobation (which nobody holds); (3) particular predestination to election with the option of salvation by self-initiative to those not elect (a qualified Arminianism) which Brunner emphatically rejects; and (4) particular predestination to reprobation with the option of salvation by self-initiative to those not reprobate (which nobody holds). The only other kind of single predestination is the dialectical kind, which is absurd. **[Acts 13:48, Rom 8:29-30, Eph 1:3-12, Thess 2:13-14, 2 Tim 1:9 describe predestination that is positive election to salvation —not the Reform description.]** (I once witnessed a closed discussion of theology between H. M. Kuitert of the Netherlands and Cornelius Van Til of Westminster Seminary. Kuitert went into a lengthy discourse on theology, utilizing the method of the dialectic as he went. When he was finished, Dr. Van Til calmly replied: "Now tell me your theology *without the dialectic*, so I can understand it!" Kuitert was unable to do so. With Brunner's view of predestination the only way to avoid "double" predestination is with the use of "double-talk." **[Theological philosophy is often counterproductive to affirming biblical truth and refuting error.]**

Thus, "single" predestination can be consistently maintained only within the framework of universalism or some sort of qualified Arminianism. If particular election is to be maintained and if the notion that all salvation is ultimately based upon that particular election is to be maintained, then we must speak of double predestination. **[The sentence, "Thus "single"... is in error. This author believes in "single" predestination, i.e., that nothing frustrates Christ building His church; yet I recognize all are not of His body; Hence, universalism cannot be applied to my belief. My belief is not "qualified Arminianism." Further, Sproul introduces "particular" election in this paragraph. "P" has slowly replaced the "U" of TULIP since "unconditional election" has fallen into appropriate disrepute.]**

The much greater issue of "double" predestination is the issue over the relationship between election and reprobation with respect to the nature of the decrees and the nature of the divine outworking of the decrees. If "double" predestination means a symmetrical view of predestination, then we must reject the notion. But such a view of "double" predestination would be a caricature and a serious distortion of the Reformed doctrine of predestination. **[Lexical study of biblical terms relating to "decree" produces results that do not support Calvinist lapsarian suppositions. I remind the reader that single, not double predestination is claimed biblical —with no need to defend caricatures (distortions) of Reform double predestination. And who teaches "symmetry" is necessary to apply any of the above listed Scriptures to salvation doctrine? No one. Symmetry is a smokescreen that only confuses.]**

The Double-Predestination Distortion

The distortion of double predestination looks like this: There is a symmetry that exists between election and reprobation. God WORKS in the same way and same manner with respect to the elect and to the reprobate. That is to say, from all eternity God decreed some to election and by divine initiative works faith in their hearts and brings them actively to salvation. **[Where is the citation of teachers/works that describe this 'symmetrical' single predestination? Of the fifty books I have on this topic, none of them claim 'symmetry' is necessary to teach election to heaven.]** By the same token, from all eternity God decrees some to sin and damnation (*destinare ad peccatum*) and actively intervenes to work sin in their lives, bringing them to damnation by divine initiative. **[Who accuses God of being the cause of my sin or yours?]** In the case of the elect, *regeneration* is the monergistic work of God. **[See additional article on refuting Monergism.]** In the case of the reprobate, sin and *degeneration* are the monergistic

work of God. Stated another way, we can establish a parallelism of foreordination and predestination by means of a *positive* symmetry. We can call this a *positive-positive* view of predestination. This is, God *positively* and *actively* intervenes in the lives of the elect to bring them to salvation. In the same way God *positively* and *actively* intervenes in the life of the reprobate to bring him to sin. **[Actually, a much simpler explanation is offered by Calvinism of why God intentionally damns souls: "These are all damned to begin with; God simply chooses to leave them in their state." Of course, men are conceived in iniquity! But to argue that any of God's plan, i.e., His having "made a way", could prevent even one soul from attaining to that end ignores the goodness of God (Rom 2:4).]**

This distortion of positive-positive predestination clearly makes God the author of sin who punishes a person for doing what God monergistically and irresistibly coerces man to do. Such a view is indeed a monstrous assault on the integrity of God. This is not the Reformed view of predestination, but a gross and inexcusable caricature of the doctrine. Such a view may be identified with what is often loosely described as hyper-Calvinism and involves a radical form of supralapsarianism. Such a view of predestination has been virtually universally and monolithically rejected by Reformed thinkers. **[I write this on 17 July 2014. Does Dr. Sproul know his words are no longer accurate? Just take a survey of Calvinists and press the issue. They will tell you they believe it is ordained that God intentionally damn those who are simply *not electable*. Failing to agree with this position means one has actually left Calvinism but has not owned up to the fact. Yet, hard shell Calvinism is increasing in favor.]**

The Reformed View of Predestination

In sharp contrast to the caricature of double predestination seen in the positive-positive schema is the classic position of Reformed theology on predestination. In this view predestination is double in that it involves both election and reprobation but is not symmetrical with respect to the mode of divine activity. A strict parallelism of operation is denied. Rather we view predestination in terms of a positive-negative relationship. **[The importance is not symmetry. It is whether God pre-determines souls be damned.]**

In the Reformed view God from all eternity decrees some to election and positively intervenes in their lives to work regeneration and faith by a monergistic work of grace. To the non-elect God withholds this monergistic work of grace, passing them by and leaving them to themselves. **[By what distortion of the English language can this sentence mean any other than a willful act of God?]** He does not monergistically work sin or unbelief in their lives. Even in the case of the "hardening" of the sinners' already recalcitrant hearts, God does not, as Luther stated, "work evil in us (for hardening is working evil) by creating fresh evil in us."² **[Of course. But this does not address the question of whether God is an inclusionist or an exclusionist by how He offers and performs salvation.]** Luther continued:

When men hear us say that God works both good and evil in us, and that we are subject to God's working by mere passive necessity, they seem to imagine a man who is in himself good, and not evil, having an evil work wrought in him by God **[Where does Luther's assumption come from? Which advocates of single predestination (election to heaven only) claim man is good, then or now?]**; for they do not sufficiently bear in mind how incessantly active God is in all His creatures, allowing none of them to keep holiday. He who would understand these matters, however, should think thus: God works evil in us (that is, by means of us) not through God's own fault, but by reason of our own defect. We being evil by nature, and God being good, when He impels us to act by His own acting upon us according to the nature of His omnipotence, good though He is in Himself, He cannot but do evil by our evil instrumentality;

although, according to His wisdom, He makes good use of this evil for His own glory and for our salvation.² **[Stated earlier: Luther cannot speak for himself now. His work is better left alone.]**

Thus, the mode of operation in the lives of the elect is not parallel with that operation in the lives of the reprobate. God works regeneration monergistically but never sin. Sin falls within the category of providential concurrence. **["Providential concurrence" is a fascinating topic calling for elaboration.]**

Another significant difference between the activity of God with respect to the elect and the reprobate concerns God's justice. The decree and fulfillment of election provide mercy for the elect while the efficacy of reprobation provides justice for the reprobate. **[Mercy vs. judgment makes little sense. Grace compared to mercy does. To discuss justice entails also injustice; not comparing justice to mercy.]** God shows mercy sovereignly and unconditionally to some, and gives justice to those passed over in election. **[Does this mean the saved were not shown justice? Is it not just for God to make good on His offer of salvation?]** That is to say, God grants the mercy of election to some and justice to others. No one is the victim of injustice. To fail to receive mercy is not to be treated unjustly. God is under no obligation to grant mercy to all — in fact He is under no obligation to grant mercy to any. **[But we cannot say it follows He intends to be unmerciful simply because His sovereignty would allow Him to be so.]** He says, "I will have mercy upon whom I will have mercy" (Rom. 9). **[A classic misstep by non-dispensationalists is failure to provide the context of Rom 9:15. This chapter is not about individual salvation. It is about God declaring He has chosen Israel over the other nations; chapter 9 is specific to Israel's past.]** The divine prerogative to grant mercy voluntarily cannot be faulted. If God is required by some cosmic law apart from Himself to be merciful to all men, then we would have to conclude that justice demands mercy. If that is so, then mercy is no longer voluntary, but required. If mercy is required, it is no longer mercy, but justice. What God does not do is sin by visiting injustice upon the reprobate. Only by considering election and reprobation as being asymmetrical in terms of a positive-negative schema can God be exonerated from injustice. **[No. God is exonerated from injustice because He does not create a soul for the irreversible intention and purpose to damn them.]**

The Reformed Confessions

By a brief reconnaissance of Reformed confessions and by a brief roll-call of the theologians of the Reformed faith, we can readily see that double predestination has been consistently maintained along the lines of a positive-negative schema. **[This writer agrees double predestination is historically maintained by Reformed confession. But the implication flowing from this position that impugns the character of God —is not so readily admitted by Reform advocates.]**

The Reformed Confession: 1536

Our salvation is from God, but from ourselves there is nothing but sin and damnation. (Art. 9)

French Confession of Faith: 1559

We believe that from this corruption and general condemnation in which all men are plunged, God, according to his eternal and immutable counsel, calleth those whom he hath chosen by his goodness and mercy alone in our Lord Jesus Christ, without consideration of their works, to display in them the riches of his mercy; leaving the rest in this same corruption and condemnation to show in them his justice. (Art. XII)

The Belgic Confession of Faith: 1561

We believe that all the posterity of Adam, being thus fallen into perdition and ruin by the sin of our first parents, God then did manifest himself such as he is; that is to say, MERCIFUL AND JUST: MERCIFUL, since he delivers and preserves from this perdition all whom he, in his eternal and unchangeable council, of mere goodness hath elected in Christ Jesus our Lord, without respect to their works: JUST, in leaving others in the fall and perdition wherein they have involved themselves. (Art. XVI)

The Second Helvetic Confession: 1566

Finally, as often as God in Scripture is said or seems to do something evil, it is not thereby said that man does not do evil, but that God permits it and does not prevent it, according to his just judgment, who could prevent it if he wished, or because he turns man's evil into good. . . . St. Augustine writes in his *Enchiridion*: "What happens contrary to his will occurs, in a wonderful and ineffable way, not apart from his will. For it would not happen if he did not allow it. And yet he does not allow it unwillingly but willingly." (Art. VIII)

The Westminster Confession of Faith: 1643

As God hath appointed the elect unto glory, so hath He, by the eternal and most free purpose of His will, foreordained all the means thereunto. Wherefore, they who are elected . . . are effectually called unto faith in Christ by His Spirit working in due season, are justified, adopted, sanctified, and kept by His power. through faith, unto salvation. Neither are any other redeemed by Christ, effectually called, justified, adopted, sanctified, and saved, but the elect only.

The rest of mankind God was pleased, according to the unsearchable counsel of His own will, whereby He extendeth or withholdeth mercy, as He pleaseth, for the glory of His Sovereign power over His creatures, to pass by; and to ordain them to dishonour and wrath for their sin, to the praise of His glorious justice. (Chap. III — Art. VI and VII)

These examples selected from confessional formulas of the Reformation indicate the care with which the doctrine of double predestination has been treated. The asymmetrical expression of the "double" aspect has been clearly maintained. This is in keeping with the care exhibited consistently throughout the history of the Church. The same kind of careful delineation can be seen in Augustine, Aquinas, Luther, Calvin, Zanchius, Turretini, Edwards, Hodge, Warfield, Bavinck, Berkouwer, *et al.*

Foreordination to Reprobation

In spite of the distinction of positive-negative with respect to the mode of God's activity toward the elect and the reprobate, we are left with the thorny question of God predestinating the reprobate. If God in any sense predestines or foreordains reprobation, doesn't this make the rejection of Christ by the reprobate absolutely certain and inevitable? And if the reprobate's reprobation is certain in light of predestination, doesn't this make God responsible for the sin of the reprobate? **[The sentence begins with comment on standing (eternal disposition) but ends with condition (temporal fallen nature). Apples are not compared to apples.]** We must answer the first question in the affirmative, and the second in the negative. **[But this argument sidesteps the more important question of God's intentions.]**

If God foreordains anything, it is absolutely certain that what He foreordains will come to pass. The purpose of God can never be frustrated. Even God's foreknowledge or prescience makes future events certain with respect to time. That is to say, if God knows on Tuesday that I will drive to Pittsburgh on Friday, then there is no doubt that, come Friday, I will drive to Pittsburgh. Otherwise God's knowledge would have been in error. Yet, there is a significant difference between God's knowing that I would drive to Pittsburgh and God's ordaining that I would do so. Theoretically He could know of a future act without ordaining it, but He could not ordain it without knowing what it is that He is ordaining. **[Does this make the case that double predestination is a knowing, willful act? I think so. And because we know God desires all men to be saved (1 Tim 2:4, 2 Pet 3:9), we know He does not create a subset of all humans whose purpose is to be damned.]** But in either case, the future event would be certain with respect to time and the knowledge of God.

Luther, in discussing the traitorous act of Judas, says:

Have I not put on record in many books that I am talking about *necessity of immutability*? I know that the Father begets willingly, and that Judas betrayed Christ willingly. My point is that this act of the will in Judas was certainly and infallibly bound to take place, if God foreknew it. That is to say (if my meaning is not yet grasped), I distinguish two necessities: one I call *necessity of force (necessitatem violentam)*, referring to action; the other I call *necessity of infallibility (necessitatem infallibilem)*, referring to time. Let him who hears me understand that I am speaking of the latter, not the former; that is, I am not discussing whether Judas became a traitor willingly or unwillingly, but whether it was infallibly bound to come to pass that Judas should willingly betray Christ at a time predetermined by God.³ **[Why would an argument be made about all men based on this one, wretched, unique soul?]**

We see then, that what God knows in advance comes to pass by necessity or infallibly or necessity of immutability. But what about His foreordaining or predestinating what comes to pass? If God foreordains reprobation does this not obliterate the distinction between positive-negative and involve a *necessity of force*? If God foreordains reprobation does this not mean that God forces, compels, or coerces the reprobate to sin? Again the answer must be negative. **[The topic is not man's sin, but God's intentions.]**

If God, when He is decreeing reprobation, does so in consideration of the reprobate's being already fallen, then He does not coerce him to sin. To be reprobate is to be left in sin, not pushed or forced to sin. If the decree of reprobation **[the precursor to the disposition to hell]** were made without a view to the fall **[before the necessity of that disposition was manifest]**, then the objection to double predestination would be valid and God would be properly charged with being the author of sin. **[Not exactly. Single predestination does not posit that God is the author of a damned man's sin; Rather it posits that He does not assign that one to hell even before he commits his first sin. See "Infant Salvation in Light of the Cross" at www.pprsinc.com]** But Reformed theologians have been careful to avoid such a blasphemous notion. Berkouwer states the boundaries of the discussion clearly:

On the one hand, we want to maintain the freedom of God in election, and on the other hand, we want to avoid any conclusion which would make God the cause of sin and unbelief.⁴ **[Again, the question is not man's intentions or character; the question of double predestination involves God's character.]**

God's decree of reprobation, given in light of the fall, is a decree to justice, not injustice. **[This entire article revolves around "God's decree of reprobation." According to vocabulary.com, "originally**

reprobation was a religious word meaning "rejection by God."] In this view the biblical *a priori* that God is neither the cause nor the author of sin is safeguarded. **[Could Sproul mean that because God knew the fall was coming it justified His pre-determining a particular assigned subset of damned souls in order to demonstrate the effect of that future fall?]** Turretini says, "We have proved the object of predestination to be man considered as fallen, sin ought necessarily to be supposed as the condition in him who is reprobated, no less than him who is elected." ⁵ He writes elsewhere:

The negative act includes two, both preterition, by which in the election of some as well to glory as to grace, he neglected and slighted others, which is evident from the event of election, and *negative desertion*, by which he left them in the corrupt mass and in their misery; which, however, is as to be understood, 1. That they are not excepted from the laws of common providence, but remain subject to them, nor are immediately deprived of all God's favor, but only of the saving and vivifying which is the fruit of election, 2. That preterition and desertion; not indeed from the nature of preterition and desertion itself, and the force of the denied grace itself, but from the nature of the corrupt free will, and the force of corruption in it; as he who does not cure the disease of a sick man, is not the cause per se of the disease, nor of the results flowing from it; so sins are *the consequents*, rather than the *effects* of reprobation, necessarily bringing about the futuration of the event, but yet not infusing nor producing the wickedness. ⁶ **[There is no dignified rebuttal to this writing (1623-1687) except to reference *What Love is This?*]**

The importance of viewing the decree of reprobation in light of the fall is seen in the on-going discussions between Reformed theologians concerning infra- and supra-lapsarianism. **[I refer again to the Light of the Cross. See Age of Accountability at www.pprsinc.com.]** Both viewpoints include the fall in God's decree. Both view the decree of preterition in terms of divine permission. The real issue between the positions concerns the *logical order* of the decrees. In the supralapsarian view the decree of election and reprobation is logically prior to the decree to permit the fall. In the infralapsarian view the decree to permit the fall is logically prior to the decree to election and reprobation. **[The real issue is what one assigns as God's motives that reflects on His character.]**

Though this writer [**Sproul**] favors the infralapsarian view along the lines developed by Turretini, it is important to note that both views see election and reprobation in light of the fall and avoid the awful conclusion that God is the author of sin. Both views protect the boundaries Berkouwer mentions.

Only in a positive-positive schema of predestination does *double-predestination* leave us with a capricious deity whose sovereign decrees manifest a divine tyranny. Reformed theology has consistently eschewed such a hyper-supralapsarianism. Opponents of Calvinism, however, persistently caricature the straw man of hyper-supralapsarianism, doing violence to the Reformed faith and assaulting the dignity of God's sovereignty.

[Lapsarian categories, denominational preference, and extra-Scriptural argument do not avert the question: Did God determine in eternity past a specific sub-set of all conceived souls whose existence serves as the control group of the damned? This is the position of double predestination. It is a moot point whether the positive-negative framework is superior to the negative-negative framework—in order to justify the outcome of the answer to the question. In seminary this writer came to the conclusion that if she never found the best words to refute the heinousness of any form of double predestination, she at least will have the following anticipation of the Judgment Seat of Christ when this work done in my body is reviewed. I would much rather desire to hear my Lord and Savior say to me —"My dear child, you erred in your theological understanding; you are now

corrected and will suffer loss of reward for failing to understand that I did intend those souls be damned” —than I could bear to hear Him say, “My dear child, you erred in your theological understanding and you impugned my character; you are corrected and will suffer loss of reward for believing I intended those souls be damned.”]

We rejoice in the biblical clarity which reveals God's sovereignty in majestic terms. We rejoice in the knowledge of divine mercy and grace that go to such extremes to redeem the elect. We rejoice that God's glory and honor are manifested both in His mercy and in His justice.

Soli Deo Gloria.

Chapter Notes

1. Emil Brunner, *The Christian Doctrine of God* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1950), p. 326.
2. Martin Luther, *The Bondage of the Will* (Westwood: Fleming H. Revell, 1957), p. 206.
3. *Ibid.*, p. 220.
4. G. C. Berkouwer, *Divine Election* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1960), p. 181.
5. Francois Turretini, *Theological institutes* (Typescript manuscript of *Institutio Theologiae Elencticae*, 3 vols., 1679-1685), trans. George Musgrave Giger. D.D., p. 98.
6. *Ibid.*, p. 97.

[An additional philosophical response to Sproul's "Double" Predestination:]

1. **Sproul, et al, will not answer for their skill in argument; they will answer for the truthfulness of their conclusions in those arguments.**
2. **Our Lord is not beholden to man's sense of logic; we will not gain reward for employing such.**
3. **Our goal is not proof of theories but skill in handling God's Word in defense of the faith.**

Per directions at <http://www.ligonier.org/learn/articles/double-predestination/>:

**This article is from Ligonier Ministries, the teaching fellowship of R.C. Sproul. All rights reserved.
Website: www.ligonier.org | Phone: 1-800-435-4343.**

The article in its entirety is also posted at:

http://www.the-highway.com/DoublePredestination_Sproul.html