



TRUTH ON TOUGH TEXTS

EXPOSITIONS OF CHALLENGING SCRIPTURE PASSAGES

WWW.THESCRPTUREALONE.COM

FROM SOLA SCRIPTURA PUBLICATIONS

ISSUE 123 (Mar./Apr. 2020)

THE TRAGIC LEGACY OF CHARLES FINNEY

SELECTED TEXTS

WHAT CAN BE CALLED “THE SECOND GREAT Awakening” occurred between 1787 and 1810, but we there see some undeniably troubling developments that have carried over to this very day. A major component of this era was the “camp meeting,” which developed in the western frontier regions (centering in Kentucky and Tennessee). Because settlers were scattered over a large area, semi-annual, or even yearly, meetings were conducted in a centralized location. People would come from miles around, camp right on the spot (hence the name), and the meeting would go on for days with several preachers. The key developer of this new method was James McGready (c. 1758–1817), an “extremely uncouth” fellow¹ but one who could move his audience with drama.

The most famous camp meeting was in Cane Ridge, Kentucky (August 1801), where thousands gathered to hear Presbyterian, Methodist, and Baptist preachers. But what gives the discerning mind great pause, is the emotionalism and fanaticism that took over. Physical manifestations included jerking, dancing, laughing, running and the “barking exercise.” The latter is explained by Kentucky revivalist Barton W. Stone (1772–1844) in his autobiography (1804), which is considered the most famous account of “the jerks”:

The barking exercise, (as opposers contemptuously called it) was nothing but the jerks. A person affected with the jerks, especially in his head, would often make a grunt, or bark, if you please, from the suddenness of the jerk. This name of barking seems to have had its origin from an old Presbyterian preacher of East Tennessee. He had gone into the woods for private devotion, and was seized with the jerks. Standing near a sapling, he caught hold of it, to prevent his falling, and as his head jerked back, he uttered a grunt or kind of noise similar to a bark, his face being turned upwards. Some wag discovered him in this position, and reported that he found him barking up a tree.²

But let’s stop and discern. Note especially the words “had its origin from an old Presbyterian preacher of East Tennessee.” Indeed, this originated with a man, not God. Stone goes on to give similar descriptions of the “laughing exercise” and “the running exercise,” admitting that all this was “fanaticism” but

still shining a positive light on it. He records that “many, very many fell down, as men slain in battle, and continued for hours together in an apparently breathless and motionless state—sometimes for a few moments reviving, and exhibiting symptoms of life by a deep groan, or piercing shriek, or by a prayer for mercy most fervently uttered.”³ What is troubling about all this is that while we do not doubt for a moment that there were many true conversions during such meetings, Scripture *nowhere* implies that such things are a manifestation of the Holy Spirit and nowhere teaches fanaticism. While Scriptural support is offered for the so-called being “slain in the spirit,”⁴ it is based on complete misinterpretation.

Camp meetings continued and remain to this day in rural areas, especially among some Baptists and Methodists, and there is certainly nothing unbiblical about them, just as Whitefield preached in the open air. Through these many were added to churches both then and now. The abuses, however, are unbiblical. There were some in that day who criticized all this as emotionalism and a slipping of sound doctrine, but they were mostly ignored as are those today who sound an alarm. As has always been the case, however, personal experience and subjectivism usually trump Truth and objectivism. Thankfully, the abuses are rare today but sadly do still exist among Pentecostal and Charismatic groups. The abuses of the camp meeting, in fact, were the final development that set the stage for something far worse to come in “revivalism.”

That brings us to the key figure of the Second Awakening. It is doubtful that there is any living Christian who has not at least heard the name of so-called “revivalist” **Charles Finney** (1792–1875). He has become virtually the “patron saint” of modern evangelism and founder of Christian Pragmatism (i.e., whatever method gets the desired results is valid and even necessary). His errors, however, are almost unimaginable, which makes it all the more shocking how often historians paint Finney in wonderfully vivid colors and heap praise upon him. The real fact of the matter is that Charles Finney was a gross heretic and few individuals have had as much negative impact on Christianity and evangelism than he did. Yes, that is a strong statement, but it is totally warranted. While lauded as an *outstanding* figure in the Awakening, he was in reality *outside* the biblical message and method. He was *not* an evangelical, no matter how loosely one might define the term. As we

will see, in fact, *he was a major turning point in Church History.*

The Character of the Man

This is evident right from the very beginning, as his “conversion” (which was based on personal experience, not Scripture) laid the foundation for his entire belief system. Originally an attorney, he decided to become a Christian in 1821, so he went into the woods and prayed for salvation. He later wrote in his *Memoirs* that he had a vision of Jesus standing in front of him and that later

the Holy Spirit descended upon me in a manner that seemed to go through me, body and soul. I could feel the impression, like a wave of electricity, going through and through me. Indeed it seemed to come in waves and waves of liquid love; for I could not express it in any other way. It seemed like the very breath of God. I can recollect distinctly that it seemed to fan me, like immense wings.⁵

It is, indeed, pivotally significant that the word “experience” (along with “experiences” and “experienced”) appears 99 times in Finney’s *Memoirs*, while the exposition of *any* Scripture is non-existent. In the final analysis, Finney was just one more example in a long line of mystics, and emotionalism and anecdotes would become staples in his preaching.

Compounding his status as “a novice” (1 Tim. 3:6), there is also the matter of how Finney received his license to preach in the Presbyterian Church. Please get his. While he professed to adhere to the *Westminster Confession of Faith*, he later admitted that he could not remember ever even reading it. As he recounts in his own words, he was surprised when asked about it by the council, whose duty it was to determine his spiritual and doctrinal qualifications:

Unexpectedly to myself they asked me if I received the confession of faith of the Presbyterian church. I had not examined it—that is, the large work containing the catechism and confession. This had made no part of my study. I replied that I received it for substance of doctrine, so far as I understood it. But I spoke in a way that plainly implied, I think, that I did not pretend to know much about it. However, I answered honestly, as I understood it at the time. . . . But not expecting to be asked any such question, I had never examined it with any attention, and I think I had never read it through.⁶

Could anyone conclude that Finney was “blameless” (above reproach) in his character (1 Tim. 3:2)? Is there not reasonable doubt that he misled the council? Tragically, thinking he *was* above reproach and telling the truth, the council licensed him to preach. But there’s more. When he finally *did* read the *Confession*, he arrogantly wrote of his dissent:

As soon as I learned what were the unambiguous teachings of the confession of faith upon these points, I did not hesitate on all suitable occasions to declare my dissent from them. I repudiated and exposed them. Wherever I found that any class of persons were hidden behind these dogmas, I did not hesitate to demolish them, to the best of my ability.⁷

Again, does that not demonstrate that there is at least some

reason to believe that he misled the council? What is a lie? It is a statement made with the intent to deceive, and that certainly seems to be what he did.

So, with no theological training whatsoever—he was, in fact, totally unteachable and refused to attend any school where he could receive training—and with zero qualification for ministry, Finney took it upon himself to start conducting “revivals” in upstate New York soon after his “conversion.” One of his most popular sermons was “Sinners Bound to Change Their Own Hearts.” In other words, while Scripture says that regeneration (being born again) is the work of the Holy Spirit (Ezek. 36:26–27; Jn. 1:13; 3:5–8; 6:63; 2 Cor. 3:6; Titus 3:5), Finney declared that it is an act of the human will.

To illustrate Finney’s twisting of Scripture by violently ripping it from its context, his text for the above sermon was Ezekiel 18:31: “make you a new heart and a new spirit”:

We now have all the powers of moral agency; we are just as God made us, and do not need any alteration in the substance of soul or body. We are not required to add to the constitution of our minds or bodies any new principle or taste. Some persons speak of a change of heart as something miraculous—something in which the sinner is to be entirely passive, and for which he is to wait in the use of means, as he would wait for a surgical operation, or an electric shock. We need nothing added to the constitution of our body or mind; nor is it true in experience, that those who have a new heart, have any constitutional alteration of their powers whatever. They are the same identical persons, so far as both body and mind are concerned, that they were before. . . . If the sinner ever has a new heart, he must obey the command of the text, and make it himself.⁸

But Finney completely ignored the context. Ezekiel in no way implied that this was by human effort, much less inbred ability. On the contrary, as he made clear both *before* and *after* this verse, God declared:

I will give them one heart, and I will put a new spirit within you; and I will take the stony heart out of their flesh, and will give them an heart of flesh” (11:19).

A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you: and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you an heart of flesh. And I will put my spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes, and ye shall keep my judgments, and do them (36:26–27, emphasis added; cf. Deut. 30:6; Ps. 51:10; Jer. 32:39; 2 Cor. 5:17; Eph. 2:10).

We cannot change our heart; only God can. Further underscoring his contempt for the *Westminster Confession* and anyone who accepted it, he considered such men dupes and dimwits who could teach him nothing. Of his own pastor, the godly and doctrinally sound George W. Gale (1789–1861), he wrote:

I could not receive his views on the subject of atonement, regeneration, faith, repentance, the slavery of the Will, or any of their kindred doctrines. . . . The fact is that Mr. Gale’s education for the ministry had been entirely defective. He had imbibed a set of opinions, both theological and practical, that were a straitjacket to him. He

could accomplish very little or nothing if he carried out his own principles. I had the use of his library, and searched it thoroughly on all the questions of theology, which came up for examination; and the more I examined the books, the more was I dissatisfied.⁹

Think of it! In a library filled with books expounding biblical Truth, Finney found it worthless because he knew better! That is the precise language one reads from cult leaders who claim more knowledge than everyone else. In fact, Finney reflected three of the five basic characteristics of a cult. In summary, a cult: (1) rejects the trinity and denies the Deity of Christ; (2) insists that all Christian churches are wrong but their group; (3) claims to believe the Bible but distorts major doctrines to suit their own views and produce new interpretations; (4) denies that people are saved by faith in Christ alone; (5) is skilled at using Christian terminology but meaning entirely different things.¹⁰ It's also interesting that the same region that produced Finney also produced two of the most infamous cult leaders: William Miller and Joseph Smith. And please consider further: to reject "atonement, regeneration, faith, repentance, slavery of the will, or any of their kindred doctrines" is to reject not secondary issues but *essential and core doctrines of the Christian Faith*. This demands the question: was Charles Finney even a true, born-again Christian? How can anyone who rejects *sola scriptura* (Scripture alone), *sola gratia* (grace alone), *sola fide* (faith alone), and other core doctrines be a true *believer* since he *believes* virtually nothing biblical?

The Core of His Message

Finney, therefore, invented his own appalling theology (again, just like cult leaders). First, to call him "Arminian" is insulting to Arminians because he was no less than a full-blown Pelagian. He also rejected the Doctrines of Grace in their entirety, along with even the faintest appearance of biblical orthodoxy. Further, he denied original sin, the substitutionary atonement, justification as stated in Scripture, the need for regeneration by the Holy Spirit, the security of the believer, and the list goes on. He also was among the most passionate proponents of Christian perfectionism.

That leads us more specifically to the core of Finney's theological error, his repudiation of the biblical doctrine of justification by faith alone (*sola fide*). In other words, he rejected the biblical declarations that the righteousness of Christ is the sole ground of our justification, teaching instead that sinners must reform their own hearts in order to be acceptable to God. At the core of this doctrine is *imputation*, that is, Christ's righteousness being "imputed" (charged) to the believer.

Briefly, Romans 4 has accurately been called "the imputation chapter" because of how often the term is used and how clearly the concept is illustrated. The Greek behind "counted" (vv. 3, 5), "reckoned" (vv. 4, 9, 10), and various forms of "impute" (vv. 6, 8, 11, 22, 23) is *logizomai*, which appears 40 times in the New Testament. Its meaning is clear and straightforward: "to put together with one's mind, to count, to occupy oneself with reckonings or calculations." Therefore, "to count something to somebody means to reckon something to a person, to put to his account."¹¹ Simply stated, then, *imputation* means that Christ's own righteousness is "imputed" (charged) to us so that we are declared righteous before God. Why do we

need Christ's righteousness? Because we have none! "All our righteousnesses are as filthy rags" (Is. 64:6). Philippians 3:9 could not be clearer: "And be found in him, not having mine own righteousness, which is of the law, but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith." The same is true of 2 Corinthians 5:21: "For he hath made him [Christ] to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him."

But what did Finney say about all this? He regarded the doctrine of "imputation as a theological fiction."¹² He flatly rejected the whole idea arguing that logically (and justly) nothing of one person can be imputed to another, which is exactly what the Socinians believed in the sixteenth century and what some believe today (e.g., N. T. Wright). The inescapable conclusion of that "logic" is the rejection also of the doctrine of Christ's substitutionary atonement, which Finney did. He approached the subject as a lawyer: "I had read nothing on the subject except my Bible; and what I had there found upon the subject, I had interpreted as I would have understood the same or like passages in a law book."¹³ He, therefore, argued that it would be legally unjust to impute Adam's sin to the whole race, impute the sinner's guilt to Christ, or to impute Christ's righteousness to the sinner. As for the doctrine of original sin, he called this "anti-scriptural and nonsensical dogma,"¹⁴ thereby ignoring Paul's words, "As in Adam all die" (1 Cor. 15:22; cf. Gen. 2:17; Rom. 5:12, 14; Eph. 2:1-3; etc.). My Dear Reader, evangelicals need to recognize that Charles Finney did nothing less than gut the entire biblical Gospel!

Further still, while Scripture clearly indicates that revival comes down from heaven by the sovereign bestowing of the Spirit of God, and in that sense "prayed down" (according to God's will) in Finney's thoroughly man-centered "theology" he taught that it could be "worked up."¹⁵ "A revival is not a miracle, nor dependent on a miracle in any sense," he wrote. "It is a purely philosophical result of the right use of the constituted means, as much so as any other effect produced by the application of means."¹⁶

One of his many "New Measures" was the invention of the "anxious bench"—the front bench was reserved for those who were "anxious" about their souls and could come there to be exhorted (and pressured). This actually became the staple of modern evangelism that we call the "altar call" or "going forward," in which people are pressured to "make a decision for Jesus," "a commitment to Christ," and other clichés that have been adopted as though they were based on Scripture. "Finneyism" is, in fact, one of the major contributors to today's predominantly Arminian theology.

In view of his gross errors, it is virtually incomprehensible that Finney became (of all things!) professor of *Theology* at Oberlin College (Ohio) in 1835 until his death and was even president from 1851 to 1866. His ignorance once again of solid, unambiguous biblical truth was demonstrated by his ordaining the first woman in the United States to the ministry in 1853, Antoinette (Brown) Blackwell (1825-1921), who ultimately became a Unitarian.

Did anyone sound an alarm? Yes! Recognizing the man-centered moralism that permeates Finney's thought, theological giant B. B. Warfield (1851-1921), for example, wrote: "It is quite clear that what Finney gives us is less a theology than of morals. God might be eliminated from it entirely without es-

entially changing its character.”¹⁷ Before that, another theological titan, Charles Hodge (1797–1878), stated that Finney preached “another gospel.” Far more significant, however, was the little known theologian (Hodge’s favorite student at Princeton, in fact) John Williamson Nevin (1803–86). His book, *The Anxious Bench* (1843), remains the most probing critique not only of the “anxious bench” itself but also Finneyism in general ever written. Tragically, however, most of the evangelical world chose to listen to Finney instead of Nevin (and Scripture!), and it is still listening to this day.

Still another raised voice was that of Asahel Nettleton (1783–1844), an almost completely forgotten revival preacher of that day and strong critic of Finney. It is profoundly sad that most historians do not even mention Nettleton and those who do dedicate a mere sentence or two in the midst of their praise of Finney. In sharp contrast to Finney’s emotionalism, drama, and heretical theology, Nettleton reflected solemn dignity and adherence to the Doctrines of Grace. Also in contrast to Finney, he allowed God to work in people’s hearts. After preaching on sin and their need for Christ, he dismissed them. There was no “anxious bench” or “altar call.” Knowing that God’s Word “shall not return unto [God] void, but it shall accomplish that which I please, and it shall prosper in the thing whereto I sent it,” (Is. 55:11), Nettleton simply allowed it to do so, and as the next days unfolded many came to Christ. It is estimated that some 30,000 people did so during his 30 year ministry. Far more significant, however, is the high percentage of those converts who remained faithful, another contrast to Finney, as we will see in a moment. For example, as his biographer recounts, of the 84 converts in an 1818 revival at Rocky Hill, Connecticut, their pastor reported 26 years later that all 84 had remained faithful.¹⁸

In the latter years of his life, Nettleton became a strong defender of *biblical* revival. While he did not want confrontation, the abuses he saw compelled him to act:

I have been anxiously looking and waiting, all summer long [1826], for such men . . . [who are] most intimately acquainted with brother Finney to take hold, with a kind severity, and restore order; but in vain. . . Irregularities are prevailing so fast, and assuming such a character, in our churches, as infinitely to overbalance the good that is left. These evils, sooner or later, must be corrected. Somebody must speak, or silence will prove our ruin. Fire is an excellent thing in its place, and I am not afraid to see it blaze among briars and thorns ; but when I see it kindling where it will ruin fences, and gardens, and houses, and burn up my friends, I cannot be silent.¹⁹

What was dubbed the New Lebanon Conference met on July 18, 1826, in New Lebanon, New York, but Finney had already poisoned it by publishing his sermon on Amos 3:3: “How Can Two Walk Together Except They Be Agreed?” In it he self-righteously stated that anyone who disagreed with his “New Measures” did so because of “their frosty hearts.” Nettleton responded with a letter published in the *New York Observer* that addressed the issue of true and false zeal and listed Jonathan Edwards’ observations about the marks of spiritual pride. Needless to say, the Conference, therefore, accomplished nothing. Instead of listening to godly counsel, which he never did, Finney felt completely vindicated as churches in

the big cities on the East coast invited him into their pulpits.

As is always the case, those who stand for the Truth will be opposed, and Nettleton not only was by Finney, of course, but also Nathaniel W. Taylor (1786–1858), who likewise rejected the doctrines of man’s total depravity, the imputation of original sin, and the inability of man. There was also the more famous Lyman Beecher (1775–1863), who at first stood with Nettleton at the Conference but later separated from him because of his debate with Taylor and in the end actually sided with Taylor and Finney.

What does Asahel Nettleton teach us? He teaches us much if we will just stop and listen! What should strike us most is that he saw God’s results, not man’s. Thousands came to Christ without emotionalism, theatrics, or an “altar call,” all of which have become staples of modern evangelism. Indeed, Finneyism lives on! Just like Finney, “whatever works” is considered valid and even necessary. He started the “New Measures” and pragmatists today continue to add even newer ones. Where are the men who will, like Nettleton, refuse to accept any “New Measure” simply because it seems to work?

The Consequences of His Method

Finally, contemporary theologian Michael Horton well summarizes Charles Finney for us:

Thus, in Finney’s theology, God is not sovereign; man is not a sinner by nature; the atonement is not a true payment for sin; justification by imputation is insulting to reason and morality; the new birth is simply the effect of successful techniques, and revival is a natural result of clever campaigns. . . . Needless to say, Finney’s message is radically different from the evangelical faith, as is the basic orientation of the movements we see around us today that bear his imprint: revivalism (or its modern label, “the church growth movement”), Pentecostal perfectionism and emotionalism, political triumphalism based on the ideal of “Christian America,” and the anti-intellectual, anti-doctrinal tendencies of American evangelicalism and fundamentalism. . . . Finney, of course, is not solely responsible; he is more a product than a producer. Nevertheless, the influence he exercised and continues to exercise to this day is pervasive.²⁰

Still another tragic consequence of Finney’s folly was the “Burned-over District” he left behind in the western and central regions of New York, another detail most Church historians omit in their undiscerning praise. The term was actually first coined by Finney himself. Speaking of a region that resisted revival, he wrote:

I found that region of country what, in the western phrase, would be called, “a burnt district.” There had been, a few years previously, a wild excitement passing through that region, which they called a revival of religion, but which turned out to be spurious.

Referring to the Camp Meetings noted earlier, these had left a “bad taste in people’s mouths.” But instead of recognizing that the problem was in his *method*, Finney blamed the *people*. Yes, people were certainly unbelieving, but the emotion and extremism of the “revivalists” made matters worse. Once the “revival fires” burned out, people lapsed into coldness.

Finney, then, made matters still worse. He virtually ruined that region for future evangelism. Pastors there to this very day say how difficult it is to evangelize because of Finney's legacy and the bad impression he left behind during his years there. Now, does this mean those areas are beyond God's sovereign grace? Are those people "deader" in sin than others? Is it harder for God to save those? Of course not. Rather the issue is one of *perception*. As a colleague of mine who has ministered there puts us: "The perception is that Finney made it more difficult to conduct any kind of valid evangelistic effort because the people have a suspicion of anyone conducting gospel ministry."²¹ We have to agree that such suspicion is well founded. In the end, even Finney himself recognized failure, but whose failure? He wrote:

I was often instrumental in bringing Christians under great conviction, and into a state of temporary repentance and faith. But falling short of urging them up to a point, where they would become so acquainted with Christ as to abide in him, they would of course soon relapse again into their former state. I seldom saw, and can now understand that I had no reason to expect to see, under the instructions which I then gave, such a state of religious principle, such steady and confirmed walking with God among Christians.²²

Again, it was all about Finney instead of God, all about the failure of others, not about his message or methods. A contemporary of Finney, put the matter bluntly and more accurately:

During ten years, hundreds, and perhaps thousands, were annually reported to be converted on all hands; but now it is admitted, that his real converts are comparatively few. It is declared, even by himself, that "the great body of them are a disgrace to religion:" as a consequence of these defections, practical evils, great, terrible, and innumerable, are in various quarters rushing in on the Church.²³

Again, Charles Finney was a major turning point in Church History. It is shocking beyond words that many Church historians are so undiscerning that they say of Finney: "one of the truly great American revivalists"; "the greatest revivalist of the time"; "a preacher [who] had rare gifts"; "God's lawyer"; and "some of his practices can be respected." But there is simply no way to honestly deny that *he was the primary indicator of the shift away from biblical orthodoxy in the modern era of Church History*. While it is a strong statement to utter, it must be repeated that Charles Finney was a heretic. I do not mean to be inflammatory, but it is equally distressing (and demonstrable fact) that some of his errors would be repeated over and over again by other "evangelists" that followed (e.g., D. L. Moody, Billy Sunday, Billy Graham, and countless lesser known ones). Worse, his errors so deeply burrowed into Christianity that they are still with us today and are considered "orthodox" and adopted by other movements (e.g., Vineyard Movement, Church Growth Movement, Promise Keepers

Movement, political and social crusades, and televangelism).

One final example as proof: countless churches today have an "altar call" and loudly condemn any church that does not have one as being "liberal." Finney, by the way, said much the same thing: anyone who questioned his "New Measures" was denounced as being "enemies of the revival."²⁴ But the undisputable fact is that *this "New Measure" did not exist until Finney invented it*. It does not exist in Scripture, and it did not exist in prior history. But oh, how it exists today! How distressing and disastrous it is that the Church has not only become that undiscerning but also compounds the error by defending it even when it is exposed for what it is.

Dr. J. D. Watson – Pastor-Teacher, Grace Bible Church
Director, Sola Scriptura Publications, a ministry of GBC

NOTES

- ¹ B. K. Kuiper, *The Church In History* (Eerdmans, 1952, 1964), 357.
- ² Barton W. Stone, *The Biography of Eld. Barton Wabben Stone: Written By Himself, With Additions And Reflections by Elder John Rogers* (Published For The Author by J. A. & U. P. James, 1847), 40-42.
- ³ *Ibid*, 34
- ⁴ Matt. 17:5-7; 28:4; Mk. 14:35; Jn. 18:5-6; Acts 9:3-4; 10:10; 16:29; Rev. 1:17.
- ⁵ Charles Finney, *Memoirs of Charles Finney: Written by Himself* (A. S. Barnes and Company, 1876), 20.
- ⁶ *Memoirs*, 51, 239.
- ⁷ *Memoirs*, 59.
- ⁸ From Finney's *Sermons On Important Subjects*.
- ⁹ *Memoirs*, 46, 52-53.
- ¹⁰ Fritz Ridenour, *So What's the Difference?* (Regal, 1967, 2001), 111f.
- ¹¹ Spiros Zodhiatus, *The Complete Word Study Dictionary: NT* (Chattanooga: AMG Publishers, 1992), entry #G3049.
- ¹² *Memoirs*, 56-58.
- ¹³ *Memoirs*, 42.
- ¹⁴ Charles Finney, *Systematic Theology* (Bethany House, 1976), 464.
- ¹⁵ S. M. Houghton, *Sketches from Church History* (Banner of Truth Trust, 1980), 219.
- ¹⁶ Charles Finney, *Lectures on Revivals of Religion* (Leavitt, Lord, and Company, 1835), 12.
- ¹⁷ B. B. Warfield, *Perfectionism* (Oxford, 1931) Vol. 2, 193.
- ¹⁸ Bennet Tyler, *Memoir of the Life and Character of Rev. Asahel Nettleton* (Doctrinal Tract and Book Society, 1852), 87.
- ¹⁹ Tyler, 245.
- ²⁰ Michael Horton, "The Legacy of Charles Finney" in *Modern Reformation* (Vol. 4; Issue 1; 1/1/1995).
- ²¹ Dr. James E. Bearss, President of On Target Ministry: Teaching Faithful Men Through International Education.
- ²² Finney, *Systematic Theology*, 619.
- ²³ Joseph I. Foot, "Influence of Pelagianism on the Theological Course of Rev. C. G. Finney, Developed in His Sermons and Lectures" in *The Literary and Theological Review*, Vol. V, Conducted by Charles D. Pigeon (New York: Published for the Proprietor, 1838), 39.
- ²⁴ *Memoirs*, 204. Nettleton's biographer also reports: "The friends of brother Finney are afraid to interfere to correct anything, lest they should do mischief, or be denounced as enemies of revivals" (243).

JUST RELEASED: *The Christian's Wealth and Walk: An Expository Commentary on Ephesians*. If you purchase both volumes directly from SSP, the set is only \$32.00 (a shipping donation is optional). Just write to us at: Sola Scriptura Publications; P.O. Box 235; Meeker, CO; 81641.

***** ANNOUNCING *****

The Christian's Wealth and Walk: An Expository Commentary on Ephesians

Based on his 3-1/3 year exposition of Ephesians, Pastor Watson's two-volume exposition of Ephesians has been released. Its aim is to offer to the True Evangelical Church a comprehensive and readable exposition and application of the grandest, most awe-inspiring piece of writing known to man. As with the other books from Sola Scriptura Publications, both volumes are available directly from the publisher and on Amazon.com. Each volume on Amazon is priced at \$20.00, *but if you purchase both volumes directly from SSP, the set is only \$32.00* (a shipping donation is entirely optional). Just write to us at: **Sola Scriptura Publications; P.O. Box 235; Meeker, CO; 81641**. A free copy of the booklet *We Preach Christ: The Bible Story* is always included. (If you prefer the Kindle version, each volume is only \$9.99 on Amazon.)

SOLA SCRIPTURA PUBLICATIONS

Order Form

P.O. Box 235
Meeker, CO 81641
970-878-3228
970-404-1238
dwatson@thescripturealone.com

Name: _____

Address: _____

City: _____ **State:** _____ **Zip:** _____

Email (optional) _____

Qty.	Title	Price	Total
1	We Preach Christ: The Bible Story	FREE	FREE
Sub-Total			
<i>Entirely Optional Shipping Donation</i>			
TOTAL			\$

PLEASE LISTEN: *SEEK HIM EARLY* PODCAST ON OUR WEBSITE

BLOGS

NEW: *Sola Scriptura Publications*: Info and ordering [Sola Scriptura Publications](#)

Tas Membranas: A Blog for Sound, Solid, and Scriptural Books [Tas-Membranas.blogspot.com](#)

Expositing Ephesians: The Christian's Wealth and Walk [ExpositingEphesians.blogspot.com](#)

TRUTH ON TOUGH TEXTS

A Ministry of
Grace Bible Church
P.O. Box 235
Meeker, CO 81641
www.TheScriptureAlone.com
dwatson@thescripturealone.com
A F.I.R.E. Church
www.FireFellowship.org

This monthly publication is intended to address Scriptures that have historically been debated, are particularly difficult to understand, or have generated questions among Believers. We hope it will be an encouragement and challenge to God's people to carefully examine and discern Truth. While the positions presented here are based on years of careful biblical research, we recognize that other respected men of God differ.

If you have a question that perplexes you, please send it along so we might address it either in a full length article or in a "Reader Questions" issue. Other comments are also warmly welcomed, and letters to the editor will be published.

This publication is sent free of charge to anyone who requests it. To aid in the ministry, donations will be greatly appreciated, but never demanded. If you know someone you think would enjoy TOTT, please send along their address.