

**Scriptures and Doctrine :: "Faith" in reformed theology?**

**"Faith" in reformed theology? - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2008/7/8 20:36**

I have been studying up on Reformed theology of late. I'm presently reading R.C. Sproul's "What Is Reformed Theology?" I've noticed before this book, but am all the more aware while reading this book, that Reformed theology while it says saving faith is necessary for salvation, doesn't really seem to mean so. That is, it puts such an emphasis on total depravity, unmerited grace, and limited atonement, that faith doesn't really seem necessary to salvation. Of course, exegetically, Sproul defends why faith is necessary to salvation as opposed to works. However, faith seems to be merely the byproduct of election in their theological outlook, and doesn't really do anything as related to personal salvation... other than to say one needs it in order to be saved. But in reality, why does one need it?

Thoughts?

**Re: "Faith" in reformed theology?, on: 2008/7/8 21:18**

Quote:

-----But in reality, why does one need it?

How else, but by Faith, would one appropriate the salvation that Jesus Christ purchased for us.

I guess the real question is, does faith originate with us; is it something we possess that we can present to God, or does faith come to us by the preaching of the Word of God?

"Faith comes by hearing and hearing by the Word of God"

**Re: - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2008/7/8 21:20**

This is true dear brother that people can have faith in the creed itself and not Christ. What a dangerous error. I believe that is what some puritans spoke of as the most tragic road to hell. The road that goes right under the pulpit!

**Re: - posted by rbanks, on: 2008/7/8 21:53**

I think people misunderstand election. If a person believes that the elect are going to be saved no matter what, is that kind of faith going to save him, of course not. A person must have faith in Jesus Christ and his work of redemption on the cross and believe God raised Him from the dead.

I think it is foolish for a person to believe that he is one of the elect, and no matter what he will be saved, and that people who are not the elect, no matter what they can't be saved.

Where in the bible does it teach us to believe in man's doctrine of election, this thing is higher than man's understanding of so called doctrine of elections.

What part of John 3:16 are we not to understand when it says God so loved the world and when it says whosoever believeth in Him.

Jesus never told his disciples to go to the world and find the elect who are already saved. He never said keep in mind that some are not the elect and is not going to be saved.

The attitude of the apostles was if they don't go people are going to perish. They believe everybody needed to hear and believe.

It is just like salvation and healing, how are we going to receive if we doubt while we are trying to believe. How can we effectively please God if everybody we meet we doubt about whether they can be saved or not because we don't know if

there one of the elect. How can we be full of the love of God thinking that anybody we come across that God might not want to save them when He said He did?

**Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2008/7/8 22:32**

Please don't misunderstand me in all this. I'm not trying to stir up controversy or debate, I'm just trying to better grasp and understand Reformed theology. I'm firmly Arminian and have seen many arguments.

I'm just trying to grasp/understand why the Reformed theologian even sees faith as a necessary step in the ordo salutis. Why justification by faith, and not simply justification by mere irresistible election? Why the faith element altogether?

**Re: - posted by TaylorOtwell (), on: 2008/7/8 22:51**

I'll offer a humble explanation.

First, in Reformed theology, the Lord predestines the means as well as the end. In other words, we believe we are predestined for adoption in Christ before the foundation of the world; however, God has appointed the **means** of receiving the benefits of the Gospel as faith, an emptying, resting upon the Lord Jesus as the sole satisfaction for the punishment due my sins before God.

"All that I would infer from these things is, that the faith whereby we believe unto the justification of life, or which is required of us in a way of duty that we may be justified, is such an act of the whole soul whereby convinced sinners do wholly go out of themselves to rest upon God in Christ for mercy, pardon, life, righteousness, and salvation, with an acquiescence of heart therein; which is the whole of the truth pleaded for." (John Owen)

The Lord has appointed the means of salvation for the elect as justifying faith, without which, it is impossible to please God. One of many mistakes is to assume that Reformed theology does not have predestined means.

Likewise, we believe in the perseverance of the saints, so why not be lazy and do nothing in the ways of God? God forbid. We also believe in means in which growth in grace is accomplished. These are the preached word, Bible study, prayer, the Lord's table, baptism, communion with the saints, etc.

Also, "Thy people shall be willing in the day of thy power, in the beauties of holiness from the womb of the morning: thou hast the dew of thy youth." (Psalm 110:3)

The Lord has seen fit that His elect be not a dead, unwilling people. But a converted, regenerated, loving people.

I'm off to bed, so I won't be able to respond any further tonight, but I hope that was somewhat helpful.

**Re: - posted by TaylorOtwell (), on: 2008/7/8 22:57**

P.S.

This may be helpful too...

"In Acts 27:22 God made known that He had ordained the temporal preservation of all who accompanied Paul in the ship; yet the Apostle did not hesitate to say, "Except these abide in the ship, ye cannot be saved" (v. 31). God appointed the means for the execution of what He had decreed. From 2 Kings 20 we learn that God was absolutely resolved to add fifteen years to Hezekiah's life, yet he must take a lump of figs and lay it on his boil! Paul knew that he was eternally secure in the hand of Christ (John 10:28), yet he "kept under his body" (1 Cor. 9:27). The Apostle John assured those to whom he wrote, "Ye shall abide in Him," yet in the very next verse he exhorted them, "And now, little children, abide in Him" (1 John 2:27, 28). It is only by taking heed to this vital principle, that we are responsible to use the means of God's appointing, that we shall be enabled to preserve the balance of Truth and be saved from a paralyzing fatalism." (A.W. Pink)

## Scriptures and Doctrine :: "Faith" in reformed theology?

Re: - posted by rbanks, on: 2008/7/8 22:57

Quote:

-----  
KingJimmy wrote:

Why justification by faith, and not simply justification by mere irresistible election? Why the faith element altogether?

-----  
Justification by mere irresistible election is not found in the bible as being the way a person is saved. The gift of God is salvation. The gift of God is repentance.

The gift of God is faith to a person to believe in Christ and what He did for Him. God gave man a will so he must surrender that will when the Holy Spirit convicts him of his lost condition and enables Him to put his trust in Jesus for salvation.

Man was given a free will in the beginning and because of sin man's will is in bondage. God's desire is to free man's will again so that He can love God. God enables man by his Spirit and frees man's will to put his faith in Jesus and to obey. Man is then able to will to do God's will.

God never intended man to be a robot and not have a free will.

We can not be saved by the works of the Law neither can we be saved apart from appropriating faith in The Lord Jesus Christ.

The bible says it is by grace through faith.

Re: "Faith" in reformed theology? - posted by theopenlife, on: 2008/7/8 23:03

Hello KingJimmy, this is a good observation. I'm glad you are going to Reformed sources to learn about their views.

Speaking as a Reformed person, at least soteriologically, I will suggest immediately that Sproul may not be an adequate representative of the entire Reformed tradition. Sproul's views should be balanced with those of other Calvinist (I prefer "Pauline", but even Paul said He got his doctrine from Christ, so we're back to being "Christian") believers.

As an observation, every generation of believers is tempted to over react against whatever cultural swings seem most dangerous. Today, when Reformed believers find themselves occupying a tiny wing of the gargantuan professing Church, it should not surprise us if such affect is given to declaring their chief differences in doctrine. Looking outside of their polemical defenses, we will likely find more accurate presentations of their values.

Before showing some pertinent quotes, I will suggest perusing works by Joseph Alleine, Spurgeon, Whitefield, Sibbes, Luther, John Newton, to see how radiantly each emphasizes faith, though that emphasis is always subordinate to its object, Christ. In more recent times, consider Paul Washer (who first exposed my lack of genuine faith) or John Piper (who reminded me not to place faith in my faith, but in the finished work of Christ for everyone who will believe) or Rolfe Barnard, etc.

Here is a series of Paul Washer sermons, entitled "It comes down to Faith."

(<http://www.sermonaudio.com/search.asp?sourceonlytrue&currSectionsermonssource&keywordgcc&subsetcatseries&subsetitemBy+Faith>) It comes down to Faith

Here are some quotes by various Reformed brothers on the subject of faith, and may God bless you through them...

.....\*~~~~~\*~~~~~\*.....

Our heavenly king is pleased with all our graces: hot zeal and cool patience pleaseth Him; cheerful thankfulness and weeping repentance pleaseth Him; but none of them are welcome to Him without faith, as nothing can please Him without Christ.

-Thomas Adams

Other graces make us like Christ, faith makes us members of Christ.

-Thomas Watson

All other graces like birds in a nest depend upon what faith brings in to them.

-John Flavel

Faith is the captain grace.

-William Gurnall

The soul is the life of the body, Faith is the life of the soul. Christ is the life of faith.

-John Flavel

Till men have faith in Christ, their best services are but glorious sins.

-Thomas Brooks

Where reason cannot wade there faith may swim.

-Thomas Watson

We must understand that faith does not justify and save us by itself. . . but as an instrument, whereby we lay hold of and apply to ourselves Christ with His righteousness and merits, by which only we appear just before God. A small and weak hand, if it be able to reach the meat up to the mouth, as well performs its duty for the nourishment of the body as one of greater strength, because it is not the strength of the hand but the goodness of the meat which nourishes the body.

-George Downname

Faith is seated in the understanding, as well as in the will. It has an eye to see Christ, as well as a wing to fly to Him.

-Thomas Watson

Faith, though it hath sometimes a trembling hand, it must not have a withered hand, but must stretch.

-Thomas Watson

Judas knew the scriptures and without doubt did assent to them, when he was so zealous a preacher of the gospel; but he never had so much as one drachma of justifying faith in his soul. . . Yea, Judas' master, the devil himself, is one far enough (I suppose) from justifying faith, yet he assents to the truth of the Word. . . Assent to the truth is but an act of the understanding, which reprobates and devils may exercise. But justifying faith is a compounded habit, and hath its seat both in the understanding and will: and, therefore, called a "believing with the heart" (Rom 10:10) yea, a "believing with all the heart." (Acts 8:37)

-William Gurnall

It is the office of faith to believe what we do not see, and it shall be the reward of faith to see what we do believe.

-Thomas Adams

Faith is your spiritual optic.

-Elisha Coles

It is the nature of faith to believe God upon His bare word. . . 'it will not be', saith sense; 'it cannot be', saith reason; 'it both can and will be,' saith faith, 'for I have a promise for it.'

-John Trapp.

If faith were assurance, then a man's sins would be pardoned before he believes, for he must necessarily be pardoned before he can know that he is pardoned. The candle must be lighted before I can see it is lighted. The child must be born before I can be assured it is born. The object of faith must be before the act. Assurance is rather the fruit of faith, than faith itself. It is in faith as the flower is in the root; faith in time, after much communion with God, acquaintance with the Word, and experience of His dealing with the soul, may flourish into assurance. But as the root truly lives before the flower appears, and continues when that hath shed its beautiful leaves, and is gone again: so doth true justifying faith live before assurance comes and after it disappears.

-William Gurnall

Faith is not assurance. If it were, Saint John might have speared his pains, who wrote "to them that believe on the name of the Son of god, that they might know that they have eternal life." They might then have said, "We do this already."  
-William Gurnall

How weak soever the believer finds himself, and how powerful soever he perceives his enemy to be, it is all one to him, he hath no more to do but to put faith on work, and to wait till God works.  
-David Dickson

Finally, if I may answer your question, "why the Reformed theologian even sees faith as a necessary step in the ordo salutis. Why justification by faith, and not simply justification by mere irresistible election? Why the faith element altogether?"

Amongst myriad excellent answers, God uses faith as a means of bestowing His determined gifts simply because He is pleased to make foolish things the method of His wisdom.

**Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2008/7/8 23:05**

rbanks,

Thanks for your response. Just a request so this thread doesn't go bonkers and become a debate between Calvinism/Aminianism, but could you please limit your responses on this issue to explanations of Reformed theology? I have my fair share of hangups with Reformed theology (my present reading of RC Sproul's book is filled with counter arguments in the margins).

I'm just trying to grasp/understand their view :-)

**Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2008/7/8 23:14**

Thank you all for your responses helping me clarify my understanding of the Reformed view of faith. I think I like the emphasis of faith as the "means" by which these things come. Of course, I still disagree (though highly appreciate) the Reformed position. But, I am glad to understand it more :-). Any further thoughts would be appreciated.

**Re: - posted by rbanks, on: 2008/7/8 23:30**

Hi Jimmy,

I apologize for not reading your original post more accurately. I guess I was singing to the choir.

My desire is not to start a debate either. I think sometimes many have said good things but other times I think it seems like they get the cart ahead of the horse. It's easy for all of us to do some times.

Thanks for your spirit of kindness.

**Re: 'Faith', on: 2008/7/9 1:27**

Jimmy,

You may be interested in a book by Tom Wells entitled, "Faith: The Gift of God".

In the brief 160 pages of this book he addresses the issue with great clarity and simplicity.

He is an author who holds firmly to the views you say you're trying to grasp/understand.

One reader of this book said, "Mr. Wells writes in a clear, but repetitious style; there is nothing of sophistication here, nevertheless, he goes to the heart of the controversy regarding man's part in religious faith. He writes from the Calvinistic perspective and he wrote for the lay--rather than the scholastic--reader".

Another book he wrote which may be helpful to you as you try to grasp/understand such views is, "A Price For A Pe

ople".

It is but 158 pages and presents those views you're trying to grasp/understand, clearly, simply and adequately. This book addresses the subject of the atonement as you may have guessed from the title.

If I can be of any more help to you please let me know. I have other books for your recommendation re: doctrines m  
any believe to be of biblical foundation.

One could spend a lifetime reading the volumes of books that have been written by many an author. For those who are trying to grasp/understand why certain men believe certain doctrines to be biblical, it may be wise to begin with shorter topical books.

Be sure and let me know if the above were of any help to you.

**Re: - posted by TaylorOtwell (), on: 2008/7/9 7:48**

Jimmy,

I was looking through Calvin's Institutes this morning. There is an entire section on faith. I thought I would let you know since you were looking for clarification on faith in the reformed perspective. You can read the work for free online.

Don't neglect the reading of Calvin himself. Before reading him, I envisioned him as a cold, dead writer. However, he is actually very warm and devotional many times. His commentaries will be beneficial to you even if you do not hold to the five points.

**Re: on Sproul and faith - posted by roadsign (), on: 2008/7/9 10:57**

Quote:  
----- am all the more aware while reading this book, that Reformed theology while it saying saving faith is necessary for salvation, doesn't really seem to mean so.  
-----

KingJimmy, I have not read the book you refer to, but I do have a fair-sized collection of Sproul material. My comments to your observations are rather general, as I can't remember any specific references to faith. (It's been a long time)

Sproul, to me was a welcome relief from the easy believism/ no-thinkism environment that I had dwelt in for too long. However, I did wonder if he wasn't swinging the pendulum too far the other way, (especially his mentor/colleague, Gerstner)

I wonder if part of the concern you raise has to do with what I coin as the "Ivory Tower Syndrome" - where intellectual pursuits get way too lofty and disconnected from grass roots of life - and, yes, the practical aspect of faith too. In this "condition" faith becomes submerged in theological jargon.

In my opinion the language Sproul uses seems so advanced academically, that it is challenging for average readers to assimilate. Surely there is no need for that.

I think in many ways Sproul does remind us that we do not walk in blind faith but in a faith that is based on vibrant reality. Admittedly, for many today, that vibrant reality is the missing element, and thus faith gets relegated to the emotion/feeling/superstition "towers" of Christendom - which is not faith in a risen Messiah, at all! It's just the flip side of the same coin as intellectualism: unbelief.

Maybe THAT is a big part of the problem behind those who claim to embrace reformed theology, and yet in a way that seems to obscure the essence of faith. It certainly was in my reformed background.

I prefer to believe that Sproul has a place - only as long as his insights are kept in balance with other insights coming from the Christian Community.

KingJimmy, do any of my speculations here jive with your observations of Sproul's book?

Diane

**Re: - posted by tjservant (), on: 2008/7/9 11:23**

Some good insights from all.

I have read the book. I felt that he did not neglect the subject as much as he simply spent more time on what he, perhaps, felt were areas that warranted greater concentration and more explanation for this particular book.

He definitely has his own style. Some authors are just more "heady" (does that work?). I have thoroughly enjoyed many of his articles; I cannot say the same for his books. Not that I do not appreciate them...it's just that his "style" simply does not mesh very well with my brain.

**Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2008/7/9 18:54**

In my opinion the language Sproul uses seems so advanced academically, that it is challenging for average readers to assimilate. Surely there is no need for that.

Well, generally speaking, in this book I found the language to be accessible. Most of the theological terms he uses he defines for the reader. I personally didn't find much of it a challenge, as I have been through the academy and know much of the lingo (save for his usage of Latin, which I don't know). I was able to breeze through the 216 pages in about 4 days, reading mostly during my lunch hour at work.

Sproul, to me was a welcome relief from the easy believism/ no-thinkism environment that I had dwelt in for too long. However, I did wonder if he wasn't swinging the pendulum too far the other way, (especially his mentor/colleague, Gerstner)

Easy believism is mostly the result of Dispensational theology, not Reformed. Dispensationalism, in essence though, is watered down Reformed theology. Say thanks to Dallas Theological Seminary for filling our pulpits with preachers espousing those errors.

**Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2008/7/9 19:06**

I felt that he did not neglect the subject as much as he simply spent more time on what he, perhaps, felt were areas that warranted greater concentration and more explanation for this particular book.

No doubt, he didn't neglect the subject. I feel he spent most of the time on the subjects of total depravity and election, which pretty much became the overall theme to tie together the rest of the TULIP acrostic that he expounded on. With those two doctrines well argued, he more or less tried to let the "logical" outworkings of those doctrines attempt to take you through the rest. Personally, I felt his arguments got weaker as he went on, and by the time he got to the perseverance of the saints, he had pretty much run out of steam, and ended the book somewhat weakly (with a really bad interpretation of Hebrews 6).

Overall I found the book pretty good, and Sproul makes some strong points throughout. He seems to be writing in part for somebody who already has a bit of exposure to theology. I was disappointed that throughout the book, I don't think he



He once quoted an Arminian source directly, though he refers to it quite a bit. Indeed, the only actual sources he quotes from are from Reformed sources! Such seems a bit strange, but, being that he's simply trying to teach the essence of Reformed doctrine, I suppose such is understandable.

**Re: - posted by theopenlife, on: 2008/7/9 21:05**

KingJimmy wrote, "Dispensationalism, in essence though, is watered down Reformed theology."

I would love to read an explanation of how you came to that conclusion, seeing as most, if not all of the authors and pastors I've heard discuss the two considered them polar opposites.

But, back to the subject, Jimmy, have you read Pink's "The Sovereignty of God?" Backing that up with Pink's "Profiting from the Word", show something of the essence of my Reformed beliefs.

**Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2008/7/9 21:10**

KingJimmy wrote, "Dispensationalism, in essence though, is watered down Reformed theology."

I would love to read an explanation of how you came to that conclusion, seeing as most, if not all of the authors and pastors I've heard discuss the two considered them polar opposites.

Well, Darby/Scofield/etc, the fathers of the dispensationalism system of theology were (at least in their mind) deeply Calvinistic in their theological mindset. Granted, they are probably better thought of as "4-point" Calvinists, but, they historically align themselves with Reformed thought. I believe it was Darby that stormed out of D.L. Moody's church spouting that at Moody hadn't even begun to understand "the doctrines of grace."

But basically, the way I understand dispensationalism, it is an eschatological system that allows for "eternal security" without persevering faith. They believe the saint will be preserved in regard to judgment, but they do not believe he will necessarily be a good Christian. He can be a "carnal" Christian and still make it to heaven. Reformed theology knows nothing of this easy-belivism.

**Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2008/7/9 21:12**

But, back to the subject, Jimmy, have you read Pink's "The Sovereignty of God?" Backing that up with Pink's "Profiting from the Word", show something of the essence of my Reformed beliefs.

No I have not. But I will consider checking them out. I have read a little bit of Pink for a study I did on the sermon on the Lord's prayer for school. Personally, I did not care for his little book all that much.

**Re: Disp. Ref. Darby/Scofield etc., on: 2008/7/10 1:22**

The overwhelming majority of the Ref. camp would cringe at the thought of any association w/Dispensationalism.

They believe it to be no less than an emasculation of the Scriptures.

As far as Darby/Scofield being Calvinistic in their mind or otherwise, this could not be any farther from the truth.

Could you have gotten R.L. Dabney mixed up with J.N. Darby? Those two names often got mixed up in my mind when I was first introduced to the numerous names of men who held to conflicting theologies.

As far as D.L. Moody...one may have a good case for aligning him among the reformed.

Does any of this make a difference? Certainly it does! But I do believe we must treat the diseases as they ought to be treated, rather than merely diagnosing symptoms and individuals who carry them.

In saying that I am not denying that flaws in men's character are to be trivialized, as most always such flaws tend to taint or even destroy our right judgement, and may even contribute to an unsound or damnable heresy.



Case in point:

One biographers "detailed investigation of Scofield's past...and actual public records regarding many aspects of Scofield's life and ministry both before and after his alleged conversion...and association with D.L. Moody range from the trivial to the reprehensible".

I do not intend to make this a Scofield bashing post. He just happens to be one who has a public record far from being above reproach. The following facts this biographer writes of are not hidden but were and are public. Just a few things which disqualify this man in my mind are:

"The criminal charges of fraud and embezzlement brought against him between 1877-1879, some following his alleged conversion resulting in at least one jail sentence.

His persistent refusal, even as a Christian minister, to make restitution to those he had defrauded.

The embarrassment of having divorce proceedings initiated against him by his wife Leontine in 1881 while he was pastor of Hyde Park Congregational Church, St. Louis. Her divorce papers charged Scofield with, '...gross neglect of duty...' having, 'failed to support this plaintiff or her said children, or to contribute thereto, and has made no provision for them for food, clothing or a home...' The court decided in favour of Leontine after some delay in 1883 and issued a decree of divorce in December of that year, describing Scofield as, '...not a fit person to have custody of the children.'

His nomination as pastor to the First Congregational Church of Dallas in 1882, by James H. Brookes was apparently without reference to or acknowledgement of any Christian obligation to provide for his family.

Discrepancies exist in the conflicting length of his courtship and the date of his second marriage to Hettie Van Wark in March 1884, only three months after her arrival in Dallas and his divorce becoming final.

Scofield deserted his first wife, Leonteen Carry Scofield, and his two daughters Abigail and Helen, and he took as his mistress a young girl from the St. Louis Flower Mission. He later abandoned her for Helen van Ward, whom he eventually married.

#### Scofield divorce decree

Journal M, November Term, A.D. 1883, 8th day of December, 1883

Leontine Scofield Plaintiff Vs C. I. Scofield Defendant

Now comes the plaintiff by her attorneys Tomlinson and Griffin and the defendant enters for appearance and files answer and makes no further appearance. And thereupon this cause came on for hearing upon the pleadings and testimony and was argued by counsel upon consideration whereof the Court does find that the defendant has been guilty of wilful abandonment of the plaintiff for more than one year prior to the commencement of this action.

It is therefore adjudged and decreed by the Court here that the marriage relation heretofore existing between the said parties be and the same is hereby set aside and wholly annulled and the parties wholly released from the obligations of the same.

It is further ordered and decreed that the custody, nurture, education and care of the said minor children Abigail Scofield and Helen Scofield, be and the same, is hereby given to the said plaintiff and the said defendant is hereby forever enjoined from interfering with or disturbing the said plaintiff in the custody, care, nurture and education of the said above named children until the further order of this Court."

Scofield's behavior both before and after his alleged conversion are nevertheless consistent with, and illustrative of, the antinomianism inherent in Darby's rigid dispensationalism which Scofield popularized.

As noted above, this is not a Scofield bashing post. I merely wanted to stress my point that Christians are exhorted to guard their life and their doctrine.

All this and more may be obtained in the public domain.

For those who are no fan of Finney the man or his theology, please only let the truth be known without malice. And for those many who highly esteem this man and his theology, please reconsider.

**Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2008/7/10 6:01**

\\\\\\My roots come from Kolding Denmark. I must study where Demark fits in the Plan of God and where Denmark is coming from in their entrance and delivered Good to my brethren in Christ deliver \\\\\\\

Sorry getting sleepy, I'll collect more thoughts tomorrow.

In Christ: Phillip

**Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2008/7/10 8:01**

The overwhelming majority of the Ref. camp would cringe at the thought of any association w/Dispensationalism.

No doubt. I cringe at the thought of it as well. However, the (sad) truth of the matter is that Dispensationalism has its roots in Reformed theology. Granted, it is a highly watered down version, especially as evident in its antinomian stances.

I wasn't aware that Scofield was such a monster. How sad. I can't say such shocks me though.