

Ephesians in Greek Syllabus

Read pgs. i-xxii (yes, that includes the table of contents, which will be helpful) of Mounce's *Morphology of Biblical Greek*. Also skim sections 30-96 (pgs. 63-162), as you will need to reference these sections if you forget how to parse a particular verb. The table of contents will help you look in the right place. (By "skim," I mean looking through pgs. 63-162 in a manner that you get a handle on the contents of these sections. It should not take you more than 15 minutes to do so; you do NOT have to read all 100 pages here carefully.) Look up the five words below, which are found in John 1:1-11, using the index of Mounce as explained in the "how to use MBG" section on pgs. xvii-xxi. Write out below the five words what page in Mounce you found their parsing on, and what the correct parsing for the forms was. Note that the index gives the lexical forms, so you need to be able to at least make a good enough guess at what the lexical form of the word is to find it in the index; once you do, you can then use MBG to find out if you are correct. The point of this exercise is to learn how to use MBG so that you can use it the rest of the year in Greek, as you are allowed to use it for all passages.

John 1:1: ὁρχῆ

John 1:3: χωρὶς

John 1:5: κατέλαβεν

John 1:7: μαρτυρήσῃ

John 1:11: ἦλθε

Ephesians

Saved to the Praise of His Glory

Notes by Pastor David Sutton, rev. & exp. Thomas Ross

Introductory Material:

- I. The Circumstances
 - A. The Author—the Apostle Paul
 - 1. Ephesians 1:1 says "Paul." So Paul wrote it.
 - 2. The objections made by theological liberalism to Pauline authorship are ridiculous, illogical, and unreasonable. The reason they deny Pauline authorship is because they are deceived by the devil. Then these liberals get PhD's from ivy league schools and write books saying that the epistle to the Ephesians, and others like it, are spurious, and people believe them because they have PhD's,

- although the reasons they give are still nonsense. The specific objections are really not worth going into at any length. It is interesting to note that when Charles Hodge wrote his commentary on Ephesians in 1856 most of liberal German higher criticism received the letter to the Ephesians as legitimate, but now the “fad” is to deny it is legitimate. Higher criticism goes in fads, since it is without any basis in reality. Hoehner has a very extensive defense of Pauline authorship, and there is no reason to reproduce it here.
- B. The Place—a Roman prison
1. Paul wrote this epistle from a prison cell in Rome¹ following his third missionary journey.
 2. He identifies his restrained condition internally (Eph. 3:1; 4:1; 6:20) and in the three other prison epistles: Colossians (4:10,18), Philippians (1:13), and Philemon (vs. 10,23).
 3. Ephesians, with the other prison epistles, was sent by Tychichus (and Onesimus was also with him).
- C. The Audience—the Believers in Ephesus
1. In 1:1 Paul says that he is writing to the believers in Ephesus.
 2. Since the concoction of modern textual criticism, there has been much controversy about this epistle’s recipient; *at Ephesus* (ἐν Ἐφέσῳ).
 - a. This phrase is found in the *TR*, practically all Greek MSS (over 99%), and was used through the centuries by true churches, so it is legitimate.
 - b. Our basis for believing its authenticity is faith in perfect preservation (Mt. 4:4; 24:35).
 - c. No doubt the letter was intended to be copied and distributed to all churches, but the original audience was Ephesus.

¹ Charles Hodge effectively proves that the prison epistles were written from Rome: “Ephesians, to the Colossians, to Philemon, and to the Philippians, all belong to the same period. As to the first three, it is expressly stated that they were sent together by Tychicus and Onesimus. Compare Ephesians 6:21. Colossians 4:7-9. Philemon verse 12. And that the fourth belongs to the same period is plain,
 1. Because Timothy is mentioned as being with Paul when he wrote to the Philippians, and he was with him when he wrote to the Colossians and to Philemon.
 2. Because he enjoyed great liberty of preaching at the time when the Epistle to the Philippians was written, Philemon 1:13; and so he did when that to the Ephesians was written. Ephesians 6:20.
 3. Because he expresses both to the Philippians and to Philemon the expectation of being soon set at liberty. Philippians 2:11. Philemon verse 22.

If, therefore, one of these letters was written from Rome, they all were. But it is almost certain that the Epistle to the Philippians at least, was written during his imprisonment at Rome. In chapter 1:12, 13, he says, “The things which happened unto me have fallen out rather unto the furtherance of the gospel; so that my bonds are manifest in all the palace and in all other places.” Even admitting that the word *πραιτώριον* here used, does not necessarily refer either to the well known pretorian camp at Rome, or to the imperial palace, yet, when taken in connection with what is said in chapter 4:22, there is little doubt that the reference is to the place of abode of the pretorian guard in immediate attendance on the Emperor. The phrase οἱ ἐκ τῆς Καίσαρος οἰκίας, can only mean, those of Caesar’s household; and as they sent their salutations to the Philippians, there is no reasonable doubt that the Epistle to the church in Philippi was written at Rome. If, therefore, it was during the same imprisonment that he wrote the four epistles above mentioned, then it follows that the Epistle to the Ephesians was written from Rome.” (pg. 7ff, *Exposition of Ephesians*)

- d. Only P46² and one cursive, 1739, omit ἐν Ἐφέσῳ! The third hand of cursive 424, and one of the many hands³ who altered the text of Aleph and B, also do so. To omit the words and thus change the nature of the entire book on evidence this flimsy is most unwise—yet in Metzger’s *Textual Commentary*, and the Westcott-Hort and Tischendorf Greek Texts, they are italicized as dubious words. (Oh, by the way, Origin and Marcion questioned the words. How much stock should we put in that?) See Metzger’s *Textual Commentary*. The AMP, CEV, have notes to the effect of, “Some manuscripts do not contain “at Ephesus.” The HCSB reads, “Other mss omit *at Ephesus*.” The NIV reads, “Some early manuscripts do not have *in Ephesus*.” “Here “some” means “one,” P46, since the two cursives are not early (post 9th century). The NLT-SE reads, “The most ancient manuscripts do not include *in Ephesus*” The words “some” and “other” are very loose in the way manuscript evidence is presented in critical text theory. The perversity of this is seen in the fact that the 99+% of MSS, with the TR/Byz, has Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, while the CT has χριστου ιησου. The CT variant probably arose from looking at the Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ at the end of the verse. Note that modern Bible versions do not even tell you that this variant exists—they will follow a tiny fraction of the evidence without any note at all; does the NA-27

² The papyri are often also very sloppily copied or deliberately altered. For example (from Jack Moorman, *Forever Settled*):

As an editor the scribe of P45 wielded a sharp ax. The most striking aspect of his style is its conciseness. The dispensable word is dispensed with. He omits adverbs, adjectives, nouns, participles, verbs, personal pronouns - without any compensating habit of addition. He frequently omits phrases and clauses. He prefers the simple to the compound word. In short, he favors brevity. He shortens the text in at least fifty places in singular readings alone. But he does not drop syllables or letters. His shortened text is readable. Enough of these have been cited to make the point that P66 editorializes as he does everything else - in a sloppy fashion. He is not guided in his charges by some clearly defined goal which was always kept in view. If he has an inclination toward omission, it is not "according to knowledge," but is whimsical and careless, often leading to nothing but nonsense. (Colwell in INTT).

And yet this is the very kind of source material that modern "experts" would have us go back to in the "reconstruction" of the New Testament Text.

³ Sinaiticus is “covered with . . . alterations of an obviously correctional character[,] brought in by at least ten different revisers . . . it is plain that this . . . codex bears upon its face the most incontestable proof of its corrupt and defective character . . . on many occasions 10, 20, 30, 40 words are dropped through very carelessness . . . the impurity of the Codex Sinaiticus, in every part of it, was fully recognized by those best acquainted with it, and that from the beginning until the time when it was finally cast aside as worthless for any practical purpose.” Likewise, “in the Gospels alone Codex B (Vatican) leaves out words or whole clauses no less than 1,491 times. It bears traces of careless transcription on every page.” These two MSS regularly differ from over “ninety-nine out of a hundred of the whole body of extant MSS” (pgs. 73-80 *True or False? The Westcott-Hort Textual Theory Examined*, ed. David Otis Fuller. Grand Rapids, MI: Grand Rapids International Publications, 1973).

mention it? However, they will give you the reading of one papyrus and one very late MSS removing “in Ephesus” against every other MSS, as if this constituted significant evidence.

Hodge comments: “That the reading above given is the true one, is proved because it is found in all extant MSS. [Note: he wrote before P46 was discovered], in all the ancient versions, and in all the Fathers. This array of external evidence is decisive. No critic would venture to alter the text against these authorities. The only opposing evidence of a critical nature is, that it appears from the comment of Basil that the words ἐν Ἐφέσῳ were not in the copy which he used, and that in the MS. B. they stand in the margin and not in the text, and in MS. 67, they are inserted as a correction. This is altogether insufficient to outweigh the concurrent testimony above mentioned. On all critical principles, therefore, the [traditional] reading ... must be pronounced genuine. 2. That this epistle was addressed to the Ephesians is proved by the concurrent testimony of the ancient church. This Basil does not question; he only explains τοῖς οὖσιν in such a way as to show that they were not followed in his copy by the words ἐν Ἐφέσῳ. These two considerations would seem to be decisive. How came the epistle to be addressed to the Ephesians, if not designed for them? How came the whole ancient church to regard it as addressed to the church in Ephesus, if such were not the fact? It is a fundamental principle in historical criticism to allow greater weight to historical testimony than to conjectures drawn from circumstantial evidence.” (pgs. 8-9, *Ephesians*).

Furthermore, if the words are omitted, the grammar is very poor. τοῖς ἁγίοις τοῖς οὖσιν . . . καὶ πιστοῖς?? “the saints which are”?

Hoehner, while giving more weight to the omission than is warranted, likewise concludes that the words are genuine and the epistle was written to the Ephesians.

3. During his second missionary journey, Paul, having left Corinth, sailed to Ephesus (Acts 18:18,19).
 - a. Wanting to fulfill a vow, Paul sailed from Ephesus after spending but a short time there (Acts 18:20,21). Aquila and Priscilla, who accompanied Paul from Corinth did stay in Ephesus (Acts 18:24–28) (What is going on in Acts 18:24-19:6 is not what Hodge states on Acts 19:1-6, pg. 5 of his commentary. Also note how Acts 19:1-6 shows that they employed the Trinitarian formula of baptism in Matthew 28:19, not a Oneness formula.).⁴

⁴

From *Heaven Only for the Baptized?* by Thomas Ross:

The alleged support for a distinction between John’s baptism and Christian baptism in Acts 19:1-7 is invalid. The individuals of Acts 19 were spurious “converts,” not real disciples of John the Baptist. They did not believe in the Trinity, and so were unsaved (John 17:3), for they had never even heard of the Holy Spirit (19:2), although John preached about Him (Matthew 3:11). Their spurious discipleship is

indicated by the fact that the plural word “disciples,” *mathetai*, is nonarticular in 19:1—unlike every single one of the 25 other references in the book of Acts to the word (1:15; 6:1-2, 7; 9:1, 19, 26, 38; 11:26, 29; 14:20, 22, 28; 15:10; 18:23, 27; 19:1, 9, 30; 20:7, 30; 21:4, 16). Paul does not tell these “disciples” that John’s baptism has passed away and Christian baptism has now been inaugurated; he tells them what John the Baptist really said (19:4), upon which they believed John’s message as expounded by Paul and submitted themselves to baptism (19:5-7). Note that a truly born-again man with John’s baptism is not “rebaptized” in the immediately preceding context (18:24-28), simply instructed in the further developments of truth (for the fact that the gospel dispensation began with John does not mean that everything about God’s new method of dealing with people was instantly perfectly developed). Acts 18:24-9:7 supports, not undermines, the fact that Christian baptism is John’s baptism. . . .

Acts 2:38 promises the Spirit before baptism, and far before the time advocated by Oneness doctrine. The Bible also teaches the doctrine of the Trinity, that the one and only God has existed from eternity in three distinct Persons, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit (1 John 5:7; Matthew 28:19; 2 Corinthians 13:14; John 1:1-4). Furthermore, even before the gift of tongues, the miraculous ability to speak in known foreign languages, ceased (1 Corinthians 13:8; cf. “1 Corinthians 13:8-13 and the Cessation of Miraculous Gifts,” R. Bruce Compton. *Detroit Baptist Seminary Journal* 9 (2004) 97-144), it was never for all believers (1 Corinthians 12:30), and certainly was not a prerequisite to justification. Furthermore, in Acts 19:2 the aorist participle “believed” (*pisteusantes*) is dependent upon the aorist verb “received” (*elabete*), and the verse indicates (consider also the use of *ei* in the question) that Paul assumed that the Holy Spirit was received instantaneously upon believing (that is, with temporal simultaneity but logical subsequence to faith), not at some later period where some sort of second blessing took place. “[W]hen the aorist participle is related to an aorist main verb, the participle will often be contemporaneous (or simultaneous) to the action of the main verb” (pg. 624, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics*, Daniel Wallace). Paul’s question to these professed disciples assumed the reality of an immediate receipt of the Spirit at the moment of faith. “[In Acts 19:2] there is no question about what happened *after* believing; but the question rightly relates to what occurred *when* they believed. . . . [The verse could be rendered] rightly, ‘Did ye receive the Holy Ghost when ye believed?’” (*Word Studies in the New Testament*, Marvin Vincent, vol. 1, note on Acts 19:2, elec. acc. in AGES Digital Software Library, Classic Commentary collection). The post-believing coming of the Spirit in miraculous power recorded in Acts 19:6 employs a different Greek word (*erchomai*) than that generally used for the simple receipt of the Spirit as in verse 2 (*labano*). The word in verse 2, when employed after the historical event of Spirit baptism ceased by Acts 19, always refers to the receipt of the Spirit at the moment of faith. This use is universal in the epistles (Romans 8:15; 1 Corinthians 2:12; 2 Corinthians 11:4; Galatians 3:2, 14, cf. the prediction in John 7:39). In contrast, the word in Acts 19:6 is never used in the New Testament of the believer’s receipt of the Spirit at the moment of faith and regeneration.

The Oneness Pentecostal idea that “the one name of Matthew 28:19 is Jesus, for Jesus is the name of the Father . . . the Son . . . and the Holy Ghost . . . the name of Jesus was orally uttered as part of the baptismal formula . . . the name Jesus was orally invoked at baptism” (*The Oneness of God*, David K. Bernard, Chapter 6, “Father, Son, and Holy Ghost,” elec. acc.) is entirely erroneous and heretical, and it cannot be sustained Scripturally. If one must, as Oneness Pentecostalism affirms, employ the correct words at the time of baptism or salvation is impossible, which words should be employed? Those of Acts 2:38, “in [*epi*] the name of Jesus Christ”; those of Acts 8:16 and 19:5, “in [*eis*] the name of the Lord Jesus”; or those of Acts 10:48, “in [*en*] the name of the Lord”? Since there are three different groups of words, with three different prepositions employed (*epi*, *eis*, and *en*), and three different endings (“Jesus Christ,” “Lord Jesus,” “Lord,”—note that the last does not even have the name “Jesus” at all), which set constitutes the magic words without which salvation is impossible? Would it also not be very unfortunate that, whichever of the three sets of words one determines is the true one, every person the apostles and first century Christians baptized employing the two “wrong” sets of words was eternally damned? How many of the first century Christians must have missed heaven because they did not know which of the sets of words were the magic keys to heaven! How unfortunate, indeed, how misleading it is that Luke, writing under inspiration, does not give the slightest hint that either Acts 2:38, or 8:16, or 19:5, or any other verbal formulation whatsoever, is essential to salvation! What errors the apostles made as well in allowing all those baptized in Acts into church membership, whichever set of words are recorded in connection with

their baptism, although the two-thirds with the wrong formula were not truly saved! Or is it not rather obvious that the Oneness Pentecostal notion that a certain set of words is essential to salvation cannot be sustained in the book of Acts or elsewhere in Scripture? Since there is no consistent set of words recorded in Acts in connection with baptism “in the name of” the Lord, and so Acts is not giving a specific set of words that must be employed without sinning and facing eternal damnation, what does the “name” terminology really mean?

Baptism is “in the name of Jesus Christ” (Acts 2:38), not because Jesus is the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, nor because the words “in the name of Jesus” or some similar non-Trinitarian formula was uttered when the ceremony was performed, but because baptism is performed with Christ’s authority. The Lord Jesus, who has all authority or power (Matthew 28:18), commanded that baptism be performed with the Trinitarian formula of Matthew 28:19. When this is done (and other requirements for baptism are met, such as that the person being baptized is a believer, not an infant), the baptism is performed with Christ’s authority, that is, in His name. When Baptist churches employ the Trinitarian formula the Lord Jesus commanded for use until the end of the world (Matthew 28:20), they are baptizing in Jesus’ name.

The fact that “in the name of” means “with the authority of” is evident in Scripture. Several examples, out of many, will be given. In Deuteronomy 18:5-7, the Levites were “to minister in the name of the LORD.” Unlike the other tribes, they had Jehovah’s authority to do their Levitical work. They did not go around all day long repeating His name in a sort of mantra. Their ministrations in the tabernacle and temple, teaching the Law to God’s people and completing other work, was done with Divine authority, hence “in His name.” In 1 Samuel 25:9, “when David’s young men came, they spake to Nabal according to all those words in the name of David, and ceased.” David’s young men came to Nabal with David’s authority and gave Nabal a message from David. They did not come to Nabal and say, “David, David, David, David.” In 1 Kings 18:32, Elijah “built an altar in the name of the LORD: and he made a trench about the altar, as great as would contain two measures of seed.” Elijah built the altar with Jehovah’s authority (1 Kings 18:36). The point was not that he repeated the Tetragrammaton over and over again. In Esther 3:12, “the king’s scribes called on the thirteenth day of the first month, and there was written according to all that Haman had commanded unto the king’s lieutenants, and to the governors that *were* over every province, and to the rulers of every people of every province according to the writing thereof, and *to* every people after their language; in the name of king Ahasuerus was it written, and sealed with the king’s ring.” The letter had the authority of king Ahasuerus, so all men in his empire needed to pay attention. The words of the letter were not “Ahasuerus, Ahasuerus, Ahasuerus.” In 2 Thessalonians 3:6, Paul wrote, “[B]rethren, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ . . . withdraw yourselves from every brother that walketh disorderly, and not after the tradition which he received of us.” The apostle commanded the church at Thessalonica with Christ’s authority. Paul wrote under inspiration, and the command to practice church discipline was given by the Lord Jesus in Matthew 18:15-20. In Acts 4:7, the elders of Israel asked Peter what authority the apostle had for his message. Their question was, “By what power, or by what name, have ye done this?” In Luke 24:47—which sets the background for the use of “in the name of” formulae in Acts, since Luke wrote Acts as the continuation of his gospel (Luke 1:1-4; Acts 1:1-4) and the preaching in Acts was in fulfillment of the command given in Luke 24 (cf. Matthew 28:19-20; Mark 16:15)—“repentance and remission of sins should be preached in [Christ’s] name among all nations.” That is, the Lord Jesus gave authority to the church to preach repentance and remission of sins, and so this preaching was done as recorded in the book of Acts. “In the name of” means “with the authority of” in Scripture.

Acts 19:1-7 demonstrates that the formula given in Matthew 28:19 was employed by the apostolic churches, corroborating that Trinitarian baptism is actually baptism with Christ’s authority (Acts 19:5). When Paul found people who claimed to be “disciples” (v. 1) who had “not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost” (v. 2), the apostle, in shock, asked “Unto what then were ye baptized?” Since the churches were “baptizing . . . in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost” (Matthew 28:19), employing the Trinitarian formula in their baptismal ceremony, Paul asks these alleged “disciples” how they could have been baptized and never have heard of the Holy Ghost, when He is mentioned in the baptismal ritual itself. Paul’s question would not make any sense if the baptismal ceremony employed a formula such as “I baptize you in the name of Jesus.” How would that formula be a guarantee that all

- b. Paul did return to Ephesus on his third journey and spent three years there. The events recorded in Acts 19 and his testimony in I Cor. 16:8,9 reveal that much was happening for the Lord.
- c. Note Acts 19:8; repeated, careful preaching of the gospel to the lost; not just appearing one time, and then that is it. Note also Acts 19:10; all in Asia heard the gospel. They were reaching “every creature.” How? Acts 20:20-21 (cf. 5:32). Mass evangelism and house to house, which Paul trained the elders of the church at Ephesus in and they trained others in. Paul, all alone, did not reach the whole area with the gospel. He trained others to do the work of the ministry, Ephesians 4:12.
- d. The final farewell in Acts 20:16–38 was very emotional. There were great spiritual ties that the Apostle had with these believers.
- e. The church at Ephesus appears again in Revelation 2:1-7, where it is still standing for true doctrine and practice, although it had the significant problem them of having lost its first love. (We don’t know historically if the church got right or went bad after the warning of Revelation 2.)

D. The Time—A.D. 60–62

E. The City—Ephesus

- 1. Ephesus was colonized in the 11th century B.C. by the Athenians. Due to its location on the banks of the Cayster River, it was strategic politically, economically, and religiously.

baptized disciples had heard of the Holy Ghost? Trinitarians correctly explain Paul’s mental process as, “How could these people be disciples in Christian churches—they have not even heard of the Holy Ghost, but He is mentioned in the act of baptism itself! ‘Unto what then were ye baptized?’” Oneness Pentecostals would have made Paul think, “How could these people be disciples in Christian churches—they have not even heard of the Holy Ghost—now He isn’t mentioned in the act of baptism, since only the word “Jesus” is used in the formula. However, I’ll ask them what they were baptized unto anyway, as if that related to what they had just said somehow.”

Very early documents in church history demonstrate that even around the end of the first century baptism was administered employing the Trinitarian formula. Near the end of the first century, it was written: “Now concerning baptism, baptize as follows: after you have reviewed all these things, baptize in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit” (Didache 7:1). “For those things which the prophets announced, saying, ‘Until He come for whom it is reserved, and He shall be the expectation of the Gentiles,’ have been fulfilled in the Gospel, [our Lord saying,] ‘Go ye and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.’” (Ignatius to the Philadelphians, chapter 9). Some decades later, declarations like the following are found: “For the law of baptizing has been imposed, and the formula prescribed: ‘Go,’ He saith, ‘teach the nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit.’” (Tertullian, *On Baptism*, Chapter 13). In contrast, no extant patristic writer or ancient document says anything like “we should not baptize in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, but in the name of Jesus Christ” or anything remotely similar. True churches in the earliest centuries of Christianity employed the Trinitarian baptismal formula (as even proto-Catholicism did).

When Biblical churches employ the Trinitarian formula in baptism, they are baptizing in Jesus’ name, just like the first century churches did. Oneness Pentecostals that employ the phrase “in the name of Jesus” but believe the idolatrous heresy that Jesus is the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit do not have any authority from God for their practice—they are the ones who do not really baptize in the name of Jesus Christ.

2. It was both the chief port and capital of the province of Asia Minor.
 3. The city had a 25,000 seat theater, a race track, and the infamous temple to the love goddess Diana—one of the seven wonders of the world. It was an immoral city boasting its cultic immorality with temple prostitutes.
 4. Note the details of the city given in Hodge’s commentary, pgs. 1-4.
- II. The Cause
- A. The Theme
1. There is no categorically–delineated problem that is being addressed, unlike I Corinthians and Galatians.
 2. One can conclude that the intent of this epistle is to build up believers in the doctrine and practice of salvation.
 3. There is great and detailed doctrine regarding the God–centered salvation that He has graciously given believers, and the manner living believers are to adopt as a result.
 4. There are great riches of salvation in Christ that many times we do not realize. Being saved to the praise of His glory will change our thinking and our living.
 5. There are many similarities to the epistle to the Colossians. See Hodge, 11-12.
- B. The Contents
1. The book is divided generally into two parts: the theological and the practical.
 2. Ch. 1–3 detail the blessings of being saved to the praise of His glory.
 3. Ch. 4–6 detail the behavior since being saved to the praise of His glory.

Note: Generally speaking, although not perfect, the background material by Hoehner on Ephesians is excellent. You are required to read pgs. ix-xii, 1-2, 61-114 of Hoehner to get the background to the book. You can read the material on pgs. 2-61 that prove that Paul wrote Ephesians if you wish, but it is not required. The major area where Hoehner is in error in his introductory and background material is in his view of the nature of ἐκκλησία in Ephesians; thus, the excursus below is also required reading.

An Excursus on the Nature of ἐκκλησία in Ephesians

The nature of the *ekklesia* in Ephesians is a matter of significant importance in the study of the book. Theologically liberal, neo-orthodox, and neo-evangelical commentators (including Hoehner) almost universally assume that the *ekklesia* in the book is a designation of all believers. Usually such an assumption is made without proof; indeed, I am not aware of any published study of the word *ekklesia* by an advocate of a universal, invisible church position that seeks to refute the local-only position. All five

commentaries on Ephesians by fundamental, independent Baptists that I am aware of,⁵ on the other hand, believe that the word *ekklesia* in Ephesians is either a reference to a particular congregation or is a generic noun, based on, in their opinion, the fact that *ekklesia* does not bear a reference to an unassembled association of all believers anywhere in the NT, confining the universal, invisible association of all believers to the terms *the family of God* and *the kingdom of God*, but not *the church of God*. It is the opinion of this professor that the other fundamental, independent Baptist commentators are correct, and that the word *ekklesia* in Ephesians does not refer to all believers in an unassembled union, but to either a particular congregation or to the *ekklesia* as a generic noun. As this is a key interpretive issue for the book, and since commentaries by major evangelical publishers (there are no major fundamentalist publishers besides those of the *Bearing Precious Seed* variety) almost to a man assume that the *ekklesia* in Ephesians is at times a reference to an unassembled unity of all believers, the following word study of *ekklesia*, which consists of edited notes from a sermon I preached at two different churches, provides the reasons why the line of interpretation by the other fundamental Baptist commentaries will be followed rather than the line of the neo-evangelical interpreters.

As a preface to the following set of (somewhat adjusted) sermon notes, I must state that there are godly men in fundamental Baptist churches that hold to the universal church position. My point here is not to criticize what, say, the pastor of the church you came from believes, if that congregation holds to the universal view; if so, you should take the arguments for it made by your pastor very seriously—indeed, if you yourself believe that this is the Scriptural position, I am certainly not going to go after you in class or try to put you or your view down or somehow try to make you feel uncomfortable in any way. (In fact, if you disagree with what I say below and you feel like doing your word study for the semester on *ekklesia* to prove that I am wrong, go for it!) However, it is obviously necessary for students in this class to know how I am going to be looking at the word *ekklesia* as it comes up in the book of Ephesians and what my reasons are for so doing, and for that reason the following analysis should be read and considered. It should also be further noted that there is no disagreement about the fact, held to by both universal and local-only advocates, that in the future all believers will be assembled together in the heavenly city, so in a prospective sense, every believer has a place in a church/assembly that is to come. The disagreement is about whether all believers are not just prospectively in a single assembly, but whether such an assembly exists now, and all believers on the earth are currently part of a single, universal church.

I also note concerning Hoehner's comments on the ecclesiology of Ephesians (pgs. 111-112) does not deal with the local-only position—as a neo-evangelical, it is very possible that he has never had any interaction with fundamental Baptists who believe it,

⁵ *En Epheso: An Exegetical Commentary on Ephesians*, Thomas Strouse (<http://www.bbc-cromwell.org/publications.shtml>).

Expository Notes on the Book of Ephesians, R. Nelson Colyar (<http://baptist-books.com>)

Baptist Commentary, Garner-Howes (<http://bhfb.org/index.html>)

An Interpretation of the English Bible, vol. 15: *Colossians, Ephesians & Hebrews*, B. H. Carroll.

Ephesians, David Sutton (Pastor Sutton's notes on Ephesians were what I (very significantly) expanded and revised for my own notes on the book for this class. He is a pastor at Bethel Baptist Church in El Sobrante, CA.).

as generally in schools where the evangelical universal church view is taught the local-only view is ignored. Not much refutation of Hoehner needs to be made; it suffices to note that the possibility that a generic noun is in view in universal proof-texts, the fact that there is a connection between soteriology and ecclesiology because true churches have a regenerate church membership and the NT assumes that those who are born again will be baptized and remain united to the church, and the assumption that glorious terms that Ephesians applies to the congregation cannot possibly refer to the actual assembly of believers, but must refer to something else, is unfounded.

“My Church”—What it is, and what it means for me.

Text: Matthew 16:18

1.) Introduction: What is the church?

a.) Loose views—church=a building or a denomination

b.) Catholic view, expressed by Cyprian—“outside the church there is no salvation,” outside of the universal, visible denomination of those submitted to Rome. This became the idea that all who were within the Roman empire, or a “Catholic country” in the Dark Ages and had received infant baptism, were able to be saved by doing good works. Nobody who is outside of this universal, visible institution could be saved. The word *catholic* means *universal*. The Roman Catholics take their name from their claim to be the universal, visible church.

The church is never called *universal* or *catholic* in Scripture. The designation first appears in the Epistle of Ignatius to the Smyrneans 8:2, among a number of other unbiblical statements: “Wherever the bishop appears, there let the congregation be; just as wherever Jesus Christ is, there is the catholic church. It is not permissible either to baptize or to hold a love feast without the bishop. But whatever he approves is also pleasing to God, in order that everything you do may be trustworthy and valid” (ὅπου ἂν φανῇ ὁ ἐπίσκοπος, ἐκεῖ τὸ πλῆθος ἔστω, ὥσπερ ὅπου ἂν ᾖ Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς, ἐκεῖ ἡ καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία. οὐκ ἐξόν ἐστιν χωρὶς τοῦ ἐπισκόπου οὔτε βαπτίζειν οὔτε ἀγάπην ποιεῖν· ἀλλ’ ὃ ἂν ἐκεῖνος δοκιμάσῃ, τοῦτο καὶ τῷ θεῷ εὐάρεστον, ἵνα ἀσφαλὲς ᾖ καὶ βέβαιον πᾶν ὃ πράσσετε). It is quite likely that this affirmation of the existence of a catholic church was a later interpolation into Ignatius’ epistle, if Ignatius actually wrote to the Smyrneans at all. There are three different recensions of Ignatius’ letters, a long, middle, and short version. The long version is generally recognized as a spurious fourth century forgery which projects later hierarchicalism and other developing Roman Catholic heresies into earlier centuries. The

short recension only exists in Syriac, and contains only the letters to the Ephesians, Romans, and Polycarp, in a version shorter than either the long or middle recensions. The middle recension, the version quoted above, is found in Greek in only one manuscript, the eleventh century Codex Mediceo-Laurentianus. Scholarship is divided about the genuineness of either the middle or short recensions, with some maintaining that all the letters are extremely heavily interpolated and others arguing that “Ignatius bishop of Antioch did not exist” (pg. 66, “Ignatian Problems,” *Journal of Theological Studies*, C. P. Hammond Bammel, 33:1 (April 1982); see the article, pgs. 62-97, for a discussion of various theories on the authenticity or forging of the allegedly Ignatian epistles.) Even if one assumes that Ignatius actually wrote something similar to the middle recension, and his writings were then corrupted and falsified into the long and short recensions, there is no reason to conclude that the eleventh century Greek codex of the middle recension referring to a “catholic church” does not itself have numerous dogmatic interpolations designed to support later Roman Catholic dogmas—such as Smyrneans 8:2, the verse in question, and its reference to the catholic church—ἡ καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία.

“There are, in all, fifteen Epistles which bear the name of Ignatius. These are the following: One to the Virgin Mary, two to the Apostle John, one to Mary of Cassobelae, one to the Tarsians, one to the Antiochians, one to Hero, a deacon of Antioch, one to the Philippians, one to the Ephesians, one to the Magnesians, one to the Trallians, one to the Romans, one to the Philadelphians, one to the Smyrnaeans, and one to Polycarp. The first three exist only in Latin; all the rest are extant also in Greek. It is now the universal opinion of critics, that the first eight of these professedly Ignatian letters are spurious. They bear in themselves indubitable proofs of being the production of a later age than that in which Ignatius lived. Neither Eusebius nor Jerome makes the least reference to them; and they are now by common consent set aside as forgeries, which were at various dates, and to serve special purposes, put forth under the name of the celebrated Bishop of Antioch . . . [among the other epistles, a spurious long form, a middle recension, and a short recension exist, and] there was . . . a pretty prevalent opinion among scholars, that [no form] could . . . be regarded as absolutely free from interpolations, or as of undoubted authenticity. . . . This expression of uncertainty was repeated in substance by Jortin (1751), Mosheim (1755), Griesbach (1768), Rosenmüller (1795), Neander (1826), and many others; some going so far as to deny that we have any authentic remains of Ignatius at all, while others, though admitting the seven [middle recension] letters as being probably his, yet strongly suspected that they were not free from interpolation. . . . [T]he question [was reignited] by the discovery of a Syriac version [the short recension, first

published in 1845] of three of these Epistles among the mss. procured from the monastery of St. Mary Deipara, in the desert of Nitria, in Egypt. . . . some accepted the [view that only these three short letters] represented more accurately than any formerly published what Ignatius had actually written . . . [while] others very strenuously opposed [this position in favor of the middle recension]. . . . [T]he Ignatian controversy is not yet settled” (*Church Fathers—The Ante-Nicene Fathers*, vol. 1, *The Apostolic Fathers with Justin Martyr and Irenaeus*, “Introductory Note to the Epistle of Ignatius to the Ephesians,” ed. Alexander Roberts & James Donaldson. elec. acc. in *Accordance Bible Software*, prep. OakTree Software, ver. 1.1). While the reference to a catholic church by Ignatius is dubious, Pope Cornelius, writing against the Anabaptist Novatian, and developing a proto-Roman Catholic principle not found clearly before the third century, affirmed that there “should be but one bishop in a catholic church” (Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History*, 6:43:11).

Let it also be briefly mentioned that it is indisputable that the so-called “Apostles’ Creed” was not written by the apostles, and its present form, with its profession of faith in a “catholic church,” is a development of the era after the union of proto-Popery with the Roman state. The “Apostles’ Creed” developed from the Old Roman Creed, which simply affirmed faith in the “holy church.” It was “in the late fourth century that *catholic* began to appear in [various] Western creeds” (pg. 385, *Early Christian Creeds*, J. N. D. Kelly. London: Longman, 1972. 3rd ed.), in large part to contrast the Roman church with dissident movements including the “heretical” Anabaptists of the age among the Donatists and Novatians. The earliest physical evidence for the Apostles’ Creed itself is contained in the tract *De singulis libris canonicis* written by the monk Priminus between A. D. 710-724. Both Pope Leo the Great (d. 461) and Gregory the Great (d. 604) appear to have been ignorant of the Creed, and among scholars “very few will be likely to deny that [the received version of the Apostles’ Creed] is to be sought somewhere north of the Alps at some date in the late sixth or seventh century” (pg. 398, 410, 421, *Early Christian Creeds*, *ibid.*).

c.) Protestant view—universal, invisible church. “The catholic or universal Church, which is invisible, consists of the whole number of the elect, that have been, are, or shall be gathered into one, under Christ the Head thereof; and is the spouse, the body, the fulness of Him that fills all in all.” (Westminster Confession of Faith, chapter 25). This view was a way for the Protestants to explain how they could be saved but be outside of the Catholic denomination. It came from Augustine, who used it to combat the Baptists of his day, the Donatists.

Augustine of Hippo, to combat the Donatists, among whom it appears the Baptists of his era were to be numbered and who contended for a regenerate church membership, held to the idea of an invisible catholic church before the era of the Reformation. He held that the invisible church was a smaller remnant of true believers entirely contained within the visible catholic church, developing this concept in order to justify the catholic practice of allowing obviously ungodly, immoral, and unregenerate members within the Catholic fold. However, Augustine held that the members of this invisible church were entirely contained within the bounds of the visible Catholic denomination—following Cyprian, Augustine held that outside of the visible church there was no salvation. When Protestantism adopted Augustine’s invisible church conception, it was adjusted—at least among the more evangelical wing of the reform movement—so that one could be part of the invisible church without the absolute necessity of membership in the visible church. In this manner the Reformation and post-Reformation doctrine of the universal, invisible church developed and became the view of evangelical Protestantism.

d.) Biblical/Baptist view—word *church* means *assembly* or *congregation*. That is it. CHRIST’S church is “an assembly of baptized believers, organized to carry out the Lord’s work.” This is the view of Scripture. While the *family of God* is a universal, invisible entity that consists of all believers everywhere (Galatians 3:26), a *church* is a particular, local, visible congregation. It is noteworthy that historic Baptist confessions such as the 1833 *New Hampshire Confession*, “perhaps the most widely used and influential statement of doctrine among American Baptists at the present time” (*Baptist Confessions of Faith*, McGlothlin, part 4), make no mention of a universal church, speaking only of the church as local and visible.⁶

2.) The church—

a.) Pre-NT usage⁷

⁶ This is not to say that no Baptist confessions held to the Protestant doctrine of the church; ones that do so can be found (e. g., the *Second London Confession* of 1689, which was based on the Presbyterian Westminster Confession, and which is very influential among Calvinistic Baptists).

⁷ Cf. the verb ἐκκλησιάζω, “to hold an assembly, *convene*, *assemble*.” (BDAG); “summon to an assembly” (Liddell, H. G. & Scott, R. *Greek-English Lexicon*, 9th ed., New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 1996); “attend an assembly; attend a church service” (*Patristic Greek Lexicon* ed. G. W. Lampe (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2007, 20th ed). The verb is always employed in the LXX and related *Koiné* literature (at least until after the time of the post-NT development of the concept of a catholic church) for a visible and local assembly, not some sort of invisible and unassembled “assembly.” See Leviticus 8:3; Numbers 20:8; Deuteronomy 4:10; 31:12, 28; Esther 4:16, LXX; Josephus, *Antiquities* 4:302; 6:56; 8:277; 10:93; 12:316; 17:161; 19:158; *War* 2:490; 7:47; Philo, *On the Migration of Abraham* 1:69; *On Joseph* 1:73; *On the Decalogue* 1:39; *Freedom* 1:6.

The complete list of LXX references:

B. H. Carroll's book *Ecclesia*⁸ provides a number of helpful instances of the classical use of ἐκκλησία [transliterating the word as *ecclesia*], documenting that the word, in classical Greek, signified "an organized assembly of citizens, regularly summoned, as opposed to other meetings." Note:

Thucydides 2:22: - "Pericles, seeing them angry at the present state of things... did not call them to an assembly (ecclesia) or any other meeting."

Demosthenes 378, 24: - "When after this the assembly (ecclesia) adjourned, they came together and planned ... For the future still being uncertain, meetings and speeches of all sorts took place in the marketplace. They were afraid that an assembly (ecclesia) would be summoned suddenly, etc." Compare the distinction here between a lawfully assembled business body and a mere gathering together of the people in unofficial capacity, with the town-clerk's statement in Acts 19:35, 40.

Now some instances of the particular ecclesia of the several Greek states -

Thucydides 1,87: - "Having said such things, he himself, since he was ephor, put the question to vote in the assembly (ecclesia) of the Spartans."

Thucydides 1,139: - "And the Athenians having made a house (or called an assembly, ecclesia) freely exchanged their sentiments."

Aristophanes Act 169: - "But I forbid you calling an assembly (ecclesia) for the Thracians about pay."

Thucydides 6,8: - "And the Athenians having convened an assembly (ecclesia) ... voted, etc."

Thucydides 6,2: - "And the Syracusans having buried their dead, summoned an assembly (ecclesia)."

This historical reading concerning the business assemblies of the several petty but independent, self-governing Greek states, with their lawful conference, their free speech. Their decision by vote, whether of Spartans, Thracians, Syracusans or Athenians, sounds much like the proceedings of particular and independent Baptist churches today (*Ecclesia*, B. H. Carroll, pgs. 35-36).

This examination is valuable because Christ and the Apostles spoke the Greek language of the day. When they used the word *ekklesia*, *church*, they did not pull the word out of thin air, but used a word that was already in use in the first century. Nor is there any indication in Scripture that they gave the word a radical new meaning that it never

Deuteronomy 4:10; 9:10; 18:16; 23:2-4, 9; 31:30; Joshua 8:35; Judges 20:2; 21:5, 8; 1 Samuel 17:47; 19:20; 1 Kings 8:14, 22, 55, 65; 1 Chronicles 13:2, 4; 28:2, 8; 29:1, 10, 20; 2 Chronicles 1:3, 5; 6:3, 12-13; 7:8; 10:3; 20:5, 14; 23:3; 28:14; 29:23, 28, 31-32; 30:2, 4, 13, 17, 23-25; Ezra 2:64; 10:1, 8, 12, 14; Nehemiah 5:7, 13; 7:66; 8:2, 17; 13:1; Judith 6:16, 21; 7:29; 14:6; 1 Maccabees 2:56; 3:13; 4:59; 5:16; 14:19; Psalms 21:23, 26; 25:5, 12; 34:18; 39:10; 67:27; 88:6; 106:32; 149:1; Proverbs 5:14; Job 30:28; Sirach 15:5; 21:17; 23:24; 24:2; 26:5; 31:11; 33:19; 38:33; 39:10; 44:15; 46:7; 50:13, 20; Solomon 10:6; Micah 2:5; Joel 2:16; Lamentations 1:10.

⁸ The book is available at <http://sites.google.com/site/thross7>. Carroll was Pastor of First Baptist Church of Waco, TX, Professor of theology and Bible at Baylor University and Seminary from 1872-1905, and professor and president of the Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary from 1908-1914.

had before—and, indeed, to make a word that means *assembly* signify a group of people all over the world that never assemble would be a very radical change of meaning. So with this background, let us look at what the NT itself says about the *church*, *congregation*, or *assembly*.

b.) NT usage:

We will see that all of these uses fit into one of two categories—either they are actual, individual congregations, or the word *church* is used as a *generic* noun, a reference to every church in general, but no church in particular. These latter texts are the ones that the universal church people use to seek support for their doctrine in the Bible.

Concerning the category of generic noun:

The small minority of uses where an individual congregation in a particular location is not in view (cf. “Christ is the head of the church,” Ephesians 5:23; Colossians 1:18) do not prove the existence of a universal, invisible church any more than “the husband is the head of the wife” or “the head of the woman is the man” (Ephesians 5:23; 1 Corinthians 11:3; see below) establish that there is a single universal, invisible husband or a universal, invisible man made up of all individual husbands or men scattered all over world. Rather, these verses employ the word *church* as a generic noun, as a reference to any or every particular church (or husband, man, etc.) in the class *church* (husband, man, etc.). The common category of the “generic noun . . . focuses on the kind. . . emphasizes class traits . . . [and] has in view . . . the class as a whole” (pg. 244, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament*, Daniel B. Wallace. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1996).

Matt. 16:18 And I say also unto thee, That thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my **church**; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.

-True for the first church at Jerusalem—Christ “built” or “built [it] up” (the word is even translated “edify,” that is “build up/build.” It is also true for His churches in general; Christ builds each of them up.

In Christ’s statement in Matthew 16:18 that He will build up His congregation, the word *ekklesia* is used as a generic noun. It is true for each individual church, but it

does not prove that every congregation is somehow one large congregation that never congregates. Compare the following example of *ekklesia* as a generic noun in Plato:

[452e] Gorgias

I call it the ability to persuade with speeches either judges in the law courts or statesmen in the council-chamber or the commons in **the Assembly** or an audience at any other meeting that may be held on public affairs. And I tell you that by virtue of this power you will have the doctor as your slave, and the trainer as your slave; your money-getter will turn out to be making money not for himself, but for another,—in fact for you, who are able to speak and persuade the multitude.⁹

[452e] Γοργίας

τὸ πείθειν ἔγωγ' οἶόν τ' εἶναι τοῖς λόγοις καὶ ἐν δικαστηρίῳ δικαστὰς καὶ ἐν βουλευτηρίῳ βουλευτὰς καὶ ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐκκλησιαστὰς καὶ ἐν ἄλλῳ συλλόγῳ παντί, ὅστις ἂν πολιτικὸς σύλλογος γίγνηται. καίτοι ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ δυνάμει δοῦλον μὲν ἔξεις τὸν ἱατρὸν, δοῦλον δὲ τὸν παιδοτρίβην· ὁ δὲ χρηματιστὴς οὗτος ἄλλῳ ἀναφανήσεται χρηματιζόμενος καὶ οὐχ αὐτῷ, ἀλλὰ σοὶ τῷ δυναμένῳ λέγειν καὶ πείθειν τὰ πλήθη.¹⁰

In this statement, “the assembly/*ekklesia*” is not speaking of one particular individual assembly, but it is also hardly speaking of all the assemblies together being one big universal assembly. Rather, the statement is true for each individual assembly. “The council-chamber” and “the commons” are used in the same way. All the council-chambers are not one big, invisible, universal council-chamber; rather, the type of speech Plato is talking about is persuasive is employed in any particular council-chamber.

Note that the difference between *Christ's ekklesia*/church/congregation/assembly and other congregations/assemblies is NOT that they are some radically different thing; the difference is in the MY, not in the word *church/congregation*. If I have a pencil and you have a pencil, the difference between the two is that one is MY pencil, but both yours and mine are pencils. This is *Christ's church/congregation*, as opposed to a pagan congregation or assembly, etc. but it is still an assembly/congregation that He would build up. (BTW, note also that the church already existed here, and in Matthew 18:17; lots of people today say the church started at Pentecost, but, at least in a fundamental sense, Christ started the church in the gospels.¹¹).

⁹ Plato. (1967). *Plato in Twelve Volumes, Vol. 3 translated by W.R.M. Lamb*. Medford, MA: Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press; London, William Heinemann Ltd.

¹⁰ Plato. (1903). *Platonis Opera, ed. John Burnet*. Medford, MA: Oxford University Press.

¹¹ Christ started His church during His earthly ministry (Matthew 18:17) from people converted and baptized by John the Baptist (John 1:35-37) and promised that His assembly would overcome the powers of hell from that time to the end of the age (Matthew 16:18). Obviously already extant, the church was “added unto” on the day of Pentecost (Acts 2:41, 47) with the conversion of three thousand men. No verse anywhere states that the church started on Pentecost. The Lord referred to His church twice in the gospels (Matthew 16:18; 18:17), without any indication whatever that it did not yet exist. Jesus Christ, the

Matt. 18:17 And if he shall neglect to hear them, tell *it* unto the church: but if he neglect to hear the **church**, let him be unto thee as an heathen man and a publican.

-obviously a very visible, local church must be told about church discipline, not some universal, invisible church. The phrase “the church” here refers to whatever particular church the people in conflict are members of.

Acts 2:47 Praising God, and having favour with all the people. And the Lord added to the **church** daily such as should be saved.

-a very visible, local church in Jerusalem.

Acts 5:11 And great fear came upon all the **church**, and upon as many as heard these things.

-church at Jerusalem.

Bridegroom, had the church as His bride before Pentecost (John 3:29; cf. 2 Corinthians 11:2; Ephesians 5:22-33). “God hath set . . . in the church, first apostles” (1 Corinthians 12:28), but the Lord appointed the apostles far before Pentecost (Mark 3:13-19; Matthew 10:2-4). Christ sang in the midst of the church (Hebrews 2:12), but His only recorded singing took place at the institution of the Lord’s supper (Matthew 26:30)—an ordinance given to the church before Pentecost (Matthew 26:26-31; 1 Corinthians 11:2, 17-34). Before Pentecost Christ was the shepherd/pastor of His church (John 10:14), which was already His flock (a term for the church; Matthew 26:31; Luke 12:32; Acts 20:28-29; 1 Peter 5:2-3), until He appointed Peter to pastor His first assembly after His resurrection (John 21:15-17). His church had a business meeting (Acts 1:15-26), a membership roll (Acts 1:15), a treasurer (John 12:6; 13:29), baptism (John 4:1-2), the Lord’s supper (Matthew 26:26-31), church discipline (Matthew 18:15-18), the power to bind and loose (Matthew 18:17-18), and the Great Commission (Matthew 28:18-20) before it was “added unto” on Pentecost (Acts 2:41, 47). On the day of Pentecost in Acts 2 the church simply received the permanent indwelling of the Spirit and public recognition as the new institution for the course of the age of grace (cf. Exodus 40:35; the tabernacle; 2 Chronicles 7:1; Solomon’s temple; Ezekiel 43:4-5; the Millennial temple).

In relation to the only really significant objection to a pre-Pentecost foundation of the church, the question of how the assembly could begin before the official inauguration of the New Covenant with the death of Christ, Dr. Ron Tottingham writes, “[The objectors ask how] could you have a ‘new program’ (church) until you have the shedding of the ‘the blood of the covenant,’ of He who is the Life and Head of a ‘new and living’ institution? . . . Hebrews 9:14-18 . . . What is the answer which those . . . would give . . . who would hold that Christ established the first Church during His personal ministry upon earth[?] . . . The New Testament Church [was not] ‘of force’ [Hebrews 9:17] until after the Resurrection. Even Christ still went to the temple [during His earthly ministry]. . . . Hebrews nine only states that the covenant of the Levitical ordinances lasted until the true Blood of Christ was shed. . . . The New Testament Church could not be ready for service at its ‘baptism’ at Pentecost unless it was built, or ‘framed,’ prior. Who ever heard of moving into a house [cf. 1 Peter 2:5] (the Holy Spirit moved upon and into the church at Pentecost) without a floor, frame, and more? . . . How then could the church begin before the New Covenant began? By being built [by] the Master Himself during His own personal ministry upon the earth. Then when he died as Testator of the New Covenant, His church of the New Testament (covenant) was ready and waiting to be ‘baptized’ [with] the Holy Spirit and begin [its] ordained service” (*The Door-Step Evangel*, 24:2 (March-April 2008) pgs. 1ff. (pub. Empire Baptist Temple/Great Plains Baptist Divinity School, Sioux Falls, SD)).

Acts 7:38 This is he, that was in the **church** in the wilderness with the angel which spake to him in the mount Sina, and *with* our fathers: who received the lively oracles to give unto us:

-when Israel was in the wilderness, they were a congregation/assembly/ “church.” They were all assembled in one place camping in the wilderness. This is not a reference to CHRIST’s NT congregation/church, but to Israel as a congregation camping around Mt. Sinai.

Acts 8:1 And Saul was consenting unto his death. And at that time there was a great persecution against the **church** which was at Jerusalem; and they were all scattered abroad throughout the regions of Judaea and Samaria, except the apostles.

-obviously local and visible.

Acts 8:3 As for Saul, he made havock of the **church**, entering into every house, and haling men and women committed *them* to prison.

-church at Jerusalem.

Acts 9:31 Then had the **churches** rest throughout all Judaea and Galilee and Samaria, and were edified; and walking in the fear of the Lord, and in the comfort of the Holy Ghost, were multiplied.

—note plural churchES. It was not “the church throughout all Judaea,” etc. but the churchES.

Acts 11:22 Then tidings of these things came unto the ears of the **church** which was in Jerusalem: and they sent forth Barnabas, that he should go as far as Antioch.

-church at Jerusalem.

Acts 11:26 And when he had found him, he brought him unto Antioch. And it came to pass, that a whole year they assembled themselves with the **church**, and taught much people. And the disciples were called Christians first in Antioch.

-church at Antioch.

Acts 12:1 Now about that time Herod the king stretched forth *his* hands to vex certain of the **church**.

-the church at Jerusalem in the context.

Acts 12:5 Peter therefore was kept in prison: but prayer was made without ceasing of the **church** unto God for him.

-likewise the church at Jerusalem in context.

Acts 13:1 Now there were in the **church** that was at Antioch certain prophets and teachers; as Barnabas, and Simeon that was called Niger, and Lucius of Cyrene, and Manaen, which had been brought up with Herod the tetrarch, and Saul.

-church at Antioch.

Acts 14:23 And when they had ordained them elders in every **church**, and had prayed with fasting, they commended them to the Lord, on whom they believed.

—churches Paul and Barnabas started.

Acts 14:27 And when they were come, and had gathered the **church** together, they rehearsed all that God had done with them, and how he had opened the door of faith unto the Gentiles.

-church at Antioch.

Acts 15:3 And being brought on their way by the **church**, they passed through Phenice and Samaria, declaring the conversion of the Gentiles: and they caused great joy unto all the brethren.

--the church at Antioch sent them forth.

Acts 15:4 And when they were come to Jerusalem, they were received of the **church**, and of the apostles and elders, and they declared all things that God had done with them.

-the church at Jerusalem.

Acts 15:22 Then pleased it the apostles and elders, with the whole **church**, to send chosen men of their own company to Antioch with Paul and Barnabas; *namely*, Judas surnamed Barsabas, and Silas, chief men among the brethren:

-the church at Jerusalem.

Acts 15:41 And he went through Syria and Cilicia, confirming the **churches**.

Acts 16:5 And so were the **churches** established in the faith, and increased in number daily.

-obviously local and visible.

Acts 18:22 And when he had landed at Caesarea, and gone up, and saluted the **church**, he went down to Antioch.

-church at Caesarea.

Acts 19:32 Some therefore cried one thing, and some another: for the **assembly** was confused; and the more part knew not wherefore they were come together.

-This is a valuable use of the word *ekklesia* for what is clearly not a Christian gathering. Here the word is used for an assembly/congregation/"church" of idolators who were worshipping an idol. This was a congregation or assembly, most certainly—but it was not Christ's "MY church." And it was very local and visible!

Acts 19:39 But if ye enquire any thing concerning other matters, it shall be determined in a lawful **assembly**.

-likewise here, as in the next reference, it is the same "assembly" of idolators.

Acts 19:41 And when he had thus spoken, he dismissed the **assembly**.

Ditto.

Acts 20:17 And from Miletus he sent to Ephesus, and called the elders of the **church**.

Elders of the church at Ephesus.

Acts 20:28 Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the **church** of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood.

This is the particular church at Ephesus, to the elders of which Paul is speaking. To say that only some universal church can be called "the church of God" is nonsense. The local, visible congregation of saints is the church of God! The church where we are assembled today is the very church of God. Look not, brethren, to some other for the alleged "true" church. You are in it now. Look around! See it! Glory in it—this assembly was purchased with the blood of Christ! How highly do you value it?

Rom. 16:1 I commend unto you Phebe our sister, which is a servant of the **church** which is at Cenchrea:

-congregation at Cenchrea.

Rom. 16:4 Who have for my life laid down their own necks: unto whom not only I give thanks, but also all the **churches** of the Gentiles.

-assemblies/congregations of the Gentiles.

Rom. 16:5 Likewise *greet* the **church** that is in their house. Salute my wellbeloved Epaphroditus, who is the firstfruits of Achaia unto Christ.

-an assembly in someone's house. (Here it is very obvious that the "church" is not the building! How do you greet/salue the building inside someone's house?)

Rom. 16:16 Salute one another with an holy kiss. The **churches** of Christ salute you.

-plural local, visible churches.

Rom. 16:23 Gaius mine host, and of the whole **church**, saluteth you. Erastus the chamberlain of the city saluteth you, and Quartus a brother.

-the whole church where Gaius, Erastus, and Quartus were, which was the church at Corinth, where Paul wrote the letter/epistle to the Romans.

1Cor. 1:2 Unto the **church** of God which is at Corinth, to them that are sanctified in Christ Jesus, called *to be* saints, with all that in every place call upon the name of Jesus Christ our Lord, both theirs and ours:

Consider this with Acts 20:28—the church at Corinth, with all the problems that it had, was the very "church of God"!

1Cor. 4:17 For this cause have I sent unto you Timotheus, who is my beloved son, and faithful in the Lord, who shall bring you into remembrance of my ways which be in Christ, as I teach every where in every **church**.

-every local, visible church where Paul was.

1Cor. 6:4 If then ye have judgments of things pertaining to this life, set them to judge who are least esteemed in the **church**.

-least esteemed in the church at Corinth.

1Cor. 7:17 But as God hath distributed to every man, as the Lord hath called every one, so let him walk. And so ordain I in all **churches**.

-all local and visible churches.

1Cor. 10:32 Give none offence, neither to the Jews, nor to the Gentiles, nor to the **church** of God:

-Probably the church at Corinth, where they were—this was the "church of God" in 1:2 of this epistle. If not, then to the church considered generally—do not give offense to any church in general, to any local congregation.

1Cor. 11:16 But if any man seem to be contentious, we have no such custom, neither the **churches** of God.

-none of the true churches had this bad custom.

1Cor. 11:18 For first of all, when ye come together in the **church**, I hear that there be divisions among you; and I partly believe it.

-the church at Corinth.

1Cor. 11:22 What? have ye not houses to eat and to drink in? or despise ye the **church** of God, and shame them that have not? What shall I say to you? shall I praise you in this? I praise *you* not.

-here, for the third time in the epistle, the congregation at Corinth is called “the church of God.”

1Cor. 12:28 And God hath set some in the **church**, first apostles, secondarily prophets, thirdly teachers, after that miracles, then gifts of healings, helps, governments, diversities of tongues.

-here the church in general, the church as an institution.

1Cor. 14:4 He that speaketh in an *unknown* tongue edifieth himself; but he that prophesieth edifieth the **church**.

-the church where he is prophesying is edified.

1Cor. 14:5 I would that ye all spake with tongues, but rather that ye prophesied: for greater *is* he that prophesieth than he that speaketh with tongues, except he interpret, that the **church** may receive edifying.

-just like in 14:4.

1Cor. 14:12 Even so ye, forasmuch as ye are zealous of spiritual *gifts*, seek that ye may excel to the edifying of the **church**.

-the church where the gifts are being exercised.

1Cor. 14:19 Yet in the **church** I had rather speak five words with my understanding, that *by my voice* I might teach others also, than ten thousand words in an *unknown* tongue.

-the church where the speaking is going on.

1Cor. 14:23 If therefore the whole **church** be come together into one place, and all speak with tongues, and there come in *those that are* unlearned, or unbelievers, will they not say that ye are mad?

-the whole congregation is in one place.

1Cor. 14:28 But if there be no interpreter, let him keep silence in the **church**; and let him speak to himself, and to God.

-the congregation where he is to keep silence.

1Cor. 14:33 For God is not *the author* of confusion, but of peace, as in all **churches** of the saints.

-not the author of confusion in any of the churches.

1Cor. 14:34 Let your women keep silence in the **churches**: for it is not permitted unto them to speak; but *they are commanded* to be under obedience, as also saith the law.

-wome were commanded to be submissive in all churches.

1Cor. 14:35 And if they will learn any thing, let them ask their husbands at home: for it is a shame for women to speak in the **church**.

-the church where the women and their husbands attend.

1Cor. 15:9 For I am the least of the apostles, that am not meet to be called an apostle, because I persecuted the **church** of God.

-here the church at Jerusalem is called the church of God—the members of this church are the ones Paul had a commission to persecute in Acts. One could say that it is the members of every church in general, no church in particular (generic use), but it would stil prove zero about something universal and invisible. Try persecuting something invisible sometime.

1Cor. 16:1 Now concerning the collection for the saints, as I have given order to the **churches** of Galatia, even so do ye.

-churches in the region of Galatia.

1Cor. 16:19 The **churches** of Asia salute you. Aquila and Priscilla salute you much in the Lord, with the church that is in their house.

-churches in the region of Asia.

2Cor. 1:1 Paul, an apostle of Jesus Christ by the will of God, and Timothy *our* brother, unto the **church** of God which is at Corinth, with all the saints which are in all Achaia:

-church in Corinth.

2Cor. 8:1 Moreover, brethren, we do you to wit of the grace of God bestowed on the **churches** of Macedonia;

-churches in the region of Macedonia. (Not single, “church.”)

2Cor. 8:18 And we have sent with him the brother, whose praise *is* in the gospel throughout all the **churches**;

-local, visible churches.

2Cor. 8:19 And not *that* only, but who was also chosen of the **churches** to travel with us with this grace, which is administered by us to the glory of the same Lord, and *declaration of* your ready mind:

-churches agreed that this brother was to travel with Paul.

2Cor. 8:23 Whether *any do enquire* of Titus, *he is* my partner and fellowhelper concerning you: or our brethren *be enquired of, they are* the messengers of the **churches**, and the glory of Christ.

-the brethren were messengers from the churches.

2Cor. 8:24 Wherefore shew ye to them, and before the **churches**, the proof of your love, and of our boasting on your behalf.

-local, visible churches.

2Cor. 11:8 I robbed other **churches**, taking wages *of them*, to do you service.

-other churches than the one at Corinth.

2Cor. 11:28 Beside those things that are without, that which cometh upon me daily, the care of all the **churches**.

-all the churches Paul worked with, it seems. Note not “all the universal church,” but “churches.”

2Cor. 12:13 For what is it wherein ye were inferior to other **churches**, except *it be* that I myself was not burdensome to you? forgive me this wrong.

-other churches than Corinth.

Gal. 1:2 And all the brethren which are with me, unto the **churches** of Galatia:

-churches in the region of Galatia.

Gal. 1:13 For ye have heard of my conversation in time past in the Jews' religion, how that beyond measure I persecuted the **church** of God, and wasted it:

-the church at Jerusalem that Paul was persecuting. If one wanted to make it a generic reference, that would be fine, but it is probably the Jerusalem assembly.

Gal. 1:22 And was unknown by face unto the **churches** of Judaea which were in Christ:

-churches in the region of Judea.

Eph. 1:22 And hath put all *things* under his feet, and gave him *to be* the head over all *things* to the **church**,

-Christ is the head to each particular church. A generic reference.

Eph. 3:10 To the intent that now unto the principalities and powers in heavenly *places* might be known by the **church** the manifold wisdom of God,

-the church as an institution, a generic reference, that the wisdom of God is made known in each particular church.

Eph. 3:21 Unto him *be* glory in the **church** by Christ Jesus throughout all ages, world without end. Amen.

-every church is to give glory to Jesus Christ.

Eph. 5:23 For the husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the **church**: and he is the saviour of the body.

-this, and the other texts in Ephesians 5, are good illustrations of the generic use of nouns. "The husband," "the wife," and "the church" are generic nouns. There is no universal husband or universal, invisible wife, and there is no universal, invisible church here either. Each husband is the head of his own wife, and Christ is the head of each church.

Similarly, in Colossians 1:18, the phrase ἡ κεφαλὴ τοῦ σώματος, τῆς ἐκκλησίας both σώματος and ἐκκλησίας are generic nouns, just as in Ephesians 5:23¹² ἀνὴρ, κεφαλὴ, γυναικός, ἐκκλησίας, and σώματος are generic in reference (cf. Wallace, pgs. 253-254, for a variety of other examples). Colossians 1:18 and Ephesians 5:23 do not teach the doctrine of a universal, invisible church—such a concept is not either approved or rejected in either passage. They simply state that Christ is the head of the church generically, that is, of every particular local, visible church. Each particular church is identified as the body of Christ in this text (cf. 1 Corinthians 12:27, where the particular church at Corinth is called the body of Christ—the body metaphor emphasizes that each member of the assembly, as a different and important body part,

¹² For the husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the church: and he is the saviour of the body, ὅτι ὁ ἀνὴρ ἐστὶ κεφαλὴ τῆς γυναικός, ὡς καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς κεφαλὴ τῆς ἐκκλησίας, καὶ αὐτὸς ἐστὶ σωτὴρ τοῦ σώματος.

needs to minister to the other members of his particular congregation in accordance with his God-given gifting), and each church has Christ as her head. “The husband is the head of the wife” hardly means that all the husbands in the world are one universal, invisible husband who is the head of one universal, invisible wife. “Where *is* the wise? where *is* the scribe? where *is* the disputer of this world?” (1 Corinthians 1:20, ποῦ σοφός; ποῦ γραμματεὺς; ποῦ συζητητῆς τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου;) hardly means that all the wise men in the world are one universal, invisible wise man, nor that there is one universal, invisible scribe or disputer. No more does “Christ is the head of the church” affirm that Christ is the head of a universal, invisible church; the text teaches that Christ is the head of each particular church, just as the particular husband is the head of his particular wife.

Advocates of the universal, invisible church must find one or more undisputably clear references where *ekklesia* does not mean either a particular congregation or is employed as a generic noun, or they cannot affirm that their doctrine is Biblical. Since they are the ones who are affirming that *ekklesia* assumes a sense it does not have in any pre-Christian literature, they bear the burden of proof in demonstrating that their doctrine is clearly in the NT. The attempt fails in Ephesians 5:23, and in every other text in the NT—consequently the NT does not teach the existence of a universal, invisible church.

More extensive material on this:

Examining Ephesians 5:23 somewhat more deeply, the phrase “Christ is the head of the church” is one of the very few passages that advocates of a universal church employ support their doctrine. Apart from the fact that the verse uses the noun *church* in a generic sense, one should compare the following New Testament texts:

Ephesians 5:23: ὅτι ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐστὶ κεφαλὴ τῆς γυναικός, ὡς καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς κεφαλὴ τῆς ἐκκλησίας, καὶ αὐτὸς ἐστὶ σωτὴρ τοῦ σώματος. For **the husband is the head of the wife**, even as **Christ is the head of the church**; and he is the saviour of the body,

1Corinthians 11:3: θέλω δὲ ὑμᾶς εἰδέναι, ὅτι παντὸς ἀνδρὸς ἡ κεφαλὴ ὁ Χριστὸς ἐστὶ κεφαλὴ δὲ γυναικός, ὁ ἄνθρωπος κεφαλὴ δὲ Χριστοῦ, ὁ Θεός. But I would have you know, that **the head of every man is Christ; and the head of the woman is the man**; and the head of Christ *is* God.

The singular nouns “the husband” “the wife” “the woman” “the man” imply zero about a universal, invisible husband, wife, woman, or man. Absolutely nothing affirms the existence of a universal church in the phrase “Christ is the head of the church.” The Lord Jesus is the head of every particular local, visible congregation.

Note also 2 Kings 10:6, LXX:

καὶ ἔγραψεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς βιβλίον δευτέρον λέγων εἰ ἔμοι ὑμεῖς καὶ τῆς φωνῆς μου ὑμεῖς εἰσακούετε λάβετε **τὴν κεφαλὴν ἀνδρῶν τῶν υἱῶν τοῦ κυρίου ὑμῶν** καὶ ἐνέγκατε πρὸς με ὡς ἡ ὥρα αὐριον εἰς Ιεζραελ καὶ οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ βασιλέως ἦσαν ἐβδομήκοντα ἄνδρες οὗτοι ἄνθρωποι τῆς πόλεως ἐξέτρεφον αὐτούς And Ju wrote them a second letter, saying, If ye *are* for me, and hearken to my voice, **take the heads [Gk. singular, “head”] of the men your master’s sons**, and bring *them* to me at this time to-morrow in Jezrael. Now the sons of the king were seventy men; these great men of the city brought them up. (Brenton’s LXX translation—also below).

Nothing at all is implied about anything universal or invisible with the singular. Each son had his own particular head (until he lost it!). “the head of the sons” is teaches nothing other than that each son had his own head. So “Christ is the head of the church” teaches that Christ is the head of each particular church. Compare 2 Kings 10: 8, where the plural is used:

καὶ ἦλθεν ὁ ἄγγελος καὶ ἀπήγγειλεν λέγων ἤνεγκαν **τὰς κεφαλὰς τῶν υἱῶν τοῦ βασιλέως** καὶ εἶπεν θέτε αὐτὰς βουνοὺς δύο παρὰ τὴν θύραν τῆς πύλης εἰς πρωί. And a messenger came and told *him*, saying, They have brought **the heads of the king’s sons**. And he said, Lay them *in* two heaps by the door of the gate until the morning.

Psalms 139:10, LXX (Eng. 140:9):

ἡ κεφαλὴ τοῦ κυκλώματος αὐτῶν κόπος τῶν χειλέων αὐτῶν καλύψει αὐτούς. *As for the head of them that compass me*, the mischief of their lips shall cover them.

Note that both the Greek translated “them that compass” and “the head” are both singular nouns, just as in “Christ is the head of the church.” Each particular head of each particular enemy surrounding David would be judged.

Lamentations 2:15, LXX:

ἐκρότησαν ἐπὶ σὲ χεῖρας πάντες οἱ παραπορευόμενοι ὁδὸν ἐσύρισαν καὶ ἐκίνησαν τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτῶν ἐπὶ τὴν θυγατέρα Ιερουσαλημ ἡ αὕτη ἡ πόλις ἣν ἐροῦσιν στέφανος δόξης εὐφροσύνης πάσης τῆς γῆς. All that go by the way have clapped their hands at thee; **they have hissed and shaken their head** at the daughter of Jerusalem. Is this the city, they say, the crown of joy of all the earth?

Note that the plurality, the “all” shake the singular “head.” There was no universal, invisible head or universal, invisible person opposing Jerusalem. Each person shook his own particular head at Jerusalem.

Ezekiel 1:22, LXX:

καὶ ὁμοίωμα ὑπὲρ κεφαλῆς αὐτοῖς τῶν ζώων ὥσπερ στερέωμα ὡς ὄρασις κρυστάλλου ἐκτεταμένον ἐπὶ τῶν πτερύγων αὐτῶν ἐπάνωθεν. And **the likeness over the heads** [Gk. singular] **of the living creatures** was as a firmament, as the appearance of crystal, spread out over their wings above.

“The head of the living creatures” meant that each particular living creature had its own particular head.

Ezekiel 10:1, LXX:

καὶ εἶδον καὶ ἰδοὺ ἐπάνω τοῦ στερεώματος τοῦ ὑπὲρ κεφαλῆς τῶν χερουβὶν ὡς λίθος σαπφείρου ὁμοίωμα θρόνου ἐπ’ αὐτῶν. And the likeness over **the heads** [Gk. singular] **of the living creatures** was as a firmament, as the appearance of crystal, spread out over their wings above.

“The head of the living creatures,” again, means each living creature had its own particular head.

Josephus, *Antiquities* 4:112 (4.6.4.112)

Καὶ ὁ μὲν ταῦτα τοῦ θεοῦ κελεύσαντος ἤκει πρὸς Βάλακον δεξαμένου δὲ αὐτὸν τοῦ βασιλέως ἐκπρεπῶς ἡξίου προαχθεὶς ἐπὶ τι τῶν ὄρων σκέψασθαι πῶς τὸ τῶν Ἑβραίων ἔχοι στρατόπεδον Βάλακος δ’ αὐτὸς ἀφικνεῖται τὸν μάντιν σὺν βασιλικῇ θεραπείᾳ φιλοτίμως ἀγόμενος εἰς ὄρος ὅπερ ὑπὲρ κεφαλῆς αὐτῶν ἔκειτο τοῦ στρατοπέδου σταδίους ἀπέχον ἑξήκοντα. When God had given him this charge, he came to Balak; and when the king had entertained him in a magnificent manner, he desired him to go to one of the mountains to take a view of the state of the camp of the Hebrews. Balak himself also came to the mountain, and brought the prophet along with him, with a royal attendance. **This mountain lay over their heads** [Gk. singular], and was distant sixty furlongs from the camp.

The singular mountain was over each person, each of whom had his own particular head.

Gospel of Peter 10:40:

καὶ τῶν μὲν δύο τὴν κεφαλὴν χωροῦσαν μέχρι τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, τοῦ δὲ χειραγωγουμένου ὑπ’ αὐτῶν ὑπερβαίνουσιν τοὺς οὐρανοὺς. [A]nd **the heads** [Gk. singular] **of the two reaching to heaven**, but that of him who was led by them by the hand overpassing the heavens.

Each particular individual here had his own particular head.

Philo, *Allegorical Interpretation* 1:71:

ὥσπερ οὖν κεφαλὴ μὲν πρῶτον τοῦ ζώου καὶ ἀνωτάτω μέρος ἐστί, For as **the head is the principle and uppermost part of the animal**,

Each singular animal had its own singular head. There was no universal head of a universal, invisible animal.

Philo, *On The Life of Moses* 2:290:

θαυμάσια μὲν οὖν ταῦτα· θαυμασιώτατον δὲ καὶ τὸ τέλος τῶν ἱερῶν γραμμάτων, ὃ καθάπερ ἐν τῷ ζῳῷ κεφαλὴ τῆς ὅλης νομοθεσίας ἐστίν. These things, therefore, are wonderful; and most wonderful of all is the end of his sacred writings, which is to the whole book of the law what **the head is to an animal**.

Likewise here, each animal had its own head.

Philo, *On Rewards and Punishments* 125:

ταῦτα δ’ ἀλληγορεῖται τροπικῶς ἐξενεχθέντα· καθάπερ γὰρ ἐν ζῳῷ κεφαλὴ μὲν πρῶτον καὶ ἄριστον, οὐρὰ δ’ ὕστατον καὶ φαυλότατον, οὐ μέρος συνεκπληροῦν τὸν τῶν μελῶν ἀριθμόν, ἀλλὰ σόβησις τῶν ἐπιποτωμένων, τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον κεφαλὴν μὲν τοῦ ἀνθρωπείου γένους ἔσεσθαι φησι τὸν σπουδαῖον εἴτε ἄνδρα εἴτε λαόν, τοὺς δὲ ἄλλους ἅπαντας οἷον μέρη σώματος ψυχούμενα ταῖς ἐν κεφαλῇ καὶ ὑπεράνω δυνάμεσιν. But all these statements are uttered in a metaphorical form, and contain an allegorical meaning. For **as in an**

animal the head is the first and best part, and the tail the last and worst part, or rather no part at all, inasmuch as it does not complete the number of the limbs, being only a broom to sweep away what flies against it; so in the same manner what is said here is that **the virtuous man shall be the head of the human race whether he be a single man or a whole people**. And that all others, being as it were parts of the body, are only vivified by the powers existing in the head and superior portions of the body.

This very interesting reference by Philo shows that, as in a single animal there is a single head, so “the virtuous man,” a generic noun, not one particular man named X, is “the head of the human race,” and this is whether he “be a single man or the whole people.” The others are as “parts of the body,” are only “vivified” because of “the head” that is “the virtuous man.” The parallel to Christ as the head of the church is very clear. Nobody would think of saying that there is literally one universal, invisible virtuous man, nor that there is one universal, invisible body of people, since Philo’s point is that whether one speaks of a single man, or a group of any size, in both situations the [generic] virtuous man is the [generic] head.

Ephesians 5:23 is the capstone of the very small number of New Testament texts that advocates of a universal church position believe provide support for their doctrine. However, the passage teaches nothing of the kind. It simply affirms that Christ is the head of every particular church, just as each particular husband is the head of his particular wife. There are no verses in the Bible where the noun *ekklesia*, church/assembly/congregation, refers to all believers as an already existing group.

Eph. 5:24 Therefore as the **church** is subject unto Christ, so *let* the wives *be* to their own husbands in every thing.

-generic noun, as above.

Eph. 5:25 Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the **church**, and gave himself for it;

-Christ loved each particular church. He loved this church, and gave Himself for her in a special way. This shows us how highly we should love this church. This is how much Christ loved her!

Eph. 5:27 That he might present it to himself a glorious **church**, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish.

-This is what Christ is going to do to this church!

Eph. 5:29 For no man ever yet hated his own flesh; but nourisheth and cherisheth it, even as the Lord the **church**:

-again, an institutional use. Note that the church is Christ’s body, flesh, and bones from the next verse. We are going to talk about the body metaphor shortly.

Eph. 5:32 This is a great mystery: but I speak concerning Christ and the **church**.

-generic reference.

Phil. 3:6 Concerning zeal, persecuting the **church**; touching the righteousness which is in the law, blameless.

-the church at Jerusalem, which Paul received authority to persecute. (You could make it generic if you want, but there is no need.)

Phil. 4:15 Now ye Philippians know also, that in the beginning of the gospel, when I departed from Macedonia, no **church** communicated with me as concerning giving and receiving, but ye only.

-no particular church.

Col. 1:18 And he is the head of the body, the **church**: who is the beginning, the firstborn from the dead; that in all *things* he might have the preeminence.

-Christ is the head of each church. (generic use of the word).

Col. 1:24 Who now rejoice in my sufferings for you, and fill up that which is behind of the afflictions of Christ in my flesh for his body's sake, which is the **church**:

Another generic use; each church is Christ's body.

Col. 4:15 Salute the brethren which are in Laodicea, and Nymphas, and the **church** which is in his house.

The particular church at Nymphas' house.

Col. 4:16 And when this epistle is read among you, cause that it be read also in the **church** of the Laodiceans; and that ye likewise read the *epistle* from Laodicea.

-church of the Laodiceans.

1Th. 1:1 Paul, and Silvanus, and Timotheus, unto the **church** of the Thessalonians *which is* in God the Father and *in* the Lord Jesus Christ: Grace *be* unto you, and peace, from God our Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ.

-church at the city of Thessalonica.

1Th. 2:14 For ye, brethren, became followers of the **churches** of God which in Judaea are in Christ Jesus: for ye also have suffered like things of your own countrymen, even as they *have* of the Jews:

-churches in the region of Judaea.

2Th. 1:1 Paul, and Silvanus, and Timotheus, unto the **church** of the Thessalonians in God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ:

-church of the Thessalonians.

2Th. 1:4 So that we ourselves glory in you in the **churches** of God for your patience and faith in all your persecutions and tribulations that ye endure:

-churches of God are local, visible churches.

1Tim. 3:5 (For if a man know not how to rule his own house, how shall he take care of the **church** of God?)

“the church of God” that the man in the context is a bishop/overseer/pastor of.

1Tim. 3:15 But if I tarry long, that thou mayest know how thou oughtest to behave thyself in the house of God, which is the **church** of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth.

-the church of God that has bishops/overseers and deacons, vv. 1-14! Thus local, visible church is the “house” or temple of God, and the pillar and ground of the truth.

1Tim. 5:16 If any man or woman that believeth have widows, let them relieve them, and let not the **church** be charged; that it may relieve them that are widows indeed.

-the church with the widows.

Philem. 2 And to *our* beloved Apphia, and Archippus our fellowsoldier, and to the **church** in thy house:

-church in Philemon’s house (see v. 1)

Heb. 2:12 Saying, I will declare thy name unto my brethren, in the midst of the **church** will I sing praise unto thee.

-This is the pre-Pentecost church/congregation, the one Christ started while on earth. This is the only one that He sang in, after He built up/edified the church by giving her the Lord’s supper, Matthew 26:30; Mark 14:26.

Heb. 12:23 To the general assembly and **church** of the firstborn, which are written in heaven, and to God the Judge of all, and to the spirits of just men made perfect,

Here we have a reference to the future assembly of all believers in heaven. But at that time, they will all be in one place again, and be local and visible in the heavenly City!¹³

¹³ Thus, the uses of the word in the LXX and other pre-Christian works supports the evidence from the instances of ἐκκλησία in New Testament itself that the word always signifies a particular, visible assembly. “[A]n inductive study of all the *ecclesia* passages [in the LXX demonstrates] that in the Septuagint it never means ‘all Israel whether assembled or unassembled, but that *in every instance* it means a gathering together, and assembly. . . . [T]he New Testament writers neither coined this word nor employed it in an unusual sense. The apostles and early Christians . . . wrote in Greek to a Greek-speaking world, and used Greek words as a Greek-speaking people would understand them. . . . [I]t is a fiction that *ecclesia* was used in [the New Testament in] any new, special sense. The object of Christ’s *ecclesia*, and

James 5:14 Is any sick among you? let him call for the elders of the **church**; and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord:

-elders of the church where he is.

3John 6 Which have borne witness of thy charity before the **church**: whom if thou bring forward on their journey after a godly sort, thou shalt do well:

-the church where people are bearing witness of the charity.

3John 9 I wrote unto the **church**: but Diotrephes, who loveth to have the preeminence among them, receiveth us not.

-the church where Diotrephes was.

3John 10 Wherefore, if I come, I will remember his deeds which he doeth, prating against us with malicious words: and not content therewith, neither doth he himself receive the brethren, and forbiddeth them that would, and casteth *them* out of the **church**.

-Likewise.

Rev. 1:4 John to the seven **churches** which are in Asia: Grace *be* unto you, and peace, from him which is, and which was, and which is to come; and from the seven Spirits which are before his throne;

-seven churches in Asia. Who are they? See the following references.

Rev. 1:11 Saying, I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last: and, What thou seest, write in a book, and send *it* unto the seven **churches** which are in Asia; unto Ephesus, and unto Smyrna, and unto Pergamos, and unto Thyatira, and unto Sardis, and unto Philadelphia, and unto Laodicea.

Rev. 1:20 The mystery of the seven stars which thou sawest in my right hand, and the seven golden candlesticks. The seven stars are the angels of the seven **churches**: and the seven candlesticks which thou sawest are the seven churches.

Rev. 2:1 Unto the angel of the **church** of Ephesus write; These things saith he that holdeth the seven stars in his right hand, who walketh in the midst of the seven golden candlesticks;

terms of membership in it, were indeed different from those of the classic or Septuagint *ecclesia*. But the word itself retains its ordinary meaning. . . . [In contrast to *ecclesia*], the word *panegyros* [was employed to designate] a general, festive assembly of all the Greek states. This general assembly was not for war but peace . . . not for business but pleasure—a time of peace, and joy, and glory. In the happy Greek conceit all the heavenly beings were supposed to be present [at the *panegyros*]. How felicitiously does [Paul] adapt himself to the Greek use of the word [in Hebrews 12:23], and glorify it by application to the final heavenly state. . . . [Thus, there] is a general assembly . . . [in heaven where] warfare is over and rest has come [designated by *panegyros*, but never by *ecclesia*].” (pgs. 34-36, *Ecclesia*, Carroll).

Rev. 2:7 He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the **churches**; To him that overcometh will I give to eat of the tree of life, which is in the midst of the paradise of God.

Rev. 2:8 And unto the angel of the **church** in Smyrna write; These things saith the first and the last, which was dead, and is alive;

Rev. 2:11 He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the **churches**; He that overcometh shall not be hurt of the second death.

Rev. 2:12 And to the angel of the **church** in Pergamos write; These things saith he which hath the sharp sword with two edges;

Rev. 2:17 He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the **churches**; To him that overcometh will I give to eat of the hidden manna, and will give him a white stone, and in the stone a new name written, which no man knoweth saving he that receiveth *it*.

Rev. 2:18 And unto the angel of the **church** in Thyatira write; These things saith the Son of God, who hath his eyes like unto a flame of fire, and his feet *are* like fine brass;

Rev. 2:23 And I will kill her children with death; and all the **churches** shall know that I am he which searcheth the reins and hearts: and I will give unto every one of you according to your works.

Rev. 2:29 He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the **churches**.

Rev. 3:1 And unto the angel of the **church** in Sardis write; These things saith he that hath the seven Spirits of God, and the seven stars; I know thy works, that thou hast a name that thou livest, and art dead.

Rev. 3:6 He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the **churches**.

Rev. 3:7 And to the angel of the **church** in Philadelphia write; These things saith he that is holy, he that is true, he that hath the key of David, he that openeth, and no man shutteth; and shutteth, and no man openeth;

Rev. 3:13 He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the **churches**.

Rev. 3:14 And unto the angel of the **church** of the Laodiceans write; These things saith the Amen, the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God;

Rev. 3:22 He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the **churches**.

Rev. 22:16 I Jesus have sent mine angel to testify unto you these things in the **churches**. I am the root and the offspring of David, *and* the bright and morning star.

-Here in this last reference, it is, again, obviously the actual seven churches from before.

c.) The word illustrated by metaphors

The major metaphors for the church also demonstrate that the idea of a universal, invisible church is false. The church is Christ's body (1 Corinthians 12:27), His temple (1 Timothy 3:15), and His bride (2 Corinthians 11:2).¹⁴ Bodies are very local and

¹⁴ It is true that the bride metaphor is employed for the New Jerusalem (Revelation 21:2-3) as a synecdoche for all the people of God who will inhabit it. However, at that time they will all be present in the future heavenly festive assembly (Hebrews 12:23). There will indeed be this coming gathering of all the saints to the eternal heavenly City, but it will still be quite local and visible, it does not yet exist, and it certainly does not prove that saved people on earth in the United States, Colombia, Vietnam, and the

visible—a bunch of flesh and bones scattered around the globe is not a body. A temple is in one particular location, available for everyone to see; bricks scattered all over the place are not a building at all. And certainly every man on his wedding day rejoices that his bride is very local and visible, not invisible or cut into little pieces which are scattered all over the earth! Christ's church is not a building, a denomination, or something universal and invisible; it is a particular assembly of baptized saints.

So when people say that “the body of Christ” is all believers all over the world, they actually are espousing something that cannot be true. How can a body actually be a body if it is not in a particular location? In 1 Corinthians 12:13-27, Paul's point is unity in the congregation. The passage makes no sense if the body is anything other than the church at Corinth to which Paul is writing. 1 Cor 12:27 gives the only definition of the body of Christ metaphor, and it is defined as the church at Corinth, as “ye are the body of Christ” is written to “the church at Corinth” (1 Cor 1:2), where there were divisions that needed to be corrected by each church member fitting into that assembly where he was a member (1 Cor 1). It is noteworthy that Clement, the third pastor of the church at Rome, writing to the church at Corinth c. A. D. 100, also employed the metaphor of the body of Christ as a reference to the particular, visible assembly (cf. “Images of the Church in 1 Clement,” Thomas Ross; <http://sites.google.com/site/thross7>).

We have thus very clearly proven the Catholic and Protestant doctrines of the church are wrong. The word *ekklesia* means congregation or assembly—it is something very local, particular, and visible. The NT use fits with the pre-NT use. The difference in the Biblical church is that Christ says, “MY church”—it is an assembly that is His, not some other kind of assembly or congregation. The local, visible only view is also very evident from the uses of the word in the NT. It is evident from the Scriptural metaphors for the church as body, temple, and bride. The idea that all believers everywhere is one big universal church, whether visible or invisible, is a product of Roman Catholic history, not of NT doctrine. It developed out of the idea that outside of the church there is no salvation.

3.) Application

a.) The church does not save, contra Catholic/Protestant view. You do not join any church in order to be saved. You do not join a visible, universal church to be saved,

Central African Republic are somehow currently members of the same, never-assembling and invisible congregation, assembly, church, or *ekklesia*.

like Catholicism states. You do not join an invisible universal church to be saved, like Protestantism teaches. You must first be saved, and then you join the kind of church that is in the Bible, a local, visible congregation, by being baptized.

b.) Catholic/Protestant groups not churches, cannot baptized, do not have the special presence of Christ. There is, actually, in the book of Revelation an image that is set in contrast to the bride of Jesus Christ—the whore of Babylon. This is the one world religious system that will dominate the world in the Tribulation period, that is centered at Rome. The church of Rome is a partial fulfillment of this harlot.

2 With whom the kings of the earth have committed fornication, and the inhabitants of the earth have been made drunk with the wine of her fornication.

3 So he carried me away in the spirit into the wilderness: and I saw a woman sit upon a scarlet coloured beast, full of names of blasphemy, having seven heads and ten horns.

4 And the woman was arrayed in purple and scarlet colour, and decked with gold and precious stones and pearls, having a golden cup in her hand full of abominations and filthiness of her fornication:

5 And upon her forehead *was* a name written, MYSTERY, BABYLON THE GREAT, THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS AND ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH.

6 And I saw the woman drunken with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus: and when I saw her, I wondered with great admiration.

I would point out that this harlot has daughters, Rev 17:5, and the Protestant groups came out of Rome. (cf. the imagery of Babylon as a mother with daughters in Jeremiah 50:12; Hosea 2:2-5; contrast Galatians 4:26); WBC, NT on Rev 17:5: “the term μήτηρ, “mother,” is a figurative extension that means something like “archetype,” i.e., something “anticipating a later reality and suggesting a derivative relationship.”

You want a true church of Christ? Look around, view the assembly of the saints in which you sit. This is the body of Christ. This is the holy temple of the Lord. This is the pure and holy bride of Christ.

c.) All non-Baptist religious societies and denominations have no right to exist. I am glad for whatever good is done there, Mark 9:38-40. Nevertheless, they should shut down and all their members should be baptized into independent Baptist churches. Christ only has one institution in this age—the kind of church He started in the first century. He is not pleased with any other “churches” that compete with His church. I would be very displeased with anyone who did anything that tried to hurt my wife, and with anyone who tried to move her out of my house and start doing what she is doing. God does not want His people committing spiritual adultery with organizations outside of His church. The

command for all believers is, “Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues” (Rev 18:4) and join one of the Lord’s true churches.

c.) Rev 1:13; 2:1—Christ in the midst of His churches.

i.) The church is better than the holy of holies in the tabernacle.

a.) Consider the glorious implications of the metaphors for the church. “For no man ever yet hated his own flesh; but nourisheth and cherisheth it, even as the Lord the church: For we are members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones. For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall be joined unto his wife, and they two shall be one flesh. This is a great mystery: but I speak concerning Christ and the church.” (Ephesians 5:29-32). What a union with Christ is this! What closeness as to be Christ’s body! What love and fellowship as being His bride! “And are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner *stone*; In whom all the building fitly framed together groweth unto an holy temple in the Lord: In whom ye also are builded together for an habitation of God through the Spirit.” (Ephesians 2:20-22). If you are a member of this church, you are a very living stone in the glorious, spiritual temple of God for this age!

ii.) Join the church. No free-hanging body parts! If you are saved but not part of the church, you are not in the body of Christ, you are not part of the temple of the Lord, and you are not part of Christ’s bride on earth (although all Christians will be part of the bride in the New Jerusalem (Revelation 21:2)). Oh, what glory you are missing out on! Why do you linger, my brother, outside of the church that Christ loved, and washed with His precious blood!

iii.) Passionately love the church like Christ does, with selfless, sacrificial love, Eph 5:25-27. Long for her glorious fellowship, Psalm 84:1-2.¹⁵ Offer priestly service (1 Peter 2:9)¹⁶ with reverence and godly fear (Hebrews 12:28-29)¹⁷ in worship. You have in this assembly a greater presence of God than in the tabernacle! Do you act like it? Do you sing like it? Do you show up on time? Can you imagine the high priest on the day of atonement not showing up on time to do the sacrifice? You have better things than he in the church! What are you thinking by being late?

¹⁵ How amiable *are* thy tabernacles, O LORD of hosts! 2 My soul longeth, yea, even fainteth for the courts of the LORD: my heart and my flesh crieth out for the living God.

¹⁶ But ye *are* a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people; that ye should shew forth the praises of him who hath called you out of darkness into his marvellous light:

¹⁷ Wherefore we receiving a kingdom which cannot be moved, let us have grace, whereby we may serve God acceptably with reverence and godly fear: For our God *is* a consuming fire.

iv.) Fit into the church. You are a body part, and the body is more important than you in particular. The life of the whole body is more important than whatever the toe thinks is best for itself. Maintain unity. Reject strife and division.

v.) Follow church authority. This is part of fitting into the body. Christ rules in the midst of His enemies in this age on earth in the church (Psalm 110:2). Submit to His rule and the leadership He has placed in it. Your pastor is a star in the right hand of Christ (Revelation 1:20; 2:1). Recognize this, and pray for him, thank God for him, follow his leadership, and help him.

vi.) Support the church in bodily presence, in prayer, in mutual edification (Heb 10:24-25), financially, etc.

vii.) This is the truth about Christ's church. This is what it is, and how you need to view it. Do you?

There are many other practical impossibilities and ecclesiological errors that come from the universal church view. Dr. Thomas Strouse has well explained a number of them:

The ramifications of the biblical teaching that the local church is the body of Christ, that Spirit Baptism was a temporary phenomenon, and that the mystical body of Christ does not exist are broad and serious. . . . There is no . . . divine authority for organizations or efforts outside of the local church to practice the Great Commission. Since the Great Commission (Mt. 28:19-20) requires evangelism, baptism, and instruction in the Word of God, parachurch organizations have no divine authority for their existence . . . [nor do] . . . associations or conventions. . . . Scholars operating in the realm of the "big" universal church offer unbiblical and therefore confusing theological restatements of the Scriptures. Their weak ecclesiology impacts other doctrines such as bibliology, soteriology, and eschatology. . . . To them "true" scholarship occurs in the para-church university or seminary where theologians, trained by other para-church theologians, postulate the "truth" of Scripture. The local church is ill equipped and the pastor is ill prepared to do the real work of the ministry in the realm of scholarship, they maintain. These scholars, whether they have any affiliation with a local church or not, have earned doctorates from accredited para-church academic institutions, and therefore think that they have the last word on theology. Their condescending attitude toward the Lord's assemblies is supposedly justified because they are the "doctors" of theology since they are in "the big church." This disastrous impact undermines the authority of the Bible and usurps the ministry of the Lord's ekklesia. Scripture states that the church is "the pillar and ground of the truth" (I Tim. 3:15), that the ekklesia is to "commit [theological training] to faithful men" (II Tim. 2:2), that the church member "is to study to shew [himself] approved unto God" (II Tim. 2:15), and that the assembly has been given Christ's gift of "pastors and teachers" (Eph. 4:11). The local church as the divinely ordained doctrinal training institution is the Lord's "college." College comes from the Latin *collegeum* that means a group of colleagues who have banded together around a particular guild or trade. The particular "guild" in which the local church is engaged is the scholarly pursuit of studying the Scriptures (cf. Acts 17:11). . . . Only the Lord's candlesticks can produce NT churches. Para-church [organizations] cannot baptize

converts and cannot commission missionary candidates. . . . The NT teaches, in contradistinction, that the church at Antioch acted as Paul's "mission board" and sent out Barnabas and the Apostle (Acts 13:1 ff.). To be sure, other churches such as the Philippian church helped support Paul's missionary endeavors on his second journey (Phil. 4:15-16). Much of the same criticism could be leveled toward highly structured Baptist fellowships. The unbiblical mindset of the universal church produces the necessity for organized hierarchy outside of the local church. Fellowships, associations and conventions, which develop organizational structure beyond the local church, end up usurping the autonomy of each of the Lord's assemblies. The presidents, regional directors, etc., of these non-authorized structures tend to dictate to the churches resolutions which in turn become "suggested" tenets for orthodoxy and fundamentalism. Some pastors feel intimidated and hesitate to reject these suggestions, ultimately embracing the "traditions" of men (Mk. 7:7) and incorporating these tenets in their particular ekklesia. The NT does teach that there is a place for churches to fellowship around "the faith once delivered unto the saints" (Jude 1:3). Furthermore, the churches of Galatia were united in biblical doctrine around the Lord Jesus Christ, while retaining their respective autonomy (Gal. 1:2; 3:27-28). Once the Lord's churches recognize [the true doctrine of the church] . . . then they may realize the authority, importance, and dignity the Lord gives exclusively to His candlesticks. The Scriptures teach that the church at Jerusalem had the divine authority in precept and set the precedent to practice the Great Commission. Christ gave the precept of the Great Commission to the apostles who were representatives of the 120 disciples who made up the Lord's ekklesia on the day of Pentecost (Acts 1:20). This ekklesia began to evangelize, baptize and instruct Jews and Gentiles as the Book of Acts gives ample precedent. The Scriptures make some amazing and outstanding claims for the Lord's churches. For instance, Paul taught that Christ, Who is Head over all His creation, completely fills His body, the local church (Eph. 1:23). He revealed that the saints in the local churches teach the angelic realm redemptive truths (Eph. 3:10). He averred that local churches, like the Ephesian church, grow up in Christ to become mature bodies through doctrinal teaching (Eph. 4:11-16). He proclaimed that the Lord Jesus Christ both loved and died for individual church[es] . . . (Eph. 5:25) and that He will cleanse the church members through the washing of the word to present each ekklesia as glorious (Eph. 5:26-27). Elsewhere, the Apostle taught that the local church, the one with a bishop and deacons, was the pillar and ground of the truth (I Tim. 3:1-15). The Lord spoke through the Apostle John and gave His apocalyptic revelation to seven local churches (Rev. 1-3). When one realizes that the Scriptures teach the local church is the Lord's sole institution for His presence, worship and service, then one recognizes the glory, dignity, and honor that should be attributed to each and every one of Christ's assemblies. ("Ye Are The Body of Christ," Dr. Thomas M. Strouse. Emmanuel Baptist Theological Seminary, Newington, CT. elec. acc. http://www.faithonfire.org/articles/body_of_christ.html)

All The Instances in the NT of the Word *Church*

Matt. 16:18 And I say also unto thee, That thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my **church**; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.

Matt. 18:17 And if he shall neglect to hear them, tell *it* unto the church: but if he neglect to hear the **church**, let him be unto thee as an heathen man and a publican.

Acts 2:47 Praising God, and having favour with all the people. And the Lord added to the **church** daily such as should be saved.

Acts 5:11 And great fear came upon all the **church**, and upon as many as heard these things.

Acts 7:38 This is he, that was in the **church** in the wilderness with the angel which spake to him in the mount Sina, and *with* our fathers: who received the lively oracles to give unto us:

Acts 8:1 And Saul was consenting unto his death. And at that time there was a great persecution against the **church** which was at Jerusalem; and they were all scattered abroad throughout the regions of Judaea and Samaria, except the apostles.

Acts 8:3 As for Saul, he made havock of the **church**, entering into every house, and haling men and women committed *them* to prison.

Acts 9:31 Then had the **churches** rest throughout all Judaea and Galilee and Samaria, and were edified; and walking in the fear of the Lord, and in the comfort of the Holy Ghost, were multiplied.

Acts 11:22 Then tidings of these things came unto the ears of the **church** which was in Jerusalem: and they sent forth Barnabas, that he should go as far as Antioch.

Acts 11:26 And when he had found him, he brought him unto Antioch. And it came to pass, that a whole year they assembled themselves with the **church**, and taught much people. And the disciples were called Christians first in Antioch.

Acts 12:1 Now about that time Herod the king stretched forth *his* hands to vex certain of the **church**.

Acts 12:5 Peter therefore was kept in prison: but prayer was made without ceasing of the **church** unto God for him.

Acts 13:1 Now there were in the **church** that was at Antioch certain prophets and teachers; as Barnabas, and Simeon that was called Niger, and Lucius of Cyrene, and Manaen, which had been brought up with Herod the tetrarch, and Saul.

Acts 14:23 And when they had ordained them elders in every **church**, and had prayed with fasting, they commended them to the Lord, on whom they believed.

Acts 14:27 And when they were come, and had gathered the **church** together, they rehearsed all that God had done with them, and how he had opened the door of faith unto the Gentiles.

Acts 15:3 And being brought on their way by the **church**, they passed through Phenice and Samaria, declaring the conversion of the Gentiles: and they caused great joy unto all the brethren.

Acts 15:4 And when they were come to Jerusalem, they were received of the **church**, and *of* the apostles and elders, and they declared all things that God had done with them.

Acts 15:22 Then pleased it the apostles and elders, with the whole **church**, to send chosen men of their own company to Antioch with Paul and Barnabas; *namely*, Judas surnamed Barsabas, and Silas, chief men among the brethren:

Acts 15:41 And he went through Syria and Cilicia, confirming the **churches**.

Acts 16:5 And so were the **churches** established in the faith, and increased in number daily.

Acts 18:22 And when he had landed at Caesarea, and gone up, and saluted the **church**, he went down to Antioch.

Acts 19:32 Some therefore cried one thing, and some another: for the **assembly** was confused; and the more part knew not wherefore they were come together.

Acts 19:39 But if ye enquire any thing concerning other matters, it shall be determined in a lawful **assembly**.

Acts 19:41 And when he had thus spoken, he dismissed the **assembly**.

Acts 20:17 And from Miletus he sent to Ephesus, and called the elders of the **church**.

Acts 20:28 Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the **church** of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood.

Rom. 16:1 I commend unto you Phebe our sister, which is a servant of the **church** which is at Cenchrea:

Rom. 16:4 Who have for my life laid down their own necks: unto whom not only I give thanks, but also all the **churches** of the Gentiles.

Rom. 16:5 Likewise *greet* the **church** that is in their house. Salute my wellbeloved Epaenetus, who is the firstfruits of Achaia unto Christ.

Rom. 16:16 Salute one another with an holy kiss. The **churches** of Christ salute you.

Rom. 16:23 Gaius mine host, and of the whole **church**, saluteth you. Erastus the chamberlain of the city saluteth you, and Quartus a brother.

1Cor. 1:2 Unto the **church** of God which is at Corinth, to them that are sanctified in Christ Jesus, called *to be* saints, with all that in every place call upon the name of Jesus Christ our Lord, both theirs and ours:

1Cor. 4:17 For this cause have I sent unto you Timotheus, who is my beloved son, and faithful in the Lord, who shall bring you into remembrance of my ways which be in Christ, as I teach every where in every **church**.

1Cor. 6:4 If then ye have judgments of things pertaining to this life, set them to judge who are least esteemed in the **church**.

1Cor. 7:17 But as God hath distributed to every man, as the Lord hath called every one, so let him walk. And so ordain I in all **churches**.

1Cor. 10:32 Give none offence, neither to the Jews, nor to the Gentiles, nor to the **church** of God:

1Cor. 11:16 But if any man seem to be contentious, we have no such custom, neither the **churches** of God.

1Cor. 11:18 For first of all, when ye come together in the **church**, I hear that there be divisions among you; and I partly believe it.

1Cor. 11:22 What? have ye not houses to eat and to drink in? or despise ye the **church** of God, and shame them that have not? What shall I say to you? shall I praise you in this? I praise *you* not.

1Cor. 12:28 And God hath set some in the **church**, first apostles, secondarily prophets, thirdly teachers, after that miracles, then gifts of healings, helps, governments, diversities of tongues.

1Cor. 14:4 He that speaketh in an *unknown* tongue edifieth himself; but he that prophesieth edifieth the **church**.

1Cor. 14:5 I would that ye all spake with tongues, but rather that ye prophesied: for greater *is* he that prophesieth than he that speaketh with tongues, except he interpret, that the **church** may receive edifying.

1Cor. 14:12 Even so ye, forasmuch as ye are zealous of spiritual *gifts*, seek that ye may excel to the edifying of the **church**.

1Cor. 14:19 Yet in the **church** I had rather speak five words with my understanding, that *by my voice* I might teach others also, than ten thousand words in an *unknown* tongue.

1Cor. 14:23 If therefore the whole **church** be come together into one place, and all speak with tongues, and there come in *those that are* unlearned, or unbelievers, will they not say that ye are mad?

1Cor. 14:28 But if there be no interpreter, let him keep silence in the **church**; and let him speak to himself, and to God.

1Cor. 14:33 For God is not *the author* of confusion, but of peace, as in all **churches** of the saints.

1Cor. 14:34 Let your women keep silence in the **churches**: for it is not permitted unto them to speak; but *they are commanded* to be under obedience, as also saith the law.

1Cor. 14:35 And if they will learn any thing, let them ask their husbands at home: for it is a shame for women to speak in the **church**.

1Cor. 15:9 For I am the least of the apostles, that am not meet to be called an apostle, because I persecuted the **church** of God.

1Cor. 16:1 Now concerning the collection for the saints, as I have given order to the **churches** of Galatia, even so do ye.

1Cor. 16:19 The **churches** of Asia salute you. Aquila and Priscilla salute you much in the Lord, with the church that is in their house.

2Cor. 1:1 Paul, an apostle of Jesus Christ by the will of God, and Timothy *our* brother, unto the **church** of God which is at Corinth, with all the saints which are in all Achaia:

2Cor. 8:1 Moreover, brethren, we do you to wit of the grace of God bestowed on the **churches** of Macedonia;

2Cor. 8:18 And we have sent with him the brother, whose praise *is* in the gospel throughout all the **churches**;

2Cor. 8:19 And not *that* only, but who was also chosen of the **churches** to travel with us with this grace, which is administered by us to the glory of the same Lord, and *declaration of* your ready mind:

2Cor. 8:23 Whether *any do enquire* of Titus, *he is* my partner and fellowhelper concerning you: or our brethren *be enquired of*, *they are* the messengers of the **churches**, and the glory of Christ.

2Cor. 8:24 Wherefore shew ye to them, and before the **churches**, the proof of your love, and of our boasting on your behalf.

2Cor. 11:8 I robbed other **churches**, taking wages *of them*, to do you service.

2Cor. 11:28 Beside those things that are without, that which cometh upon me daily, the care of all the **churches**.

2Cor. 12:13 For what is it wherein ye were inferior to other **churches**, except *it be* that I myself was not burdensome to you? forgive me this wrong.

Gal. 1:2 And all the brethren which are with me, unto the **churches** of Galatia:

Gal. 1:13 For ye have heard of my conversation in time past in the Jews' religion, how that beyond measure I persecuted the **church** of God, and wasted it:

Gal. 1:22 And was unknown by face unto the **churches** of Judaea which were in Christ:

Eph. 1:22 And hath put all *things* under his feet, and gave him *to be* the head over all *things* to the **church**,

Eph. 3:10 To the intent that now unto the principalities and powers in heavenly *places* might be known by the **church** the manifold wisdom of God,

Eph. 3:21 Unto him *be* glory in the **church** by Christ Jesus throughout all ages, world without end. Amen.

Eph. 5:23 For the husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the **church**: and he is the saviour of the body.

Eph. 5:24 Therefore as the **church** is subject unto Christ, so *let* the wives *be* to their own husbands in every thing.

Eph. 5:25 Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the **church**, and gave himself for it;

Eph. 5:27 That he might present it to himself a glorious **church**, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish.

Eph. 5:29 For no man ever yet hated his own flesh; but nourisheth and cherisheth it, even as the Lord the **church**:

Eph. 5:32 This is a great mystery: but I speak concerning Christ and the **church**.

Phil. 3:6 Concerning zeal, persecuting the **church**; touching the righteousness which is in the law, blameless.

Phil. 4:15 Now ye Philippians know also, that in the beginning of the gospel, when I departed from Macedonia, no **church** communicated with me as concerning giving and receiving, but ye only.

Col. 1:18 And he is the head of the body, the **church**: who is the beginning, the firstborn from the dead; that in all *things* he might have the preeminence.

Col. 1:24 Who now rejoice in my sufferings for you, and fill up that which is behind of the afflictions of Christ in my flesh for his body's sake, which is the **church**:

Col. 4:15 Salute the brethren which are in Laodicea, and Nymphas, and the **church** which is in his house.

Col. 4:16 And when this epistle is read among you, cause that it be read also in the **church** of the Laodiceans; and that ye likewise read the *epistle* from Laodicea.

1Th. 1:1 Paul, and Silvanus, and Timotheus, unto the **church** of the Thessalonians *which is* in God the Father and *in* the Lord Jesus Christ: Grace *be* unto you, and peace, from God our Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ.

1Th. 2:14 For ye, brethren, became followers of the **churches** of God which in Judaea are in Christ Jesus: for ye also have suffered like things of your own countrymen, even as they *have* of the Jews:

2Th. 1:1 Paul, and Silvanus, and Timotheus, unto the **church** of the Thessalonians in God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ:

2Th. 1:4 So that we ourselves glory in you in the **churches** of God for your patience and faith in all your persecutions and tribulations that ye endure:

1Tim. 3:5 (For if a man know not how to rule his own house, how shall he take care of the **church** of God?)

1Tim. 3:15 But if I tarry long, that thou mayest know how thou oughtest to behave thyself in the house of God, which is the **church** of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth.

1Tim. 5:16 If any man or woman that believeth have widows, let them relieve them, and let not the **church** be charged; that it may relieve them that are widows indeed.

Philem. 2 And to *our* beloved Apphia, and Archippus our fellowsoldier, and to the **church** in thy house:

Heb. 2:12 Saying, I will declare thy name unto my brethren, in the midst of the **church** will I sing praise unto thee.

Heb. 12:23 To the general assembly and **church** of the firstborn, which are written in heaven, and to God the Judge of all, and to the spirits of just men made perfect,

James 5:14 Is any sick among you? let him call for the elders of the **church**; and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord:

3John 6 Which have borne witness of thy charity before the **church**: whom if thou bring forward on their journey after a godly sort, thou shalt do well:

3John 9 I wrote unto the **church**: but Diotrephes, who loveth to have the preeminence among them, receiveth us not.

3John 10 Wherefore, if I come, I will remember his deeds which he doeth, prating against us with malicious words: and not content therewith, neither doth he himself receive the brethren, and forbiddeth them that would, and casteth *them* out of the **church**.

Rev. 1:4 John to the seven **churches** which are in Asia: Grace *be* unto you, and peace, from him which is, and which was, and which is to come; and from the seven Spirits which are before his throne;

Rev. 1:11 Saying, I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last: and, What thou seest, write in a book, and send *it* unto the seven **churches** which are in Asia; unto Ephesus, and unto Smyrna, and unto Pergamos, and unto Thyatira, and unto Sardis, and unto Philadelphia, and unto Laodicea.

Rev. 1:20 The mystery of the seven stars which thou sawest in my right hand, and the seven golden candlesticks. The seven stars are the angels of the seven **churches**: and the seven candlesticks which thou sawest are the seven churches.

Rev. 2:1 Unto the angel of the **church** of Ephesus write; These things saith he that holdeth the seven stars in his right hand, who walketh in the midst of the seven golden candlesticks;

Rev. 2:7 He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the **churches**; To him that overcometh will I give to eat of the tree of life, which is in the midst of the paradise of God.

Rev. 2:8 And unto the angel of the **church** in Smyrna write; These things saith the first and the last, which was dead, and is alive;

Rev. 2:11 He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the **churches**; He that overcometh shall not be hurt of the second death.

Rev. 2:12 And to the angel of the **church** in Pergamos write; These things saith he which hath the sharp sword with two edges;

Rev. 2:17 He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the **churches**; To him that overcometh will I give to eat of the hidden manna, and will give him a white stone, and in the stone a new name written, which no man knoweth saving he that receiveth *it*.

Rev. 2:18 And unto the angel of the **church** in Thyatira write; These things saith the Son of God, who hath his eyes like unto a flame of fire, and his feet *are* like fine brass;

Rev. 2:23 And I will kill her children with death; and all the **churches** shall know that I am he which searcheth the reins and hearts: and I will give unto every one of you according to your works.

Rev. 2:29 He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the **churches**.

Rev. 3:1 And unto the angel of the **church** in Sardis write; These things saith he that hath the seven Spirits of God, and the seven stars; I know thy works, that thou hast a name that thou livest, and art dead.

Rev. 3:6 He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the **churches**.

Rev. 3:7 And to the angel of the **church** in Philadelphia write; These things saith he that is holy, he that is true, he that hath the key of David, he that openeth, and no man shutteth; and shutteth, and no man openeth;

Rev. 3:13 He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the **churches**.

Rev. 3:14 And unto the angel of the **church** of the Laodiceans write; These things saith the Amen, the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God;

Rev. 3:22 He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the **churches**.

Rev. 22:16 I Jesus have sent mine angel to testify unto you these things in the **churches**. I am the root and the offspring of David, *and* the bright and morning star.

Syntax Questions on Ephesians

In ἀπόστολος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ in Ephesians 1:1, what kind of genitive is found?

In Ephesians 1:1, what Greek syntactical construction is τοῖς ἁγίοις . . . καὶ πιστοῖς in? What is the significance of this construction?

What are the case and case usage of χάρις and εἰρήνη in Ephesians 1:2?

What is the case and case usage of πατρός in Ephesians 1:2?

If one points a modalist, such as a “Jesus only” Oneness Pentecostal, to Ephesians 1:2 to affirm that the Father and the Son are eternally distinct Persons in the Godhead, the modalist will reply, if he has studied his false doctrine, that “and” is the wrong translation; since καί can be ascensive (Wallace 670-671), he would affirm that the text should read, from God the Father, *even* the Lord Jesus Christ, eliminating the Personal distinctions in the Godhead. What is the proper response to this modalist argument?

Because of the truth of Ephesians 1:3, do you bless, rejoice in, and praise the Triune God because He is the infinitely blessed God?

Note that application questions such as this one are as serious, and should be given as much thought and work as a difficult syntactical or exegetical question. You should NOT just spend a few seconds on application questions and write down whatever first comes to your mind so you can just keep going. If you are to preach and teach the Word, it is essential that you exegete it correctly, but it is also essential that, empowered by the Holy Spirit, you apply it prayerfully, experientially, powerfully, and carefully to your own heart, mind, and life and then to those to whom you are giving forth the Word of life. If you are to “save thyself, and them that hear thee” from the apostasy of these last days (1 Timothy 4:1), you must “take heed unto thyself”—keep your heart right with God and flee from sin—“take heed . . . unto the doctrine”—by means of careful exegesis

thereof (1 Timothy 4:16). You must “meditate upon these things [and] give thyself wholly to them; that thy profiting may appear to all” (1 Timothy 4:15). Your heart should burn within you (Luke 24:32) as, through the instrumentality of your painstaking and diligent study of the Scriptures, Christ illuminates to you, by means of the Holy Spirit, the glorious written revelation of your Father. Are you not translating the very living oracles of the Creator of the universe—that high and holy One who has, despite your wretched sinfulness, given His very Son out of His bosom to redeem you? Are these not the infallible words of He who “utter[s] his voice . . . and the heavens and the earth shall shake” (Joel 3:16)? Does He not say, “The heaven is my throne, and the earth is my footstool . . . all those things hath mine hand made, and all those things have been, saith the LORD: but to this man will I look, even to him that is poor and of a contrite spirit, and trembleth at my word” (Isaiah 66:1-2)? Will you not then be humble, and tremble at His Word? Are not each word and sentence of the Bible the words of Christ, of whom the Psalmist prophesied, “Thou art fairer than the children of men: grace is poured into thy lips” (Psalm 45:2)? Then can you say with the Psalmist, “My heart is inditing a good matter: I speak of the things which I have made touching the king: my tongue *is* the pen of a ready writer” (Psalm 45:1), and readily write out of a heart-knowledge and experience of this Holy One, your Redeemer, that you have gained by meditation upon and sweet fellowship with Him through the study of this passage you have translated? Or will all the earth (Psalm 66:4)—yea, all the universe—worship Him, but you be silent?

What is the functional category for the conjunction καί in Ephesians 1:3?

What kind of Greek construction is ὁ Θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ in Ephesians 1:3, and what is the significance of this construction?

Christ is the Son of the Father, Ephesians 1:3, and believers are sons of the Father, Ephesians 1:5. How is our sonship different from that of Christ?

At this point you should read Hoehner, pgs. 173-174, Excursus #3: “In Christ,” to get a sense of the frequency and significance of this phrase in Ephesians. Also read Hoehner’s discussion on election, Excursus 4, pgs. 185-188 (the section on Barth, “A Discussion of the Doctrine of Election,” pgs. 188-193, does not need to be read).

What is the voice of ἐξελέξατο, and what syntactical category does the verb fall into in that voice? Look the verb up in BDAG, and also consider in particular the texts in this footnote¹⁸ if one wishes to label the verb deponent.

¹⁸

All NT texts:

Mark 13:20 καὶ εἰ μὴ Κύριος ἐκολόβωσε τὰς ἡμέρας, οὐκ ἂν ἐσώθη πᾶσα σὰρξ· ἀλλὰ διὰ τοὺς ἐκλεκτοὺς, οὓς **ἐξελέξατο**, ἐκολόβωσε τὰς ἡμέρας.

Luke 6:13 καὶ ὅτε ἐγένετο ἡμέρα, προσεφώνησε τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ· καὶ **ἐκλεξάμενος** ἀπ’ αὐτῶν δώδεκα, οὓς καὶ ἀποστόλους ὠνόμασε

Luke 10:42 ἐνὸς δὲ ἐστὶν χρεία· Μαρία δὲ τὴν ἀγαθὴν μερίδα **ἐξελέξατο**, ἥτις οὐκ ἀφαιρεθήσεται ἀπ’ αὐτῆς.

Luke 14:7 Ἐλεγε δὲ πρὸς τοὺς κεκλημένους παραβολὴν, ἐπέχων πῶς τὰς πρωτοκλισίας **ἐξελέγοντο**, λέγων πρὸς αὐτούς.

John 6:70 ἀπεκρίθη αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Οὐκ ἐγὼ ὑμᾶς τοὺς δώδεκα **ἐξελεξάμην**, καὶ ἐξ ὑμῶν εἷς διάβολός ἐστιν;

John 13:18 οὐ περὶ πάντων ὑμῶν λέγω· ἐγὼ οἶδα οὓς **ἐξελεξάμην**· ἀλλ’ ἵνα ἡ γραφὴ πληρωθῇ, Ὅ τρώγων μετ’ ἐμοῦ τὸν ἄρτον ἐπῆρεν ἐπ’ ἐμὲ τὴν πτέρναν αὐτοῦ.

John 15:16 οὐχ ὑμεῖς με **ἐξελέξασθε**, ἀλλ’ ἐγὼ **ἐξελεξάμην** ὑμᾶς, καὶ ἔθηκα ὑμᾶς, ἵνα ὑμεῖς ὑπάγητε καὶ καρπὸν φέριτε, καὶ ὁ καρπὸς ὑμῶν μένη· ἵνα ὅ τι ἂν αἰτήσητε τὸν πατέρα ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου, δῶ ὑμῖν.

John 15:19 εἰ ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου ἦτε, ὁ κόσμος ἂν τὸ ἴδιον ἐφίλει· ὅτι δὲ ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου οὐκ ἐστέ, ἀλλ’ ἐγὼ **ἐξελεξάμην** ὑμᾶς ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου, διὰ τοῦτο μισεῖ ὑμᾶς ὁ κόσμος.

Acts 1:2 ἄχρι ἧς ἡμέρας, ἐντειλάμενος τοῖς ἀποστόλοις διὰ Πνεύματος Ἁγίου οὓς **ἐξελέξατο**, ἀνελήμφθη·

Acts 1:24 καὶ προσευξάμενοι εἶπον, Σὺ Κύριε καρδιογνώστα πάντων, ἀνάδειξον ἐκ τούτων τῶν δύο ὃν ἓνα **ἐξελέξω**,

Acts 6:5 καὶ ἦρσαν ὁ λόγος ἐνώπιον παντὸς τοῦ πλήθους· καὶ **ἐξελέξαντο** Στέφανον, ἄνδρα πλήρη πίστεως καὶ Πνεύματος Ἁγίου, καὶ Φίλιππον, καὶ Πρόχορον, καὶ Νικάνορα, καὶ Τίμωνα, καὶ Παρμενᾶν, καὶ Νικόλαον προσήλυτον Ἀντιοχείας,

Acts 13:17 ὁ Θεὸς τοῦ λαοῦ τούτου Ἰσραὴλ **ἐξελέξατο** τοὺς πατέρας ἡμῶν, καὶ τὸν λαὸν ὕψωσεν ἐν τῇ παροικίᾳ ἐν γῇ Αἰγύπτῳ, καὶ μετὰ βραχίονος ὑψηλοῦ ἐξήγαγεν αὐτοὺς ἐξ αὐτῆς.

Acts 15:7 πολλῆς δὲ συζητήσεως γενομένης ἀναστὰς Πέτρος εἶπε πρὸς αὐτούς, Ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί, ὑμεῖς ἐπίστασθε ὅτι ἀφ' ἡμερῶν ἀρχαίων ὁ Θεὸς ἐν ἡμῖν **ἐξελέξατο**, διὰ τοῦ στόματός μου ἀκοῦσαι τὰ ἔθνη τὸν λόγον τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, καὶ πιστεῦσαι.

Acts 15:22 Τότε ἔδοξε τοῖς ἀποστόλοις καὶ τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις σὺν ὅλῃ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, **ἐκλεξαμένους** ἄνδρας ἐξ αὐτῶν πέμψαι εἰς Ἀντιόχειαν σὺν τῷ Παύλῳ καὶ Βαρνάβᾳ, Ἰούδαν τὸν ἐπικαλούμενον Βαρσαβάν, καὶ Σίλαν, ἄνδρας ἡγουμένους ἐν τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς,

Acts 15:25 ἔδοξεν ἡμῖν γενομένοις ὁμοθυμαδὸν, **ἐκλεξαμένους** ἄνδρας πέμψαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς, σὺν τοῖς ἀγαπητοῖς ἡμῶν Βαρνάβᾳ καὶ Παύλῳ,

1Cor. 1:27 ἀλλὰ τὰ μωρὰ τοῦ κόσμου **ἐξελέξατο** ὁ Θεός, ἵνα τοὺς σοφοὺς καταισχύνῃ· καὶ τὰ ἀσθενῆ τοῦ κόσμου **ἐξελέξατο** ὁ Θεός, ἵνα καταισχύνῃ τὰ ἰσχυρά·

1Cor. 1:28 καὶ τὰ ἀγενῆ τοῦ κόσμου καὶ τὰ ἐξουθενημένα **ἐξελέξατο** ὁ Θεός, καὶ τὰ μὴ ὄντα, ἵνα τὰ ὄντα καταργήσῃ·

Eph. 1:4 καθὼς **ἐξελέξατο** ἡμᾶς ἐν αὐτῷ πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου, εἶναι ἡμᾶς ἁγίους καὶ ἀμώμους κατενώπιον αὐτοῦ ἐν ἀγάπῃ,

James 2:5 ἀκούσατε, ἀδελφοί μου ἀγαπητοί. οὐχ ὁ Θεὸς **ἐξελέξατο** τοὺς πτωχοὺς τοῦ κόσμου τούτου, πλουσίους ἐν πίστει, καὶ κληρονόμους τῆς βασιλείας ἧς ἐπηγγείλατο τοῖς ἀγαπῶσιν αὐτόν;

Mark 13:20 **And except that the Lord had shortened those days, no flesh should be saved: but for the elect's sake, whom he hath chosen, he hath shortened the days.**

Luke 6:13 And when it was day, he called *unto him* his disciples: and of them he chose twelve, whom also he named apostles;

Luke 10:42 **But one thing is needful: and Mary hath chosen that good part, which shall not be taken away from her.**

Luke 14:7 And he put forth a parable to those which were bidden, when he marked how they chose out the chief rooms; saying unto them,

John 6:70 Jesus answered them, **Have not I chosen you twelve, and one of you is a devil?**

John 13:18 **I speak not of you all: I know whom I have chosen: but that the scripture may be fulfilled, He that eateth bread with me hath lifted up his heel against me.**

John 15:16 **Ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen you, and ordained you, that ye should go and bring forth fruit, and that your fruit should remain: that whatsoever ye shall ask of the Father in my name, he may give it you.**

John 15:19 **If ye were of the world, the world would love his own: but because ye are not of the world, but I have chosen you out of the world, therefore the world hateth you.**

Acts 1:2 Until the day in which he was taken up, after that he through the Holy Ghost had given commandments unto the apostles whom he had chosen:

Acts 1:24 And they prayed, and said, Thou, Lord, which knowest the hearts of all *men*, shew whether of these two thou hast chosen,

Acts 6:5 And the saying pleased the whole multitude: and they chose Stephen, a man full of faith and of the Holy Ghost, and Philip, and Prochorus, and Nicanor, and Timon, and Parmenas, and Nicolas a proselyte of Antioch:

Acts 13:17 The God of this people of Israel chose our fathers, and exalted the people when they dwelt as strangers in the land of Egypt, and with an high arm brought he them out of it.

Acts 15:7 And when there had been much disputing, Peter rose up, and said unto them, Men *and* brethren, ye know how that a good while ago God made choice among us, that the Gentiles by my mouth should hear the word of the gospel, and believe.

Acts 15:22 Then pleased it the apostles and elders, with the whole church, to send chosen men of their own company to Antioch with Paul and Barnabas; *namely*, Judas surnamed Barsabas, and Silas, chief men among the brethren:

Acts 15:25 It seemed good unto us, being assembled with one accord, to send chosen men unto you with our beloved Barnabas and Paul,

1Cor. 1:27 But God hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise; and God hath chosen the weak things of the world to confound the things which are mighty;

1Cor. 1:28 And base things of the world, and things which are despised, hath God chosen, *yea*, and things which are not, to bring to nought things that are:

1 Peter 1:2 states that election is according to foreknowledge. Is there evidence in the NT or LXX that “foreknow” means more than precognition, but “foreordain” or “forelove,” as Reformed theology asserts? Note the references below.

πρόγνωσις / προγινώσκω In the NT + LXX+Apostolic Patristics

Eph. 1:4 According as he hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before him in love:

James 2:5 Hearken, my beloved brethren, Hath not God chosen the poor of this world rich in faith, and heirs of the kingdom which he hath promised to them that love him?

Selected texts in Josephus:

Antiq. 8:39 Ἦσαν δὲ καὶ ἕτεροι τῷ βασιλεῖ ἡγεμόνες οἱ τῆς τε Σύρων γῆς καὶ τῶν ἀλλοφύλων ἥτις ἦν ἀπ’ Εὐφράτου ποταμοῦ διήκουσα μέχρι τῆς Αἰγυπτίων ἐπήρχον **ἐκλέγοντες** αὐτῶ φόρους παρὰ τῶν ἐθνῶν.

Antiq. 8:39 (8.2.4.39) The king had also other rulers, who were over the land of Syria, and the Philistines, which reached from the river Euphrates to Egypt, and these collected his tributes of the nations.

Antiq. 16:142 Μετὰ δὲ τὴν πανήγυριν ταύτην καὶ τὰς ἐορτὰς πόλιν ἄλλην ἀνήγειρεν ἐν τῷ πεδίῳ τῷ λεγομένῳ Καφαρσαβὰ τόπον ἔνυδρον καὶ χώραν ἀρίστην φυτοῖς **ἐκλέξας** ποταμοῦ τε περιρρέοντος τὴν πόλιν αὐτὴν καὶ καλλίστου κατὰ μέγεθος τῶν φυτῶν περιειληφότος ἄλσους

Antiq. 16:142 (16.5.2.142) After this solemnity and these festivals were over, Herod erected another city in the plain called Capharsaba, where he chose out a fit place, both for plenty of water and goodness of soil, and proper for the production of what was there planted, where a river encompassed the city itself, and a grove of the best trees for magnitude was round about it;

War 2:136 σπουδάζουσι δ’ ἐκτόπως περὶ τὰ τῶν παλαιῶν συντάγματα μάλιστα τὰ πρὸς ὠφέλειαν ψυχῆς καὶ σώματος **ἐκλέγοντες** ἔνθεν αὐτοῖς πρὸς θεραπείαν παθῶν ρίζαι τε ἀλεξητήριον καὶ λίθων ιδιότητες ἀνερευνῶνται.

War 2:136 (2.8.6.136) They also take great pains in studying the writings of the ancients, and choose out of them what is most for the advantage of their soul and body; and they inquire after such roots and medicinal stones as may cure their distempers.

War 5:550 καὶ τοὺς οὕτω δὲ σωζομένους ἕτερα πληγὴ μετελάμβανε τῶν γὰρ παρὰ τοῖς Σύροις τις αὐτομόλων φωρᾶται τῶν τῆς γαστρὸς λυμάτων χρυσοῦς **ἐκλέγων** καταπίνοντες δὲ ὡς ἔφαμεν αὐτοὺς προήεσαν ἐπειδὴ διηρεύνων πάντας οἱ στασιασταὶ καὶ πολὺ πλῆθος ἦν ἐν τῇ πόλει χρυσοῦ δώδεκα γοῦν Ἀττικῶν ὠνοῦντο πρότερον ἰσχύοντας πέντε καὶ εἴκοσιν

War 5:550 (5.13.4.550) Yet did another plague seize upon those that were thus preserved; for there was found among the Syrian deserters a certain person who was caught gathering pieces of gold out of the excrements of the Jews’ bellies; for the deserters used to swallow such pieces of gold, as we told you before, when they came out; and for these did the seditious search them all; for there was a great quantity of gold in the city, insomuch that as much was now sold [in the Roman camp] for twelve Attic [drams], as was sold before for twenty-five;

Acts 2:23 τοῦτον τῇ ὀρισμένῃ βουλῇ καὶ **προγνώσει** τοῦ Θεοῦ ἔκδοτον λαβόντες, διὰ χειρῶν ἀνόμων προσπήξαντες ἀνείλατε·

1Pet. 1:2 κατὰ **πρόγνωσιν** Θεοῦ πατρὸς ἐν ἁγιασμῷ Πνεύματος εἰς ὑπακοὴν καὶ ῥαντισμὸν αἵματος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ· χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη πληθυνθεῖη.

Acts 2:23 Him, being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, ye have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain:

1Pet. 1:2 Elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ: Grace unto you, and peace, be multiplied.

Acts 26:5 **προγινώσκοντές** με ἄνωθεν, ἐὰν θέλωσι μαρτυρεῖν, ὅτι κατὰ τὴν ἀκριβεστάτην αἵρεσιν τῆς ἡμετέρας θρησκείας ἔζησα Φαρισαῖος.

Rom. 8:29 ὅτι οὗς **προέγνω**, καὶ προώρισε συμμόρφους τῆς εἰκόνης τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ, εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν πρωτότοκον ἐν πολλοῖς ἀδελφοῖς·

Rom. 11:2 οὐκ ἀπόσατο ὁ Θεὸς τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ ὃν **προέγνω**. ἢ οὐκ οἶδατε ἐν Ἠλίᾳ τί λέγει ἡ γραφή· ὡς ἐντυγχάνει τῷ Θεῷ κατὰ τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ, λέγων,

1Pet. 1:20 **προεγνωσμένου** μὲν πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου, φανερωθέντος δὲ ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν χρόνων δι' ὑμᾶς,

2Pet. 3:17 ὑμεῖς οὖν, ἀγαπητοί, **προγινώσκοντές** φυλάσσεσθε, ἵνα μὴ, τῇ τῶν ἀθέσμων πλάνῃ συναπαχθέντες, ἐκπέσητε τοῦ ἰδίου στηριγμοῦ.

Acts 26:5 Which knew me from the beginning, if they would testify, that after the most straitest sect of our religion I lived a Pharisee.

Rom. 8:29 ¶ For whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate *to be* conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the firstborn among many brethren.

Rom. 11:2 God hath not cast away his people which he foreknew. Wot ye not what the scripture saith of Elias? how he maketh intercession to God against Israel, saying,

1Pet. 1:20 Who verily was foreordained before the foundation of the world, but was manifest in these last times for you,

2Pet. 3:17 Ye therefore, beloved, seeing ye know *these things* before, beware lest ye also, being led away with the error of the wicked, fall from your own stedfastness.

LXX:

Judith 9:6 καὶ παρέστησαν ἃ ἐβουλεύσω καὶ εἶπαν ἰδοὺ πάρεσμεν πᾶσαι γὰρ αἱ ὁδοί σου ἔτοιμοι καὶ ἡ κρίσις σου ἐν **προγνώσει**

Judith 11:19 καὶ ἄξω σε διὰ μέσου τῆς Ἰουδαίας ἕως τοῦ ἐλθεῖν ἀπέναντι Ἱερουσαλὴμ καὶ θήσω τὸν δίφρον σου ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῆς καὶ ἄξεις αὐτοὺς ὡς πρόβατα οἷς οὐκ ἔστιν ποιμὴν καὶ οὐ γρύζει κύων τῇ γλώσσει αὐτοῦ ἀπέναντί σου ὅτι ταῦτα ἐλαλήθη μοι κατὰ **πρόγνωσίν** μου καὶ ἀπηγγέλη μοι καὶ ἀπεστάλην ἀναγγεῖλαί σοι

Judith 9:6 Yea, what things thou didst determine were ready at hand, and said, Lo, we are here: for all thy ways are prepared, and thy judgments are in thy foreknowledge.

Judith 11:19 And I will lead thee through the midst of Judea, until thou come before Jerusalem; and I will set thy throne in the midst thereof; and thou shalt drive them as sheep that have no shepherd, and a dog shall not so much as open his mouth at thee: for these things were told me according to my foreknowledge, and they were declared unto me, and I am sent to tell thee.

Wis. 6:13 φθάνει τοὺς ἐπιθυμοῦντας **προγνωσθῆναι**

Wis. 8:8 εἰ δὲ καὶ πολυπειρίαν ποθεῖ τις οἶδεν τὰ ἀρχαῖα καὶ τὰ μέλλοντα εἰκάζει ἐπίσταται στροφὰς λόγων καὶ λύσεις αἰνιγμάτων σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα **προγινώσκει** καὶ ἐκβάσεις καιρῶν καὶ χρόνων

Wis. 18:6 ἐκείνη ἡ νύξ **προεγνώσθη** πατράσιν ἡμῶν ἵνα ἀσφαλῶς εἰδότες οἷς ἐπίστευσαν ὄρκοις ἐπευθυμήσωσιν

Wis. 6:13 She preventeth them that desire her, in making herself first known unto them.

Wis. 8:8 If a man desire much experience, she knoweth things of old, and conjectureth aright what is to come: she knoweth the subtilties of speeches, and can expound dark sentences: she foreseeth signs and wonders, and the events of seasons and times.

Wis. 18:6 Of that night were our fathers certified afore, that assuredly knowing unto what oaths they had given credence, they might afterwards be of good cheer.

Apostolic patristics:

Shep. 31:4 τοῖς οὖν κληθεῖσι πρὸ τούτων τῶν ἡμερῶν ἔθηκεν ὁ κύριος μετάνοιαν. καρδιογνώστης γὰρ ὢν ὁ κύριος καὶ πάντα **προγινώσκων**, ἔγνω τὴν ἀσθένειαν τῶν ἀνθρώπων καὶ τὴν πολυπλοκίαν τοῦ διαβόλου, ὅτι ποιήσει τι κακὸν τοῖς δούλοις τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ πονηρεύσεται εἰς αὐτούς.

Shep. 66:5 καὶ τοῦτο πάντως ἐὰν ἴδῃ τὴν καρδίαν τοῦ μετανοοῦντος καθαρὰν ἀπὸ παντὸς πονηροῦ πράγματος. σοὶ δὲ σύμφoron ἐστὶ καὶ τῷ οἴκῳ σου νῦν θλιβῆναι. τί δέ σοι πολλὰ λέγω; θλιβῆναί σε δεῖ, καθὼς προσέταξεν ὁ ἄγγελος τοῦ κυρίου ἐκεῖνος, ὁ παραδούς σε ἐμοί· καὶ τοῦτο εὐχαρίστει τῷ κυρίῳ, ὅτι ἄξιόν σε ἡγήσατο τοῦ προδηλώσαι σοι τὴν θλίψιν, ἵνα **προγνοῦς** αὐτὴν ὑπενέγκῃς ἰσχυρῶς.

Shep. 31:4 So, for those who were called before these days the Lord has established repentance. For since the Lord knows every heart and knows everything in advance, he knew the weakness of human beings and the cunning of the devil, and that he would do something evil to God's servants and treat them wickedly.

Shep. 66:5 And this will certainly be the case, if he sees that the heart of the one who repents is free of every evil thing. But it is beneficial for you and your family to be afflicted now. But why am I telling you so much? It is necessary for you to be afflicted, just as that angel of the Lord who handed you over to me ordered. And give thanks to the Lord for this, that he considered you worthy to reveal the affliction to you in advance, so that by knowing about it in advance, you might endure it with fortitude."

1Clem. 44:2 διὰ ταύτην οὖν τὴν αἰτίαν **πρόγνωσιν** εἰληφότες τελείαν κατέστησαν τοὺς προειρημένους καὶ μεταξὺ «ἐπιμονὴν» «δεδώκασιν», ὅπως, ἐὰν κοιμηθῶσιν, διαδέξωνται ἕτεροι δεδοκιμασμένοι ἄνδρες τὴν λειτουργίαν αὐτῶν.

1Clem. 44:2 For this reason, therefore, having received complete foreknowledge, they appointed the officials mentioned earlier and afterwards they gave the offices a permanent character; that is, if they should die, other approved men should succeed to their ministry.

In the phrase εἶναι ἡμᾶς ἁγίους καὶ ἀμώμους in Ephesians 1:4, what are the cases and case usages for ἡμᾶς, ἁγίους, and ἀμώμους? Also, specify the infinitival category for εἶναι.

What kind of participle is προορίσας in Ephesians 1:5, and what is it dependent upon?

Look up κατά in BDAG. Is there a definition of the preposition that fits its appearances in Ephesians 1:5, 7, 9, 11 (2x)?

Are the blessings of Ephesians 1:3-6 something that happen at the time of justification or at the time of glorification, or at some other time?

Read Hoehner, pgs. 194-197, on the phrase εἰς υἰοθεσίαν in Ephesians 1:5. Hoehner is correct about the Roman background to the phrase (pgs. 195-197). How does the fact that God has predestinated you to the adoption of children mean you should act in relation to God the Father?

In Ephesians 1:5, specify the case and case usage of θελήματος.

Is it better to translate, in Ephesians 1:6, εἰς ἔπαινον δόξης τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ as “to/unto a praise of a glory of his grace/the grace of him,” or as “to/unto the praise of the glory of his grace/the grace of him”? Why? Compare pg. 201, Hoehner.

According to Ephesians 1:6, the Father adopted His eternal plan “to the praise of the glory of his grace.” This has been the Father’s focus from eternity. How focused are you on praising the Father for the glory of His grace? What will you do to increase your praise of the Father for His glorious grace?

In Ephesians 1:6, what is the syntactical category of use for the article τῷ?

Note the tense and voice of ἡγαπημένῳ in Ephesians 1:6. Why is the Father’s love for Christ indicated with this tense and voice? Compare:

Matt. 3:17 καὶ ἰδοὺ, φωνὴ ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν, λέγουσα, Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν ᾧ εὐδόκησα.

Matt. 3:17 And lo a voice from heaven, saying, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased.

Matt. 17:5 ἔτι αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος, ἰδοὺ, νεφέλη φωτεινὴ ἐπεσκίασεν αὐτούς· καὶ ἰδοὺ, φωνὴ ἐκ τῆς νεφέλης, λέγουσα, Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν ᾧ εὐδόκησα· αὐτοῦ ἀκούετε.

Matt. 17:5 While he yet spake, behold, a bright cloud overshadowed them: and behold a voice out of the cloud, which said, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased; hear ye him.

John 3:35 ὁ πατὴρ ἀγαπᾷ τὸν υἱόν, καὶ πάντα δέδωκεν ἐν τῇ χειρὶ αὐτοῦ.

John 3:35 The Father loveth the Son, and hath given all things into his hand.

Col. 1:13 ὃς ἐρρύσατο ἡμᾶς ἐκ τῆς ἐξουσίας τοῦ σκοτους, καὶ μετέστησεν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ υἱοῦ τῆς ἀγάπης αὐτοῦ,

Col. 1:13 Who hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated *us* into the kingdom of his dear Son:

Note also the following texts, the complete list of NT texts with the same tense and voice as Ephesians 1:6:

Rom. 9:25 ὡς καὶ ἐν τῷ Ὡσηὲ λέγει, Καλέσω τὸν οὐ λαὸν μου λαὸν μου· καὶ τὴν οὐκ ἡγαπημένην ἡγαπημένην.

Eph. 1:6 εἰς ἔπαινον δόξης τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ, ἐν ᾗ ἐχαρίτωσεν ἡμᾶς ἐν τῷ ἡγαπημένῳ·

Col. 3:12 Ἐνδύσασθε οὖν, ὡς ἐκλεκτοὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἅγιοι καὶ ἡγαπημένοι, σπλάγχνα οἰκτιρῶν, χρηστότητα, ταπεινοφροσύνην, πραότητα, μακροθυμίαν·

In relation to Ephesians 1:7, note that the idea that the blood of Christ is merely a metonym for His death is false, contrary to the view of John MacArthur.¹⁹

¹⁹ References in the Old Testament to the “shedding of blood” are very often associated with violent death as well— one cannot demonstrate, however, that the phrase is used of death, though unnatural, that does not involve the actual loss of physical blood (cf. 2 Ki 8:15). The Hebrew verb *shafach* appears commonly as “shedding” (Gen 37:22) and “pouring” (Le 4:7) of blood, as well as in various contexts unrelated to blood. Representative uses of the word apart from blood include:

“And he shall cause the house to be scraped within round about, and they shall *pour out* the dust that they scrape off without the city into an unclean place.” (Leviticus 14:41)

“And the angel of God said unto him, ‘Take the flesh and the unleavened cakes, and lay them upon this rock, and *pour out* the broth.’ And he did so.” (Judges 6:20)

“And Hannah answered and said, ‘No, my lord, I am a woman of a sorrowful spirit: I have drunk neither wine nor strong drink, but have *poured out* my soul before the LORD.’” (1 Samuel 1:15).

“But Amasa took no heed to the sword that was in Joab’s hand: so he smote him therewith in the fifth rib, and *shed out* his bowels to the ground, and struck him not again; and he died.” (2 Samuel 20:10)

“And they came and besieged him in Abel of Bethmaachah, and they *cast up* a bank against the city, and it stood in the trench: and all the people that were with Joab battered the wall, to throw it down.” (2 Samuel 20:15)

“The LORD hath accomplished his fury; he *hath poured out* his fierce anger, and hath kindled a fire in Zion, and it hath devoured the foundations thereof.” (Lamentations 4:11)

The most common single use of the word, however, deals with the shedding or pouring out of blood. It can refer to bloody death both in relation to and apart from sacrifice. It is first mention in a non-sacrificial context: “Whoso *sheddeth* man’s blood, by man *shall* his blood *be shed* for in the image of God made him man.” (Genesis 9:6). It often appears in relation to offerings under the Law: “And thou shalt take of the blood of the bullock, and put it upon the horns of the altar with thy finger, and *pour* all the blood beside the bottom of the altar.” (Exodus 29:12). Despite the fact that the shedding or pouring out of blood in the Bible is never assigned to an act which clearly involved non-bloody death, some could use the generality of a verse such as Genesis 9:6 to argue that the “shedding of blood” simply referred to death without the necessity of the loss of physical blood. However, 1 Kings 18:28 uses the verb to refer to the shedding or loss of blood without physical death: “And they cried aloud, and cut themselves after their manner with knives and lancets, till the blood *gushed out* upon them.” Furthermore, in the sacrificial system blood was shed or poured out in a distinct act from death (Lev 8:15, 9:9). Blood of slain animals was “poured out” or shed after they were already dead, but before they could be eaten (Lev 17:13, De 12:16, 24). We have clear instances where *shafach* is used in association with blood when it cannot possibly signify violent death. The one who advocates making the phrases synonymous must simply argue that these verse involve a different, literal use of the verb with blood, while in other places where blood and death are associated it does not have this literal meaning, but rather re-names “death.” However, since there are no passages in Scripture where a metonymical, rather than literal, meaning must be given, while there are a number where the verb for shedding is used with literal blood, sound hermeneutics necessitates a rejection of the metonymical view as eisegetical. “Shedding of blood” deals with literal blood which is literally poured out, an act which commonly goes hand in hand with death Biblically, but does not necessarily do so. The Old Testament use of the phrase carries over into NT usage; the Greek verbal equivalent (Joel 2:28, Acts 2:17), *ekchuno* (ἐκχυνω), appears in contexts unrelated to the shedding of blood (“the wine *runneth out*,” Mt 9:17; “all his bowels *gushed out*,” Ac 1:18; “on the Gentiles also *was poured out* the gift of the Holy Ghost,” Ac 10:45, “the love of God *is shed abroad* in our hearts,” Rom 5:5), in relation to non-sacrificial death (“when the blood of thy martyr Stephen *was shed*,” Ac 22:20, cf. Rom 3:15, Rev 16:6), and alongside sacrificial death (Matt 26:26): “For this is my blood of the new testament, which *is shed* for many for the remission of sins.” (Matthew 26:28, cf. Mark 14:24, Lu 22:20). As in the Old Testament, it is not a re-naming for violent death, but is a separate act, the literal pouring out or shedding of physical blood. Hebrews 9:22 combines the word for blood (*haima*, αἷμα) with *ekchuno* to

In Ephesians 1:7, what is the case and case usage for ἄφεσιν?

In relation to Ephesians 1:8, note that the ἧς connects back to the feminine τῆς χάριτος. ἧς is genitive because of direct attraction (Wallace, pgs. 338-339). Calvin comments (*Ephesians*, on 1:8): “ἧς ἐπερίσσευσεν — “ἧς for ἥ (by a common Grecism, in which the relative is attracted by the antecedent,) if, at least, we take ἐπερίσσευσεν, with many modern expositors, in a *neuter* sense, ‘in which he hath renewed his abundant goodness to us;’” this is the way the Authorized Version understood the passage.

In relation to Ephesians 1:8, note Trench on the difference between σοφία and φρόνησις:

§ lxxv. σοφία, φρόνησις, γνῶσις, ἐπίγνωσις.

Σοφία, φρόνησις, and γνῶσις occur together, Dan. i. 4, 17. They are all ascribed to God (φρόνησις not in the N. T., for Ephes. i. 8 is not in point); σοφία and γνῶσις, Rom. ix. 33; φρόνησις and σοφία, Prov. iii. 19; Jer. x. 12. There have been various attempts to divide to each its own proper sphere of meaning. These, not always running in exactly the same lines, have this in common, that in all σοφία, is recognized as expressing the highest and noblest; being, as Clement of Alexandria has it (Paedag. ii. 2), θείων καὶ ἀνθρωπίνων πραγμάτων ἐποιστήμη; adding, however, elsewhere, as the Stoics had done before him, καὶ τῶν τούτων αἰτίων (Strom. i. 5).¹ Augustine distinguishes between it [Page 282] and γνῶσις as follows (*De Div. Quaest.* ii. qu. 2): ‘Haec ita discerni solent, ut sapientia [σοφία] pertineat ad intellectum aeternorum, scientia [γνῶσις] vero ad ea quae sensibus corporis experimur;’ and for a much fuller discussion to the same effect see *De Trin.* xii. 22-24; xiv. 3.

Very much the same distinction has been drawn between σοφία and φρόνησις: as by Philo, who defining φρόνησις as the mean between craftiness and folly, μέση πανουργίας καὶ μωρίας φρόνησις (*Quod Deus Imm.* 35), gives elsewhere this distinction between it and σοφία (*De Praem. et Poen.* 14): σοφία μὲν γὰρ πρὸς θεραπείαν θεοῦ, φρόνησις δὲ πρὸς ἀνθρωπίνου βίου διοίκησιν. [That is, translated, “For wisdom has reference to the service of God, and prudence to the regulation of human life.”] This was indeed the familiar and recognized distinction, as witness the words of Cicero (*De Off.* ii. 43): ‘Princeps omnium virtutum est illa sapientia quam σοφίαν Graeci vocant. Prudentiam enim, quam Graeci φρόνησιν dicunt, aliam quandam intelligimus, quae est rerum expetendarum, fugiendarumque scientia; illa autem sapientia, quam principem dixi, rerum est divinarum atque humanarum scientia’ (cf. *Tusc.* iv. 26; Seneca, *Ep.* 85). In all this he is following in the steps of Aristotle, who is careful above all to bring out the practical character of φρόνησις, and to put it in sharp contrast with σύνεσις, which, as in as many words he teaches, is the critical faculty. One acts, the other judges. This is his account of φρόνησις (*Ethic. Nic.* vi. 5. 4): ἔστις ἀληθὴς μετὰ λόγου πρακτικὴ περὶ τὰ ἀνθρώπων ἀγαθὰ καὶ κακὰ: and again (*Rhet.* 9): ἔστιν ἀρετὴ διανοίας, καθ’ ἣν εὖ βουλευέσθαι δύνανται περὶ ἀγαθῶν καὶ κακῶν τῶν εἰρημένων εἰς εὐδαιμονίαν. Not otherwise Aristo the Peripatetic (see Plutarch, *De Virt. Mor.* 2): ἡ ἀρετὴ ποιητέα ἐπισκοποῦσα καὶ μὴ ποιητέα κέκληται φρόνησις: and see too ch. 5, where he has some excellent words, discriminating between [Page 283] these. It is plain from the references and quotations just made that the Christian Fathers have drawn their distinctions here from the schools of heathen philosophy, with only such widening and deepening of meaning as must necessarily

form a word that appears only in that verse in the New Testament, *haimatekchusia*, “blood-shedding.” Note also that in the Lord’s Supper, the bread represents the broken body in death, and the cup represents the shed blood; they are two different, although connected, ideas.

follow when the ethical and philosophical terms of a lower are assumed into the service of a higher; thus compare Zeller, *Philos. d. Griechen*, iii. 1. 222.

We may affirm with confidence that σοφία is never in Scripture ascribed to other than God or good men, except in an ironical sense, and with the express addition, or subaudition, of τοῦ κόσμου τούτου (1 Cor. i. 20), τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου (1 Cor. ii. 6), or some such words (2 Cor. i. 12); nor are any of the children of this world called σοφοί, except with this tacit or expressed irony (Luke x. 21); being never more than the φάσκοντες εἶναι σοφοί, [“professing themselves to be wise,”] of Rom. i. 22. For, indeed, if σοφία includes the striving after the best ends as well as the using of the best means, is mental excellence in its highest and fullest sense (cf. Aristotle, *Ethic. Nic.* vi. 7. 3), there can be no wisdom disjoined from goodness, even as Plato had said long ago (*Menex.* 19): πᾶσα ἐπιστήμη χωριζομένη δικαιοσύνης καὶ τῆς ἄλλης ἀρετῆς, πανουργία οὐ σοφία φαίνεται: to which Eccles. xix. 20, 22, [Sir. 19:20 The fear of the Lord is all wisdom; and in all wisdom is the performance of the law, and the knowledge of his omnipotency. Sir. 19:22 The knowledge of wickedness is not wisdom, neither at any time the counsel of sinners prudence. Sir. 19:20 πᾶσα σοφία φόβος κυρίου καὶ ἐν πάσῃ σοφία ποιήσεις νόμου Sir. 19:22 καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν σοφία πονηρίας ἐπιστήμη καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ὅπου βουλὴ ἀμαρτωλῶν φρόνησις] offers a fine parallel. So, too, the Socrates of Xenophon (*Mem.* iii. 9) refuses to separate, or even by a definition to distinguish, σοφία from σωφροσύνη, from δικαιοσύνη, or indeed from any other virtue. It will follow that the true antithesis to σοφός is rather ἀνόητος (Rom. i. 14) than ἄσύνετος; for, while the ἄσύνετος need not be more than intellectually deficient, in the ἀνόητος there is always a moral fault lying behind the intellectual; the vows, the highest knowing power in man, the organ by which divine things are apprehended and known, being the ultimate seat of the error (Luke xxiv. 25, ὃ ἀνόητοι καὶ βραδεῖς τῇ καρδίᾳ: Gal. iii. 1, 3; 1 Tim. vi. 9; Tit. iii. 3). Ἀνομία, (Luke vi. 11; 2 Tim. iii. 9) is ever the foolishness which is akin to and derived from wickedness, even as [Page 284] σοφία is the wisdom which is akin to goodness, or rather is goodness itself contemplated from one particular point of view; as indeed the wisdom which only the good can possess. Ammon, a modern German rationalist, gives not badly a definition of the σοφός or ‘sapiens’; i.e. cognitione optimi, et adminiculorum ad id efficiendum idoneorum instructus.’

But φρόνησις, being a right use and application of the φρήν, is a middle term. It may be akin to σοφία (Prov. x. 23), —they are interchangeably used by Plato (*Symp.* 202a), —but it may also be akin to πανουργία²⁰ (Job v. 13 [who takes the wise in their wisdom, and subverts the counsel of the crafty-- ὁ καταλαμβάνων σοφοὺς ἐν τῇ φρονήσει βουλὴν δὲ πολυπλόκων ἐξέστησεν]; Wisd. xvii. 7 As for the illusions of art magick, they were put down, and their vaunting in wisdom was reprov'd with disgrace. μαγικῆς δὲ ἐμπαίγματα κατέκειτο τέχνης καὶ τῆς ἐπὶ φρονήσει ἀλαζονείας ἔλεγχος ἐφύβριστος). It skilfully adapts its means to the attainment of the ends which it desires; but whether the ends themselves which are proposed are good, of this it affirms nothing. On the different kinds of φρόνησις, and the very different senses in which φρόνησις is employed, see Basil the Great, *Hom. in Princ. Prov.* § 6. It is true that as often as φρόνησις occurs in the N. T. (ἐν φρονήσει δικαίων, Luke i. 17; σοφία καὶ φρονήσει, Ephes. i. 8), it is used of a laudable prudence, but for all this φρόνησις is not wisdom, nor the φρόνιμος the wise; and Augustine (*De Gen. ad Lit.* xi. 2) has perfect right when he objects to the ‘sapientissimus,’ with which his Latin Version had rendered φρονιμώτατος at Gen. iii. 1, saying, ‘Abusione nominis sapientia dicitur in malo;’ cf. *Con. Guad.* 5. And the same objection, as has been often urged, holds good against the “wise as serpents” (Matt. x. 16), “wiser than the children of light” (Luke xvi. 8), of our own Version.¹ [Note: there is nothing wrong with translating this word as wise, although it is useful to know it is φρόνησις.]

²⁰ BDAG: **πανουργία**, **ας**, **ή** (πανούργος; Aeschyl., X., Pla. et al.; Polyb. 29, 8, 8; Plut., Mor. 91b [w. ἀπάτη]; Herodian 2, 9, 11 [w. δόλος]; OGI 515, 47 [w. κακουργία]; POxy 237 VIII, 12 [II AD]; LXX; Philo, De Op. Mund. 155 al.; Jos., Bell. 4, 503 al.; Test 12Patr) quite predom., and in our lit. exclusively, in an unfavorable sense (rascally, evil) **cunning**, **craftiness**, **trickery**, lit. ‘readiness to do anything’ Lk 20:23; 1 Cor 3:19 (in Job 5:12, 13, which is basic to this pass., vs. 12 has the adj. πανούργος); 2 Cor 4:2; 11:3 (in Gen 3:1 Aq. and Sym. have the adj. πανούργος); Eph 4:14.—M-M. TW.

Liddell-Scott (abridged):

παῆνουργία, **ή**, *knavery, roguery, villany*, Lat. *malitia*, Aesch., Soph.: in pl. *knaveries, villanies*, Soph., etc.

On the distinction between σοφία and γνῶσις Bengel has the following note (*Gnomon*, in 1 Cor. xii. 8): ‘Illud certum, quod, ubi Deo ascribuntur, in solis objectis differunt; vid. Rom. xi. 33. Ubi fidelibus tribuuntur, [Page 285] sapientia [σοφία] magis in longum, latum, profundum et altum penetrat, quam cognitio [γνῶσις]. Cognitio est quasi visus; sapientia visus cum sapore; cognitio, rerum agendarum; sapientia, rerum aeternarum; quare etiam sapientia non dicitur abroganda, 1 Cor xiii. 8.’

Of ἐπίγνωσις, as compared with γνῶσις, it will be sufficient to say that ἐπί, must be regarded as intensive, giving to the compound word a greater strength than the simple possessed; thus ἐπιποθέω (2 Cor. v. 2), ἐπιμελέομαι: and, by the same rule, if γνῶσις is ‘cognitio,’ ‘kenntniss,’ ἐπίγνωσις is ‘major exactiorque cognitio’ (Grotius), ‘erkenntniss,’ a deeper and more intimate knowledge and acquaintance. This we take to be its meaning, and not ‘re cognitio,’ in the Platonic sense of reminiscence, as distinguished from cognition, if we might use that word; which Jerome (on Ephes. iv. 13), with some moderns, has affirmed. St. Paul, it will be remembered, exchanges the γινώσκω, which expresses his present and fragmentary knowledge, for ἐπιγνώσομαι, when he would express his future intuitive and perfect knowledge (1 Cor xiii. 12). It is difficult to see how this should have been preserved in the English Version; our Translators have made no attempt to preserve it; Bengel does so by aid of ‘nosco’ and ‘pernoscam,’ and Culverwell (*Spiritual Optics*, p. 180) has the following note: [‘Ἐπίγνωσις and γνῶσις differ. Ἐπίγνωσις is ἡ μετὰ τὴν πρώτην γνῶσιν τοῦ πράγματος παντελὴς κατὰ δύνάμιν κατανόησις. It is bringing me better acquainted with a thing I knew before; a more exact viewing of an object that I saw before afar off. That little portion of knowledge which we had here shall be much improved, our eye shall be raised to see the same things more strongly and clearly.’ All the uses of ἐπί - γνῶσις which St. Paul makes, justify and bear out this distinction (Rom. i. 28; 20; x. 2; Ephes. iv. 13; Phil. i. 9; 1 Tim. ii. 4; 2 Tim. ii. 25; cf. Heb. x. 26); this same intensive use of ἐπίγνωσις is borne out by other similar passages [Page 286] in the N. T. (2 Pet. i. 2, 8; ii. 20) and in the Septuagint (Prov. ii. 5; Hos. iv. 1; vi. 6); and is recognized by the Greek Fathers; thus Chrysostom on Col. i. 9: ἔγνωτε, ἀλλὰ δεῖ τι καὶ ἐπιγνῶναι. On the whole subject of this § see Lightfoot on Col. i. 9.

1 On the relation of φιλοσοφία (τῆς τῶν ὄντων ἀεὶ ἐπιστήμης ὁρεξίς Plato, *Def.* 414; ὁρεξίς τῆς θείας σοφίας, *Id.*, quoted by Diogenea Laertius, iii. 63; ἐπιτήδευσις σοφίας, Philo, *De Cong. Erud. Grat.* xiv.; ‘stadium virtutis, sed per ipsam virtutem,’ Seneca, *Ep.* 89. 7) to σοφία see Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* i. 5. The word first appears in Herodotus, i. 50; for a sketch of its history, see Ueberweg, p. i.

1 The Old Italic runs perhaps into the opposite extreme, rendering φρόνιμοι here by ‘astuti’; which, however, had not in the later Latin at all so evil a subaudition as it had in the classical; so Augustine (*Ep.* 167.6) assures us.

In Ephesians 1:9, what type of participle is γινώρισας?

What does the κατὰ clause in Ephesians 1:9 modify?

In Ephesians 1:9, who does the αὐτῷ refer to, and what is the use of the pronoun?

In Ephesians 1:10, what kind of infinitive is ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι? Also specify the voice of the infinitive and what the significance is of that voice.

A Discussion of the Mediatorial Kingdom of Christ (Examined in the Context of the Arian assault on Christ's Deity in 1 Corinthians 15:24-28—the anti-Arian material is useful, but at this point our focus is on the Mediatorial Kingdom, which is certainly in view in Ephesians 1:10).

1 Corinthians 15:28 reads, “And when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all.” Commenting on this verse, Unitarians argue:

After his resurrection, [Jesus] continues to be in a subordinate, secondary position. . . . In the everlasting future in heaven, Jesus will continue to be a separate subordinate servant of God. . . . Jesus never claimed to be God.²¹

Many modalists also use 1 Corinthians 15:28 to attack the eternal equality of the Son of God with His Father.²² Does 1 Corinthians 15:28 deny that the Son is one in essence with the Father and prove that He has no Divine nature? Does the subjection mentioned

²¹ Pg. 19-20, *Should You Believe in the Trinity?* section, “Is God Always Superior to Jesus?”

²² Oneness Pentecostal writer David Bernard writes, “Not only did the Sonship have a beginning, but it will, in at least one sense, have an ending. This is evident from I Corinthians 15:23-28. In particular, verse 24 says, ‘Then cometh the end, when he [Christ] shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father.’ Verse 28 says, ‘And when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all.’ This verse of Scripture is impossible to explain if one thinks of a ‘God the Son’ who is co-equal and co-eternal with God the Father.” Bernard also affirms that “Jesus will cease acting in His role as Son . . . [after] His final act as Son [when he] will present the church to Himself.” The former objection to the eternal Sonship of Christ in 1 Corinthians 15:24-28 is refuted in the same manner as the very similar Arian objections in the text above. The latter argument, that Christ will cease to be Son, is obviously an invalid deduction from 1 Corinthians 15:28. No affirmation is there made of an obliteration of the Son, but rather the verse states that He will continue eternally “subject” to the Father as the mediatorial King in His mediatorial kingdom.

in the verse prove that He is merely a creature, infinitely inferior in being, from eternity past to eternity future, to the Father—as is true of necessity for all of creation when contrasted to the Creator? Apart from the fact that such an affirmation would contradict vast numbers of passages of Scripture, it would be hard to see the contextual significance of such an affirmation in 1 Corinthians 15, with its emphasis upon the resurrection from the dead. Furthermore, if the verse speaks of a subordination of being, why is it that only when “all things shall be subdued unto him [Christ]” that “then shall the Son also himself be subject”? Why the “then” in the verse? If the apostle Paul wished to teach Unitarianism in this verse, how could he declare that only at this future period of time, only “then” in the eternal state, will the Son be subject? Is the Son equal to the Father now, but “then” He will no longer be equal? Would it not be the strangest of affirmations to declare that, at this present time, a part of creation, Christ, is equal in nature to his Creator, God, but in the future this created being will be inferior in his essence? If Arians wish to use 1 Corinthians 15:28 is to prove an ontological subordination of the Son to the Father, they would need to believe that the essence of the Son changes, so that He currently has an equal and unsubordinated Divine nature, but He will somehow surrender that nature in the future for one that is unequal and subject. Furthermore, if the Son is no longer to be Ruler of all, why do many passages of Scripture affirm that He “shall reign . . . for ever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end . . . of the increase of *his* government and peace *there shall be* no end . . . upon his kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice from henceforth even for ever. . . . All people, nations, and languages, [will] serve him: his dominion *is* an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom *that* which shall not be destroyed. . . . the everlasting kingdom [belongs to] our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. . . . Christ . . . shall reign for ever and ever . . . Unto the Son [the Father] *saith*, Thy throne, O God, *is* for ever and ever” (Luke 1:33; Isaiah 9:6-7; Daniel 7:14; 2 Peter 1:11; Revelation 11:15; Hebrews 1:8)?²³ Ontology simply does not fit the sense of 1

²³ It is true that the saints will also reign for ever (Daniel 7:18; Revelation 22:5), but this sort of patently subordinate authority cannot be compared with the manner of the Son’s kingship as Jehovah from eternity past to eternity future; it is utterly contrary to Scripture to compare the subordinate reign of the saints *within* the kingdom of God to the sovereign rule *over* the kingdom of “the Son” of whom it is said, “Thy throne, O God, *is* for ever and ever: a sceptre of righteousness *is* the sceptre of thy kingdom” (Hebrews 1:8).

Corinthians 15:28 at all; the subordination is of necessity one of role or office, an economic subordination pertaining to the Son as the Mediator. The Arian view of 1 Corinthians 15:28 contradicts the rest of the Bible and does not make sense of the verse itself in context. This should be expected, because it differs radically from the intention of the apostle who penned it, and of the Holy Spirit who gave the verse by inspiration.

1 Corinthians 15:24-28²⁴ deals with the mediatorial kingdom²⁵ of Christ, a rulership that concerns the Son as the God-man or *Theanthropos*,²⁶ which He fully assumed at His ascension, will powerfully manifest in the Millennial kingdom, and which

²⁴ Wilber Wallis ("The Problem of an Intermediate Kingdom in 1 Corinthians 15:20-28," *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 18:4 (Fall 1975) p. 242) notes a chiastic structure in v. 24-28:

The end—24a

Kingdom delivered over to Father—24b

All enemies destroyed—24c

All enemies put underfoot—25 (Ps. 110:1)

Last enemy destroyed—26

All things subjected—27a (Ps. 8:6)

All things completely and finally subjected (hypotetaktai)—27b

All things subjected—28a

Son made subject—28b

"That God may be all in all"—28c

²⁵ "The mediatorial kingdom may be defined . . . as the rule of God through a divinely chosen representative who not only speaks and acts for God but also represents the people before God; a rule which has especial reference to the human race (although it finally embraces the universe); and its mediatorial ruler is always a member of the human race" ("The Greatness of the Kingdom," Part I, Alva J. McClain, *Bibliotheca Sacra* 112:445 (Jan 1955) p. 18). In the eternal state, "When the last enemy is put down by our Lord as the mediatorial king, when even death itself is abolished and complete harmony is established, then the purpose of his mediatorial kingdom will have been fulfilled. Then the Son will deliver up his kingdom to God the Father, to be merged into the eternal kingdom, thus being perpetuated forever, but no longer as a separate entity (1 Cor 15:24–28). This does not mean the end of the rule of our Lord Jesus Christ. He only ceases to reign as the mediatorial King in history. But as the only begotten Son, very God of very God, He shares with the other Persons of the Triune God the throne of the eternal kingdom. In that final and eternal city of God, center of a redeemed new heaven and earth, there is but *one* throne. It is called, 'the throne of *God* and of the *Lamb*' (Rev 22:3–5)" ("The Greatness of the Kingdom, Part IV: The Mediatorial Kingdom from the Acts Period to the Eternal State," McClain, *Bibliotheca Sacra* 112:448 (Oct 55) p. 310]. The four parts of McClain's series on the Kingdom in *Bibliotheca Sacra* (12:445 (Jan 55) p. 11-27; 112:446 (Apr 55) p. 107-124; 112:447 (Jul 55) p. 209-224; 112:448 (Oct 55) p. 304-311) are very helpful in understanding the concept of the mediatorial kingdom and its distinction from the eternal kingdom of God.

²⁶ The "messianic or mediatorial kingdom . . . belongs to Christ, not as the Logos, but as the Son of Man, the *Theanthropos*; God manifest in the flesh. . . . Viewed as extending over all creatures, it is a kingdom of power, which, according to 1 Corinthians 15:24, he shall deliver up to God even the Father, when his mediatorial work is accomplished" (Charles Hodge, *Systematic Theology*, 4:4:4:5, 7 (sec. "The Kingdom of Heaven" in "The Concomitants of the Second Advent" elec. acc. in *Christian Library Series*, vol. 17: *Systematic Theologies*, AGES Library, Rio, WI: 2006).

will have its manner of administration altered markedly²⁷ at the consumation of time spoken of in 1 Corinthians 15:24-28. The passage refers of necessity to the mediatorial kingdom, not the universal kingdom of God, because v. 24 indicates that the reign in question is not in the hands of the Father—God never ceases to reign in His universal kingdom. The context of the passage strongly emphasizes the humanity of Christ; He died and rose again in His human nature (v. 20); He is the second Adam, and the salvation of the elect requires that the Lord Jesus is as equally “man” as he who sinned in the Garden of Eden (v. 21-22); He is the head and representative of redeemed mankind (v. 23); He is the human Messiah (v. 24-26), who, as “man . . . and the son of man,” has been given dominion over the creation (v. 27; Psalm 8:6, 4), and who mediates the rule of

²⁷ “As eternal Son, the 2nd person doubtless shares forever, the natural and infinite dominion of the Godhead. But this Mediatorial kingdom is conferred and economical, exercised not merely in His divine nature, but by Him as *Theanthropos*. . . . the passage from 1 Corinthians 15:24 . . . [indicates] a striking change will then take place in the method of the mediatorial kingdom . . . it will consist largely in this, that Christ’s power over the universe . . . will be returned to the [Triune] Godhead. But the restoration of the [saints] to the Father, as an accomplished enterprise, is to be received, not as implying a severance of Christ’s headship, but as a surrendering of Himself along with it, body and head, as an aggregate. Let 1 Corinthians 3:23 be compared. . . . [T]he dominion of the God-man over wicked men and angels and inanimate nature is resorted to the Godhead, so that it may again be “all in all.” (*Dabney, Systematic and Polemic Theology*, Lecture 45, “Christ’s Humiliation and Exaltation,” elec. acc. *Christian Library Series*, vol. 17, AGES Software).

“1 Corinthians 15:24-28 . . . stat[es] the ultimate purpose of the theocratic kingdom: ‘that God may be all in all.’ . . . The means by which all things are brought under subjection to God, so that He becomes all in all, is that Christ unites the authority that is His as King with the Father’s after He has ‘put down all rule and all authority and power’ (1 Corinthians 15:24). God’s original purpose was to manifest His absolute authority and this purpose is realized when Christ unites the earthly theocracy with the eternal kingdom of God. Thus, while Christ’s earthly theocratic rule is limited to one thousand years, which is sufficient time to manifest God’s perfect theocracy on the earth, His reign is eternal. . . . [1 Corinthians 15:24-28] does not even intimate that there will ever be a termination of Christ’s kingdom . . . dominion shall indeed be rescued from His enemies, and restored to the Godhead, but not in any such sense, but that His dominion is an everlasting dominion, and that of His Kingdom there shall be no end. . . . [I]n accord with Revelation 11:15 . . . Father and Son united in this Theocratic ordering and Personage . . . shall reign for ever and ever. . . . The delivery to God of a now unmarred kingdom does not imply the release of authority on the part of the Son. . . . [T]he consummation of the [kingdom] program [can be outlined] as follows: 1. When the last enemy of God is put down by our Lord, as the Mediatorial King, the purpose of the Mediatorial Kingdom will have been fulfilled (1 Corinthians 15:25-26). 2. At this time Christ will hand over the Mediatorial Kingdom to God, to be merged into the eternal Kingdom, so that the Mediatorial Kingdom is perpetuated forever, but no longer having a separate identity (1 Corinthians 15:24, 28). 3. This does not mean the end of our Lord’s rule. He only ceases to rule as a Mediatorial King. But as the eternal Son, [the] second [P]erson [of] the one true God, He shares the throne with the Father in the final Kingdom (Revelation 22:3-5; cf. 3:21). . . . By the establishment of the theocracy on earth for a thousand years, under the Messianic theocratic King, God has accomplished His purpose of demonstrating His rule in th[at] sphere [of] . . . authority[.] . . . By merging this earthly theocracy with the eternal kingdom God’s eternal sovereignty is established. Such was the purpose of God in planning the theocratic kingdom and developing it through successive stages throughout history until it reaches the climax of the program in the theocracy under the enthroned Christ in the millennium. . . . God’s right to rule is eternally vindicated” (pgs. 492-494, *Things To Come*, J. Dwight Pentecost. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1958).

God over all the universe and puts “all things under his feet” (v. 25; Psalm 8:6-8) until the time when all evil is finally and utterly destroyed and the eternal state commences (v. 28).²⁸ As God, the Son reigns unchangeably from eternity past to eternity future (Hebrews 1:8) in perfect equality with the Father and the Holy Spirit; as the incarnate Mediator He was given a special rulership by God the Father (Psalm 110:1), but He will remain eternally subordinate²⁹ to the One who bestowed this mediatorial kingdom upon

²⁸ John Darby (*Synopsis of the Books of the Bible*, part 2; the New Testament; comments on 1 Corinthians, pgs. 46-49 (598ff); elec. acc. in *Christian Library Series*, vol. 15: *Classic Commentary Collection*, AGES Library, Rio, WI: 2006) comments:

“When He has put all His enemies under His feet, and has given back the kingdom to His Father (for it is never taken from Him, nor given to another, as happens with human kingdoms), then the Son Himself is subject to Him who has put all things under Him, in order that God may be all in all. The reader should observe, that it is the counsels of God with regard to the government of all things which is here spoken of, and not His nature; and moreover it is the Son, as man, of whom these things are said. This is not an arbitrary explanation: the passage is from Psalm 8, the subject of which is the exaltation of man to the position of head of all things, God putting all things under His feet. Nothing, says the apostle, is excepted (Hebrews 2:8) save, as he adds here, that He is necessarily excepted who put all things under Him. When the man Christ, the Son of God, has in fact accomplished this subjugation, He gives back to God the universal power which had been committed to Him, and the mediatorial kingdom, which He held as man, ceases. He is again subject, as He was on earth. He does not cease to be one with the Father, even as He was so while living in humiliation on the earth, although saying at the same time “Before Abraham was, I am.” But the mediatorial government of man has disappeared — is absorbed in the supremacy of God, to which there is no longer any opposition. Christ will take His eternal place, a Man, the Head of the whole redeemed family, being at the same time God blessed for ever, one with the Father. In Psalm 2 we see the Son of God, as born on earth, King in Zion, rejected when He presented Himself on earth; in Psalm 8 the result of His rejection, exalted as Son of man at the head of all that the hand of God has made. Then we find Him here laying down this conferred authority, and resuming the normal position of humanity, namely, that of subjection to Him who has put all things under Him; but through it all, never changing His divine nature, nor — save so far as exchanging humiliation for glory — His human nature either. But God is now all in all, and the special government of man in the Person of Jesus — a government with which the assembly is associated (see Ephesians 1:20-23, which is a quotation from the same Psalm) is merged in the immutable supremacy of God, the final and normal relationship of God with His creature. We shall find the Lamb omitted in that which is said in Revelation 21:1-8, speaking of this same period.

Thus we find in this passage [1 Corinthians 15] resurrection by man — death having entered by man; the relationship of the saints with Jesus, the source and the power of life, the consequence being His resurrection, and theirs at His coming; power over all things committed to Christ, the risen Man; afterwards the kingdom given back to God the Father, the tabernacle of God with men, and the man Christ, the second Adam, eternally a man subject to the Supreme — this last a truth of infinite value to us (the resurrection of the wicked, though supposed in the resurrection brought in by Christ, not being the direct subject of the chapter).”

²⁹ Then “*shall the Son also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him*; which must be interpreted and understood with great care and caution; not in the Sabellian sense, of refunding of the characters of the Son, and so of the Father unto God; when they suppose these characters, which they imagine to be merely nominal, bare names, will be no more, and God shall be all; but as the Father will always remain a father, so the Son will remain a son; for, as the Son of the Highest, he will reign over his people for ever, and he the Son, as a priest, is consecrated for ever more: nor in the Eutychian sense, of the change of the human nature into the divine, in which they fancy it will be swallowed up, and God will be all; but Christ will always continue as a man; he went up to heaven as such, and he will return as a man, and be visible to all in the human nature, and in that be the object of the wonderful vision of the saints to all

Him.³⁰ The Christ's enemies will be "put down" (v. 24) or "destroyed" (v. 26), because all things must be "subject" or "subdued" to Him, that is, brought into their proper place, orderly arranged in submission to God's government.³¹ Perfect harmony and union of redeemed man and universe with God cannot take place until the destruction of all enemies; until then the perfect arrangement of the Son under God cannot take place, not because of an unwillingness on the part of the Messiah to be under the Father, but because the realm Christ is to bring in subjection to God is not in perfect order and submission. The Son will forever be in His proper place in God's government; as God,

eternity: nor in the Arian sense, according to the divine nature, as if he was inferior to the Father, when he is equal with him, has all the perfections he has, and the whole fulness of the Godhead dwelling in him; it is much better and safer to understand it as it commonly is of him, as man; though in this sense, he was always subject to his Father, ever since he was incarnate, whereas this seems to respect something peculiar at this time . . . it is best, therefore to understand it of the Son's giving up the account of his mediatorial kingdom and concerns to his Father; when it will appear that he has in the whole of his conduct and administration been subject to him; that he has in all things acted in his name, done all by his power, and to his honour and glory; and now having accomplished all he undertook and was intrusted with, gives in his account, delivers up his charge, and resigns his office; all which will be plain proofs of his subjection: when I say he will resign or lay aside his office as Mediator, my meaning is not that he will cease to be God-man and Mediator; but that he will cease to administer that office as under God, in the manner he now does: he will be the prophet of the [elect], but he will not teach by his Spirit, and word, and ordinances as now, but will himself be the immediate light of the saints, he will be a priest for ever, the virtue of his sacrifice and intercession will always remain, but he will not plead and intercede as he now does; he will also reign for ever over and among his saints, but his kingdom will not be a vicarious one, or administered as it now is; nor be only in his hands as Mediator, but with God, Father, Son, and Spirit" (John Gill, *An Exposition of the Old and New Testament*, orig. pub. 1809, comment on 1 Corinthians 15:28).

³⁰ Charles Hodge, in response to the question, "How does the sovereignty of Christ as Mediator differ from his sovereignty as God?" properly answers, "His sovereignty as God is essential to his nature, underived, absolute, eternal, and unchangeable. His sovereignty as mediatorial King is derived, given to him by his father as the reward of his obedience and suffering; it is special, having respect to the salvation of his own people and the administration of the provisions of the covenant of grace [and, as premillennialists recognize, it pertains to His millennial rule]; and it attaches, not to his divine nature as such, but to his person as God-man, occupying the office of Mediator" (*Outlines of Theology*, Chapter 27, "Mediatorial Kingship of Christ," Question 1.).

Similarly, Lewis Sperry Chafer ("Trinitarianism, part 7," *Bibliotheca Sacra* 98:391 (Jul 41) pg. 275), considering the relationship of the Theanthropic Person of Christ to the Father, writes, "On the divine side of His Being, the Christ of God always occupied the exalted place of fellowship with the Father on the ground of equality-notably His High Priestly prayer as recorded in John 17:1-26; and every reference to His Deity implies this equality and oneness. On the human side of His being, that which is inherently the creature's relation to the Creator is expressed to perfection, namely, perfect submission to the Father's will. The complete obedience of Christ to the Father has been made the occasion of doubt as to His equality with the Father. Strong emphasis is needed at this point which enforces the truth that His subservient attitude is altogether the function of His humanity. There was that in His own divine nature which was first *willing* to be the obedient One. He *willingly* left the glory, and that exercise of His volition preceded His incarnation (Heb 10:4-7). In like manner, He will exercise authority in all future ages by the appointment of the Father. He reigns forever and ever, but on the ground of the truth that all authority is committed unto Him of the Father (Matt 28:18; John 5:27; 1 Cor 15:24-28)."

³¹ Note the analysis of *hupotasso* below.

He is equal to the Father and consubstantial with Him; as man, He is consubstantial with humanity, and the one who unites the chosen to God through His redemptive work in human nature; 1 Corinthians 15:20-28 demonstrates that this perfect harmony of the resurrected elect with the Triune God through the incarnate Son will be the the blessed state of eternity future.³² All things will be in harmony in the eternal state. All redeemed

³² Charles Hodge comments, with excellent insight, on 1 Corinthians 15:28: “When the work of redemption has been accomplished, the dead raised, the judgment held, the enemies of Christ all subdued, then, and not till then, will the Son also himself be subject to him who put all things under him. This passage is evidently parallel with that in v. 24. The subjection of the Son to the Father here means precisely what is there meant by his delivering up the kingdom to God even the Father. The thing done, and the person who does it, are the same. The subjection here spoken of is not predicated of the eternal Logos, the second person of the Trinity, any more than the kingdom spoken of in v. 24 is the dominion which belongs essentially to Christ as God. As there the word *Christ* designates the Theanthropos, so does the word *Son* here designate, not the Logos as such, but the Logos as incarnate. And as the delivery of the kingdom or royal authority over the universe committed to Christ after his resurrection, is consistent at once with his continued dominion as God over all creatures, and with his continued headship over his people; so is the subjection here spoken of consistent with his eternal equality with the Father. It is not the subjection of the Son as Son, but of the Son as Theanthropos of which the apostle here speaks. The doctrine of the true and proper divinity of our Lord is so clearly revealed in Scripture, and is so inwrought into the faith of his people, that such passages as these, though adduced with so much confidence by the impugners of that doctrine, give believers no more trouble than the ascription of the limitations of our nature to God. When the Bible says that God repents, we know that it is consistent with his immutability; and when it says the Son is subject or inferior to the Father, we know that it is consistent with their equality, as certainly as we know that saying that man is immortal is consistent with saying he is mortal. We know that both of the last-mentioned propositions are true: because mortality is predicated of man in one aspect, and immortality in another aspect. In one sense he is mortal, in another sense he is immortal. In like manner we know that the verbally inconsistent propositions, the Son is subject to the Father, and, the Son is equal with the Father, are both true. In one sense he is subject, in another sense he is equal. The son of a king may be the equal of his father in every attribute of his nature, though officially inferior. So the eternal Son of God may be coequal with the Father, though officially subordinate. What difficulty is there in this? What shade does it cast over the full Godhead of our adorable Redeemer? The subordination, however, here spoken of, is not that of the human nature of Christ separately considered, as when he is said to suffer, or to die, or to be ignorant; but it is the official subordination of the incarnate Son to God as God. The words *αὐτός ὁ υἱός*, *the Son himself*, here designate, as in so many other places, not the second person of the Trinity as such, but that person as clothed in our nature. And the subjection spoken of, is not of the former, but of the latter, i.e. not of the Son as Son, but of the Son as incarnate; and the subjection itself is official and therefore perfectly consistent with equality of nature.

There is another difficulty connected with this verse which it may be well to notice. According to the Scriptures and the creeds of all the great historical churches . . . the term Son, as applied to Christ, designates his divine nature. It is a term of nature and not of office. He was from eternity the Son of God. Yet it is of the Son that subjection is here predicated. This is urged as an argument against his eternal sonship. The fact, however, is, that the person of Christ may be designated from one nature, when the predicate belongs either to the opposite nature or to the whole person [the doctrine of the *communicatio idiomatum*]. That is, he may be called God when what is said of him is true only of his human nature or of his complex person as God and man; and he may be called man, when what is said is true only of his divine nature. Thus he is called the Son of Man when omnipresence and omniscience are ascribed to him; and he is called God, the Son of God, the Lord of glory when he is said to die. These passages do not prove that the human nature of Christ is every where present; or that his divine nature suffered and died. Neither do such expressions as that in the text prove that the Son as such is inferior to the Father, nor that the term Son

humanity and the redeemed creation (which is under man, and so ultimately under the Man of men, the Messiah, as in Psalm 8) will be subject in He who is Son of God and Son of Man to the one Triune God,³³ who will reign eternally³⁴ as the “all in all.”³⁵

is not a scriptural designation of his divine nature. The principle here adverted to is so important, and serves to explain so many passages of Scripture, that it will bear to be often repeated.

That God may be all in all. Before the ascension of Christ, God reigned as God; after that event he reigned and still reigns through the Theanthropos; when the end comes, the Theanthropos will deliver up this administrative kingdom, and God again be all in all. Such is the representation of Scripture, and such seems to be the simple meaning of this passage. When our Lord ascended up on high all power in heaven and earth was given to him. It was given to him then, and therefore not possessed before. He is to retain this delegated power in his character of Mediator, God-man, until his enemies are put under his feet. Then he, the God-man, is to deliver it up. And God as God will reign supreme. The phrase here used, τὰ πάντα . . . ἐν πᾶσιν, *all in all*, depends (as is the case with all similar formulas), for its precise meaning on the connection. . . Paul is speaking simply of the continuance of the mediatorial dominion of Christ over the universe. That dominion was given to him for a specific purpose; when that purpose is accomplished, he will give it up, and God, instead of reigning through Christ, will be recognized as the immediate sovereign of the universe; his co-equal, co-eternal Son, clothed in our nature, being, as the everlasting head of the redeemed, officially subordinate to him. In other words, the whole question, so to speak, is whose hands are to hold the reins of universal dominion. They are now in the hands of Christ; hereafter they are to be in the hands of God as such. The passage does not teach us the design of redemption, but what is to happen when the redemption of God’s people is accomplished. Then the Messianic reign is to cease, and God is to rule supreme over a universe reduced to order, the people of God being saved, and the finally impenitent shut up with Satan and his angels in the prison of despair” (*An Exposition of 1 Corinthians*, elec. acc. in *Christian Library Series*, vol. 15: *Classic Commentary Collection*, AGES Library, Rio, WI: 2006).

³³ Note the single throne of God and the Lamb in Revelation 22:3.

³⁴ “God’s original purpose was to manifest His absolute authority and this purpose is realized when Christ unites the earthly theocracy with the eternal kingdom of God. Thus, while Christ’s earthly theocratic rule is limited to one thousand years, which is sufficient time to manifest God’s perfect theocracy on earth, His reign is eternal” (*Things To Come*, J. Dwight Pentecost. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1965, pgs. 492-493).

³⁵ *That God may be all in all*; for by God is not meant the Father personally, but God essentially considered, Father, Son, and Spirit, who are the one true and living God; to whom all the saints will have immediate access, in whose presence they will be, and with whom they shall have uninterrupted fellowship, without the use of such mediums as they now enjoy; all the three divine Persons will have equal power and government in and over all the saints; they will sit upon one and the same throne; there will be no more acting by a delegated power, or a derived authority: God will be all things to all his saints, immediately without the use of means; he will be that to their bodies as meat and clothes are, without the use of them; and all light, glory, and happiness to their souls, without the use of ordinances, or any means; he will then be all perfection and bliss, to all the elect, and in them all, which he now is not; some are dead in trespasses and sins, and under the power of Satan; the number of them in conversion is not yet completed; and, of those that are called many are in a state of imperfection, and have flesh as well as spirit in them; and of those who are fallen asleep in Christ, though their separate spirits are happy with him, yet their bodies lie in the grave, and under the power of corruption and death; but then all being called by grace, and all being raised, and glorified in soul and body, God will be all in all: this phrase expresses both the perfect government of God, Father, Son, and Spirit, over the saints to all eternity, and their perfect happiness in soul and body, the glory of all which will be ascribed to God; and it will be then seen that all that the Father has done in election, in the council and covenant of peace, were all to the glory of his grace; and that all that the Son has done in the salvation of his people, is all to the glory of the divine perfections: and that all that the Spirit of God has wrought in the saints, and all that they have done under his grace and influence, are all to the praise and glory of God, which will in the most perfect manner be given to the eternal Three in One (John Gill, *An Exposition of the Old and New Testament*, orig. pub. 1809, comment on 1 Corinthians 15:28).

This mediatorial rule of Christ as the God-man is explicated elsewhere in Scripture as well. Hebrews 2:5-17 indicates that The Divine-human Messiah will have the world to come put in subjection to Him (v. 5). At this time, the Son of Man is exalted greatly, having received current dominion at His ascension (1 Peter 3:22), especially over the church (Ephesians 1:20-23), and the certain prospect of future absolute rule over all, but all creation it is not at this time completely subjected to Him (v. 6-9; Psalm 8:4-6). Those who are united by faith to the *Theanthropos*, He who assumed a completely human nature to redeem them by His substitutionary death, (v. 16-17) will partake of His glory (v. 10-15), being united to God through Him who is both God and man and made sons of God through Christ, the Captain of their salvation (v. 10). It is a shame that Arians, in ignorance of or hostility to the sublime and glorious beauty of the mediatorial kingdom of the Son as the God-man and the wonderful union the elect enjoy with Him and with the the Triune God through Him, will desecrate 1 Corinthians 15:28 to support their idolatry.

Even if the affirmation of 1 Corinthians 15:28 that “the Son also himself [shall] be subject unto him that put all things under him” referred to the Divine nature of God the Son (which it certainly does not), rather than to Him as the Mediator and God-man, the Arian dogma that the Son is a creature, a part of the created order, and therefore infinitely inferior in nature to His Father, would not be established. The word translated *be subject* in the verse, *hupotasso*, is “a Greek military term meaning ‘to arrange [troop divisions] in a military fashion under the command of a leader.’ In non-military use, it was ‘a voluntary attitude of giving in, cooperating, assuming responsibility, and carrying a burden.’”³⁶ The verb is defined as, in the active voice, “to cause to be in a submissive relationship,” and in the passive voice employed in 1 Corinthians 15:28,³⁷ to “become subject . . . subject oneself, be subjected or subordinated, obey” (BDAG); these

“It is as the incarnate Son that Christ, his mission of reconciliation completed, will deliver the kingdom to God the Father. The intention is not that the Son will then cease to reign or will disappear from the scene, but that his reign will be continued evermore within the threefold unity of the Godhead; and so *God* will be all in all—not just God the Father or God the Son or God the Holy Spirit, but God in the perfection of his trinitarian wholeness. Thus in speaking of the Son handing over the kingdom to the Father, the Apostle is teaching not the abdication of the Son but the completion of his redemptive mission and the everlasting rule of God” (pg. 409, *The True Image: The Origin and Destiny of Man in Christ*, Philip Edgcumbe Hughes. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2001).

³⁶ *Greek English Lexicon*, Joseph Henry Thayer, elec. acc. in Hamel, Ken, *The Online Bible for Mac*, version 3.0.

³⁷ ὑποταγήσεται.

considerations suit a reference to an economic subordination of role, rather than an ontological subordination of being, in 1 Corinthians 15:28. The etymological derivation of the word from the verb *tasso*, “to bring about an order of things by arranging, arrange, put in place” (BDAG), which in combination with *hupo* (“under”) gives a sense of “to arrange under,” also supports the idea of economic subordination rather than inferiority of being.³⁸ Conclusively, *hupotasso* is used many times elsewhere in Scripture for a subordination of role, one generally voluntary, of entities not at all inferior in being to those to whom they submit.³⁹ Even if one granted the invalid Arian assumption that the question of the essential nature of the Son was in view in 1 Corinthians 15:28, nothing in the Greek word employed requires the affirmation of the Unitarian dogma of His intrinsic inferiority of being—only a submission in role would be supported. The verse provides no support whatever for Arianism.

Jesus Christ is not just fully God, but also fully Man—this is orthodox Trinitarian doctrine, a belief that Trinitarians properly recognize is essential to man’s salvation. Christ’s genuine humanity is clearly proven in Scripture, and is rejoiced in by Trinitarians. Unitarian attempts to deny the Trinity with verses that deal with the humanity of the Lord Jesus Christ (Mark 13:32; Hebrews 5:8; Revelation 1:1; John 14:28; 1 Corinthians 11:3; 15:28) entirely miss the point.

³⁸ Note the economic subordination in association with ontic equality among humans in Luke 7:8, where the concept of being “under authority” is associated with *hupo* and *tasso*: καὶ γὰρ ἐγὼ ἄνθρωπός εἰμι ὑπὸ ἐξουσίαν τασσόμενος, ἔχων ὑπ’ ἐμαυτὸν στρατιώτας, καὶ λέγω τούτῳ, Πορεύητι, καὶ πορεύεται καὶ ἄλλῳ, Ἔρχου, καὶ ἔρχεται καὶ τῷ δούλῳ μου, Ποίησον τοῦτο, καὶ ποιεῖ. Compare also the association of *tasso* and *hupotasso* in Romans 13:1; 1 Corinthians 16:15-16.

³⁹ In Luke 2:51, Christ is “subject” to His earthly parents, but He certainly was not inferior in His being to them—even the most rabid Arian would admit he was superior in His being to Joseph and Mary! The Lord voluntarily assumed a subordinate role. In Luke 10:17, 20 fallen angels are subject to the disciples (admittedly involuntarily), although humans have a nature inferior to angels (Psalm 8:5; Hebrews 2:7). In 1 Corinthians 14:34, women are subject in their role to men, although they are equal in nature. Similarly, wives are subject to their husbands, although equal in nature (Ephesians 5:22, 24; Colossians 3:18; Titus 2:5; 1 Peter 3:1, 5). In 1 Corinthians 16:16, submission by believers to Paul’s fellowlaborers is enjoined; certainly this is a voluntary submission of role, not an affirmation that those working with Paul were somehow a higher class of being, super-humans that normal men were inferior to. In 1 Peter 5:5, the younger are to submit to those who are older (but identical in nature) to them. Titus 2:9 and 1 Peter 2:18 command servants to be submissive to their equally human masters. In Ephesians 5:21 and 1 Peter 5:5, all believers are to mutually submit to each other—they can hardly all be inferior in nature to one another! A voluntary assumption of a subordinate role is far more naturally the sense of the Son’s subjection in 1 Corinthians 15:28 than is an inferiority of being.

Luke 2:51; 10:17, 20; Romans 8:7, 20; 10:3; 13:1, 5; 1 Corinthians 14:32, 34; 15:27-28; 16:16; Ephesians 1:22; 5:21-22, 24; Philippians 3:21; Colossians 3:18; Titus 2:5, 9; 3:1; Hebrews 2:5, 8; 12:9; James 4:7; 1 Peter 2:13, 18; 3:1, 5, 22; 5:5; constitute the New Testament appearances of ὑποτάσσω.

Do you long for the restoration of all things under the headship of Christ as Mediator, as described in Ephesians 1:10? How ought this glorious truth affect your life?

ἐκκληρώθημεν in Ephesians 1:11 is not “chosen,” but “obtained an inheritance”—see Is 17:11, LXX.⁴⁰ See also the related noun in v.14. BDAG had stated that “the mng. of κ. in vs. 11 could be *chosen*”).

Specify the tense and tense usage of ἐκκληρώθημεν in Ephesians 1:11.

What kind of participle is προορισθέντες in Ephesians 1:11?

Specify the case and case usage for τοῦ . . . ἐνεργοῦντος in Ephesians 1:11. Also specify the kind of participle ἐνεργοῦντος is, and what the significance is of the tense of the participle.

The singular terms πρόθεσιν and βουλὴν τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ in Ephesians 1:11, rather than “counsels” of His will, are well explained by Stephen Charnock (pg. 326,

⁴⁰ Is. 17:11 τῇ δὲ ἡμέρᾳ ἣ ἂν φυτεύσης πλανηθήσῃ τὸ δὲ πρωὶ ἐὰν σπείρης ἀνθήσει εἰς ἀμητὸν ἣ ἂν ἡμέρᾳ κληρώσῃ καὶ ὡς πατὴρ ἀνθρώπου κληρώσῃ τοῖς υἱοῖς σου
In the day wherein thou shalt plant thou shalt be deceived; but if thou sow in the morning, *the seed* shall spring up for a crop in the day wherein thou shalt obtain an inheritance, and as a man’s father, thou shalt obtain an inheritance for thy sons.

Discourse 6, "On The Immutability of God," in *Discourses upon the Existence and Attributes of God*):

There is a concurrence of God's will and understanding in everything. As his knowledge is eternal, so is his purpose. Things created had not been known to be, had not God resolved them to be the act of his will; the existence of anything supposeth an act of his will. **Again, as God knows all things by one simple vision of his understanding, so he wills all things by one act of volition; therefore the purpose of God in the Scripture is not expressed by counsels in the plural number, but counsel; showing that all the purposes of God are not various, but as one will, branching itself out into many acts towards the creature; but all knit in one root, all links of one chain.** Whatsoever is eternal is immutable; as his knowledge is eternal; and therefore immutable, so is his will; he wills or nills nothing to be in time, but what he willed and nilled from eternity; if he willed in time that to be that he willed not from eternity, then he would know that in time which he knew not from eternity; for God knows nothing future, but as his will orders it to be future, and in time to be brought into being.

(3.) There can be no reason for any change in the will of God. When men change in their minds, it must be for want of foresight; because they could not foresee all the rubs and bars which might suddenly offer themselves; which if they had foreseen, they would not have taken such measures: hence men often will that which they afterwards wish they had not willed when they come to understand it clearer, and see that to be injurious to them which they thought to be good for them; or else the change proceeds from a natural instability without any just cause, and an easiness to be drawn into that which is unrighteous; or else it proceeds from a want of power, when men take new counsels, because they are invincibly hindered from executing the old. But none of those can be in God.

1st. It cannot be for want of foresight. What can be wanting to an infinite understanding? How can any unknown event defeat his purpose, since nothing happens in the world but what he wills to effect, or wills to permit; and therefore all future events are present with him? Besides, it doth not consist with God's wisdom to resolve anything, but upon the highest reason; and what is the highest and infinite reason, cannot but be unalterable in itself; for there can be no reason and wisdom higher than the highest. **All God's purposes are not bare acts of will, but acts of counsel. "He works all things according to the counsel of his own will" (Eph 1:11): and he doth not say so much that his will, as that "his counsel shall stand" (Isa 46:10). It stands, because it is counsel; and the immutability of a promise is called the "immutability of his counsel" (Heb 6:17), as being introduced and settled by the most perfect wisdom, and therefore to be carried on to a full and complete execution; his purpose, then, cannot be changed for want of foresight; for this would be a charge of weakness.**

How should the fact that God works all things according to the counsel of His will, as stated in Ephesians 1:11, change your life?

In Ephesians 1:12, what kind of infinitive is εἶναι, and what does its clause modify?

In Ephesians 1:12, is ἡμᾶς an inclusive or exclusive “we”?

In Ephesians 1:13, specify the case and case usage of ἀληθείας and σωτηρίας, and also specify the relationship of the phrases ἀκούσαντες τὸν λόγον τῆς ἀληθείας and τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς σωτηρίας ὑμῶν.

In Ephesians 1:13, what kind of participles are ἀκούσαντες . . . πιστεύσαντες?

In Ephesians 1:13, what is the case and case usage of Πνεύματι?

In Ephesians 1:13, what is the case and case usage of ἐπαγγελίας?

Specify the case and case usage of κληρονομίας, ἡμῶν, and περιποιήσεως in Ephesians 1:14.

In Ephesians 1:14, what does the εἰς in the phrase εἰς ἀπολύτρωσιν τῆς περιποιήσεως refer back to?

What kind of participle is ἀκούσας in Ephesians 1:15, and what is it dependent on?

Note BDAG #B7b on κατά for τὴν καθ' ὑμᾶς πίστιν in Ephesians 1:15. Also, A. T. Robertson, *Grammar* pg. 609:

Schmidt (*de eloc. Joseph.*, p. 21 f.) calls κατά a sort of periphrasis for the genitive in late Greek. Cf. τὰ κατ' ἐμέ (Ph. 1:12). It is more than a mere circumlocution for the genitive in the examples above and such

as τὴν καθ' ὑμῶς πίστιν (Eph. 1:15), τὸ κατ' ἐμέ (Ro. 1:15), τὸ κατὰ σάρκα (Ro. 9:5), τὰ κατ' ἐμέ (Eph. 6:21; cf. Ac. 25:14), ἀνδράσιν τοῖς κατ' ἐξοχὴν (Ac. 25:23; cf. par excellence).

What kind of participle is εὐχαριστῶν in Ephesians 1:16?

Note Hoehner, pgs. 252-253, for the structure of Ephesians 1:16b-23. Hoehner is correct about the structure with the sole exception that in v. 20 he follows the CT reading καθίσας, with 5.1% of Greek MSS, rather than the TR ἐκάθισεν, which follows 86% of MSS. (Another variant has 4.3% of MSS, another 1.3%, another 2.5%, and two others 0.6% together). The overall structure is not altered much by this—I would change the clauses “b” and “c” to “c” and “d” and make the ἐκάθισεν clause “b” above them.

In Ephesians 1:16, specify the type of participle ποιούμενος is.

What is the case and case usage of δόξης in Ephesians 1:17?

Does the phrase ὁ Θεὸς τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ in Ephesians 1:17 (cf. 1:3) establish an ontological subordination or an inferiority of nature in Christ? Explain.

In Ephesians 1:17, what is the mood and mood usage for the verb “might give”?

In Ephesians 1:17, what does the phrase πνεῦμα σοφίας καὶ ἀποκαλύψεως mean, and why? Note Wallace's discussion on pgs. 90-91. Compare, in the Pauline corpus:

Rom. 11:8 καθὼς γέγραπται, Ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Θεὸς πνεῦμα κατανύξεως, ὁφθαλμοὺς τοῦ μὴ βλέπειν, καὶ ὦτα τοῦ μὴ ἀκούειν, ἕως τῆς σήμερον ἡμέρας.

Rom. 11:8 (According as it is written, God hath given them the spirit of slumber, eyes that they should not see, and ears that they should not hear;) unto this day.

Gal. 6:1 Ἀδελφοί, ἐὰν καὶ προληφθῇ ἄνθρωπος ἐν τινι παραπτώματι, ὑμεῖς οἱ πνευματικοὶ καταρτίζετε τὸν τοιοῦτον ἐν πνεύματι πραότητος, σκοπῶν σεαυτὸν μὴ καὶ σὺ πειρασθῆς.

Gal. 6:1 Brethren, if a man be overtaken in a fault, ye which are spiritual, restore such an one in the spirit of meekness; considering thyself, lest thou also be tempted.

2Tim. 1:7 οὐ γὰρ ἔδωκεν ἡμῖν ὁ Θεὸς πνεῦμα δειλίας, ἀλλὰ δυνάμεως καὶ ἀγάπης καὶ σωφρονισμοῦ.

2Tim. 1:7 For God hath not given us the spirit of fear; but of power, and of love, and of a sound mind.

What kind of ἵνα is found in Ephesians 1:17? What kind of ἵνα clause does it introduce?

Concerning Ephesians 1:17, an intensive idea in *epignosis* over *gnosis*, which is possible because of the addition of *epi* to *gnosis*, is consistent with the texts in the NT that contain *epignosis*⁴¹ and *gnosis* (γνῶσις).⁴² 1 Corinthians 13:12 supports this distinction quite clearly. Compare Trench:

⁴¹ Rom. 1:28 ¶ Καὶ καθὼς οὐκ ἐδοκίμασαν τὸν Θεὸν ἔχειν ἐν ἐπιγνώσει, παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς ὁ Θεὸς εἰς ἀδόκιμον νοῦν, ποιεῖν τὰ μὴ καθήκοντα,

Rom. 3:20 διότι ἐξ ἔργων νόμου οὐ δικαιοθήσεται πᾶσα σὰρξ ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ· διὰ γὰρ νόμου ἐπίγνωσις ἁμαρτίας.

Rom. 10:2 μαρτυρῶ γὰρ αὐτοῖς ὅτι ζήλον Θεοῦ ἔχουσιν, ἀλλ' οὐ κατ' ἐπίγνωσιν.

Eph. 1:17 ἵνα ὁ Θεὸς τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὁ πατὴρ τῆς δόξης, δώῃ ὑμῖν πνεῦμα σοφίας καὶ ἀποκαλύψεως, ἐν **ἐπιγνώσει** αὐτοῦ·

Eph. 4:13 μέχρι καταστήσωμεν οἱ πάντες εἰς τὴν ἐνότητα τῆς πίστεως καὶ τῆς **ἐπιγνώσεως** τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ, εἰς ἄνδρα τέλειον, εἰς μέτρον ἡλικίας τοῦ πληρώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ·

Phil. 1:9 καὶ τοῦτο προσεύχομαι, ἵνα ἡ ἀγάπη ὑμῶν ἔτι μᾶλλον καὶ μᾶλλον περισσεύῃ ἐν **ἐπιγνώσει** καὶ πάσῃ αἰσθήσει,

Col. 1:9 ¶ Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ἡμεῖς, ἀφ' ἧς ἡμέρας ἠκούσαμεν, οὐ παυόμεθα ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν προσευχόμενοι, καὶ αἰτούμενοι ἵνα πληρωθῆτε τὴν **ἐπίγνωσιν** τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ καὶ συνέσει πνευματικῇ,

Col. 1:10 περιπατήσαι ὑμᾶς ἀξίως τοῦ Κυρίου εἰς πᾶσαν ἀρεσκείαν, ἐν παντὶ ἔργῳ ἀγαθῷ καρποφοροῦντες καὶ αὐξανόμενοι εἰς τὴν **ἐπίγνωσιν** τοῦ Θεοῦ·

Col. 2:2 ἵνα παρακληθῶσιν αἱ καρδίαι αὐτῶν, συμβιβασθέντων ἐν ἀγάπῃ, καὶ εἰς πάντα πλοῦτον τῆς πληροφορίας τῆς συνέσεως, εἰς **ἐπίγνωσιν** τοῦ μυστηρίου τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ,

Col. 3:10 καὶ ἐνδυσάμενοι τὸν νέον, τὸν ἀνακαινούμενον εἰς **ἐπίγνωσιν** κατ' εἰκόνα τοῦ κτίσαντος αὐτόν·

1Tim. 2:4 ὃς πάντας ἀνθρώπους θέλει σωθῆναι καὶ εἰς **ἐπίγνωσιν** ἀληθείας ἔλθειν.

2Tim. 2:25 ἐν πραότητι παιδεύοντα τοὺς ἀντιδιατιθεμένους· μήποτε δῶ αὐτοῖς ὁ Θεὸς μετάνοιαν εἰς **ἐπίγνωσιν** ἀληθείας,

2Tim. 3:7 πάντοτε μανθάνοντα, καὶ μηδέποτε εἰς **ἐπίγνωσιν** ἀληθείας ἔλθειν δυνάμενα.

Titus 1:1 ¶ Παῦλος, δούλος Θεοῦ, ἀπόστολος δὲ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, κατὰ πίστιν ἐκλεκτῶν Θεοῦ καὶ **ἐπίγνωσιν** ἀληθείας τῆς κατ' εὐσέβειαν,

Philem. 6 ὅπως ἡ κοινωνία τῆς πίστεώς σου ἐνεργῆς γένηται ἐν **ἐπιγνώσει** παντὸς ἀγαθοῦ τοῦ ἐν ὑμῖν εἰς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν.

Heb. 10:26 ¶ Ἐκουσίως γὰρ ἀμαρτανόντων ἡμῶν μετὰ τὸ λαβεῖν τὴν **ἐπίγνωσιν** τῆς ἀληθείας, οὐκέτι περὶ ἀμαρτιῶν ἀπολείπεται θυσία,

2Pet. 1:2 χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη πληθυνθείη ἐν **ἐπιγνώσει** τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν·

2Pet. 1:3 ὥς πάντα ἡμῖν τῆς θείας δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ τὰ πρὸς ζωὴν καὶ εὐσέβειαν δεδωρημένης, διὰ τῆς **ἐπιγνώσεως** τοῦ καλέσαντος ἡμᾶς διὰ δόξης καὶ ἀρετῆς·

2Pet. 1:8 ταῦτα γὰρ ὑμῖν ὑπάρχοντα καὶ πλεονάζοντα, οὐκ ἀργοὺς οὐδὲ ἀκάρπους καθίστησιν εἰς τὴν τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ **ἐπίγνωσιν**.

2Pet. 2:20 εἰ γὰρ ἀποφυγόντες τὰ μιάσματα τοῦ κόσμου ἐν **ἐπιγνώσει** τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ σωτῆρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, τούτοις δὲ πάλιν ἐμπλακέντες ἡττώνται, γέγονεν αὐτοῖς τὰ ἔσχατα χεῖρονα τῶν πρώτων.

Rom. 1:28 And even as they did not like to retain God in *their* knowledge, God gave them over to a reprobate mind, to do those things which are not convenient;

Rom. 3:20 Therefore by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight: for by the law *is* the knowledge of sin.

Rom. 10:2 For I bear them record that they have a zeal of God, but not according to knowledge.

Eph. 1:17 That the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of glory, may give unto you the spirit of wisdom and revelation in the knowledge of him:

Eph. 4:13 Till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ:

Phil. 1:9 ¶ And this I pray, that your love may abound yet more and more in knowledge and *in* all judgment;

Col. 1:9 ¶ For this cause we also, since the day we heard *it*, do not cease to pray for you, and to desire that ye might be filled with the knowledge of his will in all wisdom and spiritual understanding;

Col. 1:10 That ye might walk worthy of the Lord unto all pleasing, being fruitful in every good work, and increasing in the knowledge of God;

Col. 2:2 That their hearts might be comforted, being knit together in love, and unto all riches of the full assurance of understanding, to the acknowledgement of the mystery of God, and of the Father, and of Christ;

Col. 3:10 And have put on the new *man*, which is renewed in knowledge after the image of him that created him:

1Tim. 2:4 Who will have all men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth.

2Tim. 2:25 In meekness instructing those that oppose themselves; if God peradventure will give them repentance to the acknowledging of the truth;

2Tim. 3:7 Ever learning, and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth.

Titus 1:1 ¶ Paul, a servant of God, and an apostle of Jesus Christ, according to the faith of God's elect, and the acknowledging of the truth which is after godliness;

Philem. 6 That the communication of thy faith may become effectual by the acknowledging of every good thing which is in you in Christ Jesus.

Heb. 10:26 For if we sin wilfully after that we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins,

2Pet. 1:2 Grace and peace be multiplied unto you through the knowledge of God, and of Jesus our Lord,

2Pet. 1:3 According as his divine power hath given unto us all things that *pertain* unto life and godliness, through the knowledge of him that hath called us to glory and virtue:

2Pet. 1:8 For if these things be in you, and abound, they make *you that ye shall* neither be barren nor unfruitful in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ.

2Pet. 2:20 For if after they have escaped the pollutions of the world through the knowledge of the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, they are again entangled therein, and overcome, the latter end is worse with them than the beginning.

⁴² Luke 1:77 τοῦ δοῦναι **γνώσιν** σωτηρίας τῷ λαῷ αὐτοῦ ἐν ἀφέσει ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν,

Luke 11:52 οὐαὶ ὑμῖν τοῖς νομικοῖς, ὅτι ἤρατε τὴν κλεῖδα τῆς **γνώσεως**; αὐτοὶ οὐκ εἰσήλθετε, καὶ τοὺς εἰσερχομένους ἐκωλύσατε.

Rom. 2:20 παιδευτὴν ἀφρόνων, διδάσκαλον νηπίων, ἔχοντα τὴν μόρφωσιν τῆς **γνώσεως** καὶ τῆς ἀληθείας ἐν τῷ νόμῳ·

Rom. 11:33 Ὡς βάθος πλούτου καὶ σοφίας καὶ **γνώσεως** Θεοῦ. ὡς ἀνεξερεύνητα τὰ κρίματα αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἀνεξιχνίαστοι αἱ ὁδοὶ αὐτοῦ.

Rom. 15:14 ¶ Πέπεισμαι δέ, ἀδελφοί μου, καὶ αὐτὸς ἐγὼ περὶ ὑμῶν, ὅτι καὶ αὐτοὶ μεστοὶ ἐστε ἀγαθωσύνης, πεπληρωμένοι πάσης **γνώσεως**, δυνάμενοι καὶ ἀλλήλους νοουθετεῖν.

1Cor. 1:5 ὅτι ἐν παντὶ ἐπλουτίσθητε ἐν αὐτῷ, ἐν παντὶ λόγῳ καὶ πάσῃ **γνώσει**,

1Cor. 8:1 ¶ Περὶ δὲ τῶν εἰδωλοθύτων, οἶδαμεν ὅτι πάντες **γνώσιν** ἔχομεν. ἡ **γνώσις** φυσιοῖ, ἡ δὲ ἀγάπη οἰκοδομεῖ.

1Cor. 8:7 ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐν πάσιν ἡ **γνώσις**; τινὲς δὲ τῇ συνειδήσει τοῦ εἰδώλου ἕως ἄρτι ὡς εἰδωλόθυτον ἐσθίουσι, καὶ ἡ συνείδησις αὐτῶν ἀσθενὴς οὖσα μολύνεται.

1Cor. 8:10 ἐὰν γάρ τις ἴδῃ σὲ τὸν ἔχοντα **γνώσιν** ἐν εἰδωλείῳ κατακείμενον, οὐχὶ ἡ συνείδησις αὐτοῦ ἀσθενοῦς ὄντος οἰκοδομηθήσεται εἰς τὸ τὰ εἰδωλόθута ἐσθίειν;

1Cor. 8:11 καὶ ἀπολείται ὁ ἀσθενῶν ἀδελφὸς ἐπὶ τῇ σῇ **γνώσει**, δι' ὃν Χριστὸς ἀπέθανεν;

1Cor. 12:8 ὃ μὲν γὰρ διὰ τοῦ Πνεύματος δίδεται λόγος σοφίας, ἄλλω δὲ λόγος **γνώσεως**, κατὰ τὸ αὐτὸ Πνεῦμα·

1Cor. 13:2 καὶ ἐὰν ἔχω προφητείαν, καὶ εἶδον τὰ μυστήρια πάντα καὶ πᾶσαν τὴν **γνώσιν**, καὶ ἐὰν ἔχω πᾶσαν τὴν πίστιν, ὥστε ὅρη μεθιστάνειν, ἀγάπην δὲ μὴ ἔχω, οὐδὲν εἰμι.

1Cor. 13:8 ἡ ἀγάπη οὐδέποτε ἐκπίπτει· εἴτε δὲ προφητεῖαι, καταργηθήσονται· εἴτε γλώσσαι, παύσονται· εἴτε **γνώσις**, καταργηθήσεται.

1Cor. 14:6 νυνὶ δέ, ἀδελφοί, ἐὰν ἔλθω πρὸς ὑμᾶς γλώσσαις λαλῶν, τί ὑμᾶς ὠφελήσω, ἐὰν μὴ ὑμῖν λαλήσω ἢ ἐν ἀποκαλύψει, ἢ ἐν **γνώσει**, ἢ ἐν προφητείᾳ ἢ ἐν διδαχῇ;

2Cor. 2:14 τῷ δὲ Θεῷ χάρις τῷ πάντοτε θριαμβεύοντι ἡμᾶς ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ, καὶ τὴν ὁσμὴν τῆς **γνώσεως** αὐτοῦ φανεροῦντι δι' ἡμῶν ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ.

2Cor. 4:6 ὅτι ὁ Θεὸς ὁ εἰπὼν ἐκ σκότους φῶς λάμψαι, ὃς ἔλαμψεν ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν, πρὸς φωτισμὸν τῆς **γνώσεως** τῆς δόξης τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν προσώπῳ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

2Cor. 6:6 ἐν ἀγνότητι, ἐν **γνώσει**, ἐν μακροθυμίᾳ, ἐν χρηστότητι, ἐν Πνεύματι Ἁγίῳ, ἐν ἀγάπῃ ἀνυποκρίτῳ,

2Cor. 8:7 ἀλλ' ὥσπερ ἐν παντὶ περισσεύετε, πίστει, καὶ λόγῳ, καὶ **γνώσει**, καὶ πάσῃ σπουδῇ, καὶ τῇ ἐξ ὑμῶν ἐν ἡμῖν ἀγάπῃ, ἵνα καὶ ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ χάριτι περισσεύητε.

2Cor. 10:5 λογισμοὺς καθαιροῦντες καὶ πᾶν ὕψωμα ἐπαιρόμενον κατὰ τῆς **γνώσεως** τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ αἰχμαλωτίζοντες πᾶν νόημα εἰς τὴν ὑπακοὴν τοῦ Χριστοῦ,

2Cor. 11:6 εἰ δὲ καὶ ἰδιώτης τῷ λόγῳ, ἀλλ' οὐ τῇ **γνώσει**; ἀλλ' ἐν παντὶ φανερωθέντες ἐν πᾶσιν εἰς ὑμᾶς.

Eph. 3:19 γινῶναί τε τὴν ὑπερβάλλουσαν τῆς **γνώσεως** ἀγάπην τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἵνα πληρωθῇτε εἰς πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ Θεοῦ.

Phil. 3:8 ἀλλὰ μενοῦνγε καὶ ἡγοῦμαι πάντα ζημίαν εἶναι διὰ τὸ ὑπερέχον τῆς **γνώσεως** Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ Κυρίου μου· δι' ὃν τὰ πάντα ἐζημιώθην, καὶ ἡγοῦμαι σκύβαλα εἶναι, ἵνα Χριστὸν κερδήσω,

Col. 2:3 ἐν ᾧ εἰσὶ πάντες οἱ θησαυροὶ τῆς σοφίας καὶ τῆς **γνώσεως** ἀπόκρυφοι.

1Tim. 6:20 ¶ Ὡς Τιμόθεε, τὴν παρακαταθήκην φύλαξον, ἐκτρεπόμενος τὰς βεβήλους κenoφωνίας καὶ ἀντιθέσεις τῆς ψευδωνύμου **γνώσεως**·

1Pet. 3:7 ¶ Οἱ ἄνδρες ὁμοίως, συνοικοῦντες κατὰ **γνώσιν**, ὥς ἀσθενεστέρω σκεύει τῷ γυναικείῳ ἀπονέμοντες τιμὴν, ὥς καὶ συγκληρονόμοι χάριτος ζωῆς, εἰς τὸ μὴ ἐκκόπτεσθαι τὰς προσευχὰς ὑμῶν.

2Pet. 1:5 καὶ αὐτὸ τοῦτο δέ, σπουδὴν πᾶσαν παρεισενέγκαντες, ἐπιχορηγήσατε ἐν τῇ πίστει ὑμῶν τὴν ἀρετὴν, ἐν δὲ τῇ ἀρετῇ τὴν **γνώσιν**,

2Pet. 1:6 ἐν δὲ τῇ **γνώσει** τὴν ἐγκράτειαν, ἐν δὲ τῇ ἐγκρατείᾳ τὴν ὑπομονήν, ἐν δὲ τῇ ὑπομονῇ τὴν εὐσέβειαν,

2Pet. 3:18 αὐξάνετε δὲ ἐν χάριτι καὶ **γνώσει** τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν καὶ σωτῆρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. αὐτῷ ἡ δόξα καὶ νῦν καὶ εἰς ἡμέραν αἰῶνος. ἀμήν.

Luke 1:77 To give knowledge of salvation unto his people by the remission of their sins,

Luke 11:52 **Woe unto you, lawyers! for ye have taken away the key of knowledge: ye entered not in yourselves, and them that were entering in ye hindered.**

Rom. 2:20 An instructor of the foolish, a teacher of babes, which hast the form of knowledge and of the truth in the law.

Rom. 11:33 ¶ O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! how unsearchable *are* his judgments, and his ways past finding out!

Rom. 15:14 ¶ And I myself also am persuaded of you, my brethren, that ye also are full of goodness, filled with all knowledge, able also to admonish one another.

1Cor. 1:5 That in every thing ye are enriched by him, in all utterance, and *in* all knowledge;

1Cor. 8:1 ¶ Now as touching things offered unto idols, we know that we all have knowledge. Knowledge puffeth up, but charity edifieth.

1Cor. 8:7 ¶ Howbeit *there is* not in every man that knowledge: for some with conscience of the idol unto this hour eat *it* as a thing offered unto an idol; and their conscience being weak is defiled.

1Cor. 8:10 For if any man see thee which hast knowledge sit at meat in the idol's temple, shall not the conscience of him which is weak be emboldened to eat those things which are offered to idols;

1Cor. 8:11 And through thy knowledge shall the weak brother perish, for whom Christ died?

1Cor. 12:8 For to one is given by the Spirit the word of wisdom; to another the word of knowledge by the same Spirit;

1Cor. 13:2 And though I have *the gift of* prophecy, and understand all mysteries, and all knowledge; and though I have all faith, so that I could remove mountains, and have not charity, I am nothing.

1Cor. 13:8 ¶ Charity never faileth: but whether *there be* prophecies, they shall fail; whether *there be* tongues, they shall cease; whether *there be* knowledge, it shall vanish away.

1Cor. 14:6 ¶ Now, brethren, if I come unto you speaking with tongues, what shall I profit you, except I shall speak to you either by revelation, or by knowledge, or by prophesying, or by doctrine?

2Cor. 2:14 Now thanks *be* unto God, which always causeth us to triumph in Christ, and maketh manifest the savour of his knowledge by us in every place.

2Cor. 4:6 For God, who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts, to *give* the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ.

2Cor. 6:6 By pureness, by knowledge, by longsuffering, by kindness, by the Holy Ghost, by love unfeigned,

2Cor. 8:7 ¶ Therefore, as ye abound in every *thing, in* faith, and utterance, and knowledge, and *in* all diligence, and *in* your love to us, *see* that ye abound in this grace also.

2Cor. 10:5 Casting down imaginations, and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ;

2Cor. 11:6 But though *I be* rude in speech, yet not in knowledge; but we have been thoroughly made manifest among you in all things.

Of ἐπίγνωσις, as compared with γνῶσις, it will be sufficient to say that ἐπί, must be regarded as intensive, giving to the compound word a greater strength than the simple possessed; thus ἐπιποθέω (2 Cor. v. 2), ἐπιμελέομαι: and, by the same rule, if γνῶσις is ‘cognitio,’ ‘kenntniss,’ ἐπίγνωσις is ‘major exactiorque cognitio’ (Grotius), ‘erkenntniss,’ a deeper and more intimate knowledge and acquaintance. This we take to be its meaning, and not ‘*re* cognition,’ in the Platonic sense of reminiscence, as distinguished from cognition, if we might use that word; which Jerome (on Ephes. iv. 13), with some moderns, has affirmed. St. Paul, it will be remembered, exchanges the γινώσκω, which expresses his present and fragmentary knowledge, for ἐπιγνώσομαι, when he would express his future intuitive and perfect knowledge (1 Cor xiii. 12). It is difficult to see how this should have been preserved in the English Version; our Translators have made no attempt to preserve it; Bengel does so by aid of ‘nosco’ and ‘pernoscam,’ and Culverwell (*Spiritual Optics*, p. 180) has the following note: [‘Ἐπίγνωσις and γνῶσις differ. Ἐπίγνωσις is ἡ μετὰ τὴν πρώτην γνῶσιν τοῦ πράγματος παντελὴς κατὰ δύναμιν κατανόησις. It is bringing me better acquainted with a thing I knew before; a more exact viewing of an object that I saw before afar off. That little portion of knowledge which we had here shall be much improved, our eye shall be raised to see the same things more strongly and clearly.’ All the uses of ἐπί - γνῶσις which St. Paul makes, justify and bear out this distinction (Rom. i. 28; 20; x. 2; Ephes. iv. 13; Phil. i. 9; 1 Tim. ii. 4; 2 Tim. ii. 25; cf. Heb. x. 26); this same intensive use of ἐπίγνωσις is borne out by other similar passages [Page 286] in the N. T. (2 Pet. i. 2, 8; ii. 20) and in the Septuagint (Prov. ii. 5; Hos. iv. 1; vi. 6); and is recognized by the Greek Fathers; thus Chrysostom on Col. i. 9: ἔγνωτε, ἀλλὰ δεῖ τι καὶ ἐπιγνῶναι. On the whole subject of this § see Lightfoot on Col. i. 9.

Read Hoehner, pgs. 260-263, on Ephesians 1:18, πεφωτισμένους τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς τῆς διανοίας ὑμῶν. What is the syntactical connection of this clause, and why? The following discussion of the Accusative Absolute by A. T. Robertson, from his *Grammar*, pg. 490, should be noted. The Accusative Absolute is not discussed by Wallace:

(o) THE ACCUSATIVE ABSOLUTE. The absolute use of the accusative is rare in the N. T. as compared with the earlier Greek.² Usually the genitive occurs with the participle and substantive when used absolutely. In 1 Cor. 16:6 τυχόν is really the accusative absolute though used as an adverb. The most certain example in the N. T. is in Ac. 26:3 γνῶσθην ὄντα σε. In 1 Tim. 2:6 τὸ μαρτύριον καιροῖς ἰδίοις is in the accusative without any [Page 491] immediate connection unless it is in apposition with the preceding clause¹ (Ellicott *in loco*) or is loosely united with δούς. As to τό ἀδύνατον τοῦ νόμου (Ro. 8:3) we have either the *nominativus pendens*, the accusative in apposition with the object of the sentence, the accusative of general reference or an instance of anacoluthon.² In Lu. 24:47 the Text. Recept. reads ἀρξάμενον, which would be anacoluthon, but W. H. rightly have — νοί. Twice ἐξόν, occurs in the N. T., once with ἦν (Mt. 12:4) and once alone, ἃ οὐκ ἐξόν (2 Cor. 12:4), but in both instances in the nominative. In Ph. 1:7 ὑμᾶς ὄντας the ὑμᾶς is repeated and is not accusative absolute. A subordinate sentence may

Eph. 3:19 And to know the love of Christ, which passeth knowledge, that ye might be filled with all the fulness of God.

Phil. 3:8 Yea doubtless, and I count all things *but* loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord: for whom I have suffered the loss of all things, and do count them *but* dung, that I may win Christ,

Col. 2:3 In whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge.

1Tim. 6:20 O Timothy, keep that which is committed to thy trust, avoiding profane *and* vain babblings, and oppositions of science falsely so called:

1Pet. 3:7 Likewise, ye husbands, dwell with *them* according to knowledge, giving honour unto the wife, as unto the weaker vessel, and as being heirs together of the grace of life; that your prayers be not hindered.

2Pet. 1:5 ¶ And beside this, giving all diligence, add to your faith virtue; and to virtue knowledge;

2Pet. 1:6 And to knowledge temperance; and to temperance patience; and to patience godliness;

2Pet. 3:18 But grow in grace, and *in* the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. To him *be* glory both now and for ever. Amen.

also be in the accusative of general reference. Thus τὸ εἰδύνῃ (Mk. 9:23), τὸ τίς ἂν εἴη μείζων αὐτῶν (Lu. 9:46). See further chapter on Verbal Nouns.

Compare also *Robertson's Word Pictures* on Ephesians 1:18:

Having the eyes of your heart enlightened (πεφωτισμενους τους ὀφθαλμους της καρδιας ὑμῶν [*pephōtismenous tous ophthalmous tēs kardias humōn*]). A beautiful figure, the heart regarded as having eyes looking out toward Christ. But the grammar is difficult. There are three possible interpretations. One is an anacoluthon, the case of πεφωτισμενους [*pephōtismenous*] being changed from the dative ὑμῖν [*humin*] (to you) to the accusative because of the following infinitive like ἐκλεξαμενους [*eklexamenous*] (Acts 15:22) after ἀποστολοις [*apostolois*]. Another way of explaining it is to regard it as a tertiary predicate of δῶκε [*dōikē*], a loose expansion of πνευμα [*pneuma*]. The third way is to regard the construction as the accusative absolute, a rare idiom possible in Acts 26:3; I Cor. 16:3; I Tim. 2:6. In this case, the participle merely agrees with τους ὀφθαλμους [*tous ophthalmous*], not with ὑμῖν [*humin*], “the eyes of your heart having been enlightened.” Otherwise τους ὀφθαλμους [*tous ophthalmous*] is the accusative retained after the passive participle. That ye may know (εἰς το εἶδεναι [*eis to eidenai*]). Final use of εἰς το [*eis to*] and the infinitive (second perfect of οἶδα [*oida*]) as in verse 12. Note three indirect questions after εἶδεναι [*eidenai*] (what the hope τις ἡ ἐλπίς [*tis hē elpis*], what the riches τις ὁ πλοῦτος [*tis ho ploutos*], and what the surpassing greatness καὶ τι το ὑπερβαλλον μεγαθος [*kai ti to hyperballon megethos*]). When the Holy Spirit opens the eyes of the heart, one will be able to see all these great truths. In the saints (ἐν τοις ἁγίοις [*en tois hagiois*]). Our riches is in God, God’s is in his saints.

In Ephesians 1:18, what is the syntactical relationship indicated by the infinitive clause with εἶδέναι?

In Ephesians 1:18, what type of genitive is κλήσεως, and what type is αὐτοῦ? A comparison with Ephesians 4:4 will be helpful.

What are the case and case usage of δοξῆς in Ephesians 1:18?

What part of speech is τί in Ephesians 1:19, and how is it functioning?

Specify the case and case usage of δυνάμεως in Ephesians 1:19.

In Ephesians 1:19, what does the κατά phrase modify?

In Ephesians 1:19, specify the case and case usage of ἐνέργειαν.

After answering the questions above, you should read pgs. 268-272 of Hoehner to get the sense of the “power” terms in Ephesians 1:19.

What is the antecedent of ἣν in Ephesians 1:20, and how does it function in its own clause? Also specify the case and case usage of ἣν.

Why is the participle ἐγείρας aorist in Ephesians 1:20? What verb does it relate to? Is it subsequent or simultaneous time? What kind of participle is this?

In Ephesians 1:20, what part of speech is ἐπουρανίους, and what does it function as?

Note that ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις is unique to Ephesians, appearing in the following texts:

Eph. 1:3 Εὐλογητὸς ὁ Θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὁ εὐλόγησας ἡμᾶς ἐν πάσῃ εὐλογίᾳ πνευματικῇ **ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις** ἐν Χριστῷ.

Eph. 1:20 ἣν ἐνήργησεν ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ, ἐγείρας αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν, καὶ ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξιᾷ αὐτοῦ **ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις**.

Eph. 2:6 καὶ συνήγειρε, καὶ συνεκάθισεν **ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις** ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ.

Eph. 3:10 ἵνα γνωρισθῇ νῦν ταῖς ἀρχαῖς καὶ ταῖς ἐξουσίαις **ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις** διὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἡ πολυποίκιλος σοφία τοῦ Θεοῦ,

Eph. 6:12 ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν ἡμῖν ἡ πάλῃ πρὸς αἶμα καὶ σάρκα, ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὰς ἀρχάς, πρὸς τὰς ἐξουσίας, πρὸς τοὺς κοσμοκράτορας τοῦ σκότους τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου, πρὸς τὰ πνευματικὰ τῆς πονηρίας **ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις**.

Students should read pgs. 276-280 of Hoehner for a discussion of the “power” terms in Ephesians 1:21.

Specify the case and case usage for ἐκκλησία in Ephesians 1:22.

Since Christ alone is the head of the church, as indicated in Ephesians 1:22, neither the pope, nor any other man, has the right to institute laws in the church of Christ. The fact that the doctrine and practices of the church must be solely regulated by the Word given by the Father through Christ by the Spirit to the church has historically been called the “Regulative Principle,” and it is the fundamental principle of true worship. While the following article relates the matter to historical theology to some extent, the Biblical basis for the Regulative Principle of worship is still clearly elucidated. Historically, the Regulative Principle of worship has been accepted by Baptists, Congregationalists, and Presbyterians, but rejected by Catholics and Anglicans so that liturgy could be justified; however, today many are entirely ignorant of it, and, not surprisingly, the worship of God has declined precipitously. Thus, note the following valuable discussion:⁴³

The light of nature sheweth that there is a God, who hath lordship and sovereignty over all, is good, and doth good unto all, and is therefore to be feared, loved, praised, called upon, trusted in, and served with all the heart, and with all the soul, and all the might. *But the acceptable way of worshipping the true God is instituted by Himself, and so limited by His own revealed will, that He may not be worshipped according to the imaginations and devices of men, or the suggestions of Satan, under any visible representation, or any other way not prescribed in the holy Scripture.*

II. The Regulative Principle of Worship

The regulative principle of worship is not an innovation of the Westminster Assembly. Its roots can be traced at least to John Calvin.⁵ George Gillespie wrote that the regulative principle was well established by the time of the Westminster Assembly, and cited the Reformed theologians Jerome Zanchi and John Calvin in support of the principle.⁶

[*WTJ* 58:2 (Fall 96) p. 239]

The regulative principle was a major source of controversy between the Puritan-Presbyterian party and the Anglicans, who rejected the regulative principle. It was particularly sensitive because worship involved every believer weekly. No other Puritan-Anglican controversy confronted believers so force fully every time they attended church.

III. The Definition of the Regulative Principle

⁴³ pgs. 238–253 of “Biblical Authority and the Proof of the Regulative Principle of Worship in The Westminster Confession,” John Allen Delivuk. *Westminster Theological Journal* 58:2 (Fall 96) 237-257.

The regulative principle of worship states that the only way to worship God is in the manner that He has commanded in the Holy Scripture; all additions to or subtractions from this manner are forbidden. This is an application of the view that the Bible is sufficient for all good works, and that it is the only judge in spiritual matters, as expressed in Chapter 1 and 31:3 of the Confession. The regulative principle teaches that the proper way to determine God's will concerning worship is to study the Bible to determine acts of worship God has commanded for Christians, and do only those acts. Obviously, Christ fulfilled some rites of Old Testament worship, such as sacrifices, and these are not to be used in Christian worship. However, the acts of Old Testament worship that are of grace and not judgment, like praying and singing Psalms, are still suitable forms of worship as are the New Testament acts of worship such as the sacraments. The regulative principle is the consistent application of the Assembly's position "that nothing could be taught or required as necessary which was not found in the Bible."⁷

George Gillespie's observations are helpful in defining the regulative principle. Gillespie believed that God, by His authority alone, bound men to believe whatever He told them to believe, and, by means of the Word, He revealed what He wanted men to believe and practice concerning worship.⁸ Gillespie believed:

Jesus Christ hath prescribed and foreappointed the rule according to which he would have his worship...of his own house to be ordered.... Neither ought the voice of any to take place or be rested upon in the church but the voice of Christ alone.⁹

Gillespie said the use of authorities other than Jesus Christ to determine the ceremonies of worship results in the introduction of sources of authority other than God into the church. The regulative principle of worship was [*WTJ* 58:2 (Fall 96) p. 240] thus considered a defense of God's unique authority in the church, a doctrine taught in Chapter 1 of the *Confession*.

While critics of the regulative principle viewed it as too restrictive, the authors of the *Confession* viewed it as liberating. The Westminster Divines realized it meant, first, that they were free of the burden of the ceremonial law with its external forms. Edward Reynolds gave the position of the authors of the *Confession* as follows:

We have hereby a great encouragement to serve our God in Spirit and in Truth (John iv.24), being delivered from all those burdensome accessions...¹⁰

Having been freed from the Jewish ceremonial law, the *Confession's* authors were uncompromising in their desire to defend worship against the man-made ceremonial laws of the Romanists and Anglicans. Thus, they viewed the regulative principle not as a legalistic restriction, but as a defense of God's worship against human interference, including the adding of adiaphora. Another function of regulation was to prevent the church or any other authority from usurping God's right to be worshiped in His way.

The Westminster Assembly did make a distinction between circumstances of worship and acts or elements of worship, which will be discussed in more detail below. Circumstances are things surrounding the worship service, such as time and place. Acts or elements of worship are the spiritually significant parts of worship, like Bible reading and prayer. This distinction between acts and circumstances of worship is seen in the Assembly's directory for worship. The *Directory* makes a clear distinction between what God commands in worship and what men recommended in circumstances surrounding worship. Mitchell described the *Directory's* distinctions in these words:

I know of no formulary of the same sort which is so free from minute and harassing regulations as to posture, gestures, dressed, church pomp, ceremonies, symbolism, and other "superfluities," as Hales terms them, which "under the pretext of order and decency had crept into the church and

more and more had restricted the liberty and burdened the conscience of its ministers...As has been well said, "The obligation to practice is not the same when it is described in the Directory as *necessary, requisite, expedient, convenient,*" *lawful*, or *sufficient*, or when it is *directed, advised, or recommended*, nor finally when it is provided "in one place that the minister *is to, or shall*, in another *may,*" or another *let him,* "*do such and such things.*"¹¹

IV. Proofs for the Regulative Principle of Worship

We will now examine the proofs for the regulative principle and their relation to the Westminster doctrine of biblical authority. Evangelical Protestantism uses two common forms of doctrinal proof. One is the proof-text [*WTJ* 58:2 (Fall 96) p. 241] method, where a list of texts is gathered, listed, discussed, and summarized. This method is particularly effective when proving a doctrine to laity, and is used in the modern defenses of the regulative principle.¹² The second method is to derive a doctrine from other doctrines. This method argues if this is taught in the Bible, it implies these other truths. The authors of the *Confession* favored the latter method.

1. Proofs for the Regulative Principle from the Sufficiency of Scripture

Robert Harris used the sufficiency of Scripture, a major pillar of the doctrine of biblical authority, to defend the regulative principle of worship. He supported the regulative principle from the description of the very gestures of Christ, such as sitting and standing, in God's worship. He said that the two reasons why God informed Christians of these gestures were for the instruction of believers, and because God wanted us to know that his eye is upon every worshipper. Using these two observations, he attacked the Roman doctrine of worship which taught that the Bible was not sufficient for worship. The Romanists taught that the Bible contained only a partial rule that needs human additions. Harris argued that the Roman conclusions were defective and gave his reasons as follows:

What? doth God descend to circumstantials, and is he defective in the substance?...Doth he acquaint us with the very gestures of our Saviour, and in the meane leave out some doctrines and articles? Doth he record the Saints salutations one to another, and over slip necessarie instructions of his owne? Let bastards emplead his last Will and Testament whilst they please, as if it were imperfect, every true son will say with their elder brother, *I adore the fulnesse of the Scripture*.¹³

Here an author of the *Confession* used a good and necessary consequence of Scripture to derive the regulative principle of worship. Because the Scripture includes small details, it is sufficient for all acts of worship, and therefore, human innovations in worship infer that the Bible is insufficient and imperfect.

Harris also answered those who argued God is a Spirit, and His worship is spiritual; therefore, believers do not have to be concerned about the actions of their bodies. This attacks the regulative principle by saying it is irrelevant. Harris replied, yes, God is a Spirit, and men are to worship Him in spirit and truth. However, God made the body as well as the soul. God will redeem the body as well as the soul. Therefore, be concerned about [*WTJ* 58:2 (Fall 96) p. 242] feet, eyes, and ears, for God is concerned with gestures in His presence. Do not show poor manners and act like a clown in God's presence.¹⁴

2. Proof for the Regulative Principle from Christian Liberty

From the time of the vestments controversy of the latter sixteenth century, the Anglican additions to worship had given many sincere believers serious conscience problems. They believed that these innovations were not worship. Therefore, they had problems of conscience

every time they participated in worship. A major goal of the Westminster Assembly was to protect believers with sensitive consciences.

In Chapter 20 of the *Confession*, one learns that the Westminster Assembly distinguished several parts of Christian liberty. These are freedom from sin and the wrath of God; free access to God; freedom from the ceremonial law; and, in section 2, freedom “from the doctrines and commandments of men, which are in any thing contrary to his Word; or beside it, if matters of faith or worship.” It is this last freedom, called “liberty of conscience,” that the authors of the *Confession* used to prove the regulative principle. Because God left men’s consciences free from the doctrines and commands of men, the church is forbidden to teach or command anything the Bible does not. This prohibition extends to adiaphora as well as sins. In worship, the church is forbidden to add rites and ceremonies to those found in the Bible, because the conscience is to be free of human requirements.

Samuel Rutherford, an author of the *Confession*, used Christian liberty to derive the regulative principle of worship. Rutherford defines Christian liberty as: 1) Freedom from the Ceremonial Law (Gal 5:1–5) and the commandments of men, “for all these Ceremonies being now not commanded, but forbidden of God, become the Commandments of (Col 2:18,19, 20) men, from which the *Jewes* and *Gentiles* were freed in Christ”; 2) Free dom and redemption (Gal 3:10–13) from the moral law’s cursing and condemning by Jesus who makes men free (John 8:36); 3) Freedom from the dominion of sin (Romans 6:12–14) by the spirit of grace; 4) Freedom from the necessity of being justified by the law or its works (Romans 8:15); 5) Freedom from the law-power of our enemies.¹⁵

Professor Rutherford realized that the Anglicans did not accept his position. They believed their additions to worship were indifferent and voluntary. In answer to an opponent, Rutherford gave his position on Christian liberty, worship, and things indifferent. The opponent declared that Christian liberty is not restrained by doing or not doing a thing indifferent, for [*WTJ* 58:2 (Fall 96) p. 243] the church should make no laws concerning things indifferent. The opponent continued, Christian liberty is not hurt if the ceremonies are voluntary and are not requirements, if they are not made necessary for salvation, and if human authorities can alter them. Rutherford replied that the objection was incorrectly stated. The issue is not whether the use of things indifferent lays a bond on Christian liberty, but whether the church has the authority to make a law of things indifferent; when there is no intrinsecall necessitie in the things themselves, [however] when necessities of edification layeth on a tye [a rope tied to something], Christian libertie is not indeed restrained, for *God* then layeth on a bond.¹⁶

He continued citing Col 2:21 and Gal 2:18 to show men are dead with Christ to external observations and thus free from them. In other words, Samuel Rutherford attacked the *right* of the church to make the rules on things indifferent, rather than the restraint of Christian liberty. If the church had no authority from God to make rules concerning adiaphora, then she will always have Christian liberty, because the church will only be requiring God’s commands.

Rutherford gave a second reason for opposing the Anglican position described above. Rutherford could not understand how the ceremonies were left free to the individual’s conscience if the church could alter them. He concluded that practices like crossing and surplices signified dedication to Christianity throughout the world, so the practices cannot be called national, alterable rites, but must be called universal rites, which are therefore “at all times, and in all places doctrinall.”¹⁷ In other words, these practices were so deeply imbedded into the church that they could not be considered alterable, but had to be considered doctrinal.

George Gillespie also advocated Christian liberty against the Anglican additions to worship. He accused the prelates of enforcing ceremonies “after the heathenish and popish manner.” In contrast, Gillespie desired the “the ancient apostolical simplicity and singleness,” because ceremonies distract the minds of the people “from the spiritual and inward duties.”¹⁸ Here Gillespie combined the Christian liberty argument with the frequently used Puritan-

Presbyterian argument which said the early church was [WTJ 58:2 (Fall 96) p. 244] the pattern for Christian church and applied it to worship. This was his alternative to the prelates' system.

Gillespie was also aware of the adiaphora question. He observed that, although Anglican prelates called their religious innovations things indifferent, their ceremonies were a cause of great scandal among believers who considered the ceremonies to be ungodly and contrary to the Word. To protect these people, the Puritan movement had adopted the very charitable position that "things indifferent ought not to be practiced with the scandal and offence of the godly."¹⁹

Gillespie continued declaring that the way of the prelates was destructive to liberty of conscience and practice because it compelled practices by the will and authority of the prelates, an authority that God had not given them. He concluded, with the Puritan-Presbyterian position, saying:

We say that no canons nor constitutions of the church can bind the conscience...except in so far as they are grounded upon and warrantable by the word of God, at least by consequence, and by the general rules thereof; and that canons concerning things indifferent bind not...when they may be omitted without giving scandal, or showing any contempt of the ecclesiastical authority.²⁰

Clearly, the authors of the *Confession* believed that the Christian's liberty from the commands of men forbade the church's adding man-made ceremonies to worship even if these ceremonies were considered indifferent matters. This limitation of ecclesiastical authority was simply an application of the Westminster doctrine of biblical sufficiency as applied to Christian liberty. The Puritan-Presbyterians saw the additions to worship as usurping God's authority. They believed the Bible was the only ruler of men's consciences and the judge of what is allowable in worship. The principles of biblical authority used by the authors of the *Confession* here are God as the author of Scripture and the Bible as the sole authoritative judge of religious disputes.

3. Proof for the Regulative Principle from the Second Commandment

The next proof is from the second commandment's prohibition against idols. The Westminster Assembly's position that the second commandment taught the regulative principle is taught in the *Westminster Larger Catechism*, questions 107–110 with their scriptural proofs. (See appendix for text of these questions.) These questions and answers show that the Westminster Assembly believed the second commandment taught the regulative principle of worship. This application of the second commandment was not original. An Anglican archbishop and major influence on the Assembly, James Ussher, taught that the regulative principle was the application of [WTJ 58:2 (Fall 96) p. 245] the second commandment is seen in the following selections from his *Body of Divinitie*. Ussher said the command's meaning and purpose was,

To binde all men to that solemne forme of religious Worship which God himselfe in his Word prescribeth, that we serve him, not according to our fancies, but according to his owne will, *Deut* 12.32.21 [Emphasis his.]

Ussher continued by asking, what is forbidden in the Second Commandment? He answered,

Every forme of Worship, though of the true God, *Deut.* 12.31 . contrary to, or diverse from the prescript of God's Word, *Mat.* 15.9. called by the Apostle Will-worship, *Col.* 2.23 . together with all corruption in the true Worship of God, *2 King.* 16.10 . and all lust and inclination of heart unto superstitious Pumps, and Rites in the service of God.²²

James Ussher influenced the Westminster Assembly's conclusion that the second commandment taught the regulative principle of worship.

Because of the exposition of the second commandment in the *Larger Catechism*, pursuing the topic in detail among the authors of the *Confession* is unnecessary. However, one topic relating to the second commandment, that of “will-worship,” deserves comment. Following the usage of the King James Bible, the Puritans called the practice of adding human rites and ceremonies to worship services, “will-worship,” from the term’s usage in Col 2:23. Anglicans and Puritans agreed that will-worship was a sin, but their definitions of this sin varied.

As indicated above, James Ussher taught that will-worship was a sin. Naturally, most Anglicans disagreed with his understanding of will-worship. One, Thomas Coleman, argued that will-worship pertained only to the essentials of worship. Gillespie replied that Coleman’s view served as permission for men to add any Jewish, papist, or heathen ceremonies to worship unless those practices could be proven contrary to the Word of God.²³ The difference concerning will-worship revolved around the burden of proof. The Puritans argued that God allowed no ceremony in worship unless He commanded it in Scripture. The Anglicans argued that any ceremony in worship was allowed unless it was forbidden in Scripture. That is the key to their different definitions of will-worship. If the Puritan-Presbyterian proofs of the regulative principle of worship stand, then they win the debate, otherwise the Anglicans win.

[*WTJ* 58:2 (Fall 96) p. 246]

4. Proof for the Regulative Principle from the Positive Commands of Scripture

Also related to the Second Commandment argument is the method of biblical interpretation that the Puritan-Presbyterians used to interpret the law of God. The principle they used teaches that the positive command forbids the negative practice. This method is used in questions 108 and 109 found in the appendix. The authors of the *Confession* give us more insight into this method of argument.

Samuel Rutherford believed that the positive commands with respect to worship forbade any other practices of worship, even in the smallest matters,²⁴ and defended his position from the Bible. In answer to the question, “Whether or not Humane Ceremonies in God’s Worship, can consist [coexist] with the perfection of God’s Word?” Rutherford answered:

These humane Ceremonies we cannot but reject upon these grounds; *Our first Argument* is: Every positive and Religious observance, and Rite in Gods worship, not warranted by Gods Word, is unlawfull: But humane Ceremonies are such: *Ergo*,

The Proposition is sure, the holy Spirit useth a Negative Argument, *Act. 15.24. We gave no such Commandment*, Levit. 10:1. Jer. 7.30. and 19:5, 6. and 32:35. 2 Sam 7.7. 1 Chron. 15.13. The Lord Commanded not this, *Ergo*, It is not Lawfull.²⁵ [Emphasis and punctuation his.]

These examples concern sins not forbidden in the Bible. For example, in Jer 19:5–6, God condemns Israel for burning its sons to Baal, “which I commanded not, nor spake it, neither came it into my mind.” Here Rutherford used an example of an Old Testament’s positive worship command forbidding all other forms of worship, another argument that uses the hermeneutic of good and necessary consequence.

Thomas Gataker supported the position that the positive command forbids the negative. In the following quotation, he taught that the positive command implies the negative and vice versa. He wrote:

there are in Gods Law as well affirmatives as negatives; yea that as every affirmative includeth a negative, so every negative hath an affirmative infolded in it: and that there is (Deut. 27.26 . Gal. 3.10 .) *a curse* imposed as a penalty as well on the breach of the one, as of the breach on the

other: and that the one is as well broken by the omission of that that therein is enjoined, as the other by the practise of that that therein is inhibited.²⁶

The following example clarifies Gataker's position. He applied the principle that the positive forbids the negative to the sacraments, showing how men could abuse the sacraments without this principle to protect them. He observed:

[*WTJ* 58:2 (Fall 96) p. 247]

And in many cases it holdeth *only therefore*: For why we should use *water* and not *wine* in *Baptisme*: Why *bread*, rather than *roasted flesh* in the *Lord's Supper*, and why *bread only* and not *cheese* too, as some haue vsed, no reason can be rendred, but because *God so pleased* to determine the *elements* in either. [His emphasis.]²⁷

Gataker believed that if the positive commands of Scripture did not forbid their negative counter parts, havoc could be done to the celebration of the sacraments.

The church could also suffer harm by a sloppy application of the principle that the positive command forbids the negative and vice versa. The Westminster Divines were careful in the application of this principle. For example, if one examines the negative and positive commands in the questions and the corresponding Scripture proofs in the Larger Catechism regarding the second commandment, one finds that they teach no negative or positive duty without an accompanying text of Scripture for support. The principle that the positive command forbids the negative is not a licence to say no to almost everything.

The Westminster Divines also carefully limited the application of this principle, thus leaving other areas of life as adiaphora. For example, Thomas Gataker wrote,

an Action may haue warrant sufficient by permission without precept or practise. For where God hath not limited the vse of any Creature or ordinance, there he hath left the vse of it free. Where he hath not determined the circumstances of any action, there what he hath not prohibited, that hath he permitted, and that is warrant sufficient for it. Where therefore circumstances are determined, the argument holdeth from the negatiue to make that vnwarrantable, that is not either expresly or by good consequence inioyned. But where they are not determined, the argument is strong enough from the negatiue to proue that warrantable that is not either expresly or by iust consequence prohibited.

For this cause in the point of Gods worship the argument holdeth (Jer. 7.31 & 19.5 , Coloss. 2.22,23.) from the negatiue for the substance of it, because (Deut. 12.30,31, 32) God hath determined it.²⁸

While the Westminster Assembly believed the Bible taught that affirmative commands forbade their negative counter-parts, it applied this rule with great caution, and it only applied the rule in areas such as worship, which God had authoritatively addressed; other areas were considered adiaphora. Good and necessary consequence was used in deriving and defending the rule that a positive command forbids other actions by implication.

[*WTJ* 58:2 (Fall 96) p. 248]

V. The Principle of Uniformity

The next proof for the regulative principle is also an implied one, the proof from uniformity.²⁹ The goal of the Westminster Assembly was religious uniformity in Great Britain and Ireland. The Assembly's members realized that this uniformity could only be accomplished if

they derived the church's ethics, doctrines, and practices solely from the Bible. Except for Gillespie, the authors of the *Confession* had little to say about uniformity. This does not necessarily mean that they were not concerned with it, since a commonly accepted idea is frequently not discussed. The actions of the Westminster Assembly show its concern with uniformity in writing the *Confession*, the catechisms, the directories for worship and church government, and the psalter.

George Gillespie gave a biblical proof for uniformity in the church. Gillespie stated his love for uniformity and then condemned the Anglican ordinances as a defective uniformity because of their human origin as "commandments of men" (Col 2:22 and Matt 15:9). Next, he argued for uniformity from nature and gave several Bible passages that teach uniformity in nature, such as Job 38:31–33, relating to uniformity in the heavens; Gen 8:22, on uniformity in seed time and harvest not ceasing; and Jesus' prediction of uniformity in nature found in John 4:35 (four months till harvest). Gillespie continued with biblical proofs from the Old Testament of "uniformity both in the substantials and rituals of the worship and service of God." Old Testament texts used to support uniformity included: Num 9:13, commanding that the passover is to be kept at the appointed time in the appointed way; Exod 12:49, commanding one law for home-born and stranger; the rules on sacrifices in Leviticus 1–7; and the services of Levities in 1 Chron 23:26.30

With that foundation, Gillespie moved to the New Testament for additional proof. He observed,

Of the church of the New Testament it was prophesied, that God would give them one way as well as one heart, Jer. xxxii.39; that there shall not only be one Lord, but his name one, Zech. xiv.9. We are exhorted to walk by the same rule, so far as we have attained; that it, to study unity, not diversity, in those things which are agreed upon to be good and right, Phil. iii.16. Doth not the Apostle plainly intimate and commend an uniformity in the worship of God, 1 Cor. xiv.27, "If any man speak in an unknown tongue, let it be by two, or at the most by three, and that by course; and let one interpret;" ver. 33, "For God is not the author of confusion, but of peace, as in all churches of the saints;" ver. 40, "Let all things [*WTJ* 58:2 (Fall 96) p. 249] be done decently, and in order"? He limiteth the prophets to the same number of two or three, even as he limiteth those that had the gift of tongues, ver. 29. And was it not a great unity, that he would have every man who prayed or prophesied to have his head uncovered, and every woman covered, 1 Cor. xi. ? Doth not the same Apostle, besides the doctrine of faith, and practical duties of a Christian life, deliver several canons to be observed in the ordination and admission of elders and deacons, concerning widows, concerning accusations, administrations, censures, and other things belonging to church policy, as appeareth especially from the epistles to Timothy and Titus?31

Because he believed the Bible taught uniformity, George Gillespie had a deep and sincere desire for uniformity in the churches of England, Scotland, Wales, and Ireland. To reach that goal, worship must be based not on human innovations, but on the practices of worship found in the Bible. The uniformity argument led Gillespie to the regulative principle of worship.

Gillespie's argument for uniformity uses the principles of biblical authority taught in Chapter 1 of the *Westminster Confession*. These principles are: Scripture as the final judge in determining the doctrine of uniformity, and the analogy of faith, which uses Scripture to interpret Scripture. He also uses good and necessary consequence, first, in drawing the conclusion that uniformity forbids human rites and ceremonies, and, secondly, in the application of some biblical texts, like seed time and harvest not ceasing, to this question.

Summing up then, the authors of the *Confession* used the sufficiency of Scripture, Christian liberty and the limits of church power, the second commandment, the principle that positive commands forbid their negatives, and the doctrine of uniformity as proofs for the regulative principle. The use of these arguments involved principles of biblical authority found in

Chapter 1 of the *Confession*, especially the analogy of faith, good and necessary consequence, the sufficiency of Scripture, and Scripture as the sole judge of religious doctrines and practices. The method of proving the regulative principle was primarily that of deriving it from other doctrines.

VI. The Circumstances of Worship

What about the circumstances of worship? All agree that not everything connected with worship is worship.³² These non-worship items include the [*WTJ* 58:2 (Fall 96) p. 250] shape of the building, the length of the service, seating and other items of no religious significance. The Westminster Divines addressed this issue in chapter 1, paragraph 6 of the *Confession*, which reads,

there are some circumstances concerning the worship of God, and government of the church, common to human actions and societies, which are to be ordered by the light of nature and Christian prudence, according to the general rules of the Word, which are always to be observed.

George Gillespie's discussion of circumstances is commonly used to define the distinction between worship and circumstances.³³ Three conditions must be met for a matter to be a circumstance. First,

It must be onely a circumstance of Divine Worship, no substantiall part of it, no sacred significant and efficacious Ceremonie. For the order and decency left to the definition of the Church, as concerning the particulars of it, comprehendeth more, but mere circumstances.³⁴

Samuel Rutherford is of great help in understanding the meaning of circumstances. By circumstances, Rutherford meant things merely natural (physical), and not spiritual, which included such circumstances as time and place. Circumstances are either merely physical, merely moral, or partly moral and partly physical. The latter class he called mixed circumstances. Physical circumstances are adjuncts of worship, things that occur concurrently with other civil and religious actions done by men, but are not part of the action. As adjuncts, they contribute no moral goodness or badness to the agent in his performance. He listed some of the physical circumstances, time, place, person or agent, name, family, condition (country, family, house), garments, and gestures, as sitting and standing.³⁵

Rutherford further clarified the meaning of this rule by showing that a physical circumstance can become a moral matter by God commanding it. The examples he used were the Lord's Day (the Christian Sabbath), the temple, and the apparel of the worshipper. Time is a circumstance or adjunct to worship. "But such a time, to wit, the *Lords-day*, is both the time of [*WTJ* 58:2 (Fall 96) p. 251] Worship, and Worship it self." So also, there is a place of worship (circumstance) and the temple as a special place of worship (command). The clothing of a worshipper is an accident of worship, but if God commanded a priestly ephod, then this is not a mere circumstance. Thus while these circumstances taken in the common and universal sense are merely physical, when God restricts them, they become moral circumstances.³⁶

Gillespie's second condition is that Scripture does not determine a circumstance. He wrote,

That which the church may lawfully prescribe by her Lawes and ordinances, as a thing left to her determination, must be one such things as were not determinable by Scripture...because *individua* are *infinita*.³⁷

Gillespie above deals with the things relating to worship not mentioned in the Bible. He does not mean the liturgical acts of worship, but is referring to the multitude of individual details that the

Scripture does not address, such as the hours of worship for the thousands of churches on earth, the sizes and types of buildings, and other such individual details. For the Bible to specify such petty matters for every church in Christendom would be absurd.

The final condition for a circumstance is it must have a good reason for it, because of love for brethren with a tender conscience. For example, the use of pews in church is a circumstance justified on the basis that people worship better when they are more comfortable. Gillespie wrote,

If the Church prescribe any thing lawfully so that she prescribe no more then she hath power given her to prescribe, her ordinance must be accompanied with some good reason and warrant given for the satisfaction of tender consciences.³⁸

Here too, Samuel Rutherford is helpful in understanding Gillespie. He realized that while physical circumstances were not worship, they were important to worship, and the poor planning of circumstances could destroy a worship service. Rutherford called these “mixed circumstances” because the poor implementation of circumstances could destroy the worship service, and thus become a moral matter. Thus, the time for worship, must be a convenient time, not a scandalous and superstitious time. People required a fit place for worship, not the marketplace. The probability of inconvenient circumstances destroying worship makes them a moral matter.³⁹

VII. The Practices of Worship

While a detailed discussion of the practices of worship is beyond the scope of this essay, I will make some observations relating them to biblical authority. [WTJ 58:2 (Fall 96) p. 252] From the list given in the *Confession*, Chapter 21:3–5, and the Westminster Assembly’s directory for worship, a complete list of the parts of worship emerges. The ordinary acts of worship are prayer, the reading of Scripture, the “sound preaching” of the Word, the “conscionable hearing of the Word, in obedience unto God,” the “singing of psalms with grace in the heart,” and the administration and “worthy receiving of the sacraments.” This list tells us the how of worship as well as the what. The occasional acts of worship are “religious oaths, vows, solemn fastings, and thanksgivings.” The list of regular acts of worship prove to be the biggest surprise because the regular acts of worship are identical to the means of grace: namely, the word (read, preached, heard, and sung), the sacraments, and prayer.⁴⁰ No evidence exists that the members of the Assembly realized that they devised a system of worship whose regular acts were limited to the means of grace. If they had realized it, they probably would have used the argument that edification is the goal of Christian worship (1 Cor 14:26) and can only be accomplished by the means of grace.

Endnotes:

5 For a brief history of the Regulative Principle, see Michael Bushell, *The Songs of Zion* (Pittsburgh: Crown and Covenant Publications, 1980), 10–16.

6 George Gillespie, *A Dispyte against the English-Popish Ceremonies, Obtrvded vpon the Chvrch of Scotland. Wherein Not Only Our Owne Arguments against the Same Are Strongly Confirmed, But Likewise the Answeres and Defense of Our Opposites, Svch As Hooker, Mortovne, Bvrges, Sprint, Paybody, Andrewes, Saravia, Tilen, Spotswood, Lindsey, Forbesse, &c Particularly Confuted* (n.p.: n.p., 1637), pt. 3, pp. 93, 121–22.

7 Wayne R. Spear, “The Westminster Assembly and Biblical Interpretation,” in *The Book of Books*, ed. John H. White (Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1978), 46.

8 Gillespie, *A Dispyte against the English-Popish Ceremonies*, pt. 3, p. 176.

9 George Gillespie, *One Hundred and Eleven Propositions Concerning the Ministry and Government of the Church* (London: Tyler, 1647; reprint ed. in *The Presbyterian's Armoury*, vol. 2, Edinburgh: Ogle, and Oliver & Boyd, 1844), 5–6.

10 Edwards Reynolds, *The Whole Works of the Right Rev. Edward Reynolds, D.D.*, 6 vols. (London: B. Holdsworth, 1826), 3:120.

11 Mitchell, *The Westminster Assembly*, 238. Mitchell does not give the sources of his quotations.

12 An example of the modern use of the proof text method is by Michael Bushell, *The Songs of Zion*, 37–47.

13 Robert Harris, *The Workes of Robert Harris, Bachelor in Divinity and Pastor of Hanwell, in Oxfordshire. Revised and in Sundrie Places Corrected, and Now Collected into One Volume* (London: J. Bartlet, 1635), 245.

14 Ibid.

15 Samuel Rutherford, *A Survey of the Spirituall Antichrist. Opening the Secrets of Familisme and Antinomianisme in the Antichristian Doctrine of John Saltmarsh, and Will. Del, the Present Preachers of the Army Now in England, and of Robert Town, Rob. Crisp, H. Denne, Eaton, and Others. In Which Is Revealed the Rise and Spring of Antinomians, Familists, Libertines, Swenck-feldians, Enthysiasts, &c* (London: Andrew Crooke, 1648), pt. 2, pp. 93–94.

16 Samuel Rutherford, *The Divine Right of Church-Government and Excommunication: or a Peaceable Dispute for the Perfection of the Holy Scripture in Point of Ceremonies and Church Government; in Which the Removal of the Service Book is Justified* (London: Christopher Meredith, 1646), pt. 2, p. 57.

17 Ibid., pt. 2, pp. 57–8.

18 George Gillespie, *A Treatise of Miscellany Questions; Wherein Many Useful Questions and Cases of Conscience are Discussed and Resolved, for the Satisfaction of Those Who Desire Nothing More than to Search for and Find Out Precious Truths in the Controversies of these Times* (Edinburgh: George Swintoun, 1649; reprint ed. in *The Presbyterian's Armoury*, vol. 1, Edinburgh: Ogle, and Oliver & Boyd, 1844), 83.

19 Ibid.

20 Ibid.

21 James Ussher, *A Body of Divinitie, or the Symme and Svbsstance of Christian Religion* (London: Tho: Dovvnes and Geo: Badger, 1645), 222.

22 Ibid.

23 George Gillespie, *Male Audis; or, An Answer to Mr. Coleman's Male Dicis* (London: Robert Bostocke, 1646; reprint ed. in *The Presbyterian's Armoury*, vol. 2, Edinburgh: Ogle, and Oliver & Boyd, 1844), 17.

24 Rutherford, *Divine Right of Church-Government*, 95.

25 Ibid. The emphasis and punctuation are identical to that of the original. Unfortunately, the original punctuation makes it unclear that the quoted passage is from Acts 15:24.

26 Thomas Gataker, *Certaine Sermons, First Preached, and after Published at Severall Times* (London: Fulke Clifton, 1637), pt. 2, p. 51.

27 Thomas Gataker, *A Iust Defence of Certaine Passages in a Former Treatise Concerning the Nature and Use of Lots, Against Such Exceptions and Oppositions as Haue Beene Made Thereunto by Mr. I. B.* (London: Robert Bird, 1623), 264.

28 Ibid., 244-45.

29 Uniformity, meaning compliance with one standard of religious opinion, practice and procedure, was a much more important concern before our time of individualism. Historically, it was in part an outgrowth of the Medieval idea of one God, one king, and one church. It meant, for example, that the directory for worship was to be followed much more closely than our individualist age frequently understands it to be followed.

30 Gillespie, *Treatise of Miscellany Questions*, 82–84.

31 Ibid., 84-85.

32 The position taken by the Westminster Confession on circumstances is different that take by Prof. John Frame in a recent article. The *Confession* teaches that the regulative principle is an exception to the doctrine of good works. Frame argues for an expansion of the regulative principle to all of life, which leads one to conclude that there are no circumstances (pp. 361- 364). Frame also uses “mode” of the “how” a thing is done and argues that the Bible does not dictate how we are to exercise the various parts of worship (p. 360). The *Confession* contradicts Frame by indicating the “hows” of worship. The Scriptures are to be read “with godly fear,” and singing is to be done with “grace in the heart.” In my opinion, Dr. Frame has made the error of interpreting the regulative principle without an understanding of its historical meaning. See John Frame, “Some Questions about the Regulative Principle,” *Westminster Theological Journal* 54 (Fall 1992): 357-366.

The expansion of the regulative principle is not original with Dr. Frame. See Norman Shepherd, “The Biblical Basis for the Regulative Principle of Worship,” in *The Biblical Doctrine of Worship*, ed. Philip Martin, et al., (Pittsburgh: Reformed Presbyterian Church, 1974), 42–56.

33 Examples of appeals to Gillespie are Bushell, *The Songs of Zion*, 28–31, Presbyterian Church in the United States, *Memorial Volume of the Westminster Assembly, 1647–1897* (Richmond, Va.: The Presbyterian Committee of Publication, 1897), 153, and John L. Girardeau, *Instrumental Music in the Public Worship of the Church* (Richmond, Va.: Whittett & Shepperson, 1888), 148–150.

34 Gillespie, *A Dispyte against the English-Popish Ceremonies*, pt. 3, 112.

35 Rutherford, *Divine Right of Church-Government*, 4

36 Ibid., 3-4.

37 Gillespie, *A Dispyte against the English-Popish Ceremonies*, pt. 3, 114.

38 Ibid.

39 Rutherford, *Divine Right of Church-Government*, 4.

40 Charles Hodge, *Systematic Theology*, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1965), vol. 3:466.

In Ephesians 1:23, what are the voice and tense of πληρουμένου, and what is the significance of this voice and tense?

Chapter 2

In Ephesians 2:1, specify the case and case usage of παραπτώμασι . . . ἁμαρτίαις.

In Ephesians 2:1, specify the case and case usage of νεκρούς.

In Ephesians 2:1, what kind of participle is ὄντας? Also, what is the significance of the participle's tense?

Note the structural insight by Wallace on pg. 336 concerning the relative pronouns in Ephesians 2:2-3.

Concerning Ephesians 2:2, the *Pillar New Testament Commentary* notes:

The genitive τοῦ πνεύματος ('of the spirit') has been taken: (1) as in apposition to the immediate antecedent, τοῦ ἀέρος ('of the air'), so providing an explanation of the air as the spiritual atmosphere controlling the disobedient (Caird, 51; Schlier, 104; cf. S. H. T. Page, *Powers*, 185), or (2) as parallel to τῆς ἐξουσίας ('of the realm') and governed by τὸν ἄρχοντα ('the ruler'), signifying that the ruler of the kingdom of the air is the ruler of the spirit that is now at work in the disobedient (Lincoln, 96). But to speak of 'the ruler of the spirit which now operates' is rather unusual if not awkward, and it is better (3) to regard the genitive τοῦ πνεύματος ('of the spirit') as one of apposition (cf. BDF §167) to τὸν ἄρχοντα ('the ruler'), or as attracted to the preceding genitive phrase (cf. Gnilka, 115; Arnold, 61; and G. D. Fee, *God's Empowering Presence*, 679; note, however, D. B. Wallace, *Greek Grammar*, 104). Accordingly, this phrase is independent of and parallel with the preceding one. This spirit is clearly the devil, the ruler of all spiritual forces.

In relation to view #3, taken by the *Pillar Commentary*, BDF 167 is cited in support:

167. Genitive of content and appositive genitive. To the genitive of content belongs *inter al.* Jn 21:8 τὸ δίκτυον τῶν ἰχθύων; cf. classical πλοῖα σίτου etc. (K.–G. I 333; pap. s. Mayser II 2, 122f.).—The use of the appositive genitive, i.e. of the genitive used in the sense of an appositive, conforms in the NT to classical usage: 2 C 5:5 τὸν ἄρραβῶνα τοῦ πνεύματος ‘the guarantee (earnest) which consists in the Spirit’. Cf. K.–G. I 264; Pfister, Festgabe Deissmann (1927) 72f.; Rob. 498f.

R 4:11 σημεῖον περιτομῆς (–μήν AC*). 2 C 5:1 ἡ οἰκία τοῦ σκήνους. Jn 2:21 τοῦ ναοῦ τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ. E 2:14 τὸ μεσότοιχον τοῦ φραγμοῦ. With πόλις (Homer Ἰλίου πόλιν) only 2 P 2:6 πόλεις Σοδόμων καὶ Γομόρρας; but πόλεως Θουατίρων A 16:14 is the gen. of πόλις Θουάτιρα, cf. ἐν πόλει Ἰόππῃ 11:5; with gen. of inhabitants 2 C 11:32 τὴν πόλιν Δαμασκηνῶν, Rev 3:12, 18:10, 21, 21:2, 10. Γῆ Αἰγύπτου s. §261(7). E 4:9 τὰ κατώτερα (μέρη) τῆς γῆς is not partitive (Winer §59, 8 [Winer–M.³ 666]; Sasse, TW I 679) or appositive (‘the lower regions’, i.e. the earth; cf. Barn 10.5 ἐν τῇ γῇ κάτω τοῦ βυθοῦ ‘down

al. others (*alii*)

cf. compare (*confer*)

K.–G. Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache, II Satzlehre, 3. Auflage von B. Gerth (in 2 vols.) (Hanover and Leipzig, 1898–1904; reprinted 1955).

pap. papyrus (–i), papyrological

s. see

Mayser Edwin Mayser, Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit, I (Leipzig, 1906; I² Berlin, 1923), II 1 (Berlin, 1926), II 2 (1934), II 3 (1934); 2nd ed.: I 2 (1938), I 3 (1936).

f. for, following

i.e. that is (*id est*)

NT New Testament

K.–G. Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache, II Satzlehre, 3. Auflage von B. Gerth (in 2 vols.) (Hanover and Leipzig, 1898–1904; reprinted 1955).

f. for, following

Rob. A. T. Robertson, A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research⁴ (Nashville, 1923).

A Codex Alexandrinus

Codex Athous referencing Hermas

gen. genitive

cf. compare (*confer*)

gen. genitive

s. see

Winer G. B. Winer, Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Sprachidioms⁷ (Leipzig, 1867).

Winer–M. Winer–Moulton, A Treatise of the Grammar of New Testament Greek³ (Edinburgh, 1882) (Cited as the English counterpart of Winer).

³ Winer–Moulton, A Treatise of the Grammar of New Testament Greek³ (Edinburgh, 1882) (Cited as the English counterpart of Winer).

TW Theologisches Wörterbuch zum NT, hg. G. Kittel und G. Friedrich, I (Stuttgart, 1933), II (1935), III (1938), IV (1942), V (1954), VI (1959), VII (1960–).

i.e. that is (*id est*)

cf. compare (*confer*)

Barn Barnabas

there in the earth, the deep'), but 'the regions under the earth' (Büchsel, TW III 641f.).—The gen. of the names of cities is seldom found in class., and then nearly always in poetry; there is only one ex. in the Ptol. pap. (Mayser II 2, 117), more frequently in Byz. (Tabachovitz 1). The same phenomenon appears in Lat. and Romance languages (Stolz–Schmalz, Lat. Gr.⁵ 394f.).—Zerwick, Graec. bibl. §33 (Holzmeister, Verbum Domini 25 [1947] 112–17).

On the other hand, read Wallace's discussion of Ephesians 2:2 on pg. 104, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics*. Wallace concludes: "Although some take πνεύματος as a gen. of apposition to ἄρχοντα, this is semantically impossible because such cannot occur when both nouns are personal." Who is correct—the commentary or Wallace? Why?

In Ephesians 2:2, what is the antecedent of αἱς?

In Ephesians 2:2, specify the case and case usage for ἀπειθείας.

TW Theologisches Wörterbuch zum NT, hg. G. Kittel und G. Friedrich, I (Stuttgart, 1933), II (1935), III (1938), IV (1942), V (1954), VI (1959), VII (1960–).

f. for, following

gen. genitive

class. classical (Greek)

ex. example(s)

Ptol. Ptolemaic

pap. papyrus (-i), papyrological

Mayser Edwin Mayser, *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit*, I (Leipzig, 1906; 1² Berlin, 1923), II 1 (Berlin, 1926), II 2 (1934), II 3 (1934); 2nd ed.: I 2 (1938), I 3 (1936).

Byz. Byzantine

Tabachovitz David Tabachovitz, *Sprachliche und textkritische Studien zur Chronik des Theophanes Confessor* (Diss. Uppsala, 1926).

Lat. Latin

Stolz–Schmalz, Lat. Gr. M. Leumann and J. B. Hofmann, Stolz–Schmalz, *Lateinische Grammatik*⁵ (Munich, 1926–8).

⁵ M. Leumann and J. B. Hofmann, Stolz–Schmalz, *Lateinische Grammatik*⁵ (Munich, 1926–8).

f. for, following

Zerwick, Graec. bibl. Max Zerwick, *Graecitas biblica exemplis illustratur*. Ed. altera et aucta et emendata (Rome, 1949; 31955) (Scripta Pontif. Inst. Bibl. 92).

Verbum Domini Verbum Domini (Rome, 1921ff.).

In Ephesians 2:2, specify the case and case usage of κόσμου.

In Ephesians 2:3, is ἡμεῖς an instance of an inclusive or exclusive “we”?

In Ephesians 2:3, specify the type of participle ποιοῦντες is and what the significance is of its tense.

In Ephesians 2:3, specify the case and case usage of σαρκὸς in the phrase ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις τῆς σαρκὸς ἡμῶν, and the case and case usage of σαρκὸς and διανοιῶν in the phrase τὰ θελήματα τῆς σαρκὸς καὶ τῶν διανοιῶν. What is the significance of ἐπιθυμίαις and θελήματα being plural?

Specify the case and case usage of ὀργῆς and φύσει in Ephesians 2:3.

In relation to Ephesians 2:1-3, which refutes the Roman Catholic, Lutheran, and Reformed doctrines of paedobaptism, note the following essay, and the two pamphlets that follow it. You do not need to read these with extreme care, but skim the material carefully enough to get a sense of the various positions.

Were the Reformers Heretics?

A Biblical, Baptist analysis

I. Introduction

II. Reformers' doctrine of baptism

a.) Stated

i.) Luther

ii.) Calvin

iii.) Zwingli

iv.) English Reformers

v.) Later Reformed writers and confessional statements

b.) Baptist doctrine of baptism

III. Conclusion

IV. Appendix: Other heresies of the Reformers

I. Introduction

Modern Baptists generally share with Protestants a very high view of the doctrine and practice of the Protestant Reformation and its leaders. The movement is generally considered a great return to the fundamental truths of the gospel of Christ and a repudiation of the errors of Romanism. The infallible Bible, the sole and sufficient authority for the Christian's faith and practice (2 Timothy 3:16-17), teaches that by means of the substitutionary death, burial, and resurrection of the Son of God (1 Corinthians 15:1-4), God justifies or declares righteous all who in repentance (Luke 13:3) trust in the blood of the Redeemer (John 3:16; Romans 5:1). This is the gospel. Justification is received simply by faith in Christ, apart from good works (Ephesians 2:8-9) and religious rituals, including those ordained by God (Galatians 2:16; 5:4-6), such as believer's immersion (Romans 6:1-7) and the Lord's supper (1 Corinthians 11:24-25). All who have been justified are eternally secure (John 10:27-30). Those who believe or teach a false gospel will be eternally damned (Galatians 1:8-9), and heretics must be

rejected (Titus 3:10). The Protestant Reformers and the movements they originated constitute no exception to this declaration. Their teachings must, therefore, be evaluated in light of the gospel and the other truths of the Bible.⁴⁴

II. The Reformers' Views of Baptism

Medieval Catholicism held that “the . . . merit of Jesus Christ is applied, both to adults and to infants, by the sacrament of baptism rightly administered in the form of the church . . . infants, newly born from their mothers' wombs . . . are to be baptized . . . for the remission of sins, that in them that may be cleansed away by regeneration, which they have contracted by generation. . . . If any one denies, that, by the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, which is conferred in baptism, the guilt of original sin is remitted; or even asserts that the whole of that which has the true and proper nature of sin is not taken away; but says that it is only rased, or not imputed; let him be anathema.”⁴⁵ Martin Luther retained the Roman Catholic teaching of baptismal regeneration, including the regeneration of infants through the instrumentality of baptism. He called baptism “a new birth by which we are . . . loosed from sin, death, and hell, and become children of life, heirs of all the gifts of God, God’s own children, and brethren of Christ.”⁴⁶ The Lutheran *Small Catechism* affirms, “baptism effects forgiveness of sins, delivers from death and the

⁴⁴ A thorough refutation of salvation by baptism and a presentation of the true gospel is *Heaven Only for the Baptized? The Gospel of Christ vs. Pardon Through Baptism*, by Thomas Ross, available for free download at www.pillarandground.org. Anyone who has believed a false gospel of salvation through baptism is heartily encouraged to acquire a copy of this work, read it, believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, and so pass from spiritual death to spiritual life. A excellent presentation of systematic theology in general is the four volume set *Landmarks of Baptist Doctrine* by Robert Sargent (Oak Harbor, WA: Bible Baptist Church Publications, n. d.). This set, and other sound books, are available at www.lvbaptist.org.

⁴⁵ *The canons and decrees of the sacred and oecumenical Council of Trent*, ed. and trans. J. Waterworth (London: Dolman, 1848), Session V: Decree Concerning Original Sin.

⁴⁶ (Luther, *Works*, 53:103).

devil, and grants eternal salvation to all who believe, as the Word and promise of God declare.” (IV). The binding Lutheran symbol, the *Augsburg Confession*, states that “baptism . . . is necessary to salvation” and “condemn[s] the Anabaptists, who reject the baptism of children, and say that children are saved without baptism” (Article IX). Luther led Lutheranism to teach that all the unbaptized—including all unbaptized infants—are eternally lost, and to anathematize those, like the Anabaptists, who taught otherwise.⁴⁷ However, Luther made a number of adjustments to the Roman teaching. Rather than baptism actually cleansing the soul from sin, it brought about the non-imputation of sin and the imputation of Christ’s righteousness. It was also not necessary to baptize with water—beer would also serve the purpose.⁴⁸ One wonders if immersion in beer would have been preferred to sprinkling or pouring; at least when using water, Luther did prefer immersion.⁴⁹ Furthermore, the sacrament of baptism was the vehicle of conveying faith to infants, so that infants were actually saved by faith, indeed, by faith alone, at the point of baptism:

⁴⁷ Both the traditional Catholic and Lutheran doctrines of baptismal regeneration require the conclusion that all pre-born infants who die are also in hell, since they have not had water applied to their bodies in the proper manner—indeed, those who would dare to think otherwise are anathema. This would infinitely aggravate the modern horror of abortion. One wonders if this “Christian truth” of the damnation of all preborn infants is set forth when a minister devoted to Catholic or Lutheran orthodoxy tries to comfort a woman who has had a miscarriage. Happily, king David believed otherwise, knowing that he would be in heaven eternally with his dead infant, who had died without circumcision or any other ceremony, and thus comforted Bathsheba (2 Samuel 12:18, 22-23; cf. Jonah 4:11).

⁴⁸ “Luther gave a new turn to the debate when in his opposition to medieval legalism he made the rhetorical suggestion that beer would meet the case just as well as water [for baptism]: no doubt it would be equally available in his country” (Pg. 134, *Baptism*, Bromiley; cf. J. de la Servi re, *La Th ologie de Bellarmine*, pg. 356).

⁴⁹ “Luther preferred immersion, and prescribed it in his baptismal service” (Schaff, Philip, *History of the Christian Church*. New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1907, 1910; 2:13:Footnotes; 7:1:7:102; 8:3:25). In Luther’s sermon on baptism in 1518, he stated that “baptism is . . . when we dip anything wholly in water, that it is completely covered over. . . . it should be thus, and would be right . . . [for] the child or any one who is to be baptized, [to] be completely sunk down into the water, and dipt again and drawn out” (*Opera Lutheri*, I. 319, Folio ed., quoted on pg. 108, Christian, J. T., *A History of the Baptists*, vol. 1, Texarkana, TX: Bogard Press, 1922.) Calvin stated that “it is evident that the term *baptize* means to immerse, and that this was the form used by the primitive Church” (Calvin, *Institutes*, 4:15:19, trans. Henry Beveridge), although he held that it did not matter if we followed the example of the primitive church or not.

According to Luther, the soul is not actually cleansed from sin, either in baptism or at any time in this present life. It is rather that sin is not imputed. Negatively, the baptismal cleansing is a non-imputation of original and actual sin. Positively it is an imputation of the perfect and all-sufficient righteousness of Jesus Christ. For Luther baptism was still the sign of remission, and under the Holy Spirit it could still be the instrument of justifying faith, but his whole conception of the relationship had broadened and deepened [in comparison to medieval Catholicism]. It had broadened: for the remission could now extend to the whole life of a Christian. And it had deepened: for it was a remission in spiritual rather than in quasi-material terms, in the terms of a righteousness of faith rather than a righteousness of sight and works. . . . The restoration of regeneration to much of its original meaning and honour as the chief grace of baptism was largely the work of Martin Luther. Luther did it by relating regeneration directly to the resurrection of Jesus Christ and the entry of the Christian believer into that resurrection. . . . The traditional teaching [on baptism] was necessarily opposed by Luther, who denied an *ex opere operato* efficiency of the sacrament and insisted upon the need for faith. Yet Luther did not draw the conclusion that there are no effects of baptism in infants, for as we have seen he maintained boldly that infants do have faith, and he challenged his opponents to prove the contrary.⁵⁰ What this faith was for Luther it is difficult to say with any precision. Sometimes he spoke of it rather as the absence of a hostile disposition, or even as an infused gift.⁵¹ Whatever it was it enabled infants to enjoy the baptismal benefits of remission and regeneration. The benefits themselves, however, were understood evangelically as remission by non-imputation and the regeneration of faith, so that no place was left for the familiar causal conception. The same was true in the case of Melancthon, who in reply to the Anabaptists claimed for infants a definite remission of original sin by virtue of the sacramental ministry. But again the remission was understood evangelically as non-imputation.⁵² . . . Luther continued to use expressions which suggest an *ex opere operato* efficacy, for he had a strong sense of the objectivity of the divine grace and work.⁵³ But at three points he broke definitely with the traditional dogma. First, . . . he pointed out that the true work of baptism is a work of faith and promise, not of sight. Second, and as a necessary corollary, he claimed that faith is indispensable to the operation of the sacrament,⁵⁴ for faith is itself the fulfillment of baptism,⁵⁵ the response of the soul which enables the sacrament to have its effect.⁵⁶ Thus the baptismal remission and regeneration is not a naturalistic or mechanical process,

⁵⁰ Luther, *Werke*, Weimarer Ausgabe, VI, pg. 538. Infants do not have faith or know anything since they cannot even discern their right hands from their left, Jonah 4:11, nor know good and evil, Deuteronomy 1:39; cf. Romans 9:11. Consider also what must be considered, at the very least, the extreme vitiation required of the content and nature of saving faith, if an infant has it.

⁵¹ Cf. Luther, *Werke*, Weimarer Ausgabe, VI, pg. 537-538.

⁵² *Corpus Reformatorum*, XXXIII, pg. 295, 859.

⁵³ Luther, *Werke*, Weimarer Ausgabe, XXX, I, pg. 218.

⁵⁴ Luther, *Werke*, Weimarer Ausgabe, XXX, I, pg. 216.

⁵⁵ Luther, *Werke*, Weimarer Ausgabe, VI, pg. 532.

⁵⁶ Luther, *Werke*, Weimarer Ausgabe, II, pg. 315.

but an intensely personal matter in which the divine promise is held out on the one hand, and faith is the appropriation and fulfillment of the promise on the other. Third, and finally, Luther did not find the power of baptism in the element, but in the baptismal word, which gives to the external sign its true signification, declaring the promises.⁵⁷ Baptism could achieve its effect only as the word of baptism was perceived and understood,⁵⁸ and the response of faith evoked. But to say that was to suspend the efficacy of the sacrament upon the free and sovereign Spirit of God who disposes of both word and sacrament. The work of baptism was not done through the water alone, nor was it done through the Spirit necessarily acting with the water. If it was done at all, it was done only in so far as the Spirit Himself worked in, with and under the water, and sign and grace came together in the one creative act by which faith is born and the soul renewed by promise.⁵⁹

These adjustments to the Catholic view of baptismal regeneration were sufficient to bring upon Luther Rome's *anathema*, but they did not separate him from the idea that baptism was necessary for regeneration and eternal life. The Baptist doctrine of justification by faith apart from sacraments and their restriction of baptism to believers, as in the New Testament, were great enough evils to Luther and Lutheranism that the Diet of Speyer (A. D. 1529) decreed the death penalty for Anabaptists, and in A. D. 1536 Luther signed a memorandum written by Melancthon assenting to putting Anabaptists to death (cf. 1 John 3:15-16). Luther stated, "The Anabaptists hold tenets relating to infant baptism, original sin, and inspiration, which have no connection with the Word of God,⁶⁰ and are indeed opposed to it . . . Secular authorities are also bound to restrain and punish avowedly false doctrine . . . For think what disaster would ensue if children were not baptized? . . . Besides this the Anabaptists separate themselves from the churches . . . and they set up a

⁵⁷ Cf. Wernle, *Luther*, pg. 38.

⁵⁸ Since "faith *cometh* by hearing, and hearing by the word of God" (Romans 10:17), one wonders if deaf infants are able to repent of their sins and trust in Christ's death, burial, and resurrection for justification when the baptismal word is pronounced. Thankfully, in Lutheran families, infants that can hear are able, despite not knowing good from evil, Deuteronomy 1:39, to turn from their sins to trust in the Lord Jesus the moment they are baptized.

⁵⁹ Pg. 172-173, 177-178, 198, 187, *Baptism*, Bromiley.

⁶⁰ Consider this declaration of Luther that those with false views of inspiration should be put to death in light of his declarations about numerous New and Old Testament books in the Appendix.

ministry and congregation of their own, which is also contrary to the command of God. From all this it becomes clear that the secular authorities are bound . . . to inflict corporal punishment on the offenders . . . Also when it is a case of only upholding some spiritual tenet, such as infant baptism, original sin, and unnecessary separation, then . . . we conclude that . . . the stubborn sectaries must be put to death.”⁶¹ The baptismal doctrines of Luther and the Baptists of the Reformation era were radically opposed to one another; so far, was the gospel believed by Baptists from the saving truth that Luther thought they should be executed. Luther lived and died believing that baptism was essential for the receipt of the remission of sin.

John Calvin likewise taught that baptism was a means of regeneration and salvation. He declared that “God, regenerating us in baptism, ingrafts us into the fellowship of his Church, and makes us his by adoption . . . whatever time we are baptized, we are washed and purified . . . forgiveness, which at our first regeneration we receive by baptism alone . . . forgiveness has reference to baptism. . . . In baptism, the Lord promises forgiveness of sins.”⁶² However, defining regeneration as the renovation of the new man which continued over the course of one’s life, rather than the work of an instant, he asserted that the guilt of sin is removed in baptism, but regeneration only begins at that moment of time. Calvin wrote, “We assert that the whole guilt of sin is taken away in baptism, so that the remains of sin still existing are not imputed. That this may be more clear, let my readers call to mind that there is a twofold grace in baptism, for therein both remission of sins and regeneration are offered to us. We teach that full remission is made, but that regeneration is only begun and goes on making progress

⁶¹ (Janssen, X, 222-223; pamphlet of 1536).

⁶² *Institutes*, 4:17:1, 4:15:3, 4, 15.

during the whole of life. Accordingly, sin truly remains in us, and is not instantly in one day extinguished by baptism, but as the guilt is effaced it is null in regard to imputation. Nothing is plainer than this doctrine.”⁶³ However, while the Holy Spirit wrought the work of regeneration, and the blood of Christ washed away the sins of baptized infants through the instrumentality of the ordinance, Calvin held, however, contrary to the Catholic and Lutheran doctrines, that baptism was not absolutely essential to salvation, but people could be saved by faith who had no opportunity to be baptized. For “when we cannot receive [baptism] from the Church, the grace of God is not so inseparably annexed to them that we cannot obtain it by faith, according to his word.”⁶⁴ Grace is annexed to baptism, and the sacrament is the ordinary vehicle for sealing grace,⁶⁵ remission of sins, and regeneration, but God may perform an extraordinary and unusual work to save some even apart from baptism. Calvin stated, “We, too [as do the Catholics], acknowledge that

⁶³ John Calvin, 1547 *Antidote to the Council of Trent*, Reply to the 1st Decree of the 5th Session.

⁶⁴ *Institutes*, 4:15:22.

⁶⁵ The Scriptural uses of the words “sign” and “seal” give no support whatever to the idea that baptism is a vehicle to convey saving grace. A Biblical “sign” was by no means a method of bestowing grace that led to the forgiveness of sin. The censured of false worshippers who were burned by the fire of God and eternally damned were a “sign unto the children of Israel” (Numbers 16:38), but they neither saved those that worshipped with them nor any other Israelite from hell. No use of “sign” in either the Old or New Testament provides any support whatever to the idea that “signs” are conjoined to justifying grace.

Nothing in Scripture associates the word “seal” with the communication of saving grace. Romans 4:11 is the only verse that one could even somewhat reasonably attempt to use to defend the Calvinist doctrine from the Bible; one could allege that circumcision is a “seal” of grace, that the sacrament of infant baptism is equivalent to circumcision, and that, therefore, infant baptism seals or conveys grace to infants. This argument breaks down at many points. First, the verse does not say that circumcision was a seal of grace to Jewish male infants; while circumcision was a “sign” by nature, it is not affirmed to have been a “seal” to all, but only to believing Abraham personally, who received it when he had already been justified by faith. A recognition of this distinction in Romans 4:11 explains the Old Testament use of the word “sign” or “token” (Hebrew *’oth*) in connection to circumcision in general (Genesis 17:11), but the total lack of Old Testament references to the ceremony as a “seal.” Second, the New Testament does not equate circumcision with baptism or state that the latter replaces the former. Third, the Biblical immersion of believers has nothing to do with the ceremonial application of water to infants that Catholics and Protestants claim is baptism. Fourth, when advocates of Reformed theology and other Protestants speak of baptism as a “seal” or vehicle of grace, they use the word in a sense entirely absent in Scripture. None of the appearances of *sphragis* in the New Testament, or similar words in the Old Testament, indicate that grace is conveyed through a “seal” (Romans 4:11; 1 Corinthians 9:2; 2 Timothy 2:19; Revelation 5:1-2, 5, 9; 6:1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 12; 7:2; 8:1; 9:4).

the use of baptism is necessary—that no one may omit it from either neglect or contempt. In this way we by no means make it free (optional). And not only do we strictly bind the faithful to the observance of it, but we also maintain that it is the ordinary instrument of God in washing and renewing us; in short, in communicating to us salvation. The only exception we make is, that the hand of God must not be tied down to the instrument. He may of himself accomplish salvation. For when an opportunity for baptism is wanting, the promise of God alone is amply sufficient.”⁶⁶ Ordinarily, baptism is the means of communicating salvation. However, in the rare situations where one cannot receive the sacrament, then God “may” of Himself save the unbaptized. The limitation of this exception to situations where “an opportunity for baptism is wanting” is significant—no hope of heaven is set forth for the unbaptized in the great majority of situations where access to the sacrament is possible. Nonetheless, infants who die without baptism, as long as they have Christian parents and the omission of sacrament was not on account of “sloth, nor contempt, nor negligence,”⁶⁷ can expect to be saved. Indeed, elect infants are “received into the Church by a formal sign [of baptism] because, in virtue of the promise [of a saving covenant between God, Christians, and the children of Christians], they previously belonged to the body of Christ. . . . the children of believers are not baptized, in order that though formerly aliens from the Church, they may then, for the first time, become children of God.”⁶⁸ Since the children of the Church were already part of the body of Christ from the womb by virtue of God’s covenant, they can be saved even without the seal of baptism. Their membership in the Church before baptism explains

⁶⁶ John Calvin, 1547 *Antidote to the Council of Trent*, Antidote to the Canons of Baptism, Canon #5.

⁶⁷ *Institutes*, 4:15:22.

⁶⁸ *Institutes*, 4:15:22.

how Calvin can maintain both the salvation of the children of Reformed parents and the doctrine that outside of the visible Church there is no salvation.⁶⁹ Since infants with Reformed parents were also not “aliens” but already “the children of God” at that time, it would also be unnecessary, indeed, sinful, for such “covenant children” to come to a place where they recognized themselves as lost, hell-bound sinners who were certain of present damnation on account of their sins and needed to, for the first time, consciously repent and believe the gospel, and so become Christians and be adopted into God’s family through a conversion experience. “Our children [those in the Reformed faith], before they are born, God declares that he adopts for his own when he promises that he will be a God to us, and to our seed after us. In this promise their salvation is included.”⁷⁰ All that was required for eternal bliss on the part of these infants was perseverance in their adherence to the Reformed faith and perseverance in the type of life consistent with Christian morality, thus evincing their election and regeneration in infancy.

⁶⁹ “It is now our purpose to discourse of the visible Church. Let us learn, from her single title of Mother, how useful, nay, how necessary the knowledge of her is, since there is no other means of entering into life unless she conceive us in the womb and give us birth, unless she nourish us at her breasts, and, in short, keep us under her charge and government, until, divested of mortal flesh, we become like the angels (Matt 22:30). For our weakness does not permit us to leave the school until we have spent our whole lives as scholars. Moreover, beyond the pale of the Church no forgiveness of sins, no salvation, can be hoped for, as Isaiah and Joel testify (Isa 37:32; Joel 2:32). To their testimony Ezekiel subscribes, when he declares, “They shall not be in the assembly of my people, neither shall they be written in the writing of the house of Israel” (Ezek 13:9), as, on the other hand, those who turn to the cultivation of true piety are said to inscribe their names among the citizens of Jerusalem. For which reason it is said in the psalm, “Remember me, O Lord, with the favour that thou bearest unto thy people: O visit me with thy salvation; that I may see the good of thy chosen, that I may rejoice in the gladness of thy nation, that I may glory with thine inheritance” (Ps 106:4-5). By these words the paternal favour of God and the special evidence of spiritual life are confined to his peculiar people, and hence the abandonment of the Church is always fatal” (Calvin, *Institutes*, 4:1:4). The notion that outside of the visible church there is no salvation is not inconsistent with the doctrine of an invisible church made up of the elect; Calvin’s favorite patristic writer, Augustine, held both dogmas, affirming that the invisible church of the elect consisted of a portion of the members of the visible catholic church, but nobody was a member of the invisible church who was not as well a member of the visible Catholic denomination.

⁷⁰ *Institutes*, 4:15:20.

Calvin also held that all those who received remission of sins as sealed in baptism were secure; those God made true Christians in their infancy in accordance with the baptismal covenant could not later fall and be finally lost. This was contrary to the Catholic and Lutheran doctrines that the regeneration given in baptism could be lost by subsequent sinning,⁷¹ so that a true Christian could fall from a state of grace and be eternally lost on account of acts of post-baptismal transgression. Calvin held that the saving power of baptism affected one's entire life, rather than only communicating grace at the moment of its administration. "Nor is it to be supposed that baptism is bestowed only with reference to the past, so that, in regard to new lapses into which we fall after baptism, we must seek new remedies of expiation in other so-called sacraments, just as if the power of baptism had become obsolete. To this error, in ancient times, it was owing that some refused to be initiated by baptism until their life was in extreme danger, and they were drawing their last breath, that they might thus obtain pardon for all the past. Against this preposterous precaution ancient bishops frequently inveigh in their writings. We ought to consider that at whatever time we are baptized, we are washed and purified once for the whole of life. Wherefore, as often as we fall, we must recall the remembrance of our baptism, and thus fortify our minds, so as to feel certain and secure of the remission of sins. For though, when once administered, it seems to have passed, it is not abolished by subsequent sins. For the purity of Christ was therein offered to us, always is in force, and is not destroyed by any stain: it wipes and washes away all our

⁷¹ The Catholic *Council of Trent* declared "that the received grace of justification is lost, not only by infidelity whereby even faith itself is lost, but also by any other mortal sin whatever" (Session VI, Chapter 15). The Lutheran *Augsburg Confession* "condemn[s] the Anabaptists, who deny that those once justified can lose the Holy Ghost."

defilements.”⁷² When a follower of Calvin’s theology sins, he does not need to fear that he is again lost; by recalling that in baptism he was washed and purified once for his whole life, he can feel certain and secure of the remission of his sins.

Bromiley provides an insightful analysis of John Calvin’s baptismal theology:

Calvin referred to baptism as “an incorporation into Christ, an entry into the divine Sonship.”⁷³ He said “we are baptized for the mortification of our flesh, which is begun in baptism [note by this writer: consider that Calvin does not say that mortification begins at the point of faith, prior to baptism, but at the moment of baptism itself], is prosecuted every day, and will be finished when we depart from this life to go to the Lord.”⁷⁴ Calvin said that the necessity of precept of baptism, was not an absolute necessity, so that it was not true “that all who have not obtained baptism must perish.”⁷⁵

The teaching of Calvin . . . like Bucer . . . repudiated the traditional “enclosing of the grace and virtue of the Spirit by the external sign.”⁷⁶ But he avoided the opposite extreme of denying that there is any connection between the sacraments and the grace which they signify.⁷⁷ He emphasized three main facts: first, that God has ordained the sacraments as means of grace; second, that repentance and faith are indispensable to their proper use; and third, that their efficacy depends ultimately upon the divine election. The sacrament of baptism does have a real effect, but only as it is sovereignly used by the Holy Spirit and received and understood in faith.

It may be noted that there are many affinities between the doctrine of Calvin and that of the Schoolmen, for they started from the same fundamental principles. But they applied the principles in very different ways and with widely divergent results. On both sides, for example, it was held that God Himself is the true and sole author of baptismal grace. But while the Schoolmen deduced from this that God will inevitably operate through the means which He Himself has instituted, Calvin contended for His continuing freedom and sovereignty as “the internal master.”⁷⁸ Again, both sides could admit the indispensability of repentance and faith, but whereas the Schoolmen conceived of repentance and faith narrowly and negatively, and argued that even the insincere and unbelieving will receive at least a spiritual impress, Calvin regarded repentance and faith positively as themselves the creative work of the Holy Spirit by which baptism

⁷² *Institutes*, 4:15:3.

⁷³ Pg. 17, *Baptism*, Bromiley.

⁷⁴ Pg. 29, *Baptism*, Bromiley, citing *Institutes*, IV, 15, 11.

⁷⁵ Pg. 54, *Baptism*, Bromiley, citing *Harmony of the Evangel.*, pg. 387.

⁷⁶ *Tracts*, II, pg. 574.

⁷⁷ *Tracts*, II, pg. 87.

⁷⁸ *Tracts*, II, pg. 214; *Institutes*, IV, 14, 9.

has its effect and without which it can never be more than the external sign.⁷⁹ And although he did not dispute that in baptism an offer of grace is made to all, and that “the grace of baptism may resume its place” at any time when there is true repentance, he could not accept either the artificial concept of a baptismal character or the view that grace itself is present even when obstructed by insincerity or unbelief. As Calvin saw it, “the promises are common to all, but the ratification of them is the gift of the Spirit.”⁸⁰ . . . With the believing . . . as they received the sign they perceived Christ Himself, and therefore they enjoyed the grace. In the normal course, it was the specific function of the sacrament to confirm the faith in Christ already evoked by the word, but in the case of infants baptism could be a powerful adjunct to the word even in the evocation of the faith by which its benefits were subsequently received and enjoyed.

Along lines such as these Calvin was able to hold a definite doctrine of sacramental efficacy without slipping into that static conception which meant an automatic efficacy and a practical denial of the free sovereignty of the Holy Spirit. The presentation of his doctrine varied to some extent with his successors, but not in any important particular. . . . The lesson had been well learned that although there is a sacramental union of sign and grace it must be understood in a dynamic rather than a static sense, related on the one hand to the sovereign freedom of God, and on the other to the individual faith of the recipient.⁸¹

The insistence of Luther and Lutheranism on the real presence and oral manducation in the Lord’s Supper, not Lutheran insistence on baptismal regeneration, was the reason for the inability for the Lutheran and the Reformed denominations to combine, either at the Colloquy of Marburg during the disputation between Luther and Zwingli, or in later times. ““In regard to the Confession of Augsburg [which affirms, “baptism . . . is necessary to salvation,” Article IX], [Calvin] says in his *Last Admonition to Westphal*, ‘my answer is, that, as it was published at Ratisbon (1541) [in this version Luther’s position on communion was moderated], it does not contain a word contrary to our doctrine.’”⁸² Baptismal regeneration was not a primary matter of disagreement between

⁷⁹ *Tracts*, II, pg. 343.

⁸⁰ *Tracts*, II, pg. 342-343.

⁸¹ Pg. 189-190, *Baptism*, Bromiley.

⁸² Philip Schaff, *History of the Christian Church*, vol. 8 (3rd. revised ed), chap. 15, sec. 133, “Calvin and the Augsburg Confession.”

Luther, Calvin, and the denominations that adopted their theologies,⁸³ because all involved held to the doctrine. Calvin's view that a possibility of salvation existed for those infants of Christian parents who died without the sacrament in the rare situations where it was not possible to have it performed, and other secondary differences from the position of Luther, did not alter the primary agreement between these Reformers that the sacrament of baptism was a means of bestowing grace and regeneration on infants and others who received it.

In agreement with Luther, John Calvin advised that "Anabaptists . . . should . . . be put to death."⁸⁴ The Baptist doctrines of justification by faith apart from sacraments, the necessity of personal conversion, and believer's baptism, were anathema to him. Calvin and the Baptists were by no means partakers of a common Christian faith.

Ulrich Zwingli was closer to the Anabaptist position that baptism, like the Lord's supper, was not a means of receiving salvation, but he still retained elements of the Catholic and Protestant connection of infant baptism and forgiveness.

⁸³ This lack of Reformed dissent and strife over the Lutheran doctrine of baptismal regeneration ("The only serious doctrinal difference which divided Luther and Zwingli at Marburg was the mode of the real presence in the eucharist," *History of the Christian Church*, vol. 8, 3rd rev. ed.) continued after the time of the Reformation into later centuries and down to modern times. The position expressed by Charles Hodge, the famous Presbyterian theologian of old Princeton, as seen in his *Systematic Theology* (vol. 3, *Soteriology*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2003, reprint ed., pg. 522-523, 517, 604), is representative. After a stirring denunciation of the Roman Catholic doctrine of baptismal regeneration, including declarations such as "Any one, therefore, who teaches that no man can be saved without the rite of baptism, and that by receiving that rite he is made a child of God and heir of heaven, is antichrist," Hodge declares that his "remarks are not intended to apply, and in fact are not applicable, to the Lutheran system," despite the fact that both "the Lutherans and Romanists . . . hold that the sacraments are necessary means of grace, in the sense that the grace which they signify is not received otherwise than in their use. There is no remission of sin or regeneration without baptism [in the Roman and Lutheran view]," and Hodge knows very well that "the Lutheran standards . . . the Augsburg Confession . . . the Apology for that Confession . . . the two catechisms of Luther, the larger and smaller . . . [affirm] that the baptism of infants is not in vain but necessary and effectual to salvation." The Reformed have constantly opposed the Roman doctrine of infant salvation, but pronounced no denunciation against the Lutheran doctrine of baptismal regeneration. It is not much different than the Reformed view.

⁸⁴ Vol. 1, Chapter 15, *A History of the Baptists*, John T. Christian, 1922, 1926. Way of Life Literature electronic edition (Oak Harbor, WA), May 2003, citing Froude, *History of England*, V.99.

The contribution made by Zwingli and the Anabaptists was on the whole the negative one of attacking the prevailing notion that the external element could itself accomplish an internal cleansing.⁸⁵ The Anabaptists in particular had no very positive doctrine to substitute for the rejected teaching. Although they maintained with truth that it is the blood of Christ which cleanses from sin,⁸⁶ they did not think of baptism as in any way a means of grace, but only as a sign of grace, and more especially as a sign of individual conversion. Zwingli did not altogether share this view. As he saw it, baptism in the full sense embraces the inward baptism of the Spirit as well as the outward baptism of water. Where the two are conjoined in true believers, the effect of baptism is a genuine inward purification. If Zwingli erred, it was in his too harsh divorcing of the two aspects or 'natures' of the sacrament. The union which he envisaged was only an incidental union suspended entirely upon an operation of the Spirit which was sovereign and unpredictable. At this point the sacramental theology of Zwingli betrays both the strength and the weakness of his doctrines of providence and the incarnation.⁸⁷ Schaff states, "Zwingli stood midway between Luther and the Anabaptists. He regarded the sacraments as signs and seals of a grace already received rather than as means of a grace to be received. They set forth and confirm, but do not create, the thing signified. He rejected the doctrine of baptismal regeneration and of the corporal presence."⁸⁸ Bromiley maintains that "Zwingli compared the external sign of baptism to the badge worn by patriotic supporters of the Confederation. Indeed, he refused to ascribe to it, as an external sign, anything more than the psychological value of a reminder and profession."⁸⁹ His successors, however, were more concerned to work out the difficult question of the supernatural operation of the Holy Spirit in baptism, and they could almost take for granted its effect as a call to Christian discipleship."⁹⁰ Bromiley also contrasts the baptismal theory of Zwingli with that of Luther and of Calvin:

"The revolt against the [absolute necessity of baptism for infant salvation] was not against the principle that the sacrament itself is a means of grace. It was

⁸⁵ *Corpus Reformatorum*, IV, pg. 215, 627

⁸⁶ *Bibliotheca Reformatoria Neerlandica*, II, pg. 280, IV, pg. 44.

⁸⁷ Pg. 173, *Baptism*, Bromiley.

⁸⁸ Philip Schaff, *History of the Christian Church*, vol. 8 (3rd. revised ed), chap. 3, sec. 27, "The Eucharistic Controversy. Zwingli and Luther."

⁸⁹ *Corpus Reformatorum*, IV, p. 210ff.

⁹⁰ Pg. 169, *Baptism*, Bromiley.

against the tacit assumption that baptism is the only means of the divine operation, the claim that grace is bound to this sacrament by an indissoluble bond. . . . Luther himself did not make any clear or definite stand against the traditional doctrine of necessity. . . . So striking was this emphasis . . . upon the ordinary necessity [of baptism for salvation] . . . that opponents could mark off his teaching on the subject from that of Bucer and Calvin.

With Zwingli the matter was otherwise. He did of course defend infant baptism, and to that extent he could urge the importance of its administration. But his very defense carried with it a denial of the absolute necessity. Christian children had a right to the sign of the covenant because by divine election they were already members of the covenant. The sign itself did not effect covenant-membership: it merely signified a covenant-membership already existing. If the sign lacked, the covenant-membership, and therefore salvation, still remained. . . . [This view of Zwingli] reduced [baptism] to a mere sign of grace, and . . . not in any sense a means of grace. Zwingli himself unashamedly admitted this fact, as far as the external action is concerned, for he argued that the outward sign is not able either to cleanse from sin or even to confirm faith. On the other hand he did not preclude an inward operation of the Spirit in fulfillment of the sign or even in conjunction with it. What he denied was that the external rite is indispensable to that inward operation . . . Zwingli commit[ed] himself to what is virtually a denial of original guilt. . . . Zwingli retorted not merely that water-baptism cannot cleanse from sin, but that there is no original sin to be cleansed. . . . [unlike] Hübmaier [the Anabaptist, who] retained some doctrine of original sin . . . Zwingli could hold out hope for the children of the heathen, as well as for those who had the privilege of a Christian descent. . . . [In contrast, for] Calvin . . . baptism . . . [had] certain specific promises . . . annexed to it. It was, moreover, a definite means of grace. Therefore ‘if anyone of his own accord abstains from the use of the sacrament . . . he contemns Christ, spurns His grace, and quenches His Spirit.’”⁹¹

Zwingli’s defense of the baptism of the infants of believers precluded the necessity of the rite for heaven, based on his doctrine that they are already partakers of salvation. However, an acceptance of this Zwinglian position also precludes, as does the doctrine of Calvin, the necessity and even the reasonableness of personal conversion. The child of Christian parents, as one who is already a partaker of God’s covenant, never needs to come to a point where he recognizes himself as a lost, hell-bound sinner, who then must repent and believe in the Lord Jesus Christ and so be born again. His view is consistent with the declaration of the modern Protestant Reformed Church, that it is a “sin against

⁹¹

Pg. 52-54, *Baptism*, Bromiley. Quote from Calvin is from *Tracts*, II, pg. 85.

God's covenant . . . that covenant, baptized, Reformed young people are made the objects of an 'evangelism' that treats them as unsaved sinners who must be saved by accepting Christ. If this is what is meant by the conversion of the child, Reformed parents and the Reformed church reject it in the name of the covenant of God sealed to their children in infancy."⁹² Zwingli "insisted that baptism, like circumcision by which it was foreshadowed, was a sign, a simple form of action which was of itself certainly not necessary for salvation. There was also a spiritual or internal baptism, given by God in man's heart, presuming and requiring faith. Not only did baptism not wash away sins, but its recipient was not then or later sinless; Christ alone did this. It was an indication that an obligation to live a Christian life had been accepted by, or on behalf of, the recipient."⁹³ Baptism was thus a public assurance that children would receive a Christian education, and an initiation ceremony to show their future allegiance. "Baptism . . . was simply a token of membership of the Christian community, a public advertisement, an initiation and an acceptance (by deputy in the case of infants) of the obligations of the followers of Christ."⁹⁴ If infants were already members of the Christian community and followers of Christ before baptism, they never need to come to a point of personal admission of an unconverted state or an experience of evangelical repentance.⁹⁵ This fit

⁹² Pgs. 21-22, *The Covenant of God and the Children of Believers*, David J. Engelsma, South Holland, IL: Evangelism Committee, Protestant Reformed Church, n. d. Cf.

⁹³ *Huldreich Zwinglis Sämtlich Werke*, hg. V. E. Egli, G. Finsler, W. Köhler, O. Farner, F. Blanke, L. v. Muralt, E. Künzli, R. Pfister, J. Staedtke, F. Büsser. Corpus Reformatorum, (Berlin/Leipzig/Zürich, 1905-), IV, 199-201, 229-231.

⁹⁴ pg. 189, 192, *Zwingli*, G. R. Potter (London: Cambridge University Press, 1976).

⁹⁵ A modern Reformed presentation of this Zwinglian method of nullifying the gospel is seen in "The Notion of Preparatory Grace in the Puritans," Martin McGeown (pgs. 83-84, *Protestant Reformed Theological Journal*, November 2007 (Vol. 41, #1): "[I]t is intolerable cruelty to demand of people a dramatic conversion experience before they can be assured of their salvation. Such obstacles may not be placed before believers who grew up in the church, who were taught to pray on their mother's knee, who were catechized and who therefore do not know of a time when they did not believe in Jesus Christ. To demand of such that they describe a dramatic conversion experience before they are allowed to confess

in with Zwingli's personal life; he gradually moved to his position of reformation doctrine, without having a personal point of conversion. Furthermore, the association of infant baptism and salvation was not absent even in Zurich, since "in the Baptismal Order at Zürich prayer could be offered for incorporation into Christ."⁹⁶ . . . The initiation [of baptism taught there] was into the church as the family of God, or the body of Christ. The sacramental entry taught clearly the divine adoption and sonship. Baptism was not merely the historical sign or badge of external church-membership. It was an entry into the people of God."⁹⁷ A connection between baptism and salvation was maintained by Zwingli's successor at Zürich, Heinrich Bullinger, who "described baptism as 'the seal of the righteousness of faith'"⁹⁸ and said "Baptism is a visible sign and seal of our ingrafting into the body of Christ."⁹⁹ Bullinger also continued Zwingli's denial of the necessity of personal conversion for those baptized in infancy, since "In Bullinger's *Decades* . . . the text 'Of such is the kingdom of heaven' was used to prove infant discipleship: 'He manifestly calleth the littler ones, not yet able to confess, believers.'"¹⁰⁰ If infants are already disciples and believers, they never need to recognize themselves as lost unbelievers and repent. Zwingli's fellow-reformer, Martin Bucer, also "could not agree either that the sacraments are 'naked and bare signs,'¹⁰¹ or that they are 'such instruments or channels of grace as that they bring grace with whatever mind or faith you partake of

their faith [take the Lord's Supper, etc.] is to grieve Christ's little ones. . . . This is the Reformed doctrine of conversion as set forth in the Heidelberg Catechism (Lord's Day 33)."

⁹⁶ Pg. 423, *Documents of the Continental Reformation*, Kidd.

⁹⁷ Pg. 17, *Baptism*, Bromiley.

⁹⁸ Pg. 12, *Baptism*, Bromiley, citing Bullinger, Parker Society Series, IV, pg. 323.

⁹⁹ Pg. 17, *Baptism*, Bromiley, citing Bullinger, Parker Society Series, IV, pg. 399.

¹⁰⁰ Pg. 105, *Baptism*, Bromiley, citing Bullinger, Parker Society Series, IV, pg. 385.

¹⁰¹ Land, Art. In *Evangelical Quarterly*, I, 2, pg. 159f.

them.’¹⁰² They have a real, instrumental efficacy, but that efficacy is dependent upon two interrelated facts: first, the divine election, and second, the faith of the individual recipient. Sign and grace together constitute the one true baptism where the Holy Spirit uses the means of grace and the response of faith is either evoked or confirmed.”¹⁰³ Bucer taught that for non-elect infants, for those who lived and died in opposition to the Christian faith in later life, the baptismal sacrament did not convey salvation, but for elect infants baptism was a real, effective vehicle, as the “sacrament of regeneration,”¹⁰⁴ of conveying God’s saving grace.

The analysis above deals with the later Zwinglian position on infant baptism; in earlier years, the Reformer had affirmed, “Nothing grieves me more than that at present I have to baptize children, for I know it ought not to be done.”¹⁰⁵ Article 18 of Zwingli’s 67 articles stated that baptism was originally designed for people of mature, responsible years.¹⁰⁶ Zwingli knew that “if we were to baptize as Christ instituted it then we would not baptize any person until he has reached the years of discretion; for I find it nowhere written that infant baptism is to be practiced.”¹⁰⁷ However, Zwingli’s recognition that, “if however I were to terminate the practice [of infant baptism] then I fear I would lose my prebend,” and his recognition of the necessity of the administration of the ordinance to infants to support a State-Church union, led him in 1525 to change his mind, and in 1530

¹⁰² W. Goode, *The Effects of Baptism in the case of Infants*, pg. 167.

¹⁰³ Pg. 188, *Baptism*, Bromiley.

¹⁰⁴ Pg. 213, *The Reformers and Their Stepchildren*, Leonard Verduin (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1964), citing *Urkundliche Quellen zur hessischen Reformationgeschichte, 4 Band (Widertäuferakten, 1527-1626)*, von Günther Franz (nach Walter Köhler, Walter Sohm, Theodor Sippell bearbeitet, Marburg, 1951), pgs. 226f.

¹⁰⁵ Pg. 198, *The Reformers and Their Stepchildren*, Verduin, citing *Quellen zur Geschichte der Täufer, VIII Band, Balthasar Hubmaiers Schriften, von Westin-Bergsten* (Gütersloh, 1962), pgs. 184f..

¹⁰⁶ Pg. 261, *Landmarks of Church History*, Robert Sargent. Oak Harbor, WA: Bible Baptist Church Publications, n. d

¹⁰⁷ pg. 199, *The Reformers and Their Stepchildren*, Verduin.

to deny that he had ever spoken against infant baptism, despite affirmations such as “The error [of believer’s baptism] also misled me some years ago, so that I thought it would be much more suitable to baptize children after they had arrived at a good age.”¹⁰⁸ He did not oppose the decree of the magistrates of Zurich in 1525 that all who would not have their children baptized were to be exiled, nor their drowning of the Baptist Felix Manz in the Limmat River in A. D. 1527. His angry outburst, “Let those who talk of going under go under indeed!” gave rise to the method of death by drowning for Anabaptists.¹⁰⁹

While the earlier Zwinglian position on baptism repudiated infant baptism entirely, even the later Zwinglian doctrine was the furthest from the explicit, unabashed doctrine of infant baptismal salvation of Catholicism and the closest to the Anabaptist denial of a salvific character of the ordinance, although Zwingli was by then far enough from the Baptists that he would have them put to death. Reformed theology after his death continued to feel his influence, but generally was closer to the sacramental baptismal theology of Calvin, although Reformed respect for the Bible and its affirmations of justification by faith apart from any religious rites continually called the Calvinist movement, and especially the elect with Reformed roots, to the Scriptural and Baptist position away from the sacramentalist salvation propounded by its founders and standard Reformed confessions.

Reformed confessional statements continued to link the sacrament of baptism and the forgiveness of sin in the manner of John Calvin. The *Second Helvetic Confession*, composed by Zwingli’s successor Bullinger in 1562, the most widely adopted and

¹⁰⁸ pg. 152, Newman, Henry Albert, *A Manual of Church History*, vol. 2 (Philadelphia, PA: American Baptist Publishing Society, 1908), cited on pg. 261 of *Landmarks of Church History*, Robert Sargent. Oak Harbor, WA: Bible Baptist Church Publications, n. d.

¹⁰⁹ Pg. 229, *Landmarks of Church History*, vol. 1, Robert Sargent. Oak Harbor, WA: Bible Baptist Church Publications, n. d.

authoritative of continental Reformed symbols after the *Heidelberg Catechism* and the official creed of the Reformed communions in Switzerland, Hungary, Poland, and Bohemia, states that “to be baptized in the name of Christ is to be enrolled, entered, and received into the covenant and family, and so into the inheritance of the sons of God . . . to be cleansed also from the filthiness of sins . . . God . . . adopts us to be his sons, and by a holy covenant joins us to himself . . . all these things are assured by baptism. . . . We condemn the Anabaptists, who deny that newborn infants of the faithful are to be baptized” (Article 20). The extremely influential *Heidelberg Catechism* of 1563, drafted by Zacharias Ursinus and Caspar Olevianus, and the chief symbol of German and Dutch Reformed churches, affirms that “Christ appointed this external washing with water . . . [of] holy baptism . . . adding thereunto this promise, that I am as certainly washed by his blood and Spirit from all the pollution of my soul, that is, from all my sins, as I am washed externally with water, by which the filthiness of the body is commonly washed away. . . . Christ promised us that he will as certainly wash us by his blood and Spirit, as we are washed with the water of baptism . . . In the institution of baptism, which is thus expressed . . . ‘he that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned.’ This promise is also repeated, where the scripture calls baptism ‘the washing of regeneration, and the washing away of sins.’¹¹⁰ . . . [T]he external baptism with water [is not] the washing away of sin itself . . . for the blood of Jesus Christ only, and the Holy Ghost, cleanse us from all sin. . . . [but] the Holy Ghost [doth] call baptism ‘the washing of regeneration,’ and ‘the washing away of sins’ . . . [with] great cause, to wit, not only thereby to teach us, that, as the filth of the body is purged away by water, so

¹¹⁰ The catechism is misinterpreting Mark 16:16; Titus 3:5; and Acts 22:16.

our sins are removed by the blood and Spirit of Jesus Christ; but especially that, by this divine pledge and sign, he may assure us that we are spiritually cleansed from our sins as really as we are externally washed with water.”¹¹¹ The Belgic Confession of 1561, prepared by Guido de Brès, and revised by Francis Junius, a student of Calvin, became the recognized symbol of the Reformed Churches of Holland and Belgium. It stated:

The sacraments . . . seal unto us [God’s] promises . . . thereby assuring and confirming in us the salvation which he imparts to us. For they are visible signs and seals of an inward and invisible thing, by means whereof God works in us by the power of the Holy Ghost. . . . [T]he number of sacraments . . . are two only, namely, the sacrament of baptism, and the holy supper of our Lord Jesus Christ. . . . Jesus Christ . . . having abolished circumcision . . . has instituted the sacrament of baptism instead thereof; by which we are received into the Church of God, and separated from all other people and strange religions, that we may wholly belong to him, whose ensign and banner we bear: and which serves as a testimony to us, that he will forever be our gracious God and Father. Therefore . . . as water washes away the filth of the body, when poured upon it, and is seen on the body of the baptized, when sprinkled upon him; so does the blood of Christ, by the power of the Holy Ghost, internally sprinkle the soul, cleanse it from its sins, and regenerate us from children of wrath, unto children of God. . . . Therefore the ministers, on their part, administer the sacrament, and that which is visible, but our Lord gives that which is signified by the sacrament, namely, the gifts and invisible grace; washing, cleansing and purging our souls of all filth and unrighteousness; renewing our hearts, and filling them with all comfort; giving unto us a true assurance of his fatherly goodness; putting on us the new man, and putting off the old man with all his deeds. Therefore we believe, that every man, who is earnestly studious of obtaining life eternal, ought to be but once baptized with this only baptism, without ever repeating the same: since we cannot be born twice. Neither does this baptism only avail us, at the time when the water is poured upon us, and received by us but also through the whole course of our life; therefore we detest the error of the Anabaptists, who are not content with the one only baptism they have once received, and moreover condemn the baptism of the infants of believers, whom we believe ought to be baptized and sealed with the sign of the covenant, as the children in Israel formerly were circumcised, upon the same promises which are made unto our children.¹¹²

If baptism is a testimony to infants that God “will forever be [their] gracious God and Father,” and God conveys and seals through it the invisible grace of “washing, cleansing

¹¹¹ Question 69, 71-73.

¹¹² Article 33, 34

and purging our souls of all filth and unrighteousness,” and the sacrament continues to be means of saving grace “through the whole course of our life,” and we ought not to be baptized twice because “we cannot be born twice,” it is clearly a channel of conveying salvation. This explains why the Belgic Confession affirms, as did Calvin, that “there is no salvation outside of . . . [the] congregation” (Article 28), the location where the sacraments are administered (Article 29); those outside of the church, the baptized community, are lost. Those who grow up in Reformed families, on the other hand, can properly believe that God is already their own Father because they have been baptized, and consequently they are under no necessity to, as lost sinners, personally and consciously repent and believe in Christ; God already performed the work of regeneration on them in their infancy, and this salvation was sealed to them in baptism. The *Westminster Confession*, which was prepared by the Westminster Assembly in 1647, adopted by the Long Parliament, by the Kirk of Scotland, and the Presbyterian Churches of America, states that “baptism . . . is a sign and seal of the covenant of grace, of [one’s] ingrafting into Christ, of regeneration, of remission of sins . . . by the right use of this ordinance the grace promised is not only offered, but really exhibited and conferred by the Holy Ghost.”¹¹³ Contrary to Baptists, who would gladly admit that baptism is a sign or picture of grace, though not a means of conveying it, the Westminster divines affirmed that the Holy Spirit also seals and confers grace through baptism. The *Westminster Shorter Catechism* likewise states that “outward and ordinary means whereby Christ communicateth to us the benefits of redemption, are . . . sacraments¹¹⁴ . . . which are made effectual to the elect for salvation . . . sacraments become effectual means of

¹¹³ Article 28.

¹¹⁴ “The Word . . . and prayer” are also said to bring the elect to salvation.

salvation . . . a sacrament is a holy ordinance instituted by Christ, wherein, by sensible signs, Christ and the benefits of the new covenant are represented, sealed, and applied unto believers. . . . The sacraments of the New Testament are baptism and the Lord's supper. . . . Baptism is a sacrament, wherein the washing with water, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, doth signify and seal our ingrafting into Christ, and partaking of the benefits of the covenant of grace, and our engagement to be the Lord's. . . . infants of such as are members of the visible Church are to be baptized.”¹¹⁵ The *Westminster Larger Catechism* affirms that “the sacraments become effectual means of salvation. . . . A sacrament is an holy ordinance instituted by Christ in his church, to signify, seal, and exhibit unto those that are within the covenant of grace, the benefits of his mediation. . . . Baptism is a sacrament of the New Testament, wherein Christ hath ordained the washing with water in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, to be a sign and seal of ingrafting into himself, of remission of sins by his blood, and regeneration by his Spirit; of adoption, and resurrection unto everlasting life; and whereby the parties baptized are solemnly admitted into the visible church, and enter into an open and professed engagement to be wholly and only the Lord's. . . . infants descending from parents, either both, or but one of them, professing faith in Christ, and obedience to him, are in that respect within the covenant, and to be baptized. . . . The needful but much neglected duty of improving our Baptism, is to be performed by us all our life long . . . by serious and thankful consideration of the nature of it, and of the ends for which Christ instituted it, the privileges and benefits conferred and sealed thereby, and our solemn vow made therein; by being humbled for our sinful

¹¹⁵

Questions 88, 91-95

defilement, our falling short of, and walking contrary to, the grace of baptism, and our engagements; by growing up to assurance of pardon of sin, and of all other blessings sealed to us in that sacrament; by drawing strength from the death and resurrection of Christ, into whom we are baptized, for the mortifying of sin, and quickening of grace . . . as those that have therein given up their names to Christ . . . as being baptized by the same Spirit into one body.”¹¹⁶ The *Westminster Directory for Public Worship*¹¹⁷ states:

Before baptism, the minister is to use some words of instruction, touching the institution, nature, use, and ends of this sacrament, shewing, “That it is instituted by our Lord Jesus Christ: That it is a seal of the covenant of grace, of our ingrafting into Christ, and of our union with him, of remission of sins, regeneration, adoption, and life eternal: . . . the promise is made to believers and their seed; and that the seed and posterity of the faithful, born within the church, have, by their birth, interest in the covenant, and right to the seal of it, and to the outward privileges of the church, under the gospel . . . children, by baptism, are solemnly received into the bosom of the visible church, distinguished from the world, and them that are without, and united with believers; and that all who are baptized in the name of Christ, do renounce, and by their baptism are bound to fight against the devil, the world, and the flesh: That they are Christians, and federally holy before baptism, and therefore are they baptized: That the inward grace and virtue of baptism is not tied to that very moment of time wherein it is administered; and that the fruit and power thereof reacheth to the whole course of our life; and that outward baptism is not so necessary, that, through the want thereof, the infant is in danger of damnation, or the parents guilty, if they do not condemn or neglect the ordinance of Christ, when and where it may be had.” . . . [The minister] is also to admonish all those that are present, “To look back to their baptism; to repent of their sins against their covenant with God; to stir up their faith; to improve and make right use of their baptism, and of the covenant sealed thereby betwixt God and their souls.” . . . This being done, prayer is also to be joined with the word of institution, for sanctifying the water to this spiritual use; and the minister is to pray to this or the like effect: “That the Lord, who hath not left us as strangers without the covenant of promise, but called us to the privileges of his ordinances, would graciously vouchsafe to sanctify and bless his own ordinance of baptism at this time: That he would join the inward baptism of his Spirit with the outward baptism of water; make this baptism to the infant a seal of adoption, remission of sin, regeneration, and eternal life, and all other promises of the covenant of grace: That the child may be planted into the likeness of the death and resurrection of Christ; and that, the body of sin being destroyed in him, he may serve God in newness of life all his days.”

¹¹⁶ Questions 161, 162, 165, 166, 167.

¹¹⁷ The section “Of the Administration of the Sacraments,” particularly “of baptism.”

Then the minister is to . . . baptize the child with water: which, for the manner of doing of it, is not only lawful but sufficient, and most expedient to be, by pouring or sprinkling of the water on the face of the child, without adding any other ceremony. This done, he is to give thanks and pray, to this or the like purpose: “Acknowledging with all thankfulness, that the Lord is true and faithful in keeping covenant and mercy: That he is good and gracious, not only in that he numbereth us among his saints, but is pleased also to bestow upon our children this singular token and badge of his love in Christ: That, in his truth and special providence, he daily bringeth some into the bosom of his church, to be partakers of his inestimable benefits, purchased by the blood of his dear Son, for the continuance and increase of his church.” And praying, “That the Lord would still continue, and daily confirm more and more this his unspeakable favour: That he would receive the infant now baptized, and solemnly entered into the household of faith, into his fatherly tuition and defence, and remember him with the favour that he sheweth to his people; that, if he shall be taken out of this life in his infancy, the Lord, who is rich in mercy, would be pleased to receive him up into glory; and if he live, and attain the years of discretion, that the Lord would so teach him by his word and Spirit, and make his baptism effectual to him, and so uphold him by his divine power and grace, that by faith he may prevail against the devil, the world, and the flesh, till in the end he obtain a full and final victory, and so be kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation, through Jesus Christ our Lord.”

Since the baby is said to be a Christian before his baptism, he never needs to come to a point where he sees himself as a lost, hell-bound sinner who must, for the first time, repent and believe the gospel; as long as he continues to assent to Reformed doctrine as he grows older, and lives a moral life, he can have confidence he will go to heaven. If he lives in this manner, then “his baptism [was] effectual to him” as a “seal of adoption, remission of sin, regeneration, and eternal life, and all other promises of the covenant of grace” and he was planted in infancy “into the likeness of the death and resurrection of Christ” and had “the body of sin being destroyed in him” and was brought “into the bosom of [Christ’s] church, to be partak[er] of his inestimable benefits” and had “inward grace and virtue” conveyed by the sacrament. As a Reformed document, following John Calvin and opposed to the universal salvific benefit of infant baptism taught by Lutheranism, non-elect infants—those who, surviving infancy, fall away from Reformed

doctrine and Christianity or live an immoral life—were not regenerated in infancy and did not have salvation sealed to them through the sacrament.

The pioneers of the English Reformation were under a mix of Catholic, Lutheran, Reformed, and Baptist influences that contributed to the various positions on baptismal salvation among them. The traditional Catholic doctrine of baptismal regeneration was firmly entrenched in the English State Church at the time of the Reformation. Henry VIII followed the baptismal views of the medieval Catholic theologians. The “Schoolmen agreed that the sign and grace necessarily concur except where prevented by insincerity or unbelief[.] . . . Certainly, a miraculous work is done when the external sign is administered. By virtue of the divine institution and the passion of Christ the baptismal sign and the baptismal grace do almost automatically concur. . . . The majority of medieval scholars, and many of their sixteenth-century admirers and successors, inclined to the most obvious and simple view that God had given to the water itself a regenerative force: the grace, or virtue, was in the water. Thomas himself favored this view, for which he could cite Augustine and Bede as venerable guarantors.¹¹⁸ In the sixteenth century it found an exponent in Henry VIII. . . . As Henry VIII put it, quoting Hugo de Sancto Victore, ‘the sacrament of baptism cleanses internally.’^{119,120} This view continued among later “High Church” Anglicans like Stephen Gardiner, who “asserted bluntly that we are all justified ‘in the sacrament of baptisme before we could talk of the justification we strive for.’”¹²¹ The opening prayer in the Anglican Baptismal Office included the words, “Who by the baptism of Thy well-beloved Son in the river Jordan

¹¹⁸ Pg. 185, *Baptism*, Bromiley, citing pgs. 344-346, *La Théologie de Bellarmine*, J. de la Serviere.

¹¹⁹ Pg. 172, *Baptism*, Bromiley, citing *Assertio*, pg. 100.

¹²⁰ Pg. 172, 185, *Baptism*, Bromiley.

¹²¹ Pg. xiv, *Baptism and the Anglican Reformers*, Bromiley, pg. xiv; Gardiner cited from *Letters* (ed. Muller) pg. 407.

didst sanctify water to the mystical washing away of sin.”¹²² However, Lutheran and Reformed influences made the situation in the English Protestant State-church more complex:

The position in England was complicated. The earlier formularies used the language of medieval theology, and even the Prayer Book and Article might suggest a traditionalist understanding. The Article, for example, described baptism as an instrument, and referred to forgiveness as one of its benefits. But there is evidence that from quite an early period the baptismal forgiveness was understood by the Reformers in a Lutheran or Reformed sense rather than the Scholastic. The *King's Book* is perhaps the one exception which confirms the general rule. Even the formularies themselves make this plain. The *Ten Articles* ascribe the forgiveness primarily to Christ Himself, and the Baptismal Office speaks of the benefits rather than the effects of the sacrament, and relates them in the first instance to the author of grace, and only secondarily to the means. The *Homilies* have exactly the same emphasis, for although it is boldly stated that baptized infants are washed from their sins, the washing is by virtue of the sacrifice of Christ and not of the sacrament. The Article certainly describes baptism as an efficacious sign, but it then shows clearly that its efficacy is not to cleanse from sin, but to sign and seal the divine promise of forgiveness. . . . The individual Anglicans were all anxious to maintain the traditional connection between baptism and forgiveness.”¹²³

While English Anglicanism never attained anything like theological uniformity in the Reformation era (or any subsequent period to the present day), Reformed views of baptismal salvation eventually became dominant:

It was the Reformed view which finally prevailed in England . . . Cranmer himself made it plain that in baptism infants do not believe either vicariously or actually, but sacramentally; i. e. they have the sign of faith. Philpot, too, did not think that infants may make any profession of present faith. The Elizabethans were if anything even more definite, for Whitaker disowned the Lutheran view in his controversy with Bellarmine, although he stressed the fact that his opponent was misrepresenting it. Rogers flatly denounced it as an error. . . . The Puritans, of course, took up the Reformed view with vigour.”¹²⁴

The Reformed doctrine found advocates in Cranmer, Jewel, Whitgift, and others.

Bromiley explains their views well:

¹²² Pg. 9, *Baptism*, Bromiley.

¹²³ Pg. 174, *Baptism*, Bromiley.

¹²⁴ Pg. 114-115, *Baptism*, Bromiley.

Whitgift believed that “Although the necessity of baptism is not so tied to the sacraments, that whosoever hath the external sign shall therefore be saved, yet it is so tied to them, that none can be saved that willingly and wittingly is void of them.”¹²⁵ . . .

The statement of Jewel clearly reflects the language of the Prayer Book: “For this cause are infants baptized, because they are born in sin, and cannot become spiritual but by this new birth of water and of the Spirit.”¹²⁶ . . . Jewel¹²⁷ . . . linked together the baptismal remission and the baptismal entry into newness of life in Christ and in the church of Christ. The emphasis is important, because it marks a return in Anglican teaching to the . . . patristic doctrine, and a rejection of the quasi-material conception of cleansing. Baptism was not merely an obliteration of past sin, but the giving of a new and divine life, an entry into the resurrection. The baptismal forgiveness was not as it were a literal washing of the soul from sin and its endowment with new grace and virtue. It was a forgiveness, and accompanying renewal, by identification in faith with the crucified and risen Redeemer.

The true grace of baptism was, in fact, the new creation of God in which by the divine promise and faith the old things are passed away and all things are become new. It was a genuine and full regeneration, an incorporation into Christ with all the benefits which that implied and involved. It was more than the formal uniting with Christ, or the change in external status, which might be presumed of all those who received the outward sign. For although the Reformers distinguished between the first regeneration of faith and the process of moral renovation in which we become by sight that which we are already by faith, regeneration itself was a deep and inward operation of the Holy Spirit; not a bare ontological change, but a renewal of the whole life by saving faith in Jesus Christ.¹²⁸ . . .

Cranmer referred “to baptism as a receiving of the Holy Ghost and putting Christ upon us.”¹²⁹ According to Cranmer, no greater reverence ought to be paid to the bread and wine than to the water, for the presence and ‘shewing’ of Christ are the same in both sacraments.”¹³⁰ . . . [T]he Holy Ghost was not given in the water or the font, but in the ministration.¹³¹ The true baptismal transformation was not the transformation of the water, but “that wonderful change which God Almighty by his omnipotence worketh really in them that be baptized therewith.”¹³² . . . Cranmer . . . perceived that there is both an outward work of baptism and also an inward, but that the true baptism will include both: “Through baptism, in this world, the body is washed, and the soul is washed: the body

¹²⁵ Pg. 61, *Baptism*, Bromiley, citing Whitgift, Parker Society, II, pg. 537.

¹²⁶ Pg. 112, *Baptism*, Bromiley.

¹²⁷ Jewel, *Parker Society Series*, I, pg. 140-141.

¹²⁸ Pg. 180-181, *Baptism*, Bromiley.

¹²⁹ Pg. 11, *Baptism*, Bromiley, citing Cranmer, Parker Society Series, I, pg. 64.

¹³⁰ Pg. 13, *Baptism*, Bromiley, citing Cranmer, *Works*, ed. Jenkins, III, ppg. 10, 61f., 242.

¹³¹ Cranmer, *Parker Society Series*, I, pg. 148

¹³² Pg. 137, Cranmer, *Parker Society Series* II, pg. 180.

outwardly, the soul inwardly: the work is one.”^{133 134} . . . *Cranmer’s Catechism* . . . related baptism directly to the regenerating activity of the Holy Spirit: “the Spirit works in faith and baptisme to make us new men agayne.”¹³⁵ In baptism the old life comes to an end with the identification of the believer with Christ’s death and the non-imputation of sin. But in baptism, too, a new life begins with the identification of the believer with Christ’s resurrection and the imputation of the whole righteousness of Christ: “baptism delivereth from death and the power of the devil, and gyveth salvation and everlastynge lyfe to all them that believe.”¹³⁶
¹³⁷ . . . Cranmer said that unbaptized infants of Christians could possibly be saved; he rejected “as impious the unscrupulous superstition of those who so entirely confine the grace of God the Holy Spirit to the elements of the sacraments as to affirm that no infant of Christians will obtain eternal salvation, who shall have died before he could be brought to baptism, which we consider to be far otherwise.”¹³⁸

The main Anglican Reformers affirmed baptismal salvation, as the continental Reformed denominations did. They likewise joined with continental Reformed theology in rejecting the Catholic notion that all unbaptized infants of Christians were necessarily lost and in shifting the materialistic aspects of Catholic baptismal regeneration to an emphasis upon the imputation of the alien righteousness of Christ, in accordance with their Protestant understanding of justification.

Anglican documents of all sorts followed the position of the Anglican Reformers in affirming baptismal salvation. The binding *39 Articles* affirm that as “by an instrument, they that receive baptism rightly are grafted into the Church; [and] the promises of the forgiveness of sin, and of our adoption to be the sons of God, by the Holy Ghost are visibly signed and sealed.”¹³⁹ The 1662 *Book of Common Prayer*, in “The Ministration of Publick Baptism of Infants, to be Used in the Church,” requires the priest

¹³³ Foxe, VI, pg. 457.

¹³⁴ Pg. 175, *Baptism*, Bromiley.

¹³⁵ *Cranmer’s Catechism*, pg. 122.

¹³⁶ *Cranmer’s Catechism*, pg. 189.

¹³⁷ Pg. 179, *Baptism*, Bromiley.

¹³⁸ Pg. 57, *Baptism*, Bromiley, citing Cranmer, Parker Society Series, II, pg. 60.

¹³⁹ Article XXVII.

to pray, “by the Baptism of thy well-beloved Son Jesus Christ, in the river Jordan, [Thou, God] didst sanctify Water to the mystical washing away of sin . . . We call upon thee for this Infant, that he, coming to thy holy Baptism, may receive remission of his sins by spiritual regeneration. Receive him, O Lord, as thou hast promised . . . that this Infant may enjoy the everlasting benediction of thy heavenly washing, and may come to the eternal kingdom which thou hast promised by Christ our Lord. Amen.” The form for “The Ministration of Private Baptism of Children” requires the priest to “pour Water upon [the child], saying these words; ‘I baptize thee in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.’ Then, all kneeling down, the Minister shall give thanks unto God, and say, ‘We yield thee hearty thanks, most merciful Father, that it hath pleased thee to regenerate this Infant with thy Holy Spirit, to receive him for thine own Child by adoption, and to incorporate him into thy holy Church. And we humbly beseech thee to grant, that as he is now made partaker of the death of thy Son, so he may be also of his resurrection; and that finally, with the residue of thy Saints, he may inherit thine everlasting kingdom; through the same thy Son Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.’” It further commends the “baptizing of [a] Child; who being born in original sin, and in the wrath of God, is now, by the laver of Regeneration in Baptism, received into the number of the children of God, and heirs of everlasting life.” While a great variety of issues were debated within the Anglican communion, the communication of saving grace through baptism was a point of general agreement.¹⁴⁰

¹⁴⁰ The Wesley brothers and the Methodist denomination retained the Anglican belief in salvation through baptism, as taught in the *39 Articles*, when they left the English state-church to start their own religion. Commenting on John 3:5, Wesley affirmed, “Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit—Except he experience that great inward change by the Spirit, and be baptized (wherever baptism can be had) as the outward sign and means of it [he cannot enter into the kingdom of God].” He states here that baptism is the means of the new birth. He also declared, “It is certain our Church supposes that all who are

John Knox, the great enemy of Scottish Catholicism, and essentially the founder of Scottish Presbyterianism, also supported the Reformed connection between salvation and baptism. He described baptism as “a holie syne and seale of God’s promises.”¹⁴¹ Knox referred to being “received in baptism into [God’s] familie and congregation,” and spoke of baptism as “the syne of our entrance into the household of God our Father.”¹⁴² Knox declared, “That lyke as water outwardlye doth wash away filth, so by baptism we are cleansed in soul.”¹⁴³ The liturgy of Knox claimed that regeneration “stands chiefly in these two points, in mortification, that is to say, a resisting of the rebellious lustes of the fleshe, and in newness of life, whereby we continually stryve to walk in that pureness and perfection wherewith we are clad in baptisme.”¹⁴⁴ The Scotsman followed Calvin in affirming a necessity of precept for infant baptism, but not an absolute necessity: “Without injurie infants cannot be debarred from the common syne of God’s children,” but “neither yet is this outwarde action of such necessitie, that the lacke thereof shuld be

baptized in their infancy are at the same time born again; and it is allowed that the whole office for the baptism of infants proceeds upon this supposition” (Wesley, sermon, *The New Birth*). In his *Doctrinal Tracts* (pg. 246, 251) he wrote, “What are the benefits . . . we receive by baptism, is the next point to be considered. And the first of these is the washing away of original sin, by the application of Christ’s death. . . the merits of Christ’s life and death, are applied to us in baptism. . . infants are . . . proper subjects of baptism, seeing, in the ordinary way, they cannot be saved unless [sin] be washed away in baptism. Infants need to be washed from original sin. Therefore they are proper subjects for baptism.” (cited in chapter 9, *The Evils of Infant Baptism*, Robert Boyt C. Howell, accessed in the *Fundamental Baptist CD-Rom Library*, Oak Harbor, WA: Way of Life Literature, 2003). John’s brother, the Methodist hymn-writer Charles Wesley, wrote against the Baptists, “Partisans of a narrow sect/ Your cruelty confess/ Nor still inhumanly reject/ Whom Jesus would embrace./ Your little ones preclude them not/ From the baptismal flood brought/ But let them now to Christ be saved/ And join the Church of God.” (*Charles Wesley’s Journal*, 18 October 1756, 2:128). The Wesleys only called adults already baptized as infants to conversion because of their heretical Arminian theology. Since they rejected the Biblical truth that once one is saved, he is always saved (Romans 8:28-39), they held that one who was regenerated in infant baptism could fall away and become a child of the devil again, at which time he would need a second new birth.

¹⁴¹ Pg. 11, *Baptism*, Bromiley, citing Knox, IV, pg. 172.

¹⁴² Pg. 17, *Baptism*, Bromiley, citing Knox, IV, pg. 172 and Knox, IV, pg. 123, respectively.

¹⁴³ Pg. 20, *Baptism*, Bromiley, citing Knox, IV, pg. 188.

¹⁴⁴ Pg. 29, *Baptism*, Bromiley, citing *Knox’s Liturgy: Baptism*.

prejudiciall to their salvation, yf that prevented by death, thei may not be conveniently be presented to the church.”¹⁴⁵ Knox’s fierce opposition to Popery appeared in his contention that Papist baptism is not the “true baptisme whilke Cryst Jesus did institute.”¹⁴⁶ The problem with the Catholic sacrament was not its connection with the salvation of the infant receiving it, for Knox retained the salvific baptismal doctrine of Reformed theology; the Catholics erred, rather, in the nature, end, and necessity of the grace communicated in infant baptism.

The medieval English Bible translator Wycliff progressively rejected aspects of the Catholic doctrine of infant baptism. Wycliff taught, “Bodily baptizing is a figure, how mennis soulis shuld be baptisid fro synne both originall and actual. . . . Baptisme is a tokene of waishing of the soule fro synne . . . bi vertu taken of Cristi’s deth.”¹⁴⁷ He taught that the baptismal immersion (the mode practiced upon infants in English Catholicism and early English Protestantism) was a picture of Christ’s death and resurrection, and of the death to sin and resurrection to new life in the one baptized. “And so this water that we ben putte inne is token of Cristis tribulacioun fro his bygynnyng to his deth . . . the baptizing of us in this water betokeneth biriynge of Crist. . . . Oure taking up of this water betokeneth the rysinge of Crist fro deth.”¹⁴⁸ . . . The baptizing of us in this water betokeneth . . . how we ben biried with him fro synne that rengneth in this world. Our takynge up of this water betokeneth . . . how we shulden rise goostli in clenness of newe life.”¹⁴⁹ “Wycliffe seems to have argued that the sacrament is not necessary to any who

¹⁴⁵ Pg. 54-55, *Baptism*, Bromiley, citing Knox, IV, pg. 186.

¹⁴⁶ Pg. 9 *Baptism*, Bromiley, citing Knox, I, pg. 19.

¹⁴⁷ Pg. 19, *Baptism*, Bromiley, citing Arnold, II, pg. 328.

¹⁴⁸ Pg. 22, *Baptism*, Bromiley, citing Arnold, II, pg. 258.

¹⁴⁹ Pg. 24, *Baptism*, Bromiley, citing Arnold, II, pg. 258.

die in infancy, but his protest merely called down Episcopal and conciliar denunciations, and even at a later date ‘Wycliffe of damnable memory’ was still condemned for his conclusion ‘that it is presumptuous to say, that infants dying without baptism will not be saved.’¹⁵⁰ . . . In England there had been a long tradition of protest against the belief in an absolute necessity [of baptism for infant salvation], and Wycliffe had already made some pertinent criticisms of it. Perhaps the main reason for his rejection was his refusal to believe that God cannot and will not ‘save an infant unless an old woman or someone perform this ceremony of baptism.’ But again, his doctrine of the twofold baptism made it impossible for him to accept the external rite as the test of the internal work, for after all, could not Christ ‘without any such washing, spiritually baptize, and by consequence save infants?’¹⁵¹ . . . Even in the fourteenth century automatic theories [of baptismal efficacy] had been opposed by such thinkers as Wycliffe, who had separated between the external baptism of water and the inward purgation of the Holy Spirit, which ‘God Himself must do.’^{152,153} Furthermore, “Wycliffe had had no place for the doctrine of ‘character’¹⁵⁴ [an indelible character being conveyed in baptism] and the later Reformers dismissed it as meaningless and artificial. The English attitude was summed up by Tyndale, when he described ‘character’ as ‘one of those feigned words with which the Papists make merchandise.’^{155,156} It is a matter of historical dispute if Wycliff ever

¹⁵⁰ Pg. 50, *Baptism*, Bromiley, citing H. Hart, *Ecclesiastical Records*, pgs. 365, 386.

¹⁵¹ Pg. 55, *Baptism*, Bromiley, citing *Triialogus*, pg. 160.

¹⁵² Arnold, II, pg. 4.

¹⁵³ Pg. 186, *Baptism*, Bromiley.

¹⁵⁴ Wycliff, *Triialogus*, pg. 157-159.

¹⁵⁵ Tyndale, *Parker Society Series*, I, pg. 342.

¹⁵⁶ Pg. 182, *Baptism*, Bromiley.

adopted the Baptist baptismal position, but it appears certain that many of the Lollards did.¹⁵⁷

William Tyndale, translator and promulgator (with Coverdale and Rodgers) of the immensely influential Tyndale Bible, held Baptist views on baptism. He described the

¹⁵⁷ J. T. Christian, in his *History of Baptists* (the chapter, "The British Baptist Churches," accessed in the Fundamental Baptist CD-ROM Library, Port Huron, MI: Way of Life Literature, 2001), stated the following: "It is evident that Wyclif made great advances in reform over the Roman Catholic Church of his day. Year after year marked a further departure from Rome and her dogma. In nothing was this more manifest than in infant baptism. In the early years Wyclif firmly believed in the efficacy of infant baptism, but in later years he appears to have greatly modified his views. Thomas Walden goes so far as to call him "one of the seven heads that came out of the bottomless pit for denying infant baptism, that heresy of the Lollards, of whom he was so great a ringleader." Walsingham says: "That damnable heretic, John Wyclif, reassumed the cursed opinions of Berengarius" (Walsingham, *Ypod. Neust.*, 133), of which it is certain denying infant baptism was one. Collier expressly tells us "he denied the necessity" of infant baptism (Collier, *An Ecclesiastical History of Great Britain*, III. 185). The statement of Collier is unquestioned. Wyclif did not deny infant baptism itself, but the necessity of it. He did not believe that a child dying unbaptized would be lost (Wall, *History of Infant Baptism*, I. 436, 437). This was greatly in advance of the age and marked Wyclif at once a heretic and "an enemy of the Church."

There is no effort in this place to assign Wyclif to a position among Baptist martyrs, but there is no doubt he held firmly to many Baptist positions. Crosby, on the other hand, declared he was a Baptist and argues the question at great length. "I am inclined to believe that Mr. Wyclif," says he, "was a Baptist, because some men of great note and learning in the Church of Rome, have left it upon record, that he denied infant baptism." Among other authorities he quotes Joseph Vicecomes (*De Bit. Bapt.*, lib. ii. chap. i). "Besides," continues Crosby, "they charged him with several of those which are called Anabaptistical errors; such as refusing to take an oath (art. 41. condemned by the Council of Constance), and also that opinion, that dominion is founded in grace (Fuller, *Church History of Great Britain*, 1.444, Art. 51). Upon these testimonies, some Protestant writers have affirmed that Wyclif was a Baptist, and have put him in the number of those who have borne witness against infant baptism. And had he been a man of scandalous character, that would have brought reproach upon those of that profession, a less proof would have been sufficient to have ranked him among that sect" (Crosby, *The History of English Baptists*, I. 8, 9).

No doubt the sentiments of Wyclif, on many points, were the same as those of the Baptists, but there is no document known to me that warrants the belief that he was a Baptist (Evans, *The Early English Baptists*, I. 13).

It is certain that the Lollards, who had preceded Wyclif and had widely diffused their opinions, repudiated infant baptism (Neal, *History of the Puritans*, II. 354). The testimony of Neal is interesting. He says:

That the denial of the right of infants to baptism was a principle generally maintained among Lollards, is abundantly confirmed by the historians of those times, (Neal, *History of the Puritans*, II. 354).

The followers of Wyclif and [the] Lollard[s] united and in a short time England was full of the "Bible Men." "Tis, therefore, most reasonable to conclude," says Crosby, "that those persons were Baptists, and on that account baptized those that came over to their sect, and professed the true faith, and desired to be baptized into it" (Crosby, I. 17).

The Lollards practiced believers' baptism and denied infant baptism. Fox says one of the articles of faith among them was "that faith ought to precede baptism." This at least was the contention of a large portion of those people.

The Lollard movement was later merged into the Anabaptist, and this was hastened by the fact that their political principles were identical (Hook, *Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury*, VI. 123). The Lollards continued to the days of the Reformation. Mosheim says: "The Wyclifites, though obliged to keep concealed, had not been exterminated by one hundred and fifty years of persecution" (Mosheim, *Institutes of Ecclesiastical History*, III. 49).

ordinance as “the sign of repentance (or, if they will so have it called, penance), washing and new birth.”¹⁵⁸ As Baptists would, “Tyndale identified baptism primarily with repentance: ‘baptism is a sign of repentance signifying that I must repent of evil, and believe to be saved there from by the blood of Christ.’”¹⁵⁹ He denied the necessity of baptism for salvation. “Tyndale . . . deduced that ‘the infants that die unbaptized of us Christians are in as good case as those that die baptized.’ He could also allow that adults who believed in Christ and lived a Christian life might well be saved even without the sacrament.”¹⁶⁰ . . . Tyndale . . . pointed out that the main function of [baptism] is that of ‘testifying and exhibiting to our senses the promises signified.’¹⁶¹ ¹⁶² . . . The Holy Spirit does not work in the water, but ‘accompanieth the preaching of faith, and with the word of faith, entereth the heart and purgeth it.’¹⁶³”¹⁶⁴ He also “described dipping or plunging [not pouring or sprinkling] as the true sign.”¹⁶⁵ It is possible, but not certain, that Tyndale was a member of a Baptist church. J. T. Christian comments:

Davis (*History of the Welsh Baptists*, 21) claims that William Tyndale (A. D. 1484-1536) was a Baptist. He was born near the line between England and Wales, but lived most of the time in Gloustershire. “Llewellyn Tyndale and Hezekiah Tyndale were members of the Baptist church at Abergaverney, South Wales.” There is much mystery around the life of Tyndale. Bale calls him “the apostle of the English.” “He was learned, a godly, and a good-natured man” (Fuller, *Church History of Britain*, II. 91). It is certain he shared many views held by the Baptists; but that he was a member of a Baptist church is nowhere proved. He always translated the word *ecclesia* by the word *congregation*, and held to a local conception of a church (Tyndale, *Works* II. 13. London, 1831). There were only two offices in the church, pastor and deacons (1.400). The elders or bishops

¹⁵⁸ Pg. 11, *Baptism*, Bromiley, citing Tyndale, British Reformers Series, pg. 407.
¹⁵⁹ Pg. 25, *Baptism*, Bromiley, citing Tyndale, Parker Society Series, III, pg. 171.
¹⁶⁰ Pg. 56, *Baptism*, Bromiley, citing Tyndale, Parker Society Series, I, pg. 350-351.
¹⁶¹ Tyndale, *Parker Society Series*, I, p. 357.
¹⁶² Pg. 179, *Baptism*, Bromiley.
¹⁶³ Tyndale, *Parker Society Series*, I, pg. 423-424.
¹⁶⁴ Pg. 192, *Baptism*, Bromiley.
¹⁶⁵ Pg. 140, *Baptism*, Bromiley.

should be married men (I. 265). Upon the subject of baptism he is very full. He is confident that baptism does not wash away sin. “It is impossible,” says he, “that the waters of the river should wash our hearts” (*Ibid*, 30). Baptism was a plunging into the water (*Ibid*, 287). Baptism to avail must include repentance, faith and confession (III. 179). The church must, therefore, consist of believers (*Ibid*, 25). His book in a wonderful manner states accurately the position of the Baptists.

The involvement of Baptists, or at least those with Baptist views, in Bible translation is in accord with Scriptural promises of the responsibility of the saints and the church for the propagation of Scripture (Matthew 28:19-20; John 17:8, etc.). Furthermore, the diligent study of Scripture evident in and required for the production of the historic, Christ-honoring, anti-Papist English Bibles¹⁶⁶ would tend to move translators toward the Baptist baptismal doctrine¹⁶⁷ taught in the Word of God.

In stark theological contrast to the mainline Catholic, Lutheran, and Reformed positions, but in closer continuity with at least some of those involved in the translation of the English Bible, Baptists maintained the Biblical position on the ordinance of baptism and opposed a connection between the ordinance and the receipt of salvation, infant baptism, and other corruptions of the ordinance by the old Catholic and the new protesting Catholic movements. “Anabaptism . . . insisted that baptism is merely a sign of individual conversion and the new birth.”¹⁶⁸ . . . The Anabaptists . . . envisaged the external rite [of baptism] purely as a sign, and that it was not in any way, except the psychological, a means of spiritual grace.¹⁶⁹ . . . The contribution made by . . . the Anabaptists was on the whole the negative one of attacking the prevailing notion that the

¹⁶⁶ It has been estimated that the readings in the *Authorized Version* are well over 90% the work of Tyndale.

¹⁶⁷ It is possible that Baptist doctrine influenced other translators of the English Bible; for example, Coverdale said, “In baptism we have an undoubted true token and evidence of the grace of God” (Pg. 18, *Baptism*, Bromiley, citing Coverdale, Parker Society Series, II, pg. 86), a declaration consistent with the Baptist position on the ordinance.

¹⁶⁸ Pg. xiv, *Baptism*, Bromiley.

¹⁶⁹ *Bibliotheca Reformatoria Neerlandica*, pg. 188, II, pg. 280, cited on pg. 188, *Baptism*, Bromiley.

external element could itself accomplish an internal cleansing.¹⁷⁰ . . . [T]hey maintained with truth that it is the blood of Christ which cleanses from sin,¹⁷¹ they did not think of baptism as in any way a means of grace, but only as a sign of grace, and more especially as a sign of individual conversion.¹⁷² . . . The main bulwark of the Anabaptists was that infants cannot have faith, and therefore lack the essential qualification for the [ordinance of baptism].”¹⁷³ The *Schleitheim Confession* of 1527 stated well the Anabaptist position:

Baptism shall be given to all those who have learned repentance and amendment of life, and who believe truly that their sins are taken away by Christ, and to all those who walk in the resurrection of Jesus Christ, and wish to be buried with Him in death, so that they may be resurrected with him, and to all those who with this significance request it [baptism] of us and demand it for themselves. This excludes all infant baptism, the highest and chief abominations of the pope.¹⁷⁴

If baptism is given only to those who, having repented, know that their sins “are” taken away already by Christ, the ordinance cannot have saving efficacy, for conversion and justification are prerequisites to being “buried” with Christ in baptism. Since infant baptism is an abomination, indeed, “the highest and chief” of popish abominations, it must not be in any wise countenanced; the view of the early Zwingli, that infant baptism is unscriptural but “on account of the possibility of offence I omit preaching this; it is better not to preach it until the world is ready to take it,”¹⁷⁵ is entirely unacceptable. Protestantism may maintain that the practice of or opposition to infant baptism is a non-separating, secondary issue or a non-issue; but Baptists, who recognize infant baptism as an abomination, cannot trivialize its practice.

¹⁷⁰ *Corpus Reformatorum*, IV, pg. 215, 627

¹⁷¹ *Bibliotheca Reformatoria Neerlandia*, II, pg. 280, IV, pg. 44.

¹⁷² Pg. 173, *Baptism*, Bromiley.

¹⁷³ Pg. 113-114, *Baptism*, Bromiley.

¹⁷⁴ Article 1 of the *Schleitheim Confession*, pg. 25, *Baptist Confessions of Faith*, William L. Lumpkin. Valley Forge, PA: Judson Press, 1969.

¹⁷⁵ Pg. 199, *The Reformers and Their Stepchildren*, Verduin.

The rejection of infant baptism had as its corollary a rejection of the universal State-church concept of the Catholics and the Reformers; indeed, many Baptists, following the New Testament definition of *ekklesia* as solely a local, visible body, entirely rejected the concept of a universal church. The ancient Donatists and the medieval Anabaptists that succeeded them denied the existence of a universal or catholic church.¹⁷⁶ The Reformation Anabaptists affirmed that the body of Christ was the local, visible assembly, entered by believer's baptism,¹⁷⁷ not a universal entity composed of the entirety of the elect.

The Baptists also held to what became known as the Regulative Principle,¹⁷⁸ namely, that whatever God did not explicitly command in His worship was forbidden. In this they were joined by the generality of the Reformed, who used the Principle to attack the patently extrabiblical ceremonies of the Papists and the Lutherans and their corollary affirmation that whatever was not explicitly forbidden in worship was permitted. In England, the Puritans endorsed the Regulative Principle, while the Anglicans opposed it. The Baptists, however, were the only ones able to consistently implement this Scriptural (Leviticus 10:1-3) teaching, since the rest maintained the practice of the infant baptism the New Testament was, at the very best, entirely silent about.¹⁷⁹ In Zurich, "Zwingli took steps to purge the office [of the state church] of all its non-scriptural elements. In this matter he was in full agreement with the Anabaptists, who were clamoring that all

¹⁷⁶ Pg. 34-35, *The Reformers and Their Stepchildren*, Verduin.

¹⁷⁷ Articles 2 + 3 of the *Schleitheim Confession*, pg. 25, *Baptist Confessions of Faith*, William L. Lumpkin.

¹⁷⁸ A Biblical and historical analysis is found in "Biblical Authority and the Proof of the Regulative Principle of Worship in *The Westminster Confession*," John Allen Delivuk, *Westminster Theological Journal* 58:2 (Fall 96) pgs. 237-256.

¹⁷⁹ See "Infant Baptism and the Regulative Principle of Worship," Fred Malone: <http://www.gracesermons.com/robbeeee/regulative.html>.

ceremonies which had no sanction in the New Testament ought ruthlessly to be discarded. . . . Calvin called for the complete destruction of . . . added ceremonies . . . and he did not retain a single one of them in the Genevan liturgies. His disciples vied with one another in their attempts to heap scorn and ridicule upon the ancient customs.”¹⁸⁰ The Regulative Principle was an important component of the Baptist doctrine of baptism.

III. Conclusion

Baptists stand for the necessity of conscious, personal and evangelical conversion as a prerequisite to baptism. The ordinance adds the saint to the membership of a local, visible assembly separated from a universal or catholic church or church-state. The Baptist restriction of immersion in the Reformation era to already justified believers accorded with the necessity of a Biblical mandate for elements of worship, but was in radical contrast to the baptismal theologies of Catholicism and all wings of the Protestant Reformation. The Catholic and Protestant movements that put Baptists to death, and the Baptists who declared that their opponents’ acceptance of infant baptism was an abomination, indeed, a chief abomination, were far more in accordance with the reality of the divergence of their soteriological doctrines than are the opinions of the many moderns in this soft, ecumenical age in Christendom who minimize baptismal differences. Modern Baptists who affirm that the Reformers were set for the defense of the gospel are greatly in error. Without sacrificing the heart of their Biblical soteriology to affirm that baptismal and sacramental salvation and a rejection of the necessity of personal,

¹⁸⁰ *Corpus Reformatorum*, IV, pg. 707, cited from pg. 149, *Baptism*, Bromiley.

conscious faith in Christ for justification are non-issues, Baptists must believe that the soteriology of all of the mainline Reformers is damnable heresy.¹⁸¹ Furthermore, when Baptists read, or promulgate through their church bookstores and Christian schools, fundamental or evangelical books that glamorize the Reformers as great heroes of the faith, they must warn their flocks that these men are false teachers and their denominations are founded on a false gospel—or refuse to use such literature at all. Baptist soulwinners should also be well acquainted with the Reformation baptismal heresies, because modern conservative Protestants are likely to hold the same views as their denominational founders, and an overly cursory inquiry into a Protestant prospect's personal state will likely lead soulwinners to erroneously conclude that their prospects are already regenerate. One who holds to a traditional Lutheran or Reformed soteriology of baptismal salvation will heartily affirm a belief in justification by faith alone if asked solely this question. Baptist involvement in interdenominational ministerial or educational activity with those who hold to infant baptism as a “secondary” or “non-separating” issue also demonstrates a wild lack of discernment; the main body of “brothers in Christ” in the Protestant denominations hold to a sacramental salvation. Finally, any truly regenerate persons in Protestant denominations, who of necessity reject sacramental salvation as inconsistent with the Biblical terms of the gospel they have received, should leave their false religions at once and be immersed into the membership of a Bible-believing Baptist church. The gospel that saved their souls is rejected in their confessional documents. Saints associated with the Romish whore (Revelation 17:1ff.)

¹⁸¹ This is established by their doctrine of baptism alone. The mainline Reformers also held many other heresies; see the Appendix to this paper.

or her Protestant daughter churches (17:5)¹⁸² should take heed to the inspired command: “Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues” (Revelation 18:4).

Appendix: Other heresies of the Reformers

Apart from their connection of baptism and salvation, the Reformers adopted many other heresies. Zwingli held that “noble” heathen who had never heard of Christ would be in heaven, and only maintained the salvation of unbaptized infants by vitiating the Biblical doctrine of original sin (Romans 5:12-19).¹⁸³ Luther either questioned or denied the canonicity of Hebrews, James, Jude, 2 Peter, 2 and 3 John, and Revelation, as well as several Old Testament books, providing a basis for the rise of theological modernism in Germany a century after his death. In Luther’s preface to James, from his first edition of his German New Testament, he stated that “this epistle of St. James was rejected by the ancients . . . I do not regard it as the writing of an apostle; and my reasons follow. In the first place it is flatly against St. Paul and all the rest of Scripture in ascribing justification to works. . . . This fault, therefore, proves that this epistle is not the work of any apostle. . . . [T]his James does nothing more than drive to the law and to its works. Besides, he throws things together so chaotically that it seems to me he must have been some good, pious man, who took a few sayings from the disciples of the apostles and thus tossed them off on paper. . . . In a word, he wanted to guard against those who relied on faith without works, but was unequal to the task in spirit, thought, and words. He mangles the Scriptures and thereby opposes Paul and all Scripture . . . Therefore, I will not have him in my Bible to be numbered among the true chief books.” In a *Tabletalk* comment in 1542, Luther affirmed, “We should throw the Epistle of James out of this school [Wittenberg], for it doesn’t amount to much. It contains not a syllable about

¹⁸² See “Can You Identify This Woman And Her Daughters?” Appendix III of *Three Witnesses for the Baptists*, Curtis A. Pugh (Bloomfield, New Mexico: The Historic Baptist, n. d.); electronically available at <http://users.aol.com/libcfl/witness1.htm>.

¹⁸³ Schaff, Philip, *History of the Christian Church*, 7:preface:11; 7:1:7:110; 8:2:9; 8:5:45; 8:3:29.

Christ. . . . I maintain that some Jew wrote it who probably heard about Christian people but never encountered any. Since he heard that Christians place great weight on faith in Christ, he thought, ‘Wait a moment! I’ll oppose them and urge works alone.’ This he did. . . . Besides, there’s no order or method in the epistle. Now he discusses clothing and then he writes about wrath and is constantly shifting from one to the other. He presents a comparison: ‘As the body apart from the spirit is dead, so faith apart from works is dead’ [Jas. 2:26]. O Mary, mother of God! What a terrible comparison that is! James compares faith with the body when he should rather have compared faith with the soul! The ancients recognized this, too, and therefore they didn’t acknowledge this letter as one of the catholic epistles” (*Luther’s Works* (LW) 54:424). He also said, “Some day I will use James to fire my stove”¹⁸⁴ (cf. Jeremiah 36:23-32).

Luther wrote concerning “the epistle of St Jude . . . he also speaks of the apostles like a disciple who comes long after them and cites sayings and incidents that are found nowhere else in the Scriptures. This moved the ancient fathers to exclude this epistle from the main body of the Scriptures . . . it is an epistle that need not be counted among the chief books which are supposed to lay the foundations of faith.”¹⁸⁵ Concerning the book of Hebrews, Luther wrote that the book “does not lay the foundation of faith . . . Therefore we should not be deterred if wood, straw, or hay are perhaps mixed with [sound teaching in the epistle] . . . to be sure, we cannot put it on the same level with the apostolic epistles.” In certain places, Hebrews is, “as it stands . . . contrary to all the gospels and to St. Paul’s epistles” (LW 35:394).

In Luther’s *Preface to the Revelation of St. John* (1522), he wrote, “About this book of the Revelation of John . . . I say what I feel. I miss more than one thing in this book, and it makes me consider it to be neither apostolic nor prophetic. . . . For myself, I think it approximates the Fourth Book of Esdras; I can in no way detect that the Holy Spirit produced it. Moreover he seems to me to be going much too far when he commends his own book so highly—indeed, more than any of the other sacred books do, though they are much more important—and threatens that if anyone takes away anything

¹⁸⁴ Weimer, “*Tischreden*” (5) pg. 5854, cited in “Luther and James: Did Luther Use the Historical-Critical Method?” by Mark F. Bartling; a paper presented to the Pastor-Teacher Conference, Western Wisconsin District, LaCrosse, WI, April 12, 1983.

¹⁸⁵ See Luther’s preface to Jude in his first edition of the German New Testament.

from it, God will take away from him, etc.¹⁸⁶ Again, they are supposed to be blessed who keep what is written in this book; and yet no one knows what that is, to say nothing of keeping it. This is just the same as if we did not have the book at all. And there are many far better books available for us to keep. Many of the fathers also rejected this book a long time ago; although St. Jerome, to be sure, refers to it in exalted terms and says that it is above all praise and that there are as many mysteries in it as words. Still, Jerome cannot prove this at all, and his praise at numerous places is too generous. . . . My spirit cannot accommodate itself to this book.”

In his *Preface to the New Testament* (1522), Luther stated, “John's Gospel is . . . far, far to be preferred to the other three and placed high above them. So, too, the Epistles of St. Paul and St. Peter far surpass the other three Gospels—Matthew, Mark, and Luke.”

Luther's relegation of portions of the New Testament canon to a secondary status is followed by “conservative” modern Lutheranism to this day. Lutheran editions of the Bible in the centuries after the Reformation generally contained their Reformer's prefaces to the Scriptures along with the books, perpetuating his blasphemies among the following generations of Lutherans.¹⁸⁷

Luther attacked portions of the Old Testament as well. He said, “Job didn't speak the way it is written [in his book] . . . One doesn't speak that way under temptation.”¹⁸⁸

¹⁸⁶ Note that here Luther explicitly rejects the warning of Revelation 22:18-19! It goes “much too far”! Is the book of Revelation correct, and Luther in error, when the inspired prophecy warns that for he who add or take away from it (Is not rejecting its inspiration most certainly taking away from it?), “God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book . . . and . . . God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book”? Or is Luther correct, and the Word of God in error, so that God goes “much too far” here?

¹⁸⁷ “The German Bible available to homes in the Missouri Synod in the late 1800's and early 1900's, the *Altenburger Bibel* (Concordia Publishing House), contained Luther's introductions to the New Testament books, giving his views about Hebrews, James, Jude, and Revelation. The laymen therefore were acquainted with the view of [the] Scriptures [of Luther, questioning their inspiration].” The American Lutheran Synod of 1857 (minutes, pg. 334ff) affirmed, “The Lutheran church must leave it uncertain whether Revelation, or any of the other books of the New Testament which were spoken against by a few in the early church, were written by an Apostle or under Apostolic authority. . . . Consequently, it was an unwise, unchristian, and provocative act on the part of [a Lutheran minister] to conceal the actual status of the doubted New Testament books. Thereby he gave rise to rumors which cast aspersions on those who maintain the distinction between canonical books of the first and second rank; whereas in this distinction they were following the earliest church Luther, and the older orthodox theologians” (Quotations from “Luther and James: Did Luther Use the Historical-Critical Method?” by Mark F. Bartling; a paper presented to the Pastor-Teacher Conference, Western Wisconsin District, LaCrosse, WI, April 12, 1983.).

¹⁸⁸ Luther on Job from the *Table Talk*, John Aurifaber's version; LW 54:79.

He affirmed that “The [author of the] book of Solomon's Proverbs [is like] . . . the author of the book of [the Apocryphal book of] Ecclesiasticus. [He] preaches the law well, but he is no prophet. [Ecclesiasticus] is not the work of Solomon, any more than is the book of Solomon's Proverbs. They are both collections made by other people. . . . [Concerning the book of] Esther . . . I wish [it] had not come to us at all, for [it has] too many heathen unnaturalities. . . . Daniel and Isaiah are [the] most excellent prophets.”¹⁸⁹ In Luther's *Preface to Ecclesiastes*, he wrote, “Now this book was certainly not written or set down by King Solomon with his own hand. Instead scholars put together what others had heard from Solomon's lips, as they themselves admit at the end of the book . . . In like manner too, the book of the Proverbs of Solomon has been put together by others, with the teaching and sayings of some wise men added at the end. The Song of Solomon too has the appearance of a book compiled by others out of things received from the lips of Solomon. For this reason these books have no particular order either, but one thing is mixed with another. This must be the character of such books, since they did not hear it all from him at one time but at different times” (LW 35:263). Luther stated concerning “Esther . . . [that] despite [the Jews] inclusion of it in the canon [it] deserves more than all the rest in my judgment to be regarded as noncanonical” (LW 33:11). Before Luther attacked inspired books of the Old and New Testaments, instead of trembling before them (Isaiah 66:2), he should have considered more carefully that “Whoso despiseth the word shall be destroyed” (Proverbs 13:13; cf. 2 Timothy 3:16; Proverbs 30:5-6; Deuteronomy 12:32; Revelation 22:18-19).

In 1519, Luther exhorted his congregation to “call upon the holy angels, particularly his own angel, the Mother of God, and all the apostles and saints,” although later on he moved away from prayers to angels, Mary, and other dead people. Nevertheless, Luther kept a graven image of Mary in his study his entire life.¹⁹⁰ Luther also believed his entire life in Mary's perpetual virginity. He taught, “Christ . . . was the only Son of Mary, and the Virgin Mary bore no children besides Him . . . [when Scripture

¹⁸⁹ *Table-Talk Of Martin Luther* Translated By William Hazlitt, Esq. Philadelphia: The Lutheran Publication Society. Utterance XXIV. Available at http://www.ccel.org/l/luther/table_talk/table_talk.htm.

¹⁹⁰ cf. Reformation Church History, Lecture 5, W. Robert Godfrey, (Grand Rapids, MI: Institute of Theological Studies); www.itscourses.org.

speaks of the Lord Jesus'] 'brothers' [it] really means 'cousins.'"¹⁹¹ Calvin similarly affirmed, "Helvidius has shown himself too ignorant, in saying that Mary had several sons, because mention is made in some passages of the brothers of Christ," arguing that "brothers" meant merely cousins or relatives.¹⁹² Calvin never denied the perpetual virginity of Mary. Zwingli affirmed, "I firmly believe that Mary, according to the words of the gospel as a pure Virgin brought forth for us the Son of God and in childbirth and after childbirth forever remained a pure, intact Virgin." Zwingli used Exodus 4:22 to defend the doctrine of Mary's perpetual virginity.¹⁹³

Luther also taught that Mary was conceived without sin, as Christ was, preaching that "It is a sweet and pious belief that the infusion of Mary's soul was effected without original sin; so that in the very infusion of her soul she was also purified from original sin and adorned with God's gifts, receiving a pure soul infused by God; thus from the first moment she began to live she was free from all sin."¹⁹⁴

The Bible teaches that Mary was a very godly woman (Luke 1:48), although John the Baptist was greater than she (Matthew 11:11). Mary needed to have Christ as her "Saviour" (Luke 1:47) because she was a sinner just like every other descendent of Adam (Romans 3:10, 23; 5:12, 19). The gospels record her bringing a sin offering for her uncleanness (Luke 2:21-24; Lev 12:1-8). Jesus was her "firstborn" son (Matthew 1:25; Lu 2:7), after which God blessed her marriage to Joseph with many other children (Matthew 13:55-56; John 7:5 + Psalm 69:8; Acts 1:14; 1 Corinthians 9:5; Galatians 1:19). She does not have special access to the Lord Jesus (Matthew 12:46-50; Luke 11:27-28) and praying to her, saying she is the queen of heaven, making her a mediator between God and man, and all other Catholic or Protestant additions to Biblical teaching about her are abominable idolatry (Deuteronomy 12:32; 1 Timothy 2:5; Isaiah 48:11). "Idolaters . . . shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone" (Revelation 21:8).

Luther also confused the cross-work of Christ by going beyond the truth that the Savior bore the sins of mankind, and thus suffered the judgment that the world of sinners

¹⁹¹ *Sermons on John*, chapters 1-4, 1537-39.

¹⁹² Bernard Leeming, "Protestants and Our Lady," *Marian Library Studies*, January 1967, pg. 9.

¹⁹³ Ulrich Zwingli, *Zwingli Opera, Corpus Reformatorum*, Volume 1, 424.

¹⁹⁴ "On the Day of the Conception of the Mother of God," 1527.

deserved, adopting instead the dangerous idea that Christ Himself became the sin of men. He wrote:

All the prophets of old said that Christ should be the greatest transgressor, murderer, adulterer, thief, blasphemer that ever was or ever could be on earth. When He took the sins of the whole world upon Himself, Christ was no longer an innocent person. . . . So the Law judged and hanged Him for a sinner. . . . I am told that it is preposterous and wicked to call the Son of God a cursed sinner. I answer: If you deny that He is a condemned sinner, you are forced to deny that Christ died. It is not less preposterous to say, the Son of God died, than to say, the Son of God was a sinner. . . . Being the unspotted Lamb of God, Christ was personally innocent. But because He took the sins of the world His sinlessness was defiled with the sinfulness of the world. Whatever sins I, you, all of us have committed or shall commit, they are Christ's sins as if He had committed them Himself. . . . By stripping Christ of our sins, by making Him sinless, [false teachers] cast our sins back at us, and make Christ absolutely worthless to us. . . .

Our merciful Father in heaven saw how the Law oppressed us and how impossible it was for us to get out from under the curse of the Law. He therefore sent His only Son into the world and said to Him: "You are now Peter, the liar; Paul, the persecutor; David, the adulterer; Adam, the disobedient; the thief on the cross. . . . Holy Writ does not say that Christ was under the curse. It says directly that Christ was made a curse. . . . Although . . . passages may be properly explained by saying that Christ was made a sacrifice for the curse and for sin, yet in my judgment it is better to [conclude that] . . . Christ was made sin itself; Christ was made the curse itself. . . .

To finish with this verse: All evils would have overwhelmed us, as they shall overwhelm the unbelievers forever, if Christ had not become the great transgressor and guilty bearer of all our sins.¹⁹⁵

Luther's confusion on the work of Christ, his deliberate rejection of the fact that Christ suffered the penalty for the world's sins to affirm instead that He Himself became a sinner, is another dangerous heresy.

Luther also agreed that Philip of Hesse could have two wives to help the prince stop committing adultery; the second marriage just needed to be kept secret. Luther was joined in this immoral counsel by Philip Melanchthon, Martin Bucer, and other lesser Reformers. They stated that "We declare under an oath that it ought to be done secretly . . . It is nothing unusual for princes to have concubines . . . and this modest way of living

¹⁹⁵ Comment on Galatians 3:13 in *Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians* (1535), Martin Luther. Trans. Theodore Graebner (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan Publishing House, 1949). Elec. acc. in *Accordance Bible Software*.

would please more than adultery.”¹⁹⁶ Luther wrote, “I cannot forbid a person to marry several wives, for it does not contradict the Scripture.”¹⁹⁷ After the secret got out, Luther lied, denying his role in the bigamy. He and the others who agreed to the second wife later were sorry that they had counseled Philip of Hesse as they had done—after they had already been exposed and the Lutheran cause had been damaged.

General Lutheran antisemitism and widespread complicity in the Holocaust under Hitler is also not surprising, in light of Luther’s affirmations about the Jews, such as: “Let their houses also be shattered and destroyed . . . Let their prayer books and Talmuds be taken from them, and their whole Bible too; let their rabbis be forbidden, on pain of death, to teach henceforth any more. Let the streets and highways be closed against them. Let them be forbidden to practice usury, and let all their money, and all their treasures of silver and gold be taken from them and put away in safety. And if all this be not enough, let them be driven like mad dogs out of the land.”¹⁹⁸

The Lutheran view of the Lord’s Supper, consubstantiation, is a well known heresy. The idea that one actually eats Christ’s real human body and drinks His real blood in the Lord’s supper was retained in Luther’s split from Rome. To support the doctrine that Christ’s humanity is actually eaten in the bread of the Supper, Lutheranism also developed the doctrine of the ubiquity of the human nature of Christ, which claims His humanity is omnipresent, rather than localized in heaven at the right hand of God the Father (Mark 16:19; Luke 22:69; Acts 2:33-34; 7:55-56; Colossians 3:1; 1 Peter 3:22).¹⁹⁹ Since, by definition, a real human body cannot be omnipresent, or in countless numbers

¹⁹⁶ Document dated December 10, 1539, *Luther's Letters*, De Wette -- Seidemann, Berlin, 1828, vol. 6, 255-265.

¹⁹⁷ De Wette, vol. 2, 459.

¹⁹⁸ Durant, 422; *About the Jews and Their Lies*, 1543; citing Janssen, III, 211-212.

¹⁹⁹ In the words of the confessionally binding Lutheran *Formula of Concord* (1577), “We believe, teach, and confess that in the Lord’s Supper the body and blood of Christ are truly and substantially present, and that they are truly distributed and taken together with the bread and wine. . . . That the right hand of God is everywhere; and that Christ, in respect of his humanity, is truly and in very deed seated thereat.” (Articles I, V). If the right hand of God is everywhere (contrary to Scripture, which affirms it is in heaven, Mark 16:19; Acts 2:33-34; Ephesians 1:20; Hebrews 1:3; 8:1; 1 Peter 3:22; etc.), and Christ’s humanity is at this “everywhere” location, His humanity is omnipresent, and Lutherans are bound to believe this heresy by their confessional documents. Not only does this heresy undermine the Lord Jesus’ true nature as man, but it makes a mockery of the ascension. Did the Lord “ascend” to everywhere? Did His body “ascend” to the earth, to the exact place where the disciples were standing looking up into heaven? Did His body “ascend” into the heart of the earth, or back into the grave where He had been laid, or to the placemat where men wipe their feet? What errors does a stubborn refusal to believe in the Scriptural, memorial view of the Supper bring!

of pieces of bread all over the world at the same time, the Lutheran doctrine of ubiquity, invented to defend Luther's heresy of consubstantiation, denies the genuine humanity of Christ (as does the Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation) and so is antichrist (1 John 4:3).

The Calvinistic and Reformed doctrine of the Supper is also heretical, in that it joins the Lutheran position in affirming that the ordinance is a vehicle of saving grace, and maintains that Christ's human body is somehow spiritually eaten in the ordinance. Calvin and the Reformed were not willing to go all the way and agree with the Biblical, Baptist position that the Supper is simply performed "in remembrance of" Christ (1 Corinthians 11:24-25) as a memorial. After the words of consecration, the bread is still bread and the juice is still juice, and nothing more is eaten or drunk than bread and the fruit of the vine (Matthew 26:29; Mark 14:25; 1 Corinthians 11:26). The Reformers erred on much more than infant baptism alone.

Select Bibliography

Accordance Bible software, version 7.0.1, OakTree Software, Inc.
(www.accordancebible.com), numerous modules.

Bromiley, G. W., *Baptism and the Anglican Reformers*. London, England: Lutterworth Press, 1953.

Calvin, John, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, electronically accessed.

Christian, John T. *A History of the Baptists*, electronically accessed. Way of Life Literature, (Oak Harbor, WA), May 2003.

Engelsma, David J., *The Covenant of God and the Children of Believers*. South Holland, IL: Evangelism Committee, Protestant Reformed Church, n. d.

Hodge, Charles, *Systematic Theology*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2003, reprint ed.

Lumpkin, William L. *Baptist Confessions of Faith*, Valley Forge, PA: Judson Press, 1969.

Potter, G. R., *Zwingli*, London: Cambridge University Press, 1976.

Sargent, Robert, *Landmarks of Church History*. Oak Harbor, WA: Bible Baptist Church Publications, n. d.

Schaff, Philip, *History of the Christian Church*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1907, 1910.

The Fundamental Baptist CD-ROM Library, ed. David Cloud. Way of Life Literature, P.O. Box 610368, Port Huron, MI 48061-0368.

The Encyclopedia Puritannica, CD Version 3.0. <http://www.puritannica.com/> Steve Mourning, P. O. Box 573, Bealeton, VA 22712.

Verduin, Leonard, *The Reformers and Their Stepchildren*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1964.

Waterworth, J, ed. & trans. *The canons and decrees of the sacred and oecumenical Council of Trent*. (London: Dolman, 1848), electronically accessed.

Bible Truths For Lutheran Friends

The confessions of faith of Lutheran churches commendably follow Martin Luther in teaching many essential Biblical doctrines, such as the Trinity, the inspiration of Scripture, and the authority of the Word of God for faith and practice. Faithful Lutherans also agree with what the Bible teaches about the sinfulness of humanity. God's Word teaches that all men sinned in Adam (Rom 5:12-19) and all are born with a terribly sinful nature: "The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked: who can know it?" (Jer 17:9). Because of this sin, "the wickedness of man [is] great in the earth, and . . . every imagination of the thoughts of his heart [is] only evil continually" (Ge 6:5). Indeed, you are so sinful by nature that until you are "born again" (Jn 3:3) and given a new nature by God (Eze 11:19) even your most seemingly righteous actions are actually sinful: "But we are all as an unclean thing, and all our righteousnesses are as filthy rags; and we all do fade as a leaf; and our iniquities, like the wind, have taken us away" (Is 64:6). You must recognize that "there is none righteous, no, not one . . . all the world [is] guilty before God" (Rom 3:10, 19). God's standard is: "Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect" (Mt 5:48), but you have fallen so miserably short of His standard of sinless perfection that you—like all the children of Adam—actually cannot please God at all until God sees you with a righteousness as pure and perfect as His own. Luther described this complete depravity of man in his book *The Bondage of the Will*, and Lutheran confessions of faith also agree: "[S]ince the fall of Adam all men begotten in the natural way are born with sin, that is, without the fear of God, without trust in God, and with concupiscence [sinful lusts and desires]; and that this disease, or vice of origin, is truly sin, even now condemning and bringing eternal death upon those not born again" (*Augsburg Confession (AC)*, Article 2).

Indeed, any and every failure to perfectly conform to the holy standard of God's Law is sin (1 Jn 3:4), but you have committed numberless sins, every one of which is written down in God's books (Rev 20:11-15). The Lord Jesus Christ said that unjust anger is murder (Mt 5:21-22), and a lustful thought is adultery (Mt 5:27-28), so you are a murderer and an adulterer. You have lied (Prov 6:16), been proud (Pr 6:16-19), bitter (Ro 3:14), unthankful (2 Tim 3:2), covetous (2 Tim 3:2), and hypocritical (Is 33:14). You continually break the greatest commandment of all: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind" (Mt 22:37). Indeed, until

you are born again, you “cannot please God” (Rom 8:8) in any way, but are “defiled and unbelieving” with “nothing pure; but even [your] mind and conscience is defiled” (Tit 1:15). You cannot truly please God at all—but even one act of sin makes you deserve the wrath of God and His judgment! “For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all” (Jam 2:10). God’s Law warns: “Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them” (Gal 3:10), yet you have not continuously and perfectly obeyed, so you are cursed. Since “the wages of sin is death” (Rom 6:23), you are subject to both physical death, the separation of the soul and spirit from the body (Heb 9:27), and spiritual death, the separation of man from God. The sobering truth is that you are “dead in trespasses and sins” (Eph 2:1), your “damnation is just” (Rom 3:8), and you are consequently headed for the second death, eternal separation from God in the lake of fire: “This is the second death. And whosoever was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire” (Rev 20:14-15). In the lake of fire you “shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of his indignation; and [you] shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels, and in the presence of the Lamb: and the smoke of [your] torment ascendeth up for ever and ever: and [you] have no rest day nor night” (Rev 14:10-11). You need to admit that you are a terrible and exceedingly wicked sinner who deserves nothing other than the wrath of God in hell, or you will never be saved (Lu 5:32). As Martin Luther said: “[T]he Law was instituted . . . to tear to pieces that monster called self-righteousness. As long as a person thinks he is right he is going to be incomprehensibly proud and presumptuous. He is going to hate God, despise His grace and mercy, and ignore the promises in Christ. The Gospel of the free forgiveness of sins through Christ will never appeal to the self-righteous. This monster of self-righteousness, this stiff-necked beast, needs a big axe. And that is what the Law is, a big axe. Accordingly, the proper use and function of the Law is to threaten until the conscience is scared stiff. . . . The Law is a mirror to show a person what he is like, a sinner who is guilty of death, and worthy of everlasting punishment.” (*Commentary on Galatians (COG)*, 3:19). Have you accepted the teaching of God’s Word about your own sinfulness? Have you ever come to a point where you recognized that you were headed to hell for your sins—and that eternal damnation was exactly what

you deserved in strict justice because of your incurably sinful nature and your awful crimes against God? If not, you will certainly be damned because of your self-righteous pride. “Every one that is proud in heart is an abomination to the LORD: though hand join in hand, he shall not be unpunished” (Prov 16:5). Hear the words of the Son of God: “Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers, how can ye escape the damnation of hell?” (Mt 23:33)

Happily, as the Bible teaches and Martin Luther recognized, God has provided a way of salvation from sin and hell through His Son, Jesus Christ! The Lord Jesus existed from eternity past with the Father and the Holy Spirit, the three Persons of the one and only true God (1 Jn 5:7). The Son took to Himself a human nature, so that, although He was still 100% God, He became 100% Man as well. He lived a sinless life and then died on the cross, where His Father “made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him” (2 Cor 5:21). Christ then rose bodily from the grave and ascended to heaven, showing that He had paid in full the penalty for your sin. He will soon return to judge the world. On the cross, God laid your transgressions on His Son, who suffered to pay your sin debt. The Law demands perfect righteousness for entry into heaven, but Christ died as your Substitute so that His death and shed blood could pay for your sin, and you could have His righteousness put to your account and be counted perfectly righteous in God’s sight for the Savior’s sake. You can be saved, not through your own works, but through His work; not by your attempts to obey the Law, but by Christ’s perfect obedience to it and death to satisfy it. “Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us” (Gal 3:13). “Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but [made alive] by the Spirit” (1 Pet 3:18). Since by “one offering he hath perfected for ever” those that are washed in His blood (Heb 10:14; Rev 1:5), there is nothing that you can do to save yourself or to keep yourself saved. “Salvation is of the LORD” (Jon 2:9). Luther said: “Christ took all our sins and died for them on the Cross. . . . Christ was charged with the sins of all men, that He should pay for them with His own blood” (*COG* 3:13).

Both the Bible and Lutheran confessions recognize that faith in Jesus Christ is the only way to have His blood wash away your sins. “He that believeth on the Son hath

everlasting life: and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him” (Jn 3:36). Saving faith in Jesus Christ involves:

a.) Repentance. “Except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish” (Lu 13:3). “Repent ye therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out” (Ac 3:19). When you repent, you agree with God that you are as bad as the Bible says you are, you recognize that you are headed to hell and deserve it for your sins, and you turn from your sins to submit unconditionally to God as your Master and trust in His Son. The Lord Jesus said, “Whosoever will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me. For whosoever will save his life [wants to live his own way and will not turn to God’s way] shall lose it [in hell]; but whosoever shall lose his life for my sake and the gospel’s, the same shall save it. For what shall it profit a man, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul?” (Mark 8:34-36).

b.) Trust in the Lord Jesus alone to save. You do not trust in or believe on Jesus Christ for salvation if you think that any good deed you have done, are doing, or will do, or any religious ritual, such as baptism or communion, has a part to do with the forgiveness of your sins. Scripture says, “For by grace [undeserved favor] are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God: not of works, lest any man should boast.” (Eph 2:8-9). The Bible states, “to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth [declares righteous based on Christ’s work on the cross] the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness. . . . God [credits] righteousness without works . . . a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law” (Rom 4:5-6; 3:28). If salvation is “by grace, then is it no more of works: otherwise grace is no more grace. But if it be of works, then is it no more grace: otherwise work is no more work” (Rom 11:6). You must forsake all confidence in your supposed goodness and place your confidence in the Savior’s death, blood, and righteousness alone. Lutheran confessions agree with Scripture on this truth: “They also are rejected who do not teach that remission of sins comes through faith but command us to merit grace through satisfactions of our own. . . . [M]en cannot be justified [declared righteous] before God by their own strength, merits, or works, but are freely justified for Christ’s sake, through faith . . . their sins are forgiven for Christ’s

sake, who, by His death, has made satisfaction for our sins.” (*AC* 4, 12). As Luther stated: “To keep the Law in order to be justified means to reject grace, to deny Christ, to despise His sacrifice, and to be lost. . . . the true Gospel has it that we are justified by faith alone, without the deeds of the Law. . . . The true way of becoming a Christian is to be justified by faith in Jesus Christ, and not by the works of the Law” (*COG* 2:21; 2:4-5; 2:16).

Have you ever become a Christian? Attending a Lutheran church, trying to live a moral and religious life, being baptized and taking the Lord’s Supper, or being catechized and confirmed do not make you a Christian. Luther was a devout monk without having understood the gospel. He testified: “[B]efore I was enlightened by the Gospel, I was as zealous . . . as ever a man was. I tried hard to live up to every law as best I could. I punished myself with fasting, watching, praying, and other exercises . . . I was so much in earnest that I imposed upon my body more than it could stand. . . . Whatever I did, I did with a single heart to the glory of God” (*COG* 1:14). Yet with all of these moral and religious deeds, he had not understood the way of salvation!

Have you ever come to a specific point in your life where you recognized that you were on your way to hell—that you were lost, and needed to become a Christian? “The Son of man is come to seek and to save that which was LOST” (Lu 19:10), and to “call . . . SINNERS to repentance”—not those who think they have no need (Lu 5:31-32). When a lost sinner repents and comes to Christ for salvation, he must agree with God that he is indeed lost and not in any way acceptable to God (Lev 26:40-41; Neh 9:33-35). An unsaved adult or child who does not agree that he really is lost rejects what God’s Word says about who he is and cannot truly repent. Every person on earth who has never come to a specific point where he agreed with God about his wickedness and the fact that he is justly on his way to hell has never truly agreed with God, and has thus never truly repented. Every person who has never truly repented is lost and headed for eternal damnation, even if he has received infant baptism, takes the Lord’s Supper, and is a good Lutheran. There is no difference between those who grow up in Lutheran churches or devout Lutheran homes and those who do not. Nobody has always been a Christian (Eph 2:1-3). Lutheran confessions agree with the Bible that at a particular moment in time—the moment of repentance and faith—one is instantly born again (Jn 3:1-21), passes from death to life, from condemnation to justification, from spiritual death to spiritual life, and

from being a child of the devil to being a child of God (Jn 5:24). The new birth and justification are not a process. Have you ever been lost? Have you ever become a Christian?

Furthermore, simple intellectual assent to the facts of the gospel and the way of salvation are not saving faith. Even memorizing every single truth in a catechism is not the same thing as true repentant faith in Jesus Christ. The Lord Jesus warned: “Verily I say unto you, Except ye be converted . . . ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven” (Mt 18:3). While repentance involves agreeing with God intellectually (Jer 8:6), there is more to it. Repentance also involves your will—it is a wholehearted turning from sin to Christ, a radical change of direction. “Repent, and turn yourselves from all your transgressions” (Eze 18:30). Repentance is also emotional—it is a change of desire. A “godly sorrow worketh repentance to salvation” (2 Cor 7:10). Those who repent “lo[at]he themselves for the evils which they have committed in all their abominations” (Eze 6:9). Repentance is a change of mind, direction, and desire. It is more than just professing Christianity, being baptized, and living a moral life. When you repent, you agree with God about who you are and what you deserve. You turn from all known specific sins, as well as sin in general, to surrender unconditionally to Christ as Lord. You turn from the ungodly way of this world, from false religion, and from self-righteousness, to God. You determine to follow Jesus Christ, whatever the cost. Have you ever repented? The Lord Jesus warned: “Except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish” (Lu 13:3).

Saving faith in Christ is also more than simply knowing and assenting to Bible truths. It is to “trus[t] in Christ” (Eph 1:12), and to “receive Christ” (Jn 1:12). You must, at a particular point in time, decisively repent and “come to” the Savior to eternally save you (Jn 6:37, 44). The devil knows all kinds of Bible truths, but he is not saved (Jam 2:19). While you must know the facts about how to be saved, you do not have saving faith until you come to a point where you actually trust in the Lord Jesus Christ to justify you, change your heart, and give you eternal life. Until you trust Him, you are still lost. Saving faith says: “I know whom I have believed, and am persuaded that he is able to keep that which I have committed unto him against that day” (2 Tim 1:12). Saving faith is being “fully persuaded” of the fact that God promises to save anyone who trusts in Christ’s Person and His work on the cross, and then relying on and resting upon Christ to

give you deliverance from sin and eternal life (Rom 4:20-5:1). Furthermore, true faith will always result in a radically changed life, since “if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature: old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new” (2 Cor 5:17). Everyone who has truly been saved by faith alone is given a new heart that makes him love God, holiness, and purity of life (Heb 8:10-12; Eph 2:8-10). If you believe “any other gospel” than the one Paul “preached” you are “accursed” (Gal 1:8-9)—headed for eternal damnation in the lake of fire. Have you merely mentally assented to the way of salvation, or have you fully placed your trust in Christ alone? If you think that baptism or communion or any other religious ritual will save or help save you, you are rejecting God’s grace (Gal 5:4-5; 2:21) by trusting partially in these rituals, instead of trusting in Jesus Christ alone, and so are lost. Salvation is by repentant faith alone (Rom 5:1). True faith also always results in a supernatural and radical change of life. Have you ever trusted in Christ? “He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life: and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him” (Jn 3:36).

Summing up what God’s Word teaches, dear Lutheran friend, even if you have Bible-believing parents and believe the Bible yourself, attend church faithfully, confess your sins, mentally assent to the doctrine of justification by faith alone and every other doctrine taught in the Bible, and try to live a moral and upright life, IF YOU HAVE NEVER COME TO A SPECIFIC POINT IN YOUR LIFE WHERE YOU HAVE AGREED WITH GOD THAT YOU WERE A LOST, ABOMINABLE, AND WRETCHED SINNER, UNDER THE WRATH OF GOD AND ON YOUR WAY TO HELL, AND AS A LOST SINNER YOU CONSCIOUSLY, FOR THE FIRST TIME, FORSOOK ALL TRUST IN BAPTISM AND OTHER SACRAMENTS AND CAME TO CHRIST IN TRUE REPENTANCE AND FAITH, AND AS A RESULT JESUS CHRIST SUPERNATURALLY AND DRAMATICALLY CHANGED YOU, YOU ARE NOT SAVED. There is not the slightest doubt that you will be eternally damned. Turn to Christ immediately! Tomorrow may be too late. “Boast not thyself of to morrow; for thou knowest not what a day may bring forth” (Prov 27:1) “Repent ye therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out” (Ac 3:19) “Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved” (Ac 16:31).

Tragically, despite the many commendable and Biblical doctrines that were taught by Martin Luther and which are found in Lutheran confessions, a very high percentage of Lutherans have never truly come to Christ and are not saved. In fact, God is highly displeased with various aspects of Lutheranism today. How can this be? There are several major reasons.

First of all, when Luther left Roman Catholicism, he recognized that “the papists . . . teach self-devised traditions and works that are not commanded of God, [but] indeed are contrary to the Word of God” (*COG* 1:7). Luther even said: “The Pope is the Antichrist, because he is against Christ, because he takes liberties with the things of God, because he lords it over the temple of God” (*COG* 3:10; cf. 1 Jn 4:3; 2 Thess 2:3-10). Luther rightly recognized that Roman Catholicism had added many unscriptural traditions to the truth of the Word of God;²⁰⁰ indeed, he agreed with the Biblical fact that the religious system centered in Rome is described in the Bible as “the mother of harlots and abominations of the earth” (Rev 17:5). Luther commendably sought to reform many of Rome’s errors and abuses. However, he did not eliminate one of Rome’s key false doctrines—infant baptism. Lutheranism undermines and actually contradicts Luther’s Biblical insight into the truth that justification is by faith alone by following Roman Catholicism in connecting infant baptism and the forgiveness of sin. Thus, Lutheranism affirms: “Baptism . . . is necessary to salvation . . . children are to be baptized who, being offered to God through Baptism, are received into God’s grace,” and Lutheranism “condemn[s] the Anabaptists [that is, Baptists] who reject the baptism of children, and say that children are saved without Baptism” (*AC* 9).

Contrary to the Roman Catholic and Lutheran idea of salvation by infant baptism, the Bible teaches that baptism is “the answer of a good conscience toward God” (1 Pet 3:21), and thus it is “he that believeth [that] is baptized” (Mr 16:16; Ac 2:38, 41). The Biblical order is that one is to first “hear” the gospel preached, then “believe” (Rom 10:14-15; Ac 18:8), and only after having “gladly received [the] [W]ord [can one be] baptized” Ac 2:41; 8:13). The question, “[W]hat doth hinder me to be baptized?” is answered in the Bible, “If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest,” and baptism is

²⁰⁰ For more information, see “Bible Truths for Catholic Friends,” available online for free at <http://sites.google.com/site/faithalonesaves/salvation>; contact the church listed at the end of this work for a free printed copy of this composition.

given only to those who can say, “I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God” (Ac 8:35-38). Scripture records that those who were baptized had first brought forth “fruits meet for [befitting] repentance” (Mt 3:6-8). No infants are baptized anywhere in Scripture. Luther admitted: “It cannot be proved by the Sacred Scriptures that infant baptism was instituted by Christ, or begun by the first Christians after the Apostles.”²⁰¹ Since “to him that worketh not, but believeth on him [Christ] that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness” (Rom 4:5), people are “justified by faith” (Rom 5:1) before they are baptized. They believe and are saved first; then they receive baptism. Christ told people: “Thy faith hath saved thee” (Luke 7:50; 18:42) totally apart from baptism. The Apostles baptized people because they had already received the Holy Spirit and been saved by faith alone (Acts 10:34-48). Baptism never has and never will save anyone. It cannot wash away a single sin.²⁰² People must already have eternal life and be justified by faith alone before they can be baptized.

Some Lutherans have tried to reconcile the truth of justification by faith alone with infant baptism by saying that infants believe and are justified by faith alone at the moment they are baptized. However, Scripture teaches what is also obvious from common sense—infants are too little to understand and believe the gospel. God’s Word says infants “cannot discern between their right hand and their left hand” (Jon 4:11)—how then can they understand and believe the gospel, the good news about salvation through Christ’s death, burial, and resurrection (1 Cor 15:1-4)? Infancy is “before [a] child shall know to refuse the evil, and choose the good” (Isa 7:16), for infants are “little ones, which . . . ha[ve] no knowledge between good and evil” (Dt 1:39) and “neither hav[e] done any good or evil” (Rom 9:11). How can an infant repent and turn from evil to Jesus Christ if he has not done any good or evil and does not even know what they are? Can infants confess their sins and bring forth fruits of repentance (Mt 3:6)? Nobody, if he just read the Bible, would adopt the absurd notion that infants believe in Christ when they

²⁰¹ See Vol. 1, chapter 10, *History of Baptists*, Thomas Armitage.

²⁰² For a detailed study and refutation of the false doctrine that baptism remits sin, see *Heaven Only for the Baptized? The Gospel of Christ vs. Pardon through Baptism*, by Thomas Ross, available online for free at <http://sites.google.com/site/faithalonesaves/salvation>, or available in print from the church listed at the back page of this composition.

have baptismal water applied to them. The idea is simply a way to try to reconcile the truth of justification by faith alone and the false human tradition of infant baptism.

Furthermore, when believers are baptized, immersion, not sprinkling or pouring, must be practiced. One who is baptized is “planted together in the likeness of [Christ’s] death” and “shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection” (Rom 6:5). Baptism is a symbol of the death, burial, and resurrection of the Savior, as well as the death of the believer’s old sinful life and his resurrection to new life in union with the Lord Jesus. Only immersion pictures death, burial, and resurrection. Does anyone bury a person in a graveyard by pouring or sprinkling a little dirt on his head? Then how can one be “buried with [Christ] in baptism” (Col 2:12) by pouring or sprinkling a little water on him? Why did people in the Bible enter a river and go “down . . . into the water . . . and . . . come up out of the water . . . [when] baptized” (Ac 8:38-39; Mt 3:16) if baptism involves only little water being poured or sprinkled on the head? In fact, the Greek verb *baptize* means “to dip” or “to immerse,” not “to pour” or “to sprinkle.”²⁰³ Martin Luther said that “baptism is . . . when we dip anything wholly in water, that it is completely covered over. . . . it should be thus, and would be right . . . [for] any one who is to be baptized, [to] be completely sunk down into the water, and dipped again and drawn out.”²⁰⁴ Luther knew that immersion is New Testament baptism. Lutheranism changes immersion in water, which God Himself commanded to picture His Son’s death, burial, and resurrection, and sprinkles or pours water on the heads of infants instead. Such practices are no baptism at all. By corrupting the ordinance of baptism and teaching that infants are saved from their sin at the time of baptism, Lutheranism keeps many people from true salvation, which comes by repentant faith in Jesus Christ alone.

Second, Lutheranism properly recognized that “the Mass in the Papacy must be the greatest and most horrible abomination, as it directly and powerfully conflicts with [the] chief article . . . [that] all have sinned and are justified without merit . . . [and] faith alone justifies us . . . [therefore] above and before all other popish idolatries [the Mass] has been the chief” (*Smalcald Articles*, 2:1-2). The Roman Catholic doctrine that in

²⁰³ Thus, the standard classical Greek dictionary defines the Greek verb *baptidzo* as to “dip, plunge” (*Greek-English Lexicon*, Liddell-Scott). No definition such as to “pour” or “sprinkle” is listed.

²⁰⁴ *Opera Lutheri*, I. 319; cf. pg. 108, Christian, J. T., *A History of the Baptists*, vol. 1. This book is available online at <http://sites.google.com/site/thross7>.

communion or the Mass the bread and fruit of the vine change into the body and blood of Jesus Christ, and His literal body and blood are eaten to forgive sin, is indeed a horrible abomination that contradicts the truth of justification by faith alone and many plain texts of the Bible. Unfortunately, Lutheranism did not entirely reject this Roman Catholic heresy to adopt the true view that the broken bread and fruit of the vine are simply symbols of Christ's death on the cross. Rather, Lutheranism affirms that in communion "the true body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ under bread and wine [is given] for us Christians to eat and to drink" (*Small Catechism* 6:1) so that at the time of this sacrament "the forgiveness of sins, life and salvation are given" (*Small Catechism* 6:3). To explain the Lutheran position that Christ's human body is literally in, with, and under the bread and wine of the Lord's Supper, Lutheranism affirms that Christ "truly fills all things . . . being everywhere present, not only as God, but also as man . . . [so that] He can be and truly is present with His body and blood in the Holy Supper" (*Formula of Concord* 8:27).

Both the Lutheran doctrine that Jesus Christ's literal human body is in, with, and under the elements in the Lord's Supper and the idea that the Lord's Supper remits sin are entirely absent from the Bible. They are a reaction against the Roman Catholic Mass, but they do not go far enough to reach the Scriptural position. The Bible states: "[T]he Lord Jesus the same night in which he was betrayed took bread: And when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, Take, eat: this is my body, which is broken for you: this do in remembrance of me. After the same manner also he took the cup, when he had supped, saying, This cup is the new testament in my blood: this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me. For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord's death till he come" (1 Cor 11:23-26). Since, referring to the bread, Christ said "This is my body," Romanism wrongly affirmed that the bread changed into Christ's body, arguing that such a change is required by the word "is." Rome ignored the fact that Christ also said "This cup is the new testament," so that if the bread changed into Christ's literal body because of the word "is," then the cup would have to change into a testament or covenant (whatever that could possibly mean!). It is obvious that "This is my body . . . this cup is the new testament in my blood" means "This bread represents my body . . . this cup represents the new testament in my blood." The broken bread and the fruit of the vine represent the broken body of Christ on the cross and the blood He shed there. They

are beautiful symbols, but that is all they are. Luther correctly recognized that, since Scripture specifically calls what people eat and drink in the Supper “bread” (1 Cor 11:26) and “fruit of the vine” (Mr 14:25), the Roman Catholic position is impossible. Unfortunately, the view Lutheranism invented when it reacted against Rome—that Christ’s literal human body and blood are in, with, and under the elements—has no support at all. It gets no support from the false Romanist view that the verb “is” in the words of Christ about the Supper is “literal.” It gets no support from what is obviously correct in the context of the passage, the fact that the elements in the Supper represent Christ’s body and blood. Nothing in the Bible gives any support whatever for the Lutheran doctrine. Furthermore, since the Apostles already had been saved from their sins when Christ instituted the Lord’s Supper with them (Mr 14:22-25; Mt 19:27-29), communion did not save the Apostles from sin, and no text in the Bible says that communion ever has or ever will save anyone else. On the contrary, salvation is not by eating bread and drinking liquids, but by faith alone (Rom 3:28).

Furthermore, the Lutheran doctrine that Christ’s human body is present everywhere, invented to get His human body in, with, and under the elements in the Lord’s Supper, is an attack upon the true humanity of Jesus Christ. The Lord Jesus is one Person with two complete and distinct natures, one Divine (Jn 20:28) and one human (1 Cor 15:21-22). Were Christ not the Son of Man (Mt 8:20), He could not have been a Substitute for mankind on the cross; were He not the Son of God (Mt 14:33), He could not have satisfied the debt we owe because of our sin. The characteristic of being present everywhere in the universe at the same time is unique to God—no one else can say: “Do not I fill heaven and earth?” (Jer 23:24). As God, the Lord Jesus is and always has been everywhere present (Mt 28:20; Jn 3:13; Eph 3:17); as Man, He has a real human body, so that from His childhood to adulthood He “grew” (Lu 2:40) and “increased . . . in stature” (Lu 2:52). His body was buried in one place and raised from that place, so that it could be said, “He is not here [in the tomb], for he is risen” (Mt 28:6). His human body ascended to heaven (Ac 1:11) and is no longer on earth, for He said “I leave the world” (Jn 16:28). In His humanity, Christ has “gone away” to heaven, and will “come again” from thence (Jn 14:28; 16:7). He is still the believer’s truly human representative, mediator, intercessor, and High Priest (1 Tim 2:5; Heb 7:24-28)—in fact, “if he were on earth, he

should not be a priest” (Heb 8:4), so claiming Christ’s humanity is present everywhere attacks His High Priestly ministry. Christ’s body had, and still has now, a real “head” with real “hair,” real “eyes,” real “feet,” and so on (Rev 1:14-15), in one real location. His human body has never been and never will be present everywhere, for then He would cease to have a real human nature, and salvation would be impossible. In fact, denying Christ’s true humanity is the “spirit of Antichrist” (1 Jn 4:3; 2 Jn 7) and the idolatrous service of a different god than the true Triune God (1 Jn 5:7; Jn 1:1-3, 14) of the Bible. Lutheranism’s doctrine that Christ’s human body is everywhere present is serious heresy and idolatry. Lutheran false doctrine on the Lord’s Supper keeps many from coming to true salvation by faith alone in Christ.

Third, Lutheranism’s doctrine that someone who has believed in Christ and has eternal life can lose salvation and go to hell confuses the truth of justification by faith alone with salvation by works. Lutheran confessions “condemn the Anabaptists, who deny that those once justified can lose the Holy Ghost” (*AC* 12). However, the Bible states: “For whom [God] did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the firstborn among many brethren. Moreover whom he did predestinate, them he also called: and whom he called, them he also justified: and whom he justified, them he also glorified. . . . Who shall lay any thing to the charge of God’s elect? It is God that justifieth. Who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died, yea rather, that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us . . . For I am persuaded, that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord” (Rom 8:28-39). God says that all who are “justified” are going to be “glorified” in heaven—not one is lost. God has “predestinated” and “elected” to eternal life all who come to Christ in faith (Jn 6:37; Ac 13:48), and His all-powerful purpose will not be frustrated. Nothing in heaven or earth, alive or dead, present or to come, nor any created being, including, of course, the individual Christian himself, can separate the elect from God. Christ “maketh intercession” for all of His believing people—He prays for them, “Father, I will that they also, whom thou hast given me, be with me where I am; that they may behold my glory, which thou hast given me: for thou

lovedst me before the foundation of the world” (Jn 17:24; cf. Lu 22:32; 1 Jn 2:1). If even one person who has ever been born again by faith alone were not to enter heaven, Christ’s intercession and prayers would have been rejected by the Father. Also, since God answers all prayers in His will (1 Jn 5:14-15), the Father’s rejecting Christ’s prayers would mean that His Son prayed out of the will of God and was therefore a sinner. Such blasphemies are the necessary consequences of Lutheranism’s doctrine that true believers can lose salvation and go to hell.

Furthermore, Jesus Christ, comparing the salvation by faith that He gives to the quenching of thirst, promised: “Whosoever drinketh of this [physical] water shall thirst again: but whosoever drinketh of the water that I shall give him shall never thirst; but the water that I shall give him shall be in him a well of water springing up into everlasting life” (Jn 4:13-14). A person must drink physical water over and over again, or he will get thirsty and eventually die of thirst, but Christ guarantees that everyone who drinks, as a one-time, one-point action, the “living water” (Jn 4:10) of “everlasting life” that He gives to those who “believe on Him” (Jn 7:37-39) “shall never thirst” again (Jn 4:14). If salvation could be lost, Christ’s spiritual blessings would be no better than physical water—one who did not continue believing enough and working enough to stay saved would go to hell, nullifying Christ’s promise that all who ever drink of Him will absolutely never thirst again. Thus, the truth is: “[T]o him that worketh not, but believeth on him [Christ] that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness. . . . God [credits] righteousness without works” (Rom 4:5-6). The idea that a Christian who does not do enough good works loses salvation attacks the truth that “by grace [unmerited favor] are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God: not of works, lest any man should boast” (Eph 2:8-9). Salvation is an unearned gift that God gives unworthy sinners. God keeps His people saved and does not change His mind about giving them the gift of eternal life, although they continue to be unworthy. Lutheranism’s teaching that Christ sends some of His own blood-washed people to hell is a dangerous heresy and an attack on the truth that “not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us” (Tit 3:5). It also lends itself to the dangerous error that true faith is simply intellectual assent rather than a complete trust in and committal to Christ, because people who claim to have faith but are living for the

devil in perpetual sin are said to have lost salvation and simply need to confess their sins to get salvation back. The truth is that people who claim to believe in Christ but have not had God powerfully transform their lives have never truly believed at all (Jam 2:14-26)—the Lord Jesus prays for all of His own both that they will be forever with Him in heaven (Jn 17:24) and that they will be “sanctified through . . . [the] Word” (Jn 17:17). The answer to both prayers is certain. People who have not been transformed by Christ do not need to just confess a few sins. They need to admit that they are hypocrites who have never been saved, and then they must turn to Christ in true repentance and faith so that they can be given a new heart and be supernaturally changed (Eze 36:26). Lutheranism’s error on the truth that salvation is not maintained based on works and obedience keeps many from receiving true salvation.

Lutheranism also engages in false worship, dishonoring “the Father” who “seeketh . . . for . . . true worshippers . . . [who] worship . . . in spirit and in truth” (Jn 4:23). In Biblical worship, whatever God commands must be done, and whatever elements of worship He does not command are forbidden simply because He has not commanded them. “What thing soever I command you, observe to do it: thou shalt not add thereto, nor diminish from it” (Dt 12:32; cf. Mt 28:20; Mr 7:13). When exactly what God commands in worship is done, with nothing added or taken away, He is honored and blesses His people (Lev 9:1-24). However, the Lord has burned people up with fire from heaven for offering Him that “which he commanded them not” (Lev 10:1-3). True churches consequently worship God by preaching (2 Tim 4:2) and teaching (Eph 4:11) His Word, singing (Eph 5:19), encouraging one another spiritually (Heb 10:25), following the godly leadership of their pastors (1 Tim 3:1-7; 1 Pet 5:1-4), offering their lives as living sacrifices to God (Rom 12:1-2), immersing in baptism those who have believed in Christ (Ac 8:36-38), celebrating the Lord’s Supper in remembrance of Christ (1 Cor 11:24-25), maintaining a church membership made up only of people who profess to have been justified by faith and are living holy lives (1 Cor 1:2), and sorrowfully removing from church membership those who fall into sin and do not repent (Mt 18:15-20).²⁰⁵ True churches do not add to the worship commanded in the Word of God, nor do

²⁰⁵ This list is not comprehensive. For more information on the beliefs and practices of true churches, please read “Bible Study #7: The Church of Jesus Christ” at

they take away from it. In contrast, Lutheran assemblies have hierarchies of boards, districts, synods, and all sorts of officials not found in Scripture; the Bible presents all congregations as independent with no hierarchy above the individual assembly (Rev 2-3; Mt 18:20) and only pastors (also called overseers or elders) and deacons as officers (1 Tim 3; Ac 20:17, 28). Lutheran assemblies allow infants who have not repented and believed in Christ to be members, based upon a false “baptism” by sprinkling or pouring that allegedly removes sin. Lutheranism corrupts the Lord’s Supper by claiming that it removes sin and by saying that the human flesh of Christ is literally eaten and His human blood is drunk. Lutheranism corrupts worship with liturgy—there are no liturgies or set forms of prayer repeated in church services (cf. Mt 6:7) in the Bible. Lutheranism does not purely preach the Word of God because it confuses the gospel through its sacramental heresies and by teaching that those who have been saved by faith can become lost and be cast into hell. The false worship in Lutheranism exceedingly displeases God and brings His curse upon Lutheran congregations.

Finally, Lutheran congregations do not match up with the fact that Christ promised, “[T]he gates of hell shall not prevail against . . . my church” (Mt 16:18). God will receive “glory in the church . . . throughout all ages” (Eph 3:21). The Lord Jesus said there would be a succession of churches believing and practicing the truth, including the truth about baptism and the Lord’s Supper, beginning in the first century when Christ started His church and then “always, even unto the end of the world” when He returns (Mt 28:18-20; 1 Cor 11:26). There were no Lutheran congregations until Martin Luther came along some 1,500 years after Jesus Christ started His church. Lutheran congregations cannot be the true churches of Christ since they did not exist for the first 75% of church history. The Roman Catholic assemblies that Luther separated from cannot be Christ’s true churches because they deny His gospel and are filled with all kinds of heresy; furthermore, no churches believed many of the doctrines of modern Roman Catholicism for centuries after the Lord Jesus started His church.²⁰⁶ In contrast, Baptist churches have existed from the first century until today. The famous Lutheran historian Mosheim wrote: “The origin of the sect . . . called Anabaptists . . . is hid in the remote depths of

<http://sites.google.com/site/faithalonesaves/salvation>, available online for free, or obtain a free copy from the church listed on the back page of this composition.

²⁰⁶ See “Bible Truths for Catholic Friends,” <http://sites.google.com/site/faithalonesaves/salvation>.

antiquity[.] . . . Prior to the age of Luther, there lay concealed in almost every country of Europe, very many persons, in whose minds were deeply rooted th[eir] principle[s] . . . centuries before Luther's time.”²⁰⁷ J. J. Durmont & Dr. Ypeig, historians specifically appointed by the State of Holland to ascertain if the historical claims of the Baptists were valid, affirmed that the Baptists “descended from the tolerably pure evangelical Waldenses [a name for Baptists in the Middle Ages]. . . . They were, therefore, in existence long before the Reformed Church. . . . We have seen that the Baptists, who were formerly called Anabaptists . . . were the original Waldenses; and who have long in the history of the Church, received the honor of that origin. On this account the Baptists may be considered the only Christian community which has stood since the Apostles; and as a Christian society which has preserved pure the doctrine of the gospel through all ages.”²⁰⁸ Churches that believe in salvation by faith and practice believer's immersion and other Scriptural truths never needed to separate from or attempt to reform Roman Catholicism because they never were part of that false religion. They are older than Romanism and than all the Protestant denominations. Their Biblical doctrine and practice proves what is confirmed by the testimony of history—they are the churches founded by the Lord Jesus Christ. All other religious groups are guilty of schism and division from the Lord's true churches. All other groups—including Lutheranism—have no Divine authority to carry on the work of God or even exist.

Dear Lutheran friend, the Bible commands: “Examine yourselves, whether ye be in the faith; prove your own selves” (2 Cor 13:5). Have you ever come to a particular point where you saw yourself as lost, forsook all confidence in sacraments and all other religious rituals, and consciously repented and believed on the Lord Jesus Christ? If you have, you will be able to describe when and how you were born again and how God clearly and powerfully changed your life.²⁰⁹ If not, you are currently on your way to hell, and, no matter what else you believe and do that is good and right, you will certainly be damned unless you repent. You should, right now, submit to the Biblical truth that you

²⁰⁷ *Institutes of Ecclesiastical History*, III. 200, cited in *History of Baptists*, J. T. Christian, vol. 1 chap. 7, <http://sites.google.com/site/thross7>.

²⁰⁸ Ypeij en Dermout, *Geschiedenis der Nederlandsche Hervormde Kerk*. Breda, 1819, cited in *History of Baptists*, J. T. Christian, vol. 1, chap. 7.

²⁰⁹ Compare the testimonies at the “Lives Changed by God” link at <http://sites.google.com/site/faithalonesaves/salvation>.

have never yet been saved, and immediately come to Christ for salvation. If you reject His Word and insist that you are saved, or that your baptism or previous life is in any way pleasing to God and able to help you be saved, you will certainly suffer in unquenchable fire for all eternity. If you forsake all confidence in your previous religious actions and good works and come to the Savior as a worthless, empty-handed sinner, with nothing but your black heart and your innumerable sins, He will receive you and save you freely by His grace. The Lord Jesus is calling you to come to Him right now (Mat 11:28). He promises, “He that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out” (John 6:37). He commands you to repent and believe in Him today: “[B]ehold, now is the accepted time; behold, now is the day of salvation” (2 Cor 6:2).

Once you are saved, you must submit to believer’s immersion and join and faithfully serve Christ in one of His true churches (Heb 10:25). The Son of God said, “Whosoever will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me” (Mr 8:34). Although people are not in any way justified before God by their works, there are no examples in the Bible of true Christians who refused to follow the Lord Jesus and who stubbornly refused and rejected believer’s baptism (cf. Ac 2:41-42; Mr 16:16). Separation from all religions that practice heresy, including salvation by infant sprinkling or pouring and salvation by taking the Lord’s Supper, is the plain command of the King of heaven: “Wherefore come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing; and I will receive you, and will be a Father unto you, and ye shall be my sons and daughters, saith the Lord Almighty” (2 Cor 6:17-18). “[M]ark them which cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned; and avoid them” (Rom 16:17). “[H]ave no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather reprove them” (Eph 5:11). The Lord Jesus said, “If ye love me, keep my commandments” (Jn 14:15). You should immediately separate from Lutheranism, and attend, be baptized, and serve joyfully in a Bible-believing and practicing Baptist church—not in order to be justified before God, but out of love for “the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me” (Gal 2:20).

For more information on the nature of true repentance and faith, and a careful analysis of the Biblical teaching on baptism, please visit <http://sites.google.com/site/faithalonesaves/salvation> and read Bible studies #5-7 (“How

Do I Receive the Gospel?” “The Christian: Security in Christ and Assurance of Salvation,” and “The Church of Jesus Christ.”), as well as the work *Heaven Only for the Baptized? The Gospel of Christ vs. Baptismal Regeneration* at the same web address. A true church in your area that you can attend, and that would also be happy to help you spiritually and study the Bible with you personally, is:

The Reformed Doctrine of Salvation

Reformed churches teach many important and essential Biblical doctrines, such as the Trinity, the inspiration of Scripture, and the authority of the Word of God for faith and practice. Furthermore, as the Bible teaches “that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law” (Rom 3:28), so Reformed confessions teach “that God imputes righteousness . . . without works. . . . And therefore we always hold fast this foundation, ascribing all the glory to God, humbling ourselves before him, and acknowledging ourselves to be such as we really are, without presuming to trust in any thing in ourselves, or in any merit of ours, relying and resting upon the obedience of Christ crucified alone, which becomes ours, when we believe in him” (Article 23, *Of Justification, Belgic Confession*). “Those whom God effectually calls, He also freely justifies; not by infusing righteousness into them, but by pardoning their sins, and by accounting and accepting their persons as righteous; not for any thing wrought in them, or done by them, but for Christ’s sake alone; nor by imputing faith itself, the act of believing, or any other evangelical obedience to them, as their righteousness; but by imputing the obedience and satisfaction of Christ unto them, they receiving and resting on Him and His righteousness by faith; which faith they have not of themselves, it is the gift of God. Faith, thus receiving and resting on Christ and His righteousness, is the alone instrument of justification: yet is it not alone in the person justified, but is ever accompanied with all other saving graces, and is no dead faith, but works by love” (*Westminster Confession*, Chapter 11:1-2). These Reformed statements line up entirely with the Word of God.

Likewise, just as the Bible teaches that “whom [God] justified, them he also glorified” (Rom 8:30) so Reformed confessions teach that “they, whom God has accepted in His Beloved, effectually called, and sanctified by His Spirit, can neither totally nor finally fall away from the state of grace, but shall certainly persevere therein to the end,

and be eternally saved” (Chapter 17:1, *Westminster Confession*). Both the Bible and Reformed confessions agree that true believers are eternally secure and not one of them can ever be lost.

Since these Reformed doctrines are Biblical, members of Reformed churches do very well to believe them heartily. Reformed church members, with their commendable acceptance of the authority of Scripture for faith and practice, also need to recognize all other Biblical truth that relates to the gospel of Jesus Christ. This includes the essential fact that *nobody has always been a Christian*, including those born in Bible-believing homes. “And you hath he quickened [made alive], who were dead in trespasses and sins; wherein in time past ye walked according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience: among whom also *we all* had our conversation [conduct] in times past in the lusts of our flesh, fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind; and were by nature the children of wrath, even as others” (Eph 2:1-3). Ephesians was written to the Christian congregation at Ephesus (Eph 1:1), which, of course, included parents who had infants and children (Eph 6:1). The children of Christians, like everyone else, are dead in their sins, under the power of the devil, and fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind, until they are made alive at the moment they are born again by grace through faith in Christ, as Ephesians two goes on to explain: “For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: *it is* the gift of God: not of works, lest any man should boast” (Eph 2:8-9). Since infants have “no knowledge between good and evil” (Deut 1:39; Isa 7:16; Jon 4:11; Rom 9:11), they do not conduct themselves “in the lusts of [their] flesh, fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind.” Since all those made alive in Christ at one time conducted themselves in the lusts of the flesh and of the mind, people—including those with Christian parents—are only born again after they have reached an age where they are able to so conduct themselves, and consciously repent and believe the gospel. Every member of a Reformed church should recognize this truth, and believe that there is nobody who has always been a Christian. The only people who are made alive in Christ are those who have been consciously lost, walking in sin, and have subsequently repented and believed.

Reformed confessions also agree with the Bible (Jer 17:9; Rom 5:12-19) that “through the disobedience of Adam, original sin is extended to all mankind; which is a corruption of the whole nature, and an hereditary disease, wherewith infants themselves are infected even in their mother’s womb, and which produceth in man all sorts of sin, being in him as a root thereof; and therefore is so vile and abominable in the sight of God, that it is sufficient to condemn all mankind” (Article 15, *Belgic Confession*). Indeed, until someone is “born of the Spirit” and made alive by Christ, he is dead in sin, simply “born of the flesh” (John 3:6)—but “they that are in the flesh cannot please God” (Rom 8:8). Someone who has not been born again has never truly pleased God in any action he has ever done in his entire life. The Lord Jesus said, “[E]xcept ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish” (Lu 13:3). The Reformed agree, stating, “Repentance is of such necessity to all sinners, that none may expect pardon without it” (Chapter 15, *Westminster Confession*). “Repentance unto life is a saving grace, whereby a sinner, out of a true sense of his sin, and apprehension of the mercy of God in Christ, doth, with grief and hatred of his sin, turn from it unto God, with full purpose of, and endeavour after, new obedience” (*Westminster Shorter Catechism*, 87). When a lost sinner repents and comes to Christ for salvation, he must agree with God that he is indeed lost and not in any way acceptable to God (Lev 26:40-41; Neh 9:33-35). A lost adult or child, who does not agree that he really is lost, does not have a “true sense of sin” and cannot truly repent. “Jesus . . . said . . . They that are whole [healthy] need not a physician; but they that are sick. I came not to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance” (Lu 5:31-32). Every person on earth who has never come to a specific point where he agrees with God that he is “vile and abominable in the sight of God” and on his way to hell has never truly agreed with God, and has thus never truly repented. Every person who has never truly repented is still lost and headed to eternal damnation. “[T]he Son of man is come to seek and to save that which was LOST” (Lu 19:10). There is no difference in this way between those who grew up in Reformed churches or homes and those who did not. Reformed confessions agree with the Bible that at a particular moment in time, the moment of repentance and faith, one is instantly born again (Jn 3:1-21), passes from death to life, from condemnation to justification, from spiritual death to spiritual life, and from being a child of the devil to being a child of God (Jn 5:24). Dear Reformed friend, even if you

have Bible-believing parents and believe the Bible yourself, attend church faithfully, confess your sins, accept the doctrine of justification by faith alone and every other doctrine taught in the Bible, and try to live a moral and upright life, **IF YOU HAVE NEVER COME TO A SPECIFIC POINT IN YOUR LIFE WHERE YOU HAVE AGREED WITH GOD THAT YOU WERE A LOST, ABOMINABLE, AND WRETCHED SINNER, A CHILD OF THE DEVIL, ONE WHO WAS UNDER THE WRATH OF GOD AND ON YOUR WAY TO HELL, AND AS A LOST SINNER YOU CONSCIOUSLY, FOR THE FIRST TIME, CAME TO CHRIST IN REPENTANCE AND FAITH, YOU HAVE NEVER TRULY REPENTED, AND YOU ARE NOT SAVED.** Unfortunately, despite the many important truths defended by Reformed churches, a very high percentage of their members are not truly born again, because many Reformed leaders and teachers either deny or do not preach the absolute necessity of consciously coming in repentance and faith to Christ, as a lost sinner, at a particular moment in time. Can you remember a point in time when you came to the Lord Jesus, recognizing your lost condition, in repentance and faith? The question is not if you have completed a catechism class or stood in front of the church at some point and made a public confession of faith. Dear Reformed friend, have you ever been lost? If not, you have never been saved—and you have never truly pleased God in your life, but you “are as an unclean thing, and all [your] righteousnesses are as filthy rags” (Is 64:6). All you are and have every done, no matter how religious you are, is a mass of filthy, rotten sin, simply making the Holy One ever more angry with you. You “shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of his indignation; and [you] shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels, and in the presence of the Lamb: and the smoke of [your] torment ascendeth up for ever and ever: and [you will] have no rest day nor night” (Rev 14:10-11). You are lost, and you will certainly go to hell unless you are converted, by God’s grace. **REPENT!**

How can Reformed denominations defend important truths like justification by faith alone and the authority of the Word of God, yet, tragically, have so many religious but unconverted people on their membership roles? When the Reformers separated from the church of Rome at the time of the Reformation, they rightly rejected many of Rome’s

errors, blasphemies, and heresies, and they correctly affirmed, “There is no other head of the Church but the Lord Jesus Christ. Nor can the Pope of Rome, in any sense, be head thereof, but is that Antichrist, that man of sin, and son of perdition, that exalts himself . . . against Christ and all that is called God” (*Westminster Confession*, Article 25). In this they agreed with the Bible, which, in contrast to the true church, the pure bride of Christ (2 Cor 11:2; Eph 5), identifies the religious system centered at Rome as a “great whore . . . full of abominations and filthiness of her fornication,” indeed, states that the Roman religion is “the mother of harlots and abominations of the earth” (Rev 17:1-6). Unfortunately, the Reformers did not abolish one of the central errors and corruptions of the false religion they protested against—infant baptism. By not eliminating this heresy of Antichrist, the Reformed have allowed the doctrine of salvation to be confused.

The Bible teaches that baptism is “the answer of a good conscience toward God” (1 Pet 3:21), and thus it is “he that believeth [that] is baptized” (Mar 16:16; Ac 2:38, 41). The Biblical order is that one is to first “hear” the gospel preached, then “believe” (Rom 10:14-15; Ac 18:8), and only after having “gladly received [the] [W]ord [be] baptized” (Ac 2:41; 8:13). The question, “[W]hat doth hinder me to be baptized?” is answered in the Bible, “If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest,” and baptism is given only to those who can say, “I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God” (Ac 8:35-38). In the Bible, those who were baptized had first brought forth “fruits meet for [befitting] repentance” (Matt 3:6-8). Since infants do not “know to refuse the evil, and choose the good” (Isa 7:16) and “cannot discern between their right hand and their left hand” (Jon 4:11), much less understand and believe the gospel, confess their sins (Matt 3:6), and show fruits of repentance, they cannot be Biblically baptized.

Sometimes people who do not wish to repent of the heresy of infant baptism, but do not want to admit that it is merely a human tradition added to the Word of God, attempt to argue in favor of it because there are several records of entire households receiving baptism in the Bible (Ac 16:15, 33; 1 Cor 1:16). Defenders of infant baptism assume that these households had infants, and the infants were baptized. However, in each example, it is never stated that the households had infants, and it is actually obvious that believer’s baptism was practiced. In Acts 16:31-34, all in the household had the “word of the Lord” preached to them, and having received Christ by faith, the whole

household “rejoiced, believing in God” (v. 34). In Acts 16:15, the head of the house was a rather wealthy unmarried woman doing business far from her home, and her household consisted of servants who responded, as she did, to the gospel. Do babies make good household servants? In 1 Cor 1:16, the household of a man named Stephanas was baptized (1 Cor 1:16), and the members of the household “addicted themselves to the ministry of the saints” (1 Cor 16:15). Do infants go around performing all kinds of Christian ministry? Just about the only other passage in the New Testament that those who practice infant baptism try to employ in its favor is 1 Cor 7:14, a verse that does not use the word *baptize* or have anything to do with baptism at all. The verse simply teaches that when one believing person is in a household, an unbelieving spouse, and infants or unbelieving older children, are “sanctified” by the believer’s presence. This simply means that unbelievers participate in some of God’s blessing on account of the presence of the Lord’s favor on a believer in a household (cf. Gen 39:5). This sanctification takes place the very moment the first household member is saved; it does not wait until later when infants are supposedly baptized. 1 Cor 7:14 no more proves that infants are baptized than it does that the unbelieving spouse in the verse is baptized without his or her consent. Finally, advocates of infant baptism argue that baptism replaces circumcision, and since infants were circumcised in the Old Testament, babies are to be baptized in the New. However, neither Christ nor the apostles ever stated that baptism replaces or is equivalent to circumcision. The Jewish and Gentile Christians who received both baptism and circumcision in the New Testament (cf. Ac 10:45; 16:3) obviously did not think the one replaced the other. Furthermore, only male babies were circumcised, but baby girls also receive infant baptism in the denominations that practice it. The New Testament, using Abraham as our pattern (Rom 4:23-25), also states that circumcision was a “seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had yet being uncircumcised: that he might be the father of all them that believe, though they be not circumcised” (4:11). If one wants to argue that circumcision is replaced by baptism, then the New Testament pattern would be faith before baptism, as Abraham believed before he was circumcised, and baptism would not be a means of receiving salvation, but only a token or sign (Gen 17:11) of a previously received “righteousness of faith” (Rom 4:1-25). However, the fact is that the spiritual equivalent in the New Testament of circumcision is

not baptism, but being born again (Phil 3:3), a spiritual act that happens “without hands” (Col 2:11) and which is a prerequisite to baptism (Col 2:12). There is nothing in the Bible that teaches infant baptism. It is an error, a false human tradition that the devil has used to deceive millions.

Those who practice infant baptism inevitably confuse the gospel by doing so. In any particular location, the “church of God [has as members] . . . them that are sanctified in Christ Jesus, called to be saints” (1 Cor 1:2; Col 1:2), so only people who have been justified by faith, only saved people, are fit church members. Since baptism adds one to the membership of the church that authorizes the ordinance (Ac 2:41, 47; 1 Cor 12:13), but true churches require the new birth for membership, infant baptism is really only consistent with the heresy that the salvation of babies is somehow connected to the application of water to them. At the very least, infant baptism leads people to think that they do not need to be converted when they get older, while the great majority of “Christian” groups that practice it say that sins are actually removed at the time of baptism.

The Reformed claim that God “hath instituted the sacrament of baptism . . . which serves as a testimony to us, that he will forever be our gracious God and Father” (*Belgic Confession*, Article 34). A sacrament is supposedly a “holy ordinance instituted by Christ, wherein, by sensible signs, Christ, and the benefits of the new covenant, are represented, sealed, and applied to believers,” so that “sacraments become effectual means of salvation” (*Westminster Shorter Catechism*, 91, 92). However, the Bible never says that baptism or the Lord’s supper “seal” or “apply” salvation to anyone. The word *seal* appears 16 times in the New Testament, and none of its appearances indicate that a “seal” gives a particle of saving grace to anybody. The word *sacrament* never appears in the Bible. The Reformed did not go far enough when they reduced the seven sacraments invented by the Antichrist-led church of Rome to two sacraments. The truth is that there are no sacraments, and the ordinances of baptism and the Lord’s Supper do not do anything to justify anybody—salvation is by faith alone (Rom 3:28).

Absolutely nothing in the Bible either affirms that baptism is the way to be born again or teaches infant baptism. The Reformed claim that they “reject all mixtures and damnable inventions, which men have added unto, and blended with the [ordinances], as

profanations of them: and affirm that we ought to rest satisfied with the ordinance[s] which Christ and his apostles have taught us, and that we must speak of them in the same manner as they have spoken” (Article 35, *Belgic Confession*). This is in accord with God’s command, “Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall ye diminish ought from it, that ye may keep the commandments of the LORD your God . . . What thing soever I command you, observe to do it: thou shalt not add thereto, nor diminish from it” (Deut 4:2; 12:32; Prov 30:6; Matt 28:19-20; Rev 22:18-19). If the Reformed were consistent with their own confessions, they would reject infant baptism just like they reject infant communion, and just like they reject many other of the damnable inventions of the church at Rome. The error of infant baptism was recognized at the time of the Reformation by men like Zwingli, the father of the Swiss Reformation, who said, “Nothing grieves me more than that at present I have to baptize children, for I know it ought not to be done,” and “if we were to baptize as Christ instituted it then we would not baptize any person until he has reached the years of discretion; for I find it nowhere written that infant baptism is to be practiced.”²¹⁰ By retaining infant baptism—as Zwingli did, against what he knew the Bible taught—the Reformed undermine the gospel and confuse justification by faith alone. Dear Reformed friend, you must face the fact that your infant baptism did absolutely nothing to contribute to your salvation—so far from helping to save you, or from proving that you were somehow already saved or destined to be saved, it was not true baptism at all, but actually an abomination to God.

Furthermore, when believers are baptized, immersion, not sprinkling or pouring, is necessarily practiced for Biblical baptism. One who is baptized is “planted together in the likeness of [Christ’s] death” and “shall be also *in the likeness of his* resurrection” (Rom 6:5); baptism pictures the death, burial, and resurrection of the Savior, as well as the death of the believer’s old life and his resurrection to new life in the Lord Jesus. Only immersion pictures death, burial, and resurrection. Does anyone bury a person in a graveyard by pouring or sprinkling a little dirt on his head? Then how can one be “buried with [Christ] in baptism” (Col 2:12) by pouring or sprinkling a little water on him? Why did people go “down . . . into the water . . . and . . . come up out of the water . . . [when]

²¹⁰ See pgs. 198-199, *The Reformers and Their Stepchildren*, by the Christian Reformed author Leonard Verduin.

baptized” (Ac 8:38-39; Mat 3:16) in the Bible if only a little water was poured or sprinkled on the head? Furthermore, the Greek verb *baptize* means to dip or immerse, not to pour or sprinkle. The father of Reformed denominations, John Calvin, acknowledged this, saying that “it is evident that the term *baptize* means to immerse, and that this was the form used by the primitive church” (Calvin, *Institutes*, 4:15:19), while the first of the Reformers, Martin Luther, said that “baptism is . . . when we dip anything wholly in water, that it is completely covered over. . . . it should be thus, and would be right . . . [for] any one who is to be baptized, [to] be completely sunk down into the water, and dipped again and drawn out.”²¹¹ The Reformers themselves acknowledged that the Bible teaches immersion is New Testament baptism, and what is probably the most influential Reformed work of systematic theology ever written admits: “[I]n baptism we have changed immersion for sprinkling . . . [t]he church by changing the custom of immersing, substituted sprinkling.”²¹² Do we dare change what God Himself has commanded to picture His Son’s death, burial, and resurrection to practice instead a corruption inherited from the false religion of Rome? Do we change the ordinance of God to that of a system of religion that the Holy One calls “the mother of harlots and abominations of the earth” (Rev 17:5)?

No church, including those within Reformed denominations, can be a true church if it confuses the gospel by not demanding that the children of believing parents come to a place where they see themselves as lost and at a point in time repent and believe the gospel. All who do not preach this therefore fall under the dread curse of Galatians 1:8-9: “But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed. As we said before, so say I now again, If any man preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed.” Furthermore, Reformed denominations cannot be Christ’s churches because they reject Biblical baptism, the immersion of the believer, to practice instead the heresy and human tradition of sprinkling or pouring water on the head of infants. Furthermore, Reformed denominations cannot be Christ’s churches because they did not exist for 1,500

²¹¹ *Opera Lutheri*, I. 319, cf. pg. 108, Christian, J. T., *A History of the Baptists*, vol. 1, <http://sites.google.com/site/t/hross7>.

²¹² Pg. 458 (Q25:21), *Institutes of Elenctic Theology*, by Francis Turretin (trans. George M. Giger, ed. James T. Dennison, Jr.), vol. 3.

years after Christ started His church in the first century. The Lord Jesus said “the gates of hell shall not prevail against” His church (Mat 16:18), but rather that God would receive “glory in the church by Christ Jesus throughout all ages” (Eph 3:21), and He would be with His churches “alway, *even* unto the end of the world” (Mat 28:20). If Reformed denominations are Christ’s churches, then the Son of God failed to keep His promises to preserve true churches in the world for the first three-fourths of Christian history! Furthermore, when people who adopted Reformed doctrine in the era of the Reformation started new churches, they separated from the church of Rome—which they rightly saw as headed by “the Pope of Rome . . . that Antichrist, that man of sin, and son of perdition” (*Westminster Confession* 25:6). The Reformers and the first generation of Reformed church members received baptism from a religion they correctly saw as headed by Antichrist. Unless the church of Antichrist can perform valid baptisms, the Reformers and the first members of the denominations they started were not baptized, and thus not truly church members. If they were not church members, they could not baptize anyone else. For the Reformed denominations to be Christ’s churches, either unbaptized people must be able to perform baptism, or the church of Antichrist can legitimately administer the ordinances!

In contrast, churches that believe and practice like modern day Bible-believing Baptists, churches that defend the true gospel of justification by faith without works and practice the baptism only of believers, have existed from the first century until today. In the words of Dr. J. J. Durmont & Dr. Ypeij, Reformed historians specifically appointed by the State of Holland to ascertain if the historical claims of the Baptists were valid, the Baptists “descended from the tolerably pure evangelical Waldenses [a name for Baptists in the Middle Ages]. . . . They were, therefore, in existence long before the Reformed Church. . . . We have seen that the Baptists, who were formerly called Anabaptists . . . were the original Waldenses; and who have long in the history of the Church, received the honor of that origin. On this account the Baptists may be considered the only Christian community which has stood since the Apostles; and as a Christian society which has preserved pure the doctrine of the gospel through all ages.”²¹³ The Christian

²¹³ Ypeij en Dermout, *Geschiedenis der Nederlandsche Hervormde Kerk*. Breda, 1819, cited in *History of Baptists*, J. T. Christian, vol. 1, chap. 7; elec. acc. <http://sites.google.com/site/thross7>.

Reformed scholar Leonard Verduin stated, “No one is credited with having invented the Anabaptism of the sixteenth century for the simple reason that no one did. . . . There were Anabaptists, called by that name, in the fourth century.”²¹⁴ Churches that believe in salvation by faith and practice believer’s immersion never needed to separate from the church of Rome because they never were part of that false religion. They are older than the church of Rome and than all the Protestant denominations. Their Biblical doctrine and practice proves what is confirmed by the testimony of history—they are the churches founded by the Lord Jesus Christ. All other religious groups are guilty of schism and division from the Lord’s true churches. All other groups—including the Reformed denominations—thus have no Divine authority to baptize, carry on the work of God, or exist at all.

Dear Reformed friend, the Bible commands, “Examine yourselves, whether ye be in the faith; prove your own selves” (2 Cor 13:5). Have you ever come to a particular point where you saw yourself as lost, and consciously repented and believed on the Lord Jesus Christ? If not, you are currently on your way to hell, and, no matter what else you believe and do that is good and right, you will certainly be damned unless you repent. You should, right now, submit to the Biblical truth that you have never yet been saved, and immediately come to Christ for salvation. If you reject His Word and insist that you are saved, or that your baptism or previous life is in any way pleasing to God, you will suffer in unquenchable fire for all eternity. If you forsake all confidence in your previous religious actions and good works and come to the Savior as a worthless, empty-handed sinner, with nothing but your black heart and your innumerable sins, He will receive you and save you by His free and sovereign grace. The Lord Jesus calls you to come to Him (Mat 11:28), and promises, “He that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out” (John 6:37). The Lord commands you to come to Him right now: “[B]ehold, now is the accepted time; behold, now is the day of salvation” (2 Cor 6:2). If you are saved, God commands you to submit to believer’s immersion, join and faithfully serve Him in one of His true churches (Heb 10:25). The Son of God said, “Whosoever will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me” (Mr 8:34). Although people are not in any way justified before God by their works, there are no examples in the Bible of true

²¹⁴ Pgs. 189-190, *The Reformers and Their Stepchildren*.

Christians who refused to follow the Lord Jesus and who stubbornly refused and rejected believer's baptism (cf. Ac 2:41-42; Mr 16:16). Separation from all religions that practice heresy, including infant sprinkling or pouring, is the plain command of the King of heaven. "Wherefore come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing; and I will receive you, and will be a Father unto you, and ye shall be my sons and daughters, saith the Lord Almighty" (2 Cor 6:17-18). "[M]ark them which cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned; and avoid them" (Rom 16:17). "[H]ave no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather reprove them" (Eph 5:11). The Lord Jesus said, "If ye love me, keep my commandments" (Jn 14:15). Immediately separate from Reformed religion, and attend, be baptized, and serve joyfully in a Bible-believing and practicing Baptist church.

For more information on the nature of true repentance and faith, and a careful analysis of the Biblical teaching on baptism, please visit <http://sites.google.com/site/faithalonesaves/salvation> and read Bible studies #5-7 ("How Do I Receive the Gospel?" "The Christian: Security in Christ and Assurance of Salvation," and "The Church of Jesus Christ."), as well as the work *Heaven Only for the Baptized?* at the same web address. A true church in your area that would also be happy to study the Bible with you and help you spiritually is:

Note the following material on John Wesley also:

Historic Baptists and fundamentalists who obtain their history mainly from sanitized and hagiographical Protestant sources often have a very inaccurate view of the theology of John Wesley. The following material should serve as a corrective, and will bring up some of the facts often left out of the sanitized and hagiographical accounts.

1.) Wesley was an Arminian – he believed saints could lose their salvation.

For example, he said: "'I believe a saint may fall away; that one who is holy or righteous in the judgment of God himself may nevertheless so fall from God as to perish everlastingly.'" (pg. 81, *Works*, vol. 6). This heresy of his is so well known that I will not provide further documentation of it.

2.) Wesley believed in the continuation of the sign gifts.

The Wesley brothers abandoned the dominant Protestant cessationism to adopt a continuationist doctrine, a view in which they were followed by the Methodist

movement, and which explains much of the fanaticism that came to characterize much of Methodism. Wesley said: “[I]f the Quakers [who were strong continuationists] hold the same perceptible inspiration with me, I am glad” (“Letter to ‘John Smith,’ March 25, 1747; elec. acc. Wesley Center Online: Wesley’s Letters, 1747, <http://wesley.nnu.edu/john-wesley/the-letters-of-john-wesley/wesleys-letters-1747/>).

Compare pg. 43, *Theological Roots of Pentecostalism*, Dayton). Thus, nineteenth-century Methodists, writing to defend continuationism, noted: “[W]e dare to maintain that many of the phenomena of the Pentecostal times have been continued, are common, and ought to be expected in every age. . . . [Cessationist] censors are exceedingly severe, [unjustly so, upon] the habitual reference made by the . . . teachers to the direct influence of the Holy Spirit . . . [as] a revealer as well as an interpreter of truth . . . speak[ing] to us not only by the written Word, but also by visions, or feelings, or aspirations, or impressions, independent of the Word; and extending even to what is sometimes claimed as a physical consciousness . . . [as by continuationist antecedent] Dr. Upham” (pg. 106, “The Brighton Convention Its Opponents.” *London Quarterly Review*, October 1875). Indeed, “much in Pentecostal teaching is a legacy from Anglicanism . . . through the mediation of Wesley” (pg. 185, *The Pentecostals*, Hollenweger).

3.) Wesley loved medieval Roman Catholic mysticism, and developed his doctrine of perfectionism in connection with it.

Roman Catholic mysticism was key to the development of the perfectionism and continuationism of John Wesley. “John Wesley . . . says that he began his teaching on Perfection in 1725 . . . [although he] was not converted [on his own testimony] until 1738 . . . [h]ow did he come to teach it? His father and mother . . . had both been interested in . . . Roman Catholic mystical teaching . . . and had read a great deal of it. . . . John Wesley had read [in addition to other Romanist mystics such as] . . . Tauler . . . Thomas à Kempis . . . [and the] ‘Protestant mystic . . . [who] wrote a book on Perfection . . . William Law,’ but he was influenced “in particular [by]. . . Madame Guyon . . . [and] the Roman Catholic Archbishop Fénelon,” although the Romanist mystic “Marquis or Baron de Renty” was probably Wesley’s single “favorite author,” eclipsing even Guyon and Fénelon (pgs. 307-308, *The Puritans: Their Origins and Successors*, Lloyd-Jones). Thus, Wesley could speak of “that excellent man, the Marquis de Renty” although he knew the Catholic was infected with “many touches of superstition, and some of idolatry, in worshipping saints, the Virgin Mary in particular” (cf. Sermon 72, series 2, Sermon 133, series 4, *Sermons, on Several Occasions, and to which reference is made in the trust-deeds of the Methodist Chapels, as constituting, with Mr. Wesley’s notes on the New Testament, the standard doctrines of the Methodist connexion*, John Wesley. Orig. pub. 4 vol, 1771. Elec. acc. *Logos Bible Software*). Wesley was also profoundly influenced by the ascetic, Romanist, and Eastern Orthodox “monastic piety of the fourth-century ‘desert fathers’” during his time in the “Holy Club” at Oxford University. “[T]he consideration of Macarius the Egyptian and Ephraem Syrus and their descriptions of “perfection” (*teleiosis*) as the goal (*skopos*) of the Christian in this life” were influential in “shaping . . . Wesley’s . . . doctrine of Christian perfection . . . John Wesley . . . was . . . in touch with Gregory of Nyssa, the greatest of all the Eastern [Catholic] teachers of the quest for perfection. Thus, in his early days, [Wesley] drank deep of this Byzantine tradition of

spirituality at its source and assimilated its concept of devotion as the way and perfection as the goal of the Christian life. . . . The devotional works . . . of two Latin [Roman Catholic] traditions of mystical spirituality . . . [and] the traditions of Eastern Orthodoxy—Clement of Alexandria, Gregory of Nyssa, Macarius of Egypt, and others . . . introduced [important] factors of . . . [Wesley’s] understanding of perfection. . . . Wesley . . . was inclined to go beyond logical subsequence [in justification and sanctification] to experiential subsequence because of the deep influence of the Eastern Fathers on him in terms of the relation of perfection to process and goal.” (pgs. 93-97, “‘Dialogue’ Within a Tradition: John Wesley and Gregory of Nyssa Discuss Christian Perfection,” John G. Merritt. *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 22:2 (Fall, 1987) 92-117). Thus, Wesley received his idea of Christians entering into perfection or a second-blessing from Catholic mysticism, and transferred his two-stage notions transferred into the Higher Life movement and into Pentecostalism. “John Wesley . . . under the influence of Catholic works of edification, distinguished between the ordinary believer and those who were ‘sanctified’ or ‘baptized with the Spirit.’ . . . This view was adopted . . . by the evangelists and theologians of the American Holiness movement . . . such as Asa Mahan and C. G. Finney . . . [and] the early Pentecostal movement” (pgs. 21, 322, *The Pentecostals*, Hollenweger). Along with perfectionism, Wesley (as already mentioned above) also adopted the ancient and medieval Catholic continuationism (cf. pgs. 44-45, *Theological Roots of Pentecostalism*, Dayton) that provided such key support in the apologetic for image worship in the iconoclastic controversy and at other times, as well as Catholic worship of the saints themselves, transubstantiation, and other idolatries, since the marvels which were so often performed by the graven images of and relics culled from the saints, transubstantiated bread, and so on, validated such Catholic beliefs in a way that Scripture certainly could not (cf. pgs. 135ff., *Counterfeit Miracles*, Warfield).

It is noteworthy that John Wesley, while preaching Methodist perfectionism, “never claimed the experience for himself. He was a very honest man. He taught this perfectionism but he would never say that it was true of himself.” Indeed, for “many years he had great difficulty of producing any examples of it,” although at one point “he felt he could produce 30 such people; but only one of the 30 seemed to persist—the others fell away” (pg. 311, *The Puritans: Their Origins and Successors*, D. M. Lloyd-Jones).

4.) Wesley held erroneous views on the assurance of salvation.

“Wesley and Fletcher” held to a doctrinal error of an improper “immediate enjoyment of personal assurance” (pg. 180, *The Doctrine of Justification*, James Buchanan). Early in his ministry, “John Wesley summed up his thoughts on this subject in a letter written in January, 1740: ‘I never yet knew one soul thus saved without what you call the faith of assurance; I mean a sure confidence that by the merits of Christ he was reconciled to the favour of God’ [pg. 200, *Wesley’s Standard Sermons*]. Thus the *cognition* that saving grace had worked in a life was seen as the final means to ascertain if saving grace had indeed been present. The implications of this teaching, taken by itself, seem to lead to a condition in which superficial self-analysis (‘yes, I’ve got the witness’) results in spirituality while the kind of doubt which assailed such people as Luther and even at

times John Wesley himself results in a loss of the hope of salvation” (pg. 171, “John Wesley and the Doctrine of Assurance,” Mark A. Noll. *Bibliotheca Sacra* 132:526 (April 1975). However, by 1755 Wesley had moderated his position slightly, so that one could be shaken in his assurance without losing his salvation, although a total lack of assurance was still only compatible with a lost estate: “I know that I am accepted: And yet that knowledge is sometimes shaken, though not destroyed, by doubt or fear. If that knowledge were destroyed, or wholly withdrawn, I could not then say I had Christian faith. To me it appears the same thing, to say, ‘I know God has accepted me’; or, ‘I have a sure trust that God has accepted me.’ . . . [Nonetheless,] justifying faith cannot be a conviction that I am justified. . . . But still I believe the proper Christian faith, which purifies the heart, implies such a conviction” (pgs. 452-453, Letter DXXXII, July 25, 1755, in *The Works of the Rev. John Wesley*, vol 12, 3rd. ed, with the last corrections of the author. London: John Mason, 1830). Furthermore, Wesley affirmed that objective marks cannot be elaborated to distinguish between the witness of the Spirit to one’s regenerated state and self-delusion; “this kind of defense based on intuition . . . raised the specter of enthusiasm for some of Wesley’s critics” (pg. 174, *ibid.*). In this doctrine of assurance Wesley’s view was similar to that of Jacob Arminius: “Arminius thought that no one would be a true Christian who did not have a present assurance of present salvation. He wrote: ‘Since God promises eternal life to all who believe in Christ, it is impossible for him who believes, and who knows that he believes, to doubt of his own salvation, unless he doubts of this willingness of God.’” (pgs. 164-165, “John Wesley and the Doctrine of Assurance,” Noll, citing pg. 348, *Arminius: A Study in the Dutch Reformation*, Carl Bangs. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1971. Compare *The Doctrine of Assurance, with Special Reference to John Wesley*, Arthur S. Yates. London: Epworth, 1952).

Wesleyan confusion about conversion and assurance appeared in various preachers influenced by his theology; thus, for example, Welsh holiness evangelist Seth Joshua wrote: “[People] are entering into full assurance of faith coupled with a baptism of the Holy Ghost. . . . I also think that those seeking assurance may be fairly counted as converts” (pg. 122, *The Welsh Religious Revival*, Morgan, citing Mr. Joshua’s diary. Of course, some people who think that they are in need of assurance truly are unconverted, but such clarity appears to be lacking in Mr. Joshua’s comments. Spirit baptism has nothing to do with obtaining assurance in the Bible.). Methodist confusion on assurance passed over into the Pentecostal movement, which taught that assurance was of the essence of saving faith: “If God for Christ’s sake has forgiven you your sins, you know it. And if you do not know it better than you know anything in this world, you are still in your sins. When you go down in the atonement, in the sacrifice of our Lord Jesus Christ, you are accepted. And if you are accepted, and He has given you a clean heart and sanctified your soul, you know it. And if you do not know it, the work is not done” (pg. 2, *The Apostolic Faith* I:2 (Los Angeles, October 1906), reprinted on pg. 6, *Like As of Fire: Newspapers from the Azusa Street World Wide Revival: A Reprint of “The Apostolic Faith” (1906-1908)*, coll. Fred T. Corum & Rachel A. Sizelove).

Scripture teaches that all believers can have assurance of salvation, but that assurance that one has personally passed from death to life is not of the essence of saving faith (cf. 1 John & *London Baptist Confession of Faith of 1689*, 18:1-4).

5.) Wesley rejected the imputation of Christ's righteousness in justification.

John Wesley also rejected the doctrine of the imputation of Christ's righteousness in justification, writing: "Does 'the righteousness of God' ever mean . . . 'the merits of Christ?' . . . I believe not once in all the Scripture. . . . It often means, and particularly in the Epistle to the Romans, 'God's method of justifying sinners.' . . . 'The righteousness of God' signifies, the righteousness which the God-man wrought out[?] No. . . . It signifies 'God's method of justifying sinners.'" (pg. 217, *Aspasio Vindicated, and the Scripture Doctrine of Imputed Righteousness Defended, in Eleven Letters from Mr. Hervey to Mr. Wesley, in Answer to that Gentleman's Remarks on Theron and Aspasio*, W. Hervey. Glasgo: J. & M. Robertson, 1762; & pg. 137, *Eleven Letters from the Late Rev. Mr. Hervey, to the Rev. Mr. John Wesley, Containing an Answer to that Gentleman's Remarks on Thereon and Aspasio*, W. Hervey. 2nd ed. London: J. & F. & C. Rivinot, 1789. cf. pg. 497, *The Doctrine of Justification*, James Buchanan. Carlisle, PA: Banner of Truth, 1997 (orig. pub. 1867)). "Many Wesleyan Methodists, following the example of their founder, have . . . keenly opposed . . . the doctrine . . . of [Christ's] imputed righteousness" (pg. 500, *The Doctrine of Justification*, Buchanan). Thus, "Wesley could not resist assimilating justification into sanctification—the latter being his preeminent and enduring interest. The . . . notion that the believer is *simul justus et peccator* (at once both righteous and a sinner) Wesley firmly rejected. Many Arminians [including Wesley] further assert that faith is not merely the *instrument* of justification but the *ground* on which justification rests. Thus Wesley wrote that 'any righteousness created by the act of justification is real because of the ethical or moral dimension of faith'" (pg. 353, *The Cross and Salvation: The Doctrine of Salvation*, Bruce Demarest). Thus, Wesley wrote: "Least of all does justification imply that God is deceived in those whom he justifies; that he thinks them to be what, in fact, they are not; that he accounts them to be otherwise than they are. It does by no means imply that God . . . esteems us better than we really are, or believes us righteous when we are unrighteous. Surely no. . . . Neither can it ever consist with his unerring wisdom to think that I am innocent, to judge that I am righteous or holy, because another is so. He can no more, in this manner, confound me with Christ, than with David or Abraham. . . . [S]uch a notion of justification is neither reconcilable to reason nor Scripture" (pg. 47, *The Works of the Reverend John Wesley*, vol. 1. New York: Emory & Waugh, 1831—note that "reason" is mentioned before "Scripture" as a reason to oppose the Biblical doctrine of justification.)

6.) Wesley believed in the damnable heresy of baptismal regeneration.

The Wesley brothers and the Methodist denomination retained the Anglican belief in baptismal regeneration when they left the English state-church to start their own religion. Commenting on John 3:5, Wesley affirmed, "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit—Except he experience that great inward change by the Spirit, and be baptized (wherever baptism can be had) as the outward sign and means of it [he cannot enter into the kingdom of God]." Commenting on Acts 22:16, he wrote: "Baptism administered to real penitents, is both a means and seal of pardon. Nor did God ordinarily in the

primitive Church bestow this on any, unless through this means.” On both texts John Wesley clearly affirmed that baptism is the means of the new birth. He also declared, “It is certain our Church supposes that all who are baptized in their infancy are at the same time born again; and it is allowed that the whole office for the baptism of infants proceeds upon this supposition” (Wesley, sermon, *The New Birth*). In his *Doctrinal Tracts* (pg. 246, 251) he wrote, “What are the benefits . . . we receive by baptism, is the next point to be considered. And the first of these is the washing away of original sin, by the application of Christ’s death. . . . the merits of Christ’s life and death, are applied to us in baptism. . . . infants are . . . proper subjects of baptism, seeing, in the ordinary way, they cannot be saved unless [sin] be washed away in baptism. Infants need to be washed from original sin. Therefore they are proper subjects for baptism.” (cited in chapter 9, *The Evils of Infant Baptism*, Robert Boyt C. Howell, accessed in the *Fundamental Baptist CD-Rom Library*, Oak Harbor, WA: Way of Life Literature, 2003). John’s brother, the Methodist hymn-writer Charles Wesley, wrote against the Baptists, “Partisans of a narrow sect/ Your cruelty confess/ Nor still inhumanly reject/ Whom Jesus would embrace./ Your little ones preclude them not/ From the baptismal flood brought/ But let them now to Christ be saved/ And join the Church of God.” (*Charles Wesley’s Journal*, 18 October 1756, 2:128). The Wesleys only called adults already baptized as infants to conversion because of their heretical Arminian theology. Since they rejected the Biblical truth that once one is saved, he is always saved (Romans 8:28-39), they held that one who was regenerated in infant baptism could fall away and become a child of the devil again, at which time he would need a second new birth.

See “John Wesley’s View of Baptism,” John Chongnahm Cho, *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 7 (Spring 1972) 60-73) for more on Wesley's doctrine of baptismal regeneration.

Before making Wesley into a hero of the faith, historic Baptists and fundamentalists should make sure that their churches know that Wesley believed in Arminianism, in the continuation of the sign gifts (helping to prepare the way for Pentecostalism), in Catholic mysticism, in perfectionism, in a false doctrine of justification by becoming inwardly holy, and in baptismal regeneration.

Meditate for a few moments on the διὰ τὴν πολλὴν ἀγάπην αὐτοῦ ἣν ἠγάπησεν ἡμᾶς of Ephesians 2:4 in its context. How should this truth affect your life and your affections for God?

In Ephesians 2:5, specify the semantic category of conjunction for the καί that begins the verse.

What kind of dative is τῷ Χριστῷ in Ephesians 2:5?

In Ephesians 2:5, what type of participle is ὄντας?

In Ephesians 2:5, specify the structural and semantic categories for the voice of σεσωσμένοι. Also state what the construction ἐστε σεσωσμένοι is called, and what it indicates.

In Ephesians 2:5, specify the case and case usage of χάριτί. (Compare the question about χάριτι in v. 8 below).

Specify the case and case usage of πλοῦτον in Ephesians 2:7.

In Ephesians 2:7, specify the type of ἵνα clause found in the verse.

In Ephesians 2:8, what kind of dative is τῇ . . . χάριτί? Also specify the semantic category for the article τῇ.

Specify the semantic category for the γάρ that begins Ephesians 2:8. Which of the definitions in BDAG does the conjunction fit into?

In Ephesians 2:8, specify the case and case usage of Θεοῦ.

In Ephesians 2:8, what is the antecedent of τοῦτο (KJV *that*)?

In Ephesians 2:9, specify the type of ἵνα clause in the verse.

In Ephesians 2:10, specify the category in BDAG that best fits the ἐπί.

In Ephesians 2:10, specify the kind of participle κτισθέντες is.

What is the tense usage of περιπατήσωμεν in Ephesians 2:10?

In Ephesians 2:10, is it certain, or only possible, that believers will do good works? Consider, in addition to the context of the verse, the following texts with προετοιμάζω in the NT and other related literature, and the complete list of texts with in the NT:

Rom. 9:23 καὶ ἵνα γνωρίσῃ τὸν πλοῦτον τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ σκεύη ἐλέους, ἃ **προητοίμασεν** εἰς δόξαν,

Eph. 2:10 αὐτοῦ γάρ ἐσμεν ποίημα, κτισθέντες ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ ἐπὶ ἔργοις ἀγαθοῖς, οἷς **προητοίμασεν** ὁ Θεός, ἵνα ἐν αὐτοῖς περιπατήσωμεν.

Rom. 9:23 And that he might make known the riches of his glory on the vessels of mercy, which he had afore prepared unto glory,

Eph. 2:10 For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them.

LXX:

Wis. 9:8 εἶπας οἰκοδομῆσαι ναὸν ἐν ὄρει ἁγίῳ σου καὶ ἐν πόλει κατασκηνώσεώς σου
θυσιαστήριον μίμημα σκηνῆς ἁγίας ἢν **προητοιμάσας** ἀπ' ἀρχῆς
Is. 28:24 μὴ ὅλην τὴν ἡμέραν μέλλει ὁ ἀροτριῶν ἀροτριᾶν ἢ σπόρον **προετοιμάσει** πρὶν
ἐργάσασθαι τὴν γῆν

Wis. 9:8 Thou hast commanded me to build a temple upon thy holy mount, and an altar in the city wherein
thou dwellest, a resemblance of the holy tabernacle, which thou hast prepared from the beginning.

Is 28:24 Will the ploughman plough all the day? or will he prepare the seed beforehand, before he tills the
ground?

Apostolic patristics:

1Clem. 33:3 τῷ γὰρ παμμεγεθεστάτῳ αὐτοῦ κράτει οὐρανοὺς ἐστήρισεν καὶ τῇ ἀκαταλήπτῳ
αὐτοῦ συνέσει διεκόσμησεν αὐτοὺς· γῆν τε διεχώρισεν ἀπὸ τοῦ περιέχοντος αὐτὴν ὕδατος
καὶ ἥδρασεν ἐπὶ τὸν ἀσφαλὴ τοῦ ἰδίου βουλήματος θεμέλιον· τὰ τε ἐν αὐτῇ ζῶα φοιτῶντα
τῇ ἐαυτοῦ διατάξει ἐκέλευσεν εἶναι· θάλασσαν καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐτῇ ζῶα **προετοιμάσας** [128]
ἐνέκλεισεν τῇ ἐαυτοῦ δυνάμει.

1Clem. 38:3 ἀναλογισώμεθα οὖν, ἀδελφοί, ἐκ ποίας ὕλης ἐγενήθημεν, ποιοὶ καὶ τίνες
εἰσῆλθαμεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον· ἐκ ποίου τάφου καὶ σκότους ὁ πλάσας ἡμᾶς καὶ δημιουργήσας
εἰσήγαγεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον αὐτοῦ, **προετοιμάσας** τὰς εὐεργεσίας αὐτοῦ πρὶν ἡμᾶς
γεννηθῆναι.

Eph. 9:1 Ἐγὼν δὲ παροδύσαντάς τινας ἐκεῖθεν, ἔχοντας κακὴν διδασχὴν· οὓς οὐκ εἰάσατε
σπεῖραι εἰς ὑμᾶς, βύσαντες τὰ ὥτα εἰς τὸ μὴ παραδέξασθαι τὰ σπειρόμενα ὑπ' αὐτῶν, ὥς
ὄντες λίθοι ναοῦ **προητοιμασμένοι** [27] εἰς οἰκοδομὴν θεοῦ πατρός, ἀναφερόμενοι εἰς τὰ
ὑψηλὰ διὰ τῆς μηχανῆς Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὅς ἐστιν σταυρός, σχοινίῳ χρώμενοι τῷ πνεύματι τῷ
ἁγίῳ· ἡ δὲ πίστις ὑμῶν ἀναγωγεὺς ὑμῶν, ἡ δὲ ἀγάπη ὁδὸς ἢ ἀναφέρουσα εἰς θεόν.

MPoly. 14:2 εὐλογῶ σε ὅτι κατηξιώσας [46] με τῆς ἡμέρας καὶ ὥρας ταύτης, τοῦ λαβεῖν
μέρος ἐν ἀριθμῷ τῶν μαρτύρων [47] ἐν τῷ ποτηρίῳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ [σου], [48] εἰς ἀνάστασιν
ζωῆς αἰωνίου ψυχῆς τε καὶ σώματος ἐν ἀφθαρσίᾳ πνεύματος ἁγίου· ἐν οἷς προσδεχθεῖν
ἐνώπιόν σου σήμερον ἐν θυσίᾳ πίονι καὶ προσδεκτῇ, καθὼς **προητοιμάσας** καὶ
προεφάνέρωσας καὶ ἐπλήρωσας, ὁ ἀψευδὴς καὶ ἀληθινὸς θεός.

Shep. 23:5 ὕπαγε οὖν καὶ ἐξήγησαι τοῖς ἐκλεκτοῖς τοῦ κυρίου τὰ μεγαλεῖα αὐτοῦ, καὶ εἰπὲ
αὐτοῖς ὅτι τὸ θηρίον τοῦτο τύπος ἐστὶν θλίψεως τῆς μελλούσης τῆς μεγάλης· ἐὰν οὖν
προετοιμάσῃτε καὶ μετανοήσῃτε ἐξ ὅλης καρδίας ὑμῶν πρὸς τὸν κύριον, δυνήσεσθε
ἐκφυγεῖν αὐτήν, ἐὰν ἡ καρδία ὑμῶν γένηται καθαρὰ καὶ ἄμωμος, καὶ τὰς λοιπὰς τῆς ζωῆς
ἡμέρας ὑμῶν δουλεύσητε τῷ κυρίῳ ἀμέμπως, ἐπιρίψατε τὰς μερίμνας ὑμῶν ἐπὶ τὸν κύριον,
καὶ αὐτὸς κατορθώσει αὐτάς.

1Clem. 33:3 For by his infinitely great might he established the heavens, and in his incomprehensible
wisdom he set them in order. Likewise he separated the earth from the water surrounding it, and set it
firmly upon the sure foundation of his own will; and the living creatures which walk upon it he called into
existence by his decree. Having already created the sea and the living creatures in it, he fixed its boundaries
by his own power.

1Clem. 38:3 Let us acknowledge, brothers, from what matter we were made; who and what we were, when
we came into the world; from what grave and what darkness he who made and created us brought us into
his world, having prepared his benefits for us before we were born.

Eph. 9:1 But I have learned that certain people from there have passed your way with evil doctrine, but you
did not allow them to sow it among you. You covered up your ears in order to avoid receiving the things
being sown by them, because you are stones of a temple, prepared beforehand[12] for the building of God
the Father, hoisted up to the heights by the crane of Jesus Christ, which is the cross, using as a rope the
Holy Spirit; your faith is what lifts you up, and love is the way that leads up to God.

MPoly. 14:2 I bless you because you have considered me worthy of this day and hour, that I might receive
a place among the number of the martyrs in the cup of your Christ, to the resurrection to eternal life, both of
soul and of body, in the incorruptibility of the Holy Spirit. May I be received among them in your presence
today, as a rich and acceptable sacrifice, as you have prepared and revealed beforehand, and have now
accomplished, you who are the undeceiving and true God.

Shep. 23:5 Go, therefore, and declare to the Lord's elect his mighty works, and tell them that this beast is a
foreshadowing of the great tribulation that is coming. So, if you prepare yourselves in advance and turn to
the Lord with all your heart, you will be able to escape it, if your heart is clean and unblemished and you

serve the Lord blamelessly for the rest of the days of your life. Cast your cares upon the Lord, and he will set them straight.

ἐτοιμάζω in the NT:

Matt. 3:3 οὗτος γάρ ἐστιν ὁ ῥηθεὶς ὑπὸ Ἡσαίου τοῦ προφήτου, λέγοντος, Φωνὴ βοῶντος ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, **Ἐτοιμάσατε** τὴν ὁδὸν Κυρίου· εὐθείας ποιεῖτε τὰς τρίβους αὐτοῦ.

Matt. 20:23 καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς, Τὸ μὲν ποτήριόν μου πίεσθε, καὶ τὸ βάπτισμα ὃ ἐγὼ βαπτίζομαι βαπτισθήσεσθε· τὸ δὲ καθίσαι ἐκ δεξιῶν μου, καὶ ἐξ εὐωνύμων μου οὐκ ἔστιν ἐμὸν δοῦναι, ἀλλ' οἷς **ἡτοιμάσται** ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς μου.

Matt. 22:4 πάλιν ἀπέστειλεν ἄλλους δούλους, λέγων, Εἴπατε τοῖς κεκλημένοις, Ἴδού, τὸ ἄριστόν μου **ἡτοίμασα**, οἱ ταῦροί μου καὶ τὰ σιτιστὰ τεθυμένα, καὶ πάντα ἔτοιμα· δεῦτε εἰς τοὺς γάμους.

Matt. 25:34 τότε ἐρεῖ ὁ βασιλεὺς τοῖς ἐκ δεξιῶν αὐτοῦ, Δεῦτε, οἱ εὐλογημένοι τοῦ πατρὸς μου, κληρονομήσατε τὴν **ἡτοιμασμένην** ὑμῖν βασιλείαν ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου.

Matt. 25:41 τότε ἐρεῖ καὶ τοῖς ἐξ εὐωνύμων, Πορεύεσθε ἀπ' ἐμοῦ, οἱ κατηραμένοι, εἰς τὸ πῦρ τὸ αἰώνιον, τὸ **ἡτοιμασμένον** τῷ διαβόλῳ καὶ τοῖς ἀγγέλοις αὐτοῦ.

Matt. 26:17 Τῇ δὲ πρώτῃ τῶν ἁζύμων προσήλθον οἱ μαθηταὶ τῷ Ἰησοῦ, λέγοντες αὐτῷ, Ποῦ θέλεις **ἐτοιμάσωμέν** σοι φαγεῖν τὸ πάσχα;

Matt. 26:19 καὶ ἐποίησαν οἱ μαθηταὶ ὡς συνέταξεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, καὶ **ἡτοίμασαν** τὸ πάσχα.

Mark 1:3 φωνὴ βοῶντος ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, **Ἐτοιμάσατε** τὴν ὁδὸν Κυρίου· εὐθείας ποιεῖτε τὰς τρίβους αὐτοῦ.

Mark 10:40 τὸ δὲ καθίσαι ἐκ δεξιῶν μου καὶ ἐξ εὐωνύμων μου οὐκ ἔστιν ἐμὸν δοῦναι, ἀλλ' οἷς **ἡτοιμάσται**.

Mark 14:12 Καὶ τῇ πρώτῃ ἡμέρᾳ τῶν ἁζύμων, ὅτε τὸ πάσχα ἔθουν, λέγουσιν αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ, Ποῦ θέλεις ἀπελθόντες **ἐτοιμάσωμεν** ἵνα φάγῃς τὸ πάσχα;

Mark 14:15 καὶ αὐτὸς ὑμῖν δείξει ἀνώγειον μέγα ἐστρωμένον ἑτοιμον· ἐκεῖ **ἐτοιμάσατε** ἡμῖν.

Mark 14:16 καὶ ἐξήλθον οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἦλθον εἰς τὴν πόλιν, καὶ εὗρον καθὼς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, καὶ **ἡτοίμασαν** τὸ πάσχα.

Luke 1:17 καὶ αὐτὸς προελεύσεται ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ ἐν πνεύματι καὶ δυνάμει Ἡλίου, ἐπιστρέψαι καρδίας πατέρων ἐπὶ τέκνα, καὶ ἀπειθεῖς ἐν φρονήσει δικαίων, **ἐτοιμάσαι** Κυρίῳ λαὸν κατεσκευασμένον.

Luke 1:76 καὶ σύ, παιδίον, προφήτης ὑψίστου κληθήσῃ· προπορεύσῃ γὰρ πρὸ προσώπου Κυρίου **ἐτοιμάσαι** ὁδοὺς αὐτοῦ·

Luke 2:31 ὁ **ἡτοιμάσας** κατὰ πρόσωπον πάντων τῶν λαῶν

Luke 3:4 ὡς γέγραπται ἐν βίβλῳ λόγων Ἡσαίου τοῦ προφήτου, λέγοντος, Φωνὴ βοῶντος ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, **Ἐτοιμάσατε** τὴν ὁδὸν Κυρίου· εὐθείας ποιεῖτε τὰς τρίβους αὐτοῦ.

Luke 9:52 καὶ ἀπέστειλεν ἀγγέλους πρὸ προσώπου αὐτοῦ· καὶ πορευθέντες εἰσῆλθον εἰς κώμην Σαμαρειτῶν, ὥστε **ἐτοιμάσαι** αὐτῷ.

Luke 12:20 εἶπε δὲ αὐτῷ ὁ Θεός, Ὁ Αφρον, ταύτῃ τῇ νυκτὶ τὴν ψυχὴν σου ἀπαιτοῦσιν ἀπὸ σοῦ· ἃ δὲ **ἡτοιμάσας**, τί νίκαται;

Luke 12:47 ἐκεῖνος δὲ ὁ δοῦλος ὁ γνοὺς τὸ θέλημα τοῦ κυρίου ἑαυτοῦ, καὶ μὴ **ἐτοιμάσας** μηδὲ ποιήσας πρὸς τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ, δαρήσεται πολλὰς·

Luke 17:8 ἀλλ' οὐχὶ ἐρεῖ αὐτῷ, **Ἐτοιμάσον** τί δειπνήσω, καὶ περιζωσάμενος διακόνει μοι, ἕως φάγω καὶ πίω· καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα φάγεσαι καὶ πίεσαι σύ;

Luke 22:8 καὶ ἀπέστειλε Πέτρον καὶ Ἰωάννην, εἰπὼν, Πορευθέντες **ἐτοιμάσατε** ἡμῖν τὸ πάσχα, ἵνα φάγωμεν.

Luke 22:9 οἱ δὲ εἶπον αὐτῷ, Ποῦ θέλεις **ἐτοιμάσωμεν**;

Luke 22:12 κάκεινος ὑμῖν δείξει ἀνώγειον μέγα ἐστρωμένον· ἐκεῖ **ἐτοιμάσατε**.

Luke 22:13 ἀπελθόντες δὲ εὗρον καθὼς εἶρηκεν αὐτοῖς· καὶ **ἡτοίμασαν** τὸ πάσχα.

Luke 23:56 ὑποστρέψασαι δὲ **ἡτοίμασαν** ἄρώματα καὶ Μύρα. Καὶ τὸ μὲν σάββατον ἡσύχασαν κατὰ τὴν ἐντολήν.

Luke 24:1 τῇ δὲ μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων, ὀρθροῦ βαθέος, ἦλθον ἐπὶ τὸ μνήμα, φέρουσαι ἃ **ἡτοίμασαν** ἄρώματα, καὶ τινες σὺν αὐταῖς.

John 14:2 ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ τοῦ πατρὸς μου μοναὶ πολλαὶ εἰσιν· εἰ δὲ μή, εἶπον ἂν ὑμῖν· πορεύομαι **ἐτοιμάσαι** τόπον ὑμῖν.

John 14:3 καὶ ἐὰν πορευθῶ καὶ **ἐτοιμάσω** ὑμῖν τόπον, πάλιν ἔρχομαι καὶ παραλήψομαι ὑμᾶς πρὸς ἑμαυτὸν ἵνα ὅπου εἰμὶ ἐγώ, καὶ ὑμεῖς ᾗτε.

Acts 23:23 καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος δύο τινὰς τῶν ἑκατονταρχῶν εἶπεν, **Ἐτοιμάσατε** στρατιώτας διακοσίους ὅπως πορευθῶσιν ἕως Καισαρείας, καὶ ἵππεις ἑβδομήκοντα, καὶ δεξιολάβους διακοσίους, ἀπὸ τρίτης ὥρας τῆς νυκτός·

1Cor. 2:9 ἀλλὰ καθὼς γέγραπται, Ὁ ὀφθαλμὸς οὐκ εἶδε, καὶ οὐς οὐκ ἤκουσε, καὶ ἐπὶ καρδίαν ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἀνέβη, ἃ **ἠτοίμασε** ὁ Θεὸς τοῖς ἀγαπῶσιν αὐτόν.

2Tim. 2:21 ἐὰν οὖν τις ἐκκαθάρῃ ἑαυτὸν ἀπὸ τούτων, ἔσται σκευὸς εἰς τιμὴν, ἡγιασμένον, καὶ εὐχρηστον τῷ δεσπότῃ, εἰς πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθὸν **ἠτοιμασμένον**.

Philem. 22 ἅμα δὲ καὶ **ἐτοιμάζε** μοι ξενίαν· ἐλπίζω γὰρ ὅτι διὰ τῶν προσευχῶν ὑμῶν χαρισθήσομαι ὑμῖν.

Heb. 11:16 νυνὶ δὲ κρείττονος ὀρέγονται, τοῦτ' ἔστιν, ἐπουρανίου· διὸ οὐκ ἐπαισχύνεται αὐτοὺς ὁ Θεός, Θεὸς ἐπικαλεῖσθαι αὐτῶν· **ἠτοίμασε** γὰρ αὐτοῖς πόλιν.

Rev. 8:6 Καὶ οἱ ἐπὶ τὰ ἄγγελοι οἱ ἔχοντες τὰς ἑπτὰ σάλπιγγας **ἠτοίμασαν** ἑαυτοὺς ἵνα σαλπίσωσι.

Rev. 9:7 καὶ τὰ ὁμοιώματα τῶν ἀκρίδων ὅμοια ἵπποις **ἠτοιμασμένοις** εἰς πόλεμον, καὶ ἐπὶ τὰς κεφαλὰς αὐτῶν ὡς στέφανοι ὅμοιοι χρυσῷ, καὶ τὰ πρόσωπα αὐτῶν ὡς πρόσωπα ἀνθρώπων.

Rev. 9:15 καὶ ἐλύθησαν οἱ τέσσαρες ἄγγελοι οἱ **ἠτοιμασμένοι** εἰς τὴν ὥραν καὶ ἡμέραν καὶ μῆνα καὶ ἐνιαυτόν, ἵνα ἀποκτείνωσι τὸ τρίτον τῶν ἀνθρώπων.

Rev. 12:6 καὶ ἡ γυνὴ ἔφυγεν εἰς τὴν ἔρημον, ὅπου ἔχει τόπον **ἠτοιμασμένον** ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἵνα ἐκεῖ τρέφωσιν αὐτὴν ἡμέρας χιλίας διακοσίας ἐξήκοντα.

Rev. 16:12 Καὶ ὁ ἔκτος ἄγγελος ἐξέχεε τὴν φιάλην αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὸν ποταμὸν τὸν μέγαν τὸν Εὐφράτην· καὶ ἐξηράνθη τὸ ὕδωρ αὐτοῦ, ἵνα **ἐτοιμασθῇ** ἡ ὁδὸς τῶν βασιλέων τῶν ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν ἡλίου.

Rev. 19:7 χαίρωμεν καὶ ἀγαλλιώμεθα, καὶ δώμεν τὴν δόξαν αὐτῷ· ὅτι ἦλθεν ὁ γάμος τοῦ ἀρνίου, καὶ ἡ γυνὴ αὐτοῦ **ἠτοίμασεν** ἑαυτήν.

Rev. 21:2 καὶ ἐγὼ Ἰωάννης εἶδον τὴν πόλιν τὴν ἁγίαν, Ἱερουσαλὴμ καὶνὴν, καταβαίνουσαν ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, **ἠτοιμασμένην** ὡς νύμφην κεκοσμημένην τῷ ἀνδρὶ αὐτῆς.

Matt. 3:3 For this is he that was spoken of by the prophet Esaias, saying, The voice of one crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make his paths straight.

Matt. 20:23 And he saith unto them, **Ye shall drink indeed of my cup, and be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with: but to sit on my right hand, and on my left, is not mine to give, but it shall be given to them for whom it is prepared of my Father.**

Matt. 22:4 Again, he sent forth other servants, saying, Tell them which are bidden, Behold, I have prepared my dinner: my oxen and my fatlings *are* killed, and all things *are* ready: come unto the marriage.

Matt. 25:34 Then shall the King say unto them on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world:

Matt. 25:41 Then shall he say also unto them on the left hand, Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels:

Matt. 26:17 Now the first *day* of the *feast of* unleavened bread the disciples came to Jesus, saying unto him, Where wilt thou that we prepare for thee to eat the passover?

Matt. 26:19 And the disciples did as Jesus had appointed them; and they made ready the passover.

Mark 1:3 The voice of one crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make his paths straight.

Mark 10:40 **But to sit on my right hand and on my left hand is not mine to give; but it shall be given to them for whom it is prepared.**

Mark 14:12 And the first day of unleavened bread, when they killed the passover, his disciples said unto him, Where wilt thou that we go and prepare that thou mayest eat the passover?

Mark 14:15 **And he will shew you a large upper room furnished and prepared: there make ready for us.**

Mark 14:16 And his disciples went forth, and came into the city, and found as he had said unto them: and they made ready the passover.

Luke 1:17 And he shall go before him in the spirit and power of Elias, to turn the hearts of the fathers to the children, and the disobedient to the wisdom of the just; to make ready a people prepared for the Lord.

Luke 1:76 And thou, child, shalt be called the prophet of the Highest: for thou shalt go before the face of the Lord to prepare his ways;

Luke 2:31 Which thou hast prepared before the face of all people;

Luke 3:4 As it is written in the book of the words of Esaias the prophet, saying, The voice of one crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make his paths straight.

Luke 9:52 And sent messengers before his face: and they went, and entered into a village of the Samaritans, to make ready for him.

Luke 12:20 But God said unto him, *Thou fool, this night thy soul shall be required of thee: then whose shall those things be, which thou hast provided?*

Luke 12:47 And that servant, which knew his lord's will, and prepared not *himself*, neither did according to his will, shall be beaten with many *stripes*.

Luke 17:8 And will not rather say unto him, Make ready wherewith I may sup, and gird thyself, and serve me, till I have eaten and drunken; and afterward thou shalt eat and drink?

Luke 22:8 And he sent Peter and John, saying, *Go and prepare us the passover, that we may eat.*

Luke 22:9 And they said unto him, Where wilt thou that we prepare?

Luke 22:12 *And he shall shew you a large upper room furnished: there make ready.*

Luke 22:13 And they went, and found as he had said unto them: and they made ready the passover.

Luke 23:56 And they returned, and prepared spices and ointments; and rested the sabbath day according to the commandment.

Luke 24:1 Now upon the first *day* of the week, very early in the morning, they came unto the sepulchre, bringing the spices which they had prepared, and certain *others* with them.

John 14:2 *In my Father's house are many mansions: if it were not so, I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you.*

John 14:3 *And if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again, and receive you unto myself; that where I am, there ye may be also.*

Acts 23:23 And he called unto *him* two centurions, saying, Make ready two hundred soldiers to go to Caesarea, and horsemen threescore and ten, and spearmen two hundred, at the third hour of the night;

1Cor. 2:9 But as it is written, Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love him.

2Tim. 2:21 If a man therefore purge himself from these, he shall be a vessel unto honour, sanctified, and meet for the master's use, *and* prepared unto every good work.

Philem. 22 But withal prepare me also a lodging: for I trust that through your prayers I shall be given unto you.

Heb. 11:16 But now they desire a better *country*, that is, an heavenly: wherefore God is not ashamed to be called their God: for he hath prepared for them a city.

Rev. 8:6 And the seven angels which had the seven trumpets prepared themselves to sound.

Rev. 9:7 And the shapes of the locusts *were* like unto horses prepared unto battle; and on their heads *were* as it were crowns like gold, and their faces *were* as the faces of men.

Rev. 9:15 And the four angels were loosed, which were prepared for an hour, and a day, and a month, and a year, for to slay the third part of men.

Rev. 12:6 And the woman fled into the wilderness, where she hath a place prepared of God, that they should feed her there a thousand two hundred *and* threescore days.

Rev. 16:12 And the sixth angel poured out his vial upon the great river Euphrates; and the water thereof was dried up, that the way of the kings of the east might be prepared.

Rev. 19:7 Let us be glad and rejoice, and give honour to him: for the marriage of the Lamb is come, and his wife hath made herself ready.

Rev. 21:2 And I John saw the holy city, new Jerusalem, coming down from God out of heaven, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband.

Chapter 5

Spend c. 1-2 hours studying Ephesians 5:18. Does 5:18a teach “moderate” drinking or command total abstinence from alcohol? Why? Look at standard lexica on πληρόω and its NT cognate words for *filling*, and look at the Biblical instances of these words. Also read the relevant article in the *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Be ready to give a detailed explanation of what Spirit filling is in class. You should also interact with

the view of Wallace on Ephesians 5:18 (see pgs. 93-94, 170-171, 215, 375, 525, 639, 717) and its more extreme advocate William W. Combs, who stated: “[Ephesians 5:18] would be the only example we have in Greek literature if this really is ‘filled with the Spirit,’ and that is the content . . . there is no filling with the Spirit.”²¹⁵ Is Combs’ affirmation true, or Wallace’s position? Why or why not? You can work with other students to tackle different aspects of this question.

²¹⁵ “Filling of the Holy Spirit,” Dr. William W. Combs, Detroit Baptist Seminary lecture, Mid-America Conference on Preaching 2003, “The Ministry of the Holy Spirit,” <http://www.dbts.edu/5-1/5-12.asp#03>.

In relation to Ephesians 5:19, look at the texts below. Are ψαλμός and ψάλλω ever clearly used for anything other than singing songs from the book of Psalms? What impact should Ephesians 5:19 have on the worship of God?

ψαλμός in the NT:

Luke 20:42 καὶ αὐτὸς Δαβὶδ λέγει ἐν βίβλῳ **ψαλμῶν**, Εἶπεν ὁ Κύριος τῷ Κυρίῳ μου, Κάθου ἐκ δεξιῶν μου,

Luke 24:44 Εἶπε δὲ αὐτοῖς, Οὗτοι οἱ λόγοι, οὓς ἐλάλησα πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἔτι ὦν σὺν ὑμῖν, ὅτι δεῖ πληρωθῆναι πάντα τὰ γεγραμμένα ἐν τῷ νόμῳ Μωσέως καὶ προφήταις καὶ **ψαλμοῖς** περὶ ἐμοῦ.

Acts 1:20 γέγραπται γὰρ ἐν βίβλῳ **Ψαλμῶν**, Γενηθήτω ἡ ἔπαυλις αὐτοῦ ἔρημος, καὶ μὴ ἔστω ὁ κατοικῶν ἐν αὐτῇ· καί, Τὴν ἐπισκοπὴν αὐτοῦ λάβοι ἕτερος.

Acts 13:33 ὅτι ταύτην ὁ Θεὸς ἐκπεπλήρωκε τοῖς τέκνοις αὐτῶν ἡμῖν, ἀναστήσας Ἰησοῦν ὡς καὶ ἐν τῷ **ψαλμῷ** τῷ δευτέρῳ γέγραπται, Υἱός μου εἶ σύ, ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε.

1Cor. 14:26 Τί οὖν ἐστίν, ἀδελφοί; ὅταν συνέρχησθε, ἕκαστος ὑμῶν **ψαλμὸν** ἔχει, διδασκὴν ἔχει, γλῶσσαν ἔχει, ἀποκάλυψιν ἔχει, ἐρμηνείαν ἔχει, πάντα πρὸς οἰκοδομὴν γενέσθω.

Eph. 5:19 λαλοῦντες ἑαυτοῖς **ψαλμοῖς** καὶ ὕμνοις καὶ ᾠδαῖς πνευματικαῖς, ᾄδοντες καὶ ψάλλοντες ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ ὑμῶν τῷ Κυρίῳ,

Col. 3:16 ὁ λόγος τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐνοικεῖτω ἐν ὑμῖν πλουσίως ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ· διδάσκοντες καὶ νοθετοῦντες ἑαυτούς, **ψαλμοῖς**, καὶ ὕμνοις, καὶ ᾠδαῖς πνευματικαῖς, ἐν χάριτι ᾄδοντες ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ ὑμῶν τῷ Κυρίῳ.

Luke 20:42 **And David himself saith in the book of Psalms, The LORD said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand,**

Luke 24:44 **And he said unto them, These are the words which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled, which were written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the psalms, concerning me.**

Acts 1:20 For it is written in the book of Psalms, Let his habitation be desolate, and let no man dwell therein: and his bishoprick let another take.

Acts 13:33 God hath fulfilled the same unto us their children, in that he hath raised up Jesus again; as it is also written in the second psalm, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee.

1Cor. 14:26 How is it then, brethren? when ye come together, every one of you hath a psalm, hath a doctrine, hath a tongue, hath a revelation, hath an interpretation. Let all things be done unto edifying.

Eph. 5:19 Speaking to yourselves in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing and making melody in your heart to the Lord;

Col. 3:16 Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly in all wisdom; teaching and admonishing one another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing with grace in your hearts to the Lord.

The verb ψάλλω appears in:

Rom. 15:9 τὰ δὲ ἔθνη ὑπὲρ ἐλέους δοξάσαι τὸν Θεόν, καθὼς γέγραπται, Διὰ τοῦτο ἐξομολογήσομαί σοι ἐν ἔθνεσι, καὶ τῷ ὀνόματί σου **ψαλῶ**.

1Cor. 14:15 τί οὖν ἐστὶ; προσεύξομαι τῷ πνεύματι, προσεύξομαι δὲ καὶ τῷ νοῒ, **ψαλῶ** τῷ πνεύματι, **ψαλῶ** δὲ καὶ τῷ νοῒ.

Eph. 5:19 λαλοῦντες ἑαυτοῖς ψαλμοῖς καὶ ὕμνοις καὶ ᾠδαῖς πνευματικαῖς, ᾄδοντες καὶ **ψάλλοντες** ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ ὑμῶν τῷ Κυρίῳ,

James 5:13 Κακοπαθεῖ τις ἐν ὑμῖν; προσευχέσθω. εὐθυμεῖ τις; **ψαλλέτω**.

Rom. 15:9 And that the Gentiles might glorify God for *his* mercy; as it is written, For this cause I will confess to thee among the Gentiles, and sing unto thy name.

1Cor. 14:15 What is it then? I will pray with the spirit, and I will pray with the understanding also: I will sing with the spirit, and I will sing with the understanding also.

Eph. 5:19 Speaking to yourselves in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing and making melody in your heart to the Lord;

James 5:13 Is any among you afflicted? let him pray. Is any merry? let him sing psalms.