

How John A. Broadus Embraced the Doctrine of Election

“How John A. Broadus Embraced the Doctrine of Election”[\[1\]](#) [\[2\]](#)

By

[Dr. Roger D. Duke](#)

Assistant Professor of Religion & Communication

Baptist College of Health Science

Memphis, TN

A Lecture (or Sermon)

Delivered at the Annual Founders Conference Mid-West

Given February 27 & 28, 2012

In St. Louis, Missouri

At the Invitation of Dr. Curtis McClain

Of the Missouri Baptist University

Personal Introduction

Upon reflection of Dr. McClain’s invitation to give these two lectures (or sermons), I was taken back in my mind to a time many years ago when we first met. It was January of 1982. Curtis and his wife Patsy had just arrived in Memphis. I too had just arrived with my little family—consisting of my wife Linda, who was 6 months pregnant at the time, and my nearly 3-year-old daughter Leah. Both Curtis and I had come to Memphis to study at Mid-America Baptist Theological Seminary: Curtis with a newly minted Master of Divinity “in hand” to begin work on his PhD degree and me—who had left the construction trades as a Union Steamfitter Journeyman and had never even attended college—AT ALL! It is quite ironic that he would extend to me such an opportunity as this! I confessed to him: “I attend Founders Conferences Curtis—I don’t SPEAK AT THEM!” Needless to say we became fast friends over the years through some very random acts of Providence. Well—at least they seem random to me.

Early Remembrance from Seminary Days

One of the funny issues that stand out in my mind about the academe early in my seminary career was the friendly (and sometimes not so friendly) competition between the language department and the theology department. But these seem to have always been “in house” arguments which go back at least to the days of James P. Boyce and John A. Broadus. In his *A Gentleman and a Scholar*, Broadus related how that

“ His colleague [Broadus speaking of himself] who was professor of the New Testament once said to . . . [Boyce], in some pleasantries of conversation, that students of exegesis might have some freedom if it were not for those dreadful theological people, who know beforehand what every passage ought to mean, in order to suit their creeds and systems, and who have not a proper respect for philology and criticism.[3]

This remark may have been friendly teasing but might give some insight into the fact of how or why Broadus came to his Reformational understanding of the “doctrine of election” late. This was because he had been a classicist and linguist at the University of Virginia in the earlier days before coming to the new Southern Baptist Theological Seminary. At the University he served as professor and tutor of languages, university chaplain, and pastor of the Baptist church. When the seminary was formed, only two of the original four founding faculty were seminary trained—Basil Manly, Jr. and James Boyce. William Williams was trained in the practice of law. David Dockery observes that “Broadus himself had not attended a seminary.”[4] And he “never really donned the mantle of a

Systematic Theologian.”[5] However, “His university education provided him an outstanding background in the classical languages and philosophy, but his theological preparation, like so many other Baptist preachers in the South, came about by self-study.”[6]

There may be one of those quirks or ironies of history working here that is somewhat glaring. Although Boyce and Manly had been trained in the seminaries of the North, they turned to Broadus to set up the program of study for the new seminary. And, “Not surprisingly the new proposal was based largely on the University of Virginia model; one based upon the English Bible, with freedom for the students in their selection of course work.” [7] “The plan emphasized scholarship for the able student with something worthwhile for all.” [8]

As early as 1857 “Broadus undertook a study of Calvinism.” [9] He wrote to Charles Hodge of Princeton University in an effort “to acquire an edition of Calvin’s works.”[10] “[T]he confessional Princeton theology” would come to govern “the thought of . . . the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary” in general. It would also become “incarnated in . . . Broadus” [11i] in particular. The Founding President had already embraced these doctrines. Broadus also consulted with his uncle Andrew Broadus and inquired of the veteran Baptist minister asking: “How far should Calvinism be carried”? [12] “His uncle affirmed both that God was completely sovereign and that that humans were fully accountable to repent and believe in Christ” [13] for these doctrines “compatibility was beyond human understanding.” [14] Broadus would confess, “I cannot fathom the mystery connected with God’s sovereignty and man’s accountability.” [15] He “[eventually] concluded that the Calvinist approach was scriptural.”[16] After much consideration “[H]e postulated a distinct line of continuity that ran from Paul through Augustine to Calvin.” [17]

***Abstract of Principles* [18]**

Just a short time later, “[I]n the months of March and April of 1858” [19] Basil Manly, Jr., one of the “founding four,” began to draw up the Seminary’s *Abstract of Principles*. [20] As he wrote, compiled, and edited it, he “produced an abridgement of . . . the 1689 [London Confession] which had been familiar to him from his youth.” [21] Manly’s life had also been immersed in what some call the “Charleston Tradition.” [22] Because of this “The articles [of the *Abstract*] reflected the wording and order of the *Charleston Confession of Faith*.” [23]

“Manly’s task . . . involved ‘extreme delicacy and difficulty.’”[24] He “needed to draft a statement that comprehended the affirmations important to virtually all the regular Baptists.” But “The confession needed to be specific and definitive enough to secure the integrity of all the ‘essential doctrines held among . . . [other contemporary Baptists].’” [25] Ironically, then as well as now, “Particular redemption had been a flash point of controversy not only between the Calvinists and Arminians in the nineteenth century, but within the ranks of the Calvinist[ic] Baptists” [26] as well. Manly also had to hold the line for those who, like Boyce, sought “A complete exhibition of the

fundamental doctrines of grace” [27] including election, predestination, and particular redemption. “Manly clearly intended that those who held to various perspectives on particular redemption and those who affirmed a general redemption could sign their agreement to . . . [the] statement” [28] of faith.

The *Abstract* ended up with twenty articles in total. “It contained articles on the Scripture, God, the Trinity, providence, **election**, [29] the fall of man, the Mediator, regeneration, repentance, faith, justification, sanctification, perseverance of the saints, the church, baptism, the Lord’s Supper, the Lord’s day, liberty of conscience, the resurrection, and judgment.” [30] In it “the *doctrine of election* [31] was defined as ‘God’s eternal choice of some persons unto everlasting life, not because of foreseen merit, in them, but of His mere mercy in Christ; in consequence of which choice, they are called, justified, and glorified.’” [32]

Although Broadus did not have a direct hand in writing the *Abstract*, he was no doubt in concert with the end result. The “Prologue” sets forth plainly that

“ . . . all persons accepting professorships in this seminary shall be considered, by such acceptance, as engaging to teach in accordance with, and not contrary to, the ***Abstract of Principles*** hereinafter laid down, a departure from which principles on his part shall be considered grounds for his resignation or removal by the Trustees (emphasis added). [33]

And because of “the seminary’s confession of faith . . . and through the determined opposition [to heresy]” and “ forthright teaching and writing,” Boyce and Broadus “established a standard of orthodoxy in the denomination that has endured to the present.” [34] At the end of the day, “The theological tradition reflected in the *Abstract* is in line with the historic orthodoxy at every point. The soteriology can be called moderately Calvinistic (italics added).” [35] It can be considered moderately Calvinistic because Particular Redemption is not mentioned only implied.

Somewhere between the times when “Broadus undertook . . . [his] study of Calvinism,” [36] Manley’s production of the *Abstract of Principles*, and when he signed the *Abstract*; we can be well assured that Broadus had embraced election as set forth in the “softer Calvinism” of the *Abstract of Principles*.

Election in Selected Broadus Writings

In his early days at Southern Seminary, Broadus did not leave much to posterity in the way of a writing legacy. Even in his preaching, he did not read, memorize, or write-out his sermons as was the custom of the “sacred rhetoricians” of his day. He preached extemporaneously and not from a manuscript, even teaching his students to do so as well. [37] Because of this there are not many of his complete extant sermons available for posterity. It was during those early days however, that he

compiled an edited version of his preaching notes for his homiletics classes which became the landmark work—*A Treatise on the Preparation and Delivery of Sermons* (or the PDS).[38]

After the PDS Broadus went on to publish two important volumes that shed major insights telling how he embraced the doctrine of election. One was his *Sermons and Addresses*. This was a transcribed compilation of different speeches and sermons delivered to various civic groups and such. Broadus was not only noted to be one of the outstanding pulpit orators of the 19th century, he was a true “Renaissance Man.” As such, was called upon to speak in a wide circle of influence outside the preaching, teaching, and pastoral ministries venues. He was invited to address such topics as; history, philosophy, classics, and the like by various groups.

The other published work was his monumental tome, the *Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew* in *An American Commentary on the New Testament* series edited by Alvah Hovey. This was the fruition of at least 20 years worth of careful study. [39] It set standards for exegetical commentaries that are still usable today. [40] Both works were released c. 1886. *Sermons and Addresses* gives insight into his developing theological understanding of “election,” while the *Matthew Commentary* better demonstrates how his exegesis informed this theology. Gleaned and synthesized insights concerning his understanding of *election* should be considered together. Let us look at each one in turn as *Particular, Practical, and Privilege*.

The Election of God is a Preference

First, consider *Sermons and Addresses*: There is no doubt that God had a preference for His people that began with a promise to Abraham. In one address entitled “The Holy Scriptures,” Broadus sees a corporate aspect of the concept of “chosen” or “election.” [41] This is demonstrated when he states that “The Old Testament is a history of redemption.” [42] “It is not merely a history of Israel.” [43i] In this history, “God’s mightiness and mercies, and of a **chosen** (or elect) nation, [is seen] all along toward the promised, long-looking-for time when God’s Son should come to be the Savior of mankind (emphasis added).” [44] Here Broadus employs the term “chosen” corporately for Israel.

Broadus does not only see the doctrine of election as a national enterprise for God concerning Israel. In addition, he understands an individual application of the doctrine. In a sermon entitled an “Intense Concern for the Salvation of Others” [45] he takes for his text Roman 9:3: “For I would wish that myself were accursed from Christ for my brethren.” [46] Broadus observes that, “This is known to students of the Scriptures as one which is commonly . . . difficult—one of the hard places” [47] in the Bible. The text is difficult because Paul bemoans the fact that his brethren—Israel—are lost, his desire is for Israel is to be saved! This verse immediately precedes one of the greatest passages on election in all of Scripture. But Broadus exercises one principle of exegesis and interpretation that superintended all of his biblical and theological work: “[B]e willing to let the

Scriptures mean what it wants to mean. . . .” [48] So how does Broadus see the Scriptural conundrum worked out? He lays it out like this:

“ Concern for the salvation of others is not prevented by a belief in what we call the doctrines of grace; not prevented by believing in the divine sovereignty, and predestination, and **election**. . . . [Many argue] if predestination be true, then it follows that a man cannot do anything for his own salvation; that if he is to be saved he will be saved, but he has nothing to do with it, and need not care, nor need any one else care. . . . [But] Paul himself, the great oracle of the doctrine in the Scripture, has uttered these words of burning passionate concern for the salvation of others, so close by in the passage in which he has taught the doctrines [of election] in question (emphasis added).[49]

Broadus continues his argument that:

“ [W]henever you find your heart or the heart of your friend inclined to shrink away from these great teachings of divine Scriptures concerning sovereignty and predestination, then I pray you make no argument about it, but turn to this language of concern for the salvation of others, so intensely passionate that men wonder and think surely it cannot mean what it says. . . . I say that whatever be true, for or against the apostle’s doctrines of predestination and divine sovereignty in salvation, it is **not true** that they will make a man careless as to his own salvation or that of others; seeing that they had no such effect on Paul himself (emphasis added). [50]

The Election of God is Particular

Now consider the *Commentary on Matthew*. In Jesus’ prayer to the Father just before the “Great Invitation” of [Matthew 11:28](#)—“Come unto me all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest,” there is a pivotal insight on *election* in verse 27 often overlooked: “All things are delivered unto me of my Father: and no man knoweth the Son, but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him” (KJV). Before his plea of invitation, where Christ calls the Jews “to come unto me,” there is a symbiotic concert between the Father and Son concerning election—or to whom salvation will be revealed. Broadus asserts, “Notice, that this is not, as often quoted, an expression of mere resignation. Our Lord acknowledges the propriety of the sovereign Father’s course [of electing] and praises him for it. Whatever pleases God ought to please us.” [51] Concerning the “all things are delivered to me of my (*by*) [52] my Father[,]” [53] Broadus waxes theological like his colleague Boyce or one of the other Princetonian theologians when he acknowledges the eternal covenant of God the Father with the Son. “At some past time, not specified, say when he [The Son] entered upon earthly mission—or, perhaps, when the covenant of redemption was formed in eternity . . . all things were committed to him.” [54] That is, the things pertaining to the covenant with God the Father, were given to the Son in His Gospel, and then would be revealed to those whom Christ would sovereignty choose.

Concerning this most important clause, “he to whomsoever the Son will (*willeth to*) [55] reveal him,” [56] Broadus concludes that “All their wisdom and intelligence [i.e., those who want to know God] will not avail to gain a true knowledge of the Father, unless the Son chooses to reveal him to them.” [57] Here he drives home the point: “The son approves the Father’s will as to hiding and revealing, and the Father has authorized him to reveal or not, according to . . . [the Son’s sovereign] will.” [58]

Perhaps the best way to “hear” how Broadus embraced election at this point is found in another place in his *Matthew Commentary*. He sets forth a balanced theological and exegetical understanding in context when he comments on [Matthew 22:14](#), “For many are called, but few are chosen.” Concerning this passage he observes:

“ Many are called to share the Messianic benefits, but few are selected [or elected] actually to attain them; a large portion of the called utterly refusing to accept and some even of those who profess acceptance not developing the corresponding character of life. This selection of the actually saved may be looked at from two sides. ***From the divine side, we can see that the Scriptures teach an eternal election of men to eternal life, simply out of God’s good pleasure. From the human side, we see that those persons attain the blessings of salvation through Christ who accept the gospel invitation and obey the gospel commandments. It is doubtful whether our minds can combine both sides in a single view, but we must not for that reason deny either of them to be true*** (emphasis added). [59]

Here can be heard the wise reverberations of his uncle Broadus from so many years earlier.

He reinforces this when he quotes the “Silver Tongued” orator John Chrysostom: “[R]everence the love of him who called you, and let no one continue to have filthy garments, but let each of you busy himself about the clothing of your soul.” [60] While the dynamics of how election works may be a contemporary issue for us. Broadus does not seem overly concerned with the mechanics of election itself. The more important consideration for Broadus is: Have you repented toward God? Have you placed your faith in His Only Son, Christ Jesus the Lord and Savior? Are you trusting him alone for your eternal salvation ([Acts 20:20](#))?

The Election of God is a Privilege

In [Matthew 13:11](#), concerning the Parable of the Sewer, Jesus’ disciples pose a question to him: “Why speakest thou unto them [the multitudes who followed] in parables?” Broadus observes that his response is most telling, especially when it comes to the doctrine of election. Jesus responds, “Unto you, it is given to know the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven, but to them it is not given.” Broadus declares that “**Because it is given you**, literally, ‘*has been given,*’ and so stands as . . .

[the Disciples] established privilege. **To know the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven,** [61] i.e., of the Messianic reign. . . .” [62] He continues with a description of the disciple’s privileged view of the reign of Messiah. This “mystery” or

“ [mysterion] signifies something hidden or secret, and known only to the initiated, It might be a very simple thing in itself, but it was a secret. Yet some of the doctrines . . . and . . . secret associations of Greek . . . [and] Egypt . . . were really profound, and difficult of comprehension, and so the word has gradually come to suggest the idea of something incomprehensible, though we still sometimes apply it to things which are merely hard to find out. But . . . the New Testament use [of the word] . . . uniformly denotes that which we could not know unless *revealed*, whether it is in its own nature simple or profound. Paul’s favorite application of [mysterion] . . . is . . . the great fact that the Gentiles were to share in the salvation of the gospel on equal terms with the Jews, a fact always before kept in silence and secrecy, but now manifested by God and to . . . [be] everywhere proclaimed.[63]

Further Broadus explains that:

“ Our Lord is in this series of parables setting forth views as to the true nature of the Messianic kingdom—such as its partial acceptance among men, its small beginnings and gradual spread, its allowing the wicked to live on in the world mingled with . . . [the Kingdom’s] subjects until the end—which the mass of the Jews were not spiritually minded enough to comprehend, nor humble enough to receive. So he presents these views in the form of parables, which would, with the help of his explanations, make them clear to his disciples [or elect] but would leave them mysteries (secrets) to the unspiritual and unbelieving multitude.[64]

***A Catechism of Bible Teaching* [65] by John A. Broadus**

Our discussion has considered Broadus’s *Sermons and Addresses* and observations from his *Commentary on Matthew*; now consider a final glimpse concerning “how he embraced the doctrine of election” towards the end of his life. In “Lesson VIII,” on “Regeneration—Question 9,” in his *A Catechism of Bible Teaching* [66] he poses the following question:

“ Q. Does faith come before the new birth?

A. No, it is the new heart that truly repents and believes. [67i]

It seems at “first blush” that he has either argued himself to a more narrow position on election, or has been persuaded by others to a more staunchly reformed position, or that he has come to believe the “regeneration precedes faith and repentance” through life experience and self-study. However he came to his catechetical conclusion, it is clear that he may have been only a “half step” in front of

the softer understandings of election held earlier. This final position smacks of the Reformational understanding of the “Ordo Salutis.”

Wayne Grudem states concerning election that it is only one event in a “list of the events in which God applies salvation to us . . . called the *order of salvation*, and is sometimes referred to [by its] Latin phrase.” [68] Grudem further explains that “election” is the primary of

“ [many] steps in God’s work of applying salvation to our lives include[ing] our hearing the gospel call, our being regenerated by the Holy Spirit, our responding in faith and repentance, and God forgiving us and giving us membership in his family, as well as granting us growth in the Christian life and keeping us faithful to himself throughout life. At the end of our life we die and go into his presence, then when Christ returns we receive resurrection bodies, and the process of acquiring salvation is complete. [69]

From a Reformation view, election is the first of a process that springs forth from God’s eternal decrees.[70] Grudem lists these as follows:

“ The Order of Salvation” [consists of . . .]

1. Election (God’s choice of people to be saved)
2. The gospel call (proclaiming the message of the gospel)
3. Regeneration (being born again)
4. Conversion (faith and repentance)
5. Justification (right legal standing)
6. Adoption (membership in God’s family)
7. Sanctification (right conduct of life)
8. Perseverance (remaining a Christian)
9. Death (going to be with the Lord)
10. Glorification (receiving a resurrection body).”[71]

Towards the end of his life and ministry Broadus stands in the same stream of theological thought with his colleague James P. Boyce and their forbearer Andrew Fuller. For “Fuller, the only way for faith to be holy is for God through his Word to regenerate the heart prior to believing.” [72] Fuller declares that

“ The . . . question is in what order these things are caused. Whether the Holy Spirit causes the mind, while carnal, to discern and believe spiritual things, and thereby renders it spiritual; or whether he imparts a holy susceptibility and relish for the truth, in consequence of which we discern its glory, and embrace it. The latter appears to me to be the truth. [73]

Gleanings Concerning “Broadus’s ‘Embrace of The Doctrine of Election’”

1. Broadus was primarily a linguist, philosopher, and historian by training. As such, he was a Professor and Tutor of ancient languages at the University of Virginia, Chaplain to the University, and Pastor of the Baptist Church at Charlottesville, Virginia. In this role he was used as Itinerant Evangelists and had acquired a name for himself as pastor and orator before ever he came to The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary.
2. Broadus came to his Reformational understandings of the “doctrine of election” late. He undertook a study of Calvinistic Soteriology sometime around 1857 after consulting with his uncle and the Princeton scholars.
3. Particular redemption was then—as it is now—a flash point of doctrinal controversy.
4. Broadus had come to consensus on the “doctrine of election” with others of the “Founding Four,” else he would not have been able in “good conscience” to sign the *Abstract of Principles*.
5. At this point Broadus was what could be considered “moderately Calvinistic.”
6. As a linguist and not a systematic theologian per se, he is not concerned with the “mechanics of election.” He just understood it to be just the plain truth of the Gospel.
7. Towards the end of his life, he seems to have embraced the *ordo salutis* from a harder reformation understanding that “it is the new heart that truly repents and believes.”

[1] In this inquiry the terms “Election,” “Doctrines of Grace,” “Calvinism” et al that have to do with the historic doctrines referred to as the Soteriological Calvinism will be employed rather interchangeably with due notice given to the doctrine of election.

[2] I offer a special thanks to Drew Harris for his editorial work on this project. Drew is a Pastoral Intern at the South Woods Baptist Church and currently pursuing Master of Divinity at The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary.

[3] John A. Broadus, *A Gentleman and a Scholar: A Memoir of James Petigru Boyce* (Birmingham: Solid Ground Christian Books, 2004; reprint New York: AC Armstrong & Son, 1893), 307 (page

citations are to the reprint edition).

[4] David S. Dockery, "The Broadus-Robertson Tradition," in Timothy George & David Dockery, eds., *Theologians of the Baptist Tradition* (Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 2001), 95.

[5] James Patterson, "Broadus's Living Legacy," in David S. Dockery and Roger D. Duke, eds., *John A. Broadus: A Living Legacy* (Nashville: Broadman & Holman Academic, 2008), 245.

[6] Dockery, "The Broadus-Robertson Tradition," 95.

[7] *Ibid.*, 95.

[8] *Ibid.*

[9] Gregory A. Wills, *Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1859-2009* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2009), 94.

[10] Wills, *Southern Baptist Theological Seminary*, 94.

[11] C. Jeffrey Robinson, Sr., "Evangelicalism from the Beginning: English Baptists of the Seventeenth Century" in Thomas K. Ascol & Nathan A. Finn, eds., *By His Grace and For His Glory: Essays in Honor of Thomas J. Nettles* (Cape Coral, FL.: Founders Press, 2011), 63.

[12] *Ibid.*

[13] *Ibid.*

[14] *Ibid.*

[15] *Ibid.* Charles Hodge to John A. Broadus, 6 Jan. 1857, box 1, Broadus Papers; Andrew Broaddus to John A. Broadus, 3 March 1875, attached to Robertson, "Life and Letters of John A Broadus." Cited in Wills, *Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1859-2009* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2009), Footnote #194, 94.

[16] Wills, *Southern Baptist Theological Seminary*, 94.

[17] James Patterson, "Broadus's Living Legacy," in David S. Dockery and Roger D. Duke, eds., *John A. Broadus: A Living Legacy* (Nashville: Broadman & Holman Academic, 2008), 245.

[18] *The Abstract of Principles* is the confessional statement of The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary. It is signed by every faculty member of the seminary every academic year publicly by all who teach at Southern. For more information on the *Abstract* see: Michael AG Haykin, Roger D. Duke, & A. James Fuller, *Soldiers of Christ: Selections from the Writings of Basil Manly, Sr., & Basil Manly, Jr.* (Cape Coral, FL: Founders Press, 2009), 36ff.

[19] Michael AG Haykin, Roger D. Duke, & A. James Fuller, *Soldiers of Christ: Selections from the Writings of Basil Manly, Sr., & Basil Manly, Jr.* (Cape Coral, FL.: Founders Press, 2009), 36.

[20] Hereafter referred to as *Abstract*.

[21] *Ibid.*, 37.

[22] *Ibid.* See: Haykin, Duke, and Fuller, *Soldiers*, footnote #42, 36.

[23] Thomas J. Nettles, *James Petigru Boyce: A Southern Baptist Statesman* (Phillipsburg, NJ.: American Reformed Biographies, 2009), 146.

[24] Wills, *Southern Baptist Theological Seminary*, 33.

[25] *Ibid.*

[26] Haykin, Duke, and Fuller, *Soldiers*, 38.

[27] Wills, *Southern Baptist Theological Seminary*, 31.

[28] *Ibid.*, 38-39.

[29] Emphasis added.

[30] Nettles, *Boyce*, 146.

[31] Emphasis added.

[32] *Ibid.*

[33] The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, *Abstract of Principles*, “Election” Article #5. To view a copy of the entire *Abstract of Principles* visit the web page of The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary at <http://www.sbts.edu/documents/abstract.pdf>.

[34] Gregory A. Wills, "Crawford H. Toy: Southern Baptists and the Lessons of Controversy," in Thomas K. Ascol & Nathan A. Finn, eds., *By His Grace and For His Glory: Essays in Honor of Thomas J. Nettles* (Cape Coral, FL.: Founders Press, 2011), 50

[35] Dockery, "Broadman-Robertson Tradition," 103.

[36] Wills, *Southern Baptist Theological Seminary*, 94.

[37] For a fuller discussion of Broadus's *A Treatise on the Preparation and Delivery of Sermons* see: Roger D. Duke, "John A. Broadus, Rhetoric, and *A Treatise on the Preparation and Delivery of Sermons* in David S. Dockery and Roger D. Duke, eds., *John A. Broadus: A Living Legacy* (Nashville: Broadman & Holman Academic, 2008).

[38] Broadus's *Preparation and Delivery of Sermons* was originally published in 1870.

[39] Broadus's *Matthew Commentary* was under development at least as early February of 1863 during the time he spent in the camps of the Army of Northern Virginia with Gen. Robert E. Lee. See: AT Robertson, *Life and Letters of John A. Broadus* (Harrisonburg, Virginia: Gano Books, 2003; reprint American Baptist Publications Society, 1901), 196 (page citations are to the reprint edition).

[40] Please see Richard Melick's "New Wine in Broadus Wineskins?" in David S. Dockery and Roger D. Duke, eds., *John A. Broadus: A Living Legacy* (Nashville: Broadman & Holman Academic, 2008).

[41] In many cases, but not all, the terms "chosen" and "elect" can be used interchangeably.

[42] John A. Broadus, "The Holy Scriptures;" in John A. Broadus's, *Sermons and Addresses*, (Nashville, TN.: H. M. Wharton/Sunday School Board of the Southern Baptist Convention, 1886), 161.

[43] Ibid.

[44] Broadus, "The Holy Scriptures," *Sermons and Addresses*, 161.

[45] John A. Broadus, "Intense Concern for the Salvation of Others;" quoted in John A. Broadus, *Sermons and Addresses*, (Nashville, TN.: H. M. Wharton/Sunday School Board of the Southern Baptist Convention, 1886), 110.

[46] Ibid.

[47] Ibid.

[48] J. D. Robertson, "Quotations from the Class Room of Dr. Broadus," in *Seminary Magazine* (April, 1895), p. 428; quoted in Vernon Latrelle Stanfield, *Favorite Sermons of John A. Broadus* (New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1959), 6.

[49] Broadus, "Intense Concern for the Salvation of Others," *Sermons and Addresses*, 117ff.

[50] Broadus, "Intense Concern," *Sermons and Addresses*, 117ff.

[51] Alvah Hovey, gen. ed., *An American Commentary of the New Testament*, vol. 1, *Commentary on Matthew* by John A. Broadus (Philadelphia: The American Baptist Publication Society, 1886), 252.

[52] Italics in Broadus's original text.

[53] Ibid.

[54] Ibid.

[55] Italics in Broadus's original text.

[56] Broadus, *Commentary*, 252.

[57] Ibid.

[58] Ibid.

[59] Broadus, *Commentary*, 448.

[60] Ibid.

[61] Emphasis added in Broadus's original text.

[62] Broadus, *Commentary*, 287.

[63] Ibid., 287.

[64] Ibid.

[65] *A Catechism of Bible Teaching* was the first publication of the new Southern Baptist Sunday School Board. It was published in 1892. Also see note 71 below.

[66] For more about John A. Broadus's, *A Catechism of Bible Teaching*, see: James Patterson, "Broadus's Living Legacy," in David S. Dockery and Roger D. Duke, eds., *John A. Broadus: A Living Legacy* (Nashville: Broadman & Holman Academic, 2008), 242-245.

[67] John A. Broadus, *A Catechism of Bible Teaching*, 1892; in John A. Broadus, *Selected Works of John A. Broadus*, Vol. III (Cape Coral, FL.; Founders Publishers, n.d.), 208 (page numbers are to the reprint edition).

[68] Wayne Grudem, *Systematic Theology: An Introduction to Biblical Doctrine* (Grand Rapids, Mich., Zondervan Publishing, 1994), 669.

[69] Ibid.

[70] For a fuller discussion of the "Eternal Decrees of God" see: Wayne Grudem, *Systematic Theology: An Introduction to Biblical Doctrine*, "The Decrees of God," (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Zondervan Publishing, 1994), 332-333.

[71] Ibid., 670.

[72] Gerald L. Priest, "Andrew Fuller's Response to the 'Modern Question'—A Reappraisal of the *Gospel Worthy of All Acceptation*," *Detroit Baptist Seminary Journal* (Fall 2001): 45-73.

[73] Andrew Fuller, *Gospel Worthy of All Acceptation* in *The Complete Works of the Rev. Andrew Fuller with a Memoir of His Life*, edited by Andrew Gunton Fuller (London: Henry G. Bohn, 1856), p. 151; quoted in Gerald L. Priest, "Andrew Fuller's Response to the 'Modern Question'—A Reappraisal of the *Gospel Worthy of All Acceptation*," *Detroit Baptist Seminary Journal* (Fall 2001): 56.