

Greek Grammar and Syntax Versus Calvinism

By

Malcolm L. Lavender,
Litt.D.

An e-book that may be downloaded free
for purposes of study and teaching

Copyright © 2000 by Malcolm L. Lavender
4023 Gratiot Avenue
Fort Gratiot, MI 48059 USA
E-Mail: malcolm@crisispub.com
Produced as an e-book in the
United States
of America

Contents

Chapter One, Point One

I. Penal Atonement

I. The Demands of Intrinsic Atonement Not Satisfied, in Which...	
Christ is both <u>Subject</u> and <u>Predicate</u> in Atonement	5
Christ is both <u>Subject</u> and <u>Object</u> in Atonement	6
Christ is Both the <u>Priest</u> and the Offering	9
Penal Atonement Not Coextensive with the Needs of Fallen Man	11
Calvinistic Atonement a Caste System	11

Chapter Two, Point Two

II. Irresistible Grace or Efficacious Call

II. <u>Irresistible</u> Grace or <u>Efficacious</u> Call Perverts the Spirit's Purpose	17
Steele and Thomas State	17
<i>The Westminster Confession of Faith</i> , 1647	18
Theologian John Miley	18
Every Conceivable One (<i>pas</i>), Whosoever (<i>hos</i>)...Call	19
Everyone Believing	21
Rom1:16 to Jew, to Greek	23
Come...Take...Freely	24
The Antithesis to Damnation of Some: The Lord...Longsuffering...Not Willing	25

Chapter Three, Point Three

III Total Depravity

III. Note the Potential Moods, and Voices of Action	27
The Imperative Mood	28
Imperative/Active/Passive	29
Man Exercises Will	30
Active Voice	32
Middle Voice	34

Chapter Four, Point Four

IV. Unconditional Election/Predestination

IV. Predestination Not in Accord With the Character/Justice of God	
John Calvin on Predestination	36
On Infants	36
Steele and Thomas on Election	37
John Wesley on Decree	38
Charles Wesley on Decree	38
Romans 8:29	39
Theological Note	39
Rom 9:11...God's Purpose/Will	40
Word Study... <i>elogēn</i>	40
Rom 9:13...Jacob Loved/Esau Hated	41
Word Study... <i>proētoimasen</i>	43
Word Studies... <i>pas/hos/epikalesētai</i>	44
Rom 11:23	44
Unconditional Election Cannot Demonstrate	45
Theologian A. M. Hills of the Evils of Calvinism	45

Chapter Five, Point Five

V. Perseverance/Eternal Security/Once in Grace, Always in Grace

V. Calvinistic security Not in Accord With Scripture	47
Sin Brings Separation from God	49
Righteousness Brings Separation from Sin	52
The <i>Accusative</i> of the <i>Thing</i> and the <i>Accusative</i> of the <i>Person</i>	55
Salvation Conditional	56
Monadic Constructions	56
Rom 5:16 Proof that Sin Brings Death	59
Glossary of Terms on Atonement	62
See Summary of This Document Generated By Copernic	65

Chapter One, Point One

Cumulative Evidence from Greek NT Versus Calvinism in This §:

1. [Predicate nominative](#) construction...1 Jn 2:2
2. Christ [Subject and Object](#) in Atonement...Eph 5:2; Heb 9:14; 10:12; 7:27.
3. Christ both [Priest and Offering](#) in Intrinsic Atonement...Jn 10:17-18; Heb10:12; 7:27.
4. [Penal atonement](#) not coextensive with Fall...[monadic](#) construction; [accusative of extent](#); 1 Jn 2:2; Heb 2:9; Lk 19:10; no limiting word in proof texts: Mat 1:21; Eph 5:23; Jn 10:15; Ac 20:28, etc.

I. Penal Atonement Cannot Be Constructed in Predicate Nominative

1. Christ is Both [Subject](#) and [Predicate](#) in Atonement

In the New Testament Atonement is expressed in *predicate nominative* construction as follows: *kai autos hilasmos estin peri tōn hamartiōn hēmōn...* and He, Himself, is an Atonement concerning the sins of us (1 John 2:2). No other atonement theory can be stated in the *predicate nominative* construction *kai* = and, *autos* = Himself, *hilasmos* = Atonement, *estin* = (He) is, *peri* = concerning, *tōn* = the, *hamartiōn* = sins, *hēmōn* = of us. Here *hilasmos* (Atonement) is in the *predicate nominative* position, the predicate of the linking verb *estin* (is), which expresses a state of being and not action. The significance of this powerful construction is that it emphatically links the Person and His work, i.e., *He* and *Atonement* are the same—Person and Atonement. Thus Christ is the Atonement and the Atonement is He. The double nominative *He* and *Himself* emphasize the Person of Christ in Atonement. This is Atonement stated in predicate nominative construction! This powerful construction can admit no additives whatsoever—*penal*,¹ *punishment*, *made sin*, *satisfaction*, *vicarious*, *wrath of God on Christ*, or *judgment of sin by punishing Christ*.

We invite the Calvinist scholar to state *penal satisfaction* in predicate nominative construction based on the Greek New Testament. Scriptural Atonement can be so stated. Simply put, the *penal* error cannot be so stated!

The *predicate nominative* construction is the Divine declarative that Christ is the All-Sufficient One. It means that Atonement is Who Christ is and what He did; Atonement is not what was done to Christ, it is what He did! Atonement is thus Priestly-Sacrificial, i.e., the *priest* and *sacrifice* of the Old Testament are brought together in the Person of Jesus Christ; He is both—Priest and Sacrifice; thus, He could *offer Himself*, as stated in Hebrews.

¹ See [Glossary of Terms](#) on Atonement/hilasmos, guilt, propitiation, substitute, and vicarious; also, *anti*, *dia*, and *hyper*, which will be discussed further in an anticipated web site on: *Steele and Thomas Refuted on The Five Points of Calvinism*, a refutation of *The Five Points of Calvinism, Defined, Defended, Documented*, by David N. Steele and Curtis C. Thomas. We agree that they have *Defined*, but deny that they have *Defended, Documented*.

The animal of the Old Testament, a type of the atoning work of Christ, was not punished, neither was Christ. Sin was not judged *in the Person of Christ* at Calvary; but a sentence was passed and an execution effected on sin. Sin was abolished or put away and now sin is removed from God's people, a point to which legal or penal atonement cannot lay claim. God's people are thus free from the cause—sin; they are free from the result—guilt and condemnation. The Calvinist, in an attempt to defend his sin, tries to put it on Christ at Calvary!

2. Christ is Both Subject and Object in Atonement

We here cite several Scriptures that show Christ as both Subject and Object in Atonement:

Ephesians 5:2 states:

“...Christ [He] loved us and He handed over Himself (object) on our behalf, an offering (obj.) and a sacrifice² (obj.) to God....”

Solus Christus...*Christ alone*; Atonement is *Solus Christus*. So, Atonement is in the Immutable One, in the Eternal One. From this lofty Sphere of an eternal order, Atonement unfolded in time and space for Adam's fallen race. The writer to Hebrews states the all-sufficiency of Christ in Atonement as follows:

“How much more will the blood of Christ, Who through His eternal Spirit,³ [He] offered Himself to God without spot, will cleanse our conscience from dead works....”

² Christ is here, in the original, in the nominative three times: *Christ, He, He*; in the accusative three times: *Himself, an Offering, a Sacrifice*.

³ Hebrews 9:14. “*dia pneumatos aiōniou* (through His eternal Spirit)” is an ablative of agency. “The” does not occur in the Original, which insertion tends to leave the impression that the Holy Spirit is in mind. “His” is *understood* in the ablative of agency.

Eternal Spirit here must be a reference to the Divinity of Christ for the following reasons: 1) The second Person of the Trinity is mentioned in this verse five times—Christ, Who, His eternal Spirit, Himself, He offered. 2) The immediate context shows the contrast between the Old Testament sacrifices and Christ. 3) Hypostatical union is shown: His *eternal Spirit* (Divinity) and *offered Himself* (humanity). Thus, the PERSON of hypostatical union or Divinity and humanity is one Person; and He cannot be separated in atonement as is done in relation to 2 Corinthians 5:21a by penal satisfactionists.

The Christ of hypostatical union—Divinity and humanity—is seen as having offered Himself in behalf of fallen man. The salvation of man is *by blood alone (solus sanguis)*; see Leviticus 17:11; Ephesians 1:7; I John 1:7. Apart from Christ's humanity, there could not have been any blood to shed; apart from His humanity, there could not have been His death of utter necessity. God is eternal: Had there been no *eternal Spirit*, there could not have been the validating efficacy of the blood—*how much more*. . . . Had there been no *eternal Spirit*, sin could not be removed . . . now or ever! Had there been no *eternal Spirit*, there could have been no *offering to God without spot*!

It is utterly impossible then that the Christ—Jehovah-Saviour—one in PERSON, one in Triune ONENESS of the Godhead, could have been punished by God the Trinity, or made sin either in fact or by imputation as asserted by the penal satisfactionists! It is as Dr. Adam Clarke, that great commentator of Christendom, says “. . . a most blasphemous doctrine;” for Jehovah-Saviour wrought atonement in the hypostatical union of His Person—God and man—and in the unity of the Triune Godhead—One God!

Thus, the doctrine of penal satisfaction *divides* God against Himself—God is made to punish God, the Son. Further, to bring to the greatest Event of time and space the presupposition that Jehovah-Saviour was made sin,

“ . . . This Man⁴ [Priest] . . . after He offered one (obj.) sacrifice (obj., i.e., Himself). . . .”⁵

“ . . . this He did once-for-all when He offered up him-self.”⁶

We note here the emphasis on the Person and work of Christ in Atonement:

1) In the above Scriptures, we have Christ as Subject/nominative: Christ, He (6 times), Who, This Man; Christ as Object/accusative: Himself (3 times), an Offering, a Sacrifice, one Sacrifice; His action is expressed as: *loved, handed over, did, offered* (3 times), *an offering*, as a *sacrifice*.

Thus Christ is Atonement and Atonement is He; He is Subject and Object in Atonement. So, the Person of Christ is emphasized in Atonement by statement in the *predicate nominative construction* and as *Subject* and *Object* or *nominative* and *accusative*. This shows that the infinite merit of Christ’s work in Atonement is in His Person, Who He is. Accordingly, Calvin and Reformed Calvinism cannot remove infinite merit from the Person of Christ to the “divine decree” as done. This is [EXTRINSIC ATONEMENT](#), which moves “infinite merit” from the Divinity of Christ to the decree. [See footnote 3 above](#).

2) His *blood* and *eternal Spirit* further describe His Person and Atonement work. This is a powerful statement about the Incarnation of the Son. As God and man, He was a prepared offering. He *offered*, He *shed blood* and *died*; as God, He could not die; as man, He died; hence, efficacy in Atonement by the hypostatical union of Divinity and humanity. The Atonement is thus grounded in the Person of Jesus Christ, not the decree. Penal atonement, commonly called penal satisfaction, is grounded in *punishment* and/or *the decree*, not the blood of Christ. Calvin states:

“If Christ **had merely died a corporeal [bodily] death, no end would have been accomplished by it**; it was requisite, also, that he should feel the severity of the Divine vengeance, in order to appease the wrath of God, and satisfy his justice.

or that He bore the wrath of God, either in fact, by imputation, or by any consideration whatsoever, necessarily constitutes a *division* of the Person of Christ. Thus, His humanity or in His body, He bore the wrath of God, and consequently the imputation of sin; but His Divinity or eternal Spirit could not be under wrath since the Punisher and the punished cannot be one; and consequently, one under wrath or imputed as sin could not possibly access God! But this is not the gospel. This is Evangelical Gnosticism that would take away the Oneness of Person in hypostatical union, which would take away that vital, spotless purity necessary to access God in a manner other than we!

And this Gnostic division of the Person of Christ in atonement affords no ground for the removal of sin in this life. Moreover, in far-reaching influence, this Gnostic curse casts its dreadful shadow over Christian experience. It claims that the believer must ever live subject to the downward pull of sin this side of the grave, and that the sins done in the body do not bring death to the soul and thus separation from God. This Evangelical Gnosticism then is that certain confidence in which its advocates fancy that they are in faith, while they vainly imagine that “believing sinners” are unconditionally secure *in Christ*!

⁴ *Man* translates *houtos*, a masculine gender, demonstrative pronoun—so, *Man* or *Priest*, or *This Man*. For euphony in an English translation, we have chosen *Man*.

⁵ Or Sin-Offering. Hebrews 10:12.

⁶ Heb 7:27.

Hence it was necessary for him to contend with the powers of hell and the horror of eternal death.”⁷

Muller states:

“Thus Christ’s satisfaction includes and implies the *obedientia Christi*...[*obedience of Christ*] through which Christ both fulfills the law for us vicariously and then accepts, vicariously, the punishment for sin required under the law, death.”

“...the assault of sin against infinite God demands infinite punishment and can be satisfied only through an infinite payment. Such payment cannot be made by a mere human being, but only by a being with infinite powers, namely God. The one who makes satisfaction must, therefore, be the God-man, Christ.... **It should be noted that Calvin had credited the all-sufficiency of Christ’s merit (*meritum Christi*, q.v.) to the divine decree**, a doctrine more in accord with the Reformed Christology than the scholastic Reformed view that the source of Christ’s infinite merit was the infinite value of his divine-human work.”⁸

Atonement then, in this system, is in the *divine decree* and *penal satisfaction*, ***not blood...and so removed from the Person of Christ***. In this atonement “infinite merit” is not in the “infinite value” of His “divine-human work;” *merit* and *value* are in the divine decree and punishment. But *infinite merit* and *value* are clearly shown to be in the Person of Christ in [Jn 10:17-18](#), and the references in [Hebrews](#) noted above.

The Calvinist is invited to state *penal satisfaction* in construction from the Greek New Testament in which Christ is both Subject and Object in Atonement. The Scriptures so state Him.

See my discussion on [2 Cor 5:21](#); [1 Cor 6:20](#); [Gal 3:13](#); [Isa 53](#) , [EXTRINSIC ATONEMENT, SIN MUST BE PUNISHED](#) and [ATONEMENT FOR REMOVAL OF SIN...NOW](#) in *The Fallacy of the “Sinning Christian.”*

Note that penal satisfaction cannot remove sin in the here and now, and is not said to; but Scripture makes such claims:

3) The result of His *offering* is *cleansing* or *removal* in the here and now for the following reasons:

Reason One: The offering has ceased; sin has ceased in believers because of the *how much more...blood* that was shed. The inspired writer in Hebrews 10:18 affirms that “there is no longer an offering concerning sins.” Under the Levitical system sins could not be removed, and thus offerings for them were necessarily perpetual because they needed to be remitted on an ongoing basis.

⁷ *Institutes*, 2.16.10; (Trans.: J. A.); bold print added.

⁸ Richard A. Muller, *Dictionary of Latin and Greek Theological Terms*, p. 272; bold print added.

So, under this system, sins were remitted⁹ or canceled on the ground of ceremonial rites and perpetual bloodshed of animal sacrifices. These pointed to the coming One, Who would *remove* sins, not *remit* them, and would offer a once-for-all Sacrifice, not a perpetual one.

But this **judaizing tenet** of Reformation and Calvinistic advocates would take away the enabling grace of the Better Sacrifice; transcendent superiority is affirmed, however, in the mighty truth that “there is no longer an offering for sins.” Thus, we have a transcendent “Offering” because *remission* gives way to *removal*! AND THIS MIGHTY TRUTH PROVES THAT SIN IS REMOVED AND NOT REMITTED!! Not remitted otherwise “an offering” would continue; not continued because removed!

Reason Two: The blood of Christ and the blood of the Levitical animal are infinitely separated in outcome. The sacrifice of Christ cannot be made equal in RESULT with the Levitical animal as has been done by the advocates of penal atonement, neither removing sin in the here and now. See [CHRIST'S BLOOD AND LEVITICAL ANIMAL EQUAL IN RESULT](#).

Reason Three: “...*kathariei tēn suneidēsin hēmōn apo nekrōn ergōn eis to latreuein Theō zōnti*...will cleanse the conscience of us from dead works to serve the living God” (Heb 9:14b).

This is the language of *solus Christus*, Christ alone. The Atonement is not what was done to Him; it is Who He Is and what He did—*solus Christus*. Thus, Atonement is internalized *in* Christ alone in blood and Divinity, and so a Priesthood of a new order—an Incarnate High Priest, capable of offering Himself, as stated. Note: there is no punishment, substitution, etc., in this terminology.

3. Christ is Both [Priest](#) and [Offering](#) in Intrinsic Atonement

In the greatest event of space and time, Christ the great High Priest offered Himself. He said on one occasion:

“I [Subject] lay My life down [object] in order that I [Subject] may take it [object] again. No one takes it from Me, but I [Subject] lay it [object] down from [apo]¹⁰ Myself. I [Subject] have authority [*exousian*]¹¹ to lay it [object] down, and I [Subject] have authority to take it [object] again...”¹²

Because of Who Christ *is*, He can both lay down His life and take it up again. His *death* by bloodshed and taking up life by *resurrection* are, if we may so speak, a

⁹ “1. to forgive or pardon (sins etc.) 2. a) to refrain from exacting (a payment, tax, etc.) to refrain from inflicting (a punishment) or enforce (a sentence or fine); cancel;” *Webster’s New World Dictionary of the American Language* s.v. “remit.”

¹⁰ *Apo* is an ablative of separation.

¹¹ *Exousian*, in this context, is authority because of Who He is, i.e., *out of being*.

¹² Jn 10:17-18.

kind of hypostasis,¹³ i.e., *distinct* events but *one* in purpose and result, and of the same authority or Person. *Death* and *resurrection* are thus inseparable, indivisible, belonging to the Person in the salvation work thus wrought.

In Hebrews 10:12, “This Man (*houtos*; Priest) . . . offered one [Object] Sacrifice [Object]. . . .” Note that “this Man” and “one Sacrifice” are the same Person. Thus, Christ is both Priest and Sacrifice in Priestly-Sacrificial Atonement, as is affirmed by the rest of the Scriptures. Accordingly, there can be no penal satisfaction in Scripture. Christ did not punish Himself, and He and the Trinity were in oneness of essence and purpose when He offered Himself. It cannot possibly be otherwise in a *voluntary* death. God in oneness of purpose cannot punish God, the Son. The death of God, the Son, cannot consist in both punishment and a voluntary act.

In Hebrews 7:27, “. . . this He did once-for-all when He [Subject] offered up [*anenegkas*] himself. [Object]”

Thus, the Great High Priest offered up himself, through Himself in Priestly-Sacrificial Atonement, in the Self-sufficiency of Himself by blood and Divinity alone.

This is Priestly-Sacrificial Atonement!

This is *intrinsic* Atonement, not penal. This is a Christ-centered truth of an event evolving out of the hallowed Sphere of His utter Self-sufficiency. The intrinsic nature of the Atonement is evident in the mighty truth that He offered Himself. Here One of an eternal order acts in the transcendent Self-sufficiency of Himself. Atonement is thus internalized in the Godhead, wrought by blood and Divinity of the Incarnate Son of God, not *forsaken* by God, but consubstantial with God, one with God, in the act of Atonement on Calvary’s hill. Thus, intrinsic sufficiency is in Him, for Divinity is in Him; humanity is in Him; atoning blood is in Him—intrinsic Atonement is in Him! What more could possibly add to sufficiency, to efficacy? Nothing!

We note that Calvin erroneously credited the all-sufficiency of Christ’s merit to the divine decree, removing sufficiency from the Person Who wrought Atonement. Accordingly, in the Calvinistic system Atonement is extrinsic, outside of Christ, not intrinsically in Him, of Him, by Him, through Him—in Christ alone!

Calvinists, or whomsoever else, are invited to show from the Greek New Testament, in *predicate nominative* construction, that Atonement is penal! We thus

¹³ Hypostasis consists in *distinction* and a certain *sameness*, as “the distinct substance or subsistence of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit in the Godhead,” *The Consolidated-Webster Comprehensive Encyclopedic Dictionary*; “An underlying principle; some fact or supposition which lies at the foundation of a course of reasoning; substance, entity, or personality, especially of any member of the Trinity,” *Webster’s New Century Dictionary of the English Language*, Unabridged, Vol. I; “Also, in Christological usage, the whole personality of Christ as distinguished from his two natures, human and divine,” *Webster’s New International Dictionary of the English Language*, Second Edition, Unabridged.

challenge the validity of the system and the integrity of all its advocates all over the world to put out the facts and stop philosophizing theology. Stop blaspheming the Son of God and His work in Atonement, claiming that God punished the Son, thus dividing the Trinity.

For a full discussion on Priestly-Sacrificial Atonement see my [NOTES ON THE ATONEMENT](#).

The Calvinist is invited to state *penal satisfaction* (Atonement) in a construction in which it is *intrinsic-in Christ* alone, not extrinsic.

4. **Penal Atonement** Not Coextensive with the Needs of Fallen Man

- Penal atonement limits God to a [caste system](#), excluding the masses

Calvinistic atonement cannot be stated as coextensive with the Fall: 1) if penal, it can only be designed for those for whom Christ was punished, the elect only, so limited; 2) or, it is universal and *all* are saved. Thus, penal atonement is necessarily *restricted* or *unlimited* in its offer to those for whom Christ was punished, whether the offer is to the elect only or universally.

The efficacy of penal atonement can rise no higher than itself; it is legal; so, it is equal in result to that of the Levitical animal. This atonement cannot remove sin and is not said to. God must “pass over” it until after death.

Calvinistic Atonement a [Caste System](#):

- 1) *New Geneva Study Bible*: “Christ did not intend to die in this efficacious sense for everyone.”
- 2) *The Agony of Deceit*: “...it is a serious hermeneutical error to enquire of John 3:16 about the extent of the atonement....”
- 3) John Calvin: “...some are preordained to eternal life, others to eternal damnation...” [Presupposes limited atonement.]
- 4) A. A. Hodge: “...all true Augustinians and Calvinists have necessarily held that Christ died *definitely*¹⁴ and personally for the elect.” [So, Christ died for a class, the elect, not the world.]

The Atonement is the Holy of Holies of the New Testament. It matters not on what we may be right if we err here. One’s view on the Atonement has destiny fixing potential, for an atonement theory will determine the nature of the Christian walk—to sin, to not sin, necessity of regenerative change, real righteousness, the nature of the Trinity, etc.

1.) *New Geneva Study Bible*: The Calvinist comes to the Holy Place of Atonement and redefines it with fictitious coinage in order to come out with *limited* atonement.

¹⁴ Emphasis added.

They even dare to say of the work of Christ in a Study Bible for lay people: “Christ did not intend to die in this efficacious sense for everyone. The proof of that... is that not all are saved.”¹⁵ Thus, Calvinistic unbelief prevails—“definite redemption, particular redemption, limited atonement,” not for the *world*, (Jn 3:16); not for *the whole world* (1 Jn 2:2), etc. Tragically, Christendom is full of unbelief with respect to Scriptural Atonement.

If Christ did not die in an *efficacious sense* for all, how can anyone, not knowing for whom He died *efficaciously*, be capable of exercising faith? The Calvinist will, of course, lay this lie or secret agenda on the Holy Spirit and claim that He calls the elect in an *effectual* sense, but the non-elect in a *general invitation*, to which call it is actually impossible to respond.

Calvinistic limited atonement is grounded in the *decree* and *punishment*, and so necessarily presupposes predestination or salvation for the elect only, while the rest of the world are powerless to act toward salvation. These are damned and “can not be saved”¹⁶ because they may be *called*, but the *effectual call* is said to be withheld from all who are not elect, so damned for all eternity by the God Who professed to love the world.

Thus, according to the New *Geneva Study Bible*, Christ never intended to die for the world, just the *few* of whom the Calvinistic elect are *a part*. We note the phrase, efficacious sense. This phrase is used to mean that *all for whom Christ died will be saved, irresistibly*.

This is nothing short of a *caste system* and pagan in nature, devoid of Christianity, devoid of the universal thrust of Christianity—the gospel to the entire world that whosoever may believe. Further, the claim that Christ did not die for all the sons and daughters of Adam’s fallen race is blasphemy.

2.) In *The Agony of Deceit*, Henry Krabbendam states: “...it is a serious hermeneutical error to enquire of John 3:16 about the extent of the atonement...”¹⁷ Krabbendam further says: “Concretely, the aim of John 3:16 is to bring out the astounding character of the love of God. That, then, should also be the aim of the exposition of the passage.”¹⁸

Krabbendam’s statement is a serious departure from the faith. Certainly John 3:16 brings out the LOVE OF GOD. Perhaps it will be helpful to have John 3:16-18

¹⁵ *Geneva Study Bible*, R. C. Sproul, General Editor, Thomas Nelson Publishers, Nashville, Atlanta, London, Vancouver, 1995 by Foundation for Reformation, s.v. Definite Redemption, p. 1682; emphasis added.

¹⁶ *Westminster Confession of Faith*, Of Effectual Calling, X. IV, cited by Philip Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom with a History and Critical Notes* 3Vols. Fourth Edition New York: Harper and Brothers, Vol. 3, p. 625; cf. II., III, pp. 24-25.

¹⁷ *The Agony of Deceit*, Michael Horton, Editor, Moody Press, Chicago, © 1990, p. 75.

¹⁸ *Ibid.* p. 76.

before us:

“¹⁶For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life. ¹⁷For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world; but that the world through him might be saved. ¹⁸He that believeth on him is not condemned: but he that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God.”

We note several things about God: 1) God acts: He loved, He gave His Son; 2) God had a purpose: the salvation of the world; 3) Salvation is expressed in the potential¹⁹ mood: subjunctive—may not perish, may have eternal life; 4) World is a *monadic*²⁰ construction, which means it is indivisible.

Accusative of Extent

The Scriptures declare that God loved the world.²¹ *The world* is in the accusative case and the direct object of God’s love. This is called the *accusative of extent*. This is an urgent, compelling love extended to *ton kosmon* (the world) without limitation whatsoever; for who [except the Calvinist] could look at the cross and see the bleeding, writhing Jehovah-Saviour dying there for *ton kosmon* and demand limitation! Clearly, *the world*, the whole world, is the object of God’s love. Thus, the extent of His love is specified and extended to its object—*ton kosmon*! *Extent* cannot be *limited* as in atonement; *extent* is the *world* and cannot be divided into a class or cast system in which *sufficiency* in atonement is for the non-elect/damned and *efficiency* is for the elect/saved.

Another vital point in this construction—*ton kosmon*—shows that “the world” cannot possibly be divided, as Calvin says:

“some . . . preordained to eternal life, others to eternal damnation . . . accordingly, as each has been created for one or other of these ends....”²²

Monadic Construction

The noun *world* is a construction in which the noun, in syntax, is *monadic*. Thus, *the world* is viewed as an indivisible unit incapable of being separated or divided into the *elect* and *damned*. The doctrine again fails, not yielding to that vital necessity of Atonement for all. Devoid of truth, and by nature of its own system, it is compelled to avoid Universalism on the one hand, and to attempt the impossible division of the world into a mixed state known as the elect and non-elect on the

¹⁹ This rules out **irresistible grace** for the so-called elect of Calvinistic theology.

²⁰ “A substantive is said to be monadic when it is the only such thing there is. An article is not always used with monadic nouns, however.” See James A Brooks and Carlton L. Winbery, *Syntax of New Testament Greek*, Lanham, MD.: University Press of America, Inc. 1988, pp. 73, 74 for examples.

²¹ John 3:16.

²² *Institutes*, 3.21.5, (Trans.: H. B.); emphasis added.

other hand. Neither of these false positions can be reconciled to Scriptural Atonement. The penal satisfaction theory, then, is an utter failure to meet the needs of a lost world, leaving millions out of the Atonement!

The *world* in monadic construction can no more be divided into the saved and damned than *light*, a monadic construction, can be divided into darkness and light. Such division is vital to penal atonement and predestination.

We invite any Calvinistic scholar in the world to tell us how God can love the world, the object of His love, and from eternity predestinate *some* of the object, including infants, to salvation and the *rest* of the same object to eternal damnation? Divide this object *syntactically*!

For further discussion on Jn 3:16 [click here](#).

3.) John Calvin will be discussed in his place under *unconditional election* or *predestination*.

4.) A. A. Hodge and others introduce a *caste system* in atonement when they claim Christ died for the elect in *limited* atonement. All *Reformed* Calvinists hold this doctrine. In an attempt to show that *limited* atonement is rational, Hodge seeks to explain how Christ died for the elect *only*. In the face of the voice of Divine inspiration on universal atonement, Hodge has his say; he says:

“...all true Augustinians and Calvinists have necessarily held that Christ died *definitely* and personally for the elect.”²³

He is saying that the atonement is *sufficient* for the world, but *efficient* for the elect only, excluding the rest of the world. So this *fictitious coinage is necessary to redefine the Scriptural faith/doctrine* of universal Atonement; for all the sons and daughters of Adams fallen race lie “in the evil one.” Here you will witness a masterstroke of deception by demonic forces against the Atonement, the very heart of the plan of salvation (1 Tim 4:1).

It will be evident to any honest Christian that instead of establishing a distinction between sufficient and efficient,²⁴ Hodge, as do all Reformed Calvinists, advocates the only *caste system* of which I am aware in so-called evangelicalism. It is pagan, not Christian; it removes Atonement from Divinity to the decree; it is exclusive, leaving the vast majority of the world hopelessly outside of the plan of salvation, doomed to the torments of the damned forever and ever. So this restrictive and exclusive order/caste system insists on atonement for the few, and they call this the gospel for the entire world.

²³ Archibald A. Hodge, *The Atonement*, Grand Rapids, Michigan: Guardian Press, p. 373.

²⁴ The *New Geneva Study Bible* uses *definite redemption*, *particular redemption*, and *limited atonement* to prove that most are lost and the elect only are saved.

No wonder Theologian A. M. Hills called Calvinism—

“...the most unreasonable, incongruous, self-contradictory, man-belittling and *God-dishonoring scheme of theology* that ever appeared in Christian thought. No one can accept its contradictory, mutually exclusive propositions without intellectual self-debasement.”²⁵

The General Consensus of Scripture Affirm Universal Atonement:

“and He, Himself, is Atonement concerning the sins of us, but [*de*] not concerning ours [sins] only, but [*alla*, stronger than *de*] also concerning the world as a whole”²⁶ (1 Jn 2:2). Limitation?

“...so as by the grace of God He might taste death on behalf of (*huper*) every conceivable man [*pantos*]”²⁷ (Hebrews 2:9). Limitation?

The rejection of this clear Scriptural truth requires dishonesty.

“...the Son...came to seek and to save the thing having been lost” (Luke 19:10). Who/what was lost? Was it the whole world? Or was it the elect only?

The doctrine of penal atonement for the elect only is doubtlessly the most diabolical doctrine ever to seize Protestantism; *irresistible grace*, *unconditional election*, and *eternal security* are all dependent upon this false doctrine.

It is a presupposition of erroneous thinking that atonement is necessarily saving and that its actual saving is extended or limited to the elect only. The Calvinist piles up Scripture skewed to mean that Christ died only for *his people*,²⁸ *his body*,²⁹ *for the sheep*,³⁰ *purchased the Church*,³¹ and on and on the list goes.³² But it should be noted that there is **not a limiting word** in any of these proof texts that limits the death of Christ to the subjects mentioned; nor is there a word or construction in these Scriptures that restricts the call of God to a class or a group, elect, etc., necessary to limited atonement.

²⁵ A. M. Hills, *Fundamental Christian Theology*, Salem, Ohio: Schmul Publishing Co., Vol. 2, 1980 Reprint, pp. 148.

²⁶ *The world as a whole* translates the force of the predicate position: *holou tou kosmou*. John also uses this construction in 5:19 where the word order is “...*ho kosmos holos*, i.e., *the whole (holos) world* lies in the evil one.” Christ died for **the whole world....the whole world [that] lies in the evil one**. Accordingly, the Atonement is coextensive with the Fall.

²⁷ Translates force of *pantos* without the article; see Herbert Weir Smyth, *Greek Grammar*, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, Renewed 1984, p. 296, 1174, c.

²⁸ Mat 1:21.

²⁹ Eph 5:23.

³⁰ Jn 10:15.

³¹ Acts 20:28.

³² These issues will be discussed more fully in an anticipated Web Site: *The Five Points of Calvinism Refuted*. This will be a refutation of David N. Steele and Curtis C. Thomas in their book: *The Five Points of Calvinism, Defined, Defended, Documented*.

We invite any Calvinistic scholar to show from any Scripture or construction grounded in the Greek text of the New Testament that Christ's death is limited to a group, elect, etc., or that He was punished by God.

Chapter Two, Point Two

Cumulative Evidence from Greek NT Versus Calvinism in This §:

1. Rom 10:13...*pas, hos, an, epekalesêtai*
2. Jn 3:16 potential mood...*apolêtai, echê, sôthê*
3. Eternal life not extraneous
4. Rom 1:16...Jew, Greek collective nouns--peoples of world
5. Rev 22:17b...imperatives: *erchesthō, labetō*
6. 2 Pet 3:9...*boulomenous, pantas*

II. Irresistible Grace or Efficacious Call

II. Irresistible Grace or Efficacious Call Perverts the Spirit's Purpose

There is no such distinction in Scripture as an *outward general call* to the non-elect, and a *special inward call* to the elect; also advanced as an *efficacious call*:

The irresistibility of grace is referred to both as *irresistible grace* and a *special inward call*.³³ This is a call to the elect only, which is irresistible; they must respond. The elect are also said to be the beneficiaries of a *general outward call*. All others not elect, *including non-elect infants [creeds, Calvin]*, are doomed to eternal damnation without possibility of repentance unto salvation. But since the *general call* of the Holy Spirit goes to all men, the Calvinist must account for that call in some sense. They claim that the non-elect receive the **offer** of grace by an *outward general call*, but there is no **offer** or possibility of grace in the **offer**, called an *outward general call*.

We here call upon the Calvinists to speak for themselves.

Steele and Thomas state:

“*The gospel invitation extends a call to salvation*”³⁴ to everyone who hears its message.... It **promises salvation** to all who repent and believe. But this **outward general call**, extended to the elect and non-elect alike, **will not bring sinners to Christ**....”

So, an empty promise that promises salvation, but will “not bring sinners to Christ.”

“Therefore, the *Holy Spirit*, in order to bring God's elect to salvation, extends to them **a special inward call** in addition to the outward call contained in the gospel message. Through this special call the Holy Spirit performs a special work of grace

³³ The formulation of two distinct calls has moved the Calvinists to heavily work the vocabulary in an attempt to prove the distinctions: general and effectual, external and internal, outer and inner, outward and inward, general and special.

³⁴ The phrase *to salvation to everyone* is fictitious coinage, because the *elect* are the only ones called *to salvation* in this system. *To salvation to everyone* is the extent of the call in phraseology, but denied in theology, in fact, thus nonexistent. Accordingly, the phrase claims a call *to salvation to everyone* on one hand, and rejects it on the other; fictitious coinage redefines the Spirit's call. The phrase *to salvation to everyone* is redundant.

within the sinner which inevitably brings him to faith in Christ....”

“.... It is for this reason that the Calvinists speak of the Spirit’s call and of God’s grace in saving sinners as being ‘efficacious,’ ‘invincible,’ or ‘irresistible.’ For the grace which the Holy Spirit extends to the elect cannot be thwarted or refused, it never fails to bring them to true faith in Christ!”³⁵

This doctrine is formulated in the Calvinistic creed, *Westminster Confession of Faith*:

“All those whom God hath predestinated unto life, **and only those**, he is pleased, in his appointed and accepted time, **effectually to call**, by his Word and Spirit, out of that state of sin and death, in which they are by nature, to grace and salvation by Jesus Christ.”³⁶

See **Theologian John Miley** for a most powerful statement against this outrageous scandal that is recognized in Christendom (?) as the gospel:

“How can there be sufficient atonement for the non-elect, when according to the principles and averments of this theory there is for them no atonement? Will limitationists answer? Did Christ die for the non-elect?... A limited atonement has only a negative answer. The doctrine must deny its most fundamental principles even to pretend to a sufficiency.... And only with egregious fallacy can there be even a pretense of sufficiency in the atonement for the non-elect.

“Then, on the doctrine of a limited atonement, it is impossible to reconcile the free and universal overture of saving grace in Christ, and the imperative duty of all who hear the Gospel savingly to believe in him, with divine sincerity. There is for many no atonement or saving grace. The offered grace is not in the offer.... The attempted reconciliation proceeds with fallacies and ends with fallacies.

“That *we* are incapable of reconciling them does not prove them to be irreconcilable. God may be capable of reconciling them; creatures of a higher intellectual and moral rank may see their reconcilableness; or we ourselves, when elevated to a brighter sphere of being, may yet be fully equal to the difficult problem.”³⁷ But so conjectural a solution will not answer for so real a difficulty. And there are contrarieties absolutely irreconcilable. Such is the case here.... God cannot sincerely offer saving grace to any soul when the grace is not in the offer. Nor can

³⁵ David N. Steele and Curtis C. Thomas, *The Five Points of Calvinism, Defined, Defended, Documented*, Presbyterian & Reformed Publishing Co., Box 817 — Phillipsburg, N.J. 08865, pp. 48-49; bold print added. [It is planned that in a future Web Site this work will be refuted in-depth.](#)

³⁶ *Westminster Confession of Faith, 1647*, Of Effectual Calling, X.I.

³⁷ Symington: *Atonement and Intercession*, p.210.

he righteously impose the duty of a saving faith in Christ upon any one for whom there is no salvation in him.”³⁸

Since irresistible grace is dependent upon penal atonement (satisfaction) and predestination, some argument will be used under predestination rather than here.

We note that the distinction in the call of God as in “irresistible grace” is an **open contradiction** to:

- Everyone, whosoever, may/might call...(Rom 10:13)
- Everyone believing (Jn 3:16; Rom 1:16)
- The one who wills (Rev 22:17)
- Not willing anyone to perish (2 Pet 3:9)

We shall here discuss one of the most demonic doctrines to ever invade the ranks of the church. Discussion will include footnotes on the significance of the Greek New Testament on these matters.

Every Conceivable One (*pas*), Whosoever (*hos*)...Calls...

In Romans 10:13, we read this powerful statement of salvation to all who may call:

“For everyone (*pas*) whosoever (*hos*), on the conditioned (*an*) that he/she may/might call for himself/herself on the name of the Lord, will be saved.”³⁹

This Scripture emphatically rules out any possibility of the Calvinistic double call necessary to Irresistible grace. The Calvinist here meets head-on several cumulative problems of an objective nature that simply cannot be circumvented; they are:

- *Pas, everyone*; the force of *pas* without the article means *every conceivable one*
- *Hos, whosoever*,
- *An*, emphasizes a contingency: *on the condition that*

³⁸ John Miley, *Systematic Theology*, 2 Vols., Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers, 1989 Reprint, Vol. 2, pp.236-238.

³⁹ *Pas* (everyone) *gar* (for) *hos* (whosoever) *an* (conditional particle; on the condition that, etc.) *epikalesētai* (may call for himself; verb, subjunctive mood, aorist tense, middle voice [action in behalf of self], 3rd person, and singular number) *on* (the) *onoma* (name) *kuriou* (of Lord) *sōthēsetai* (he/she will be saved; verb, future tense, passive voice).

- *Epikalesētai*, may call for himself/herself–
-subjunctive mood [so potential: *may*, *may not*]
-middle voice [self acting toward self in some way]
- A quote from Joel 2:32, which speaks of reformation under the new covenant (Heb 9:9-10) from elect Jews to universal salvation–Jew and Greek

This passage in Romans is woefully mishandled:

whoever will call...will be saved: Wrong. ...every conceivable one,⁴⁰ **whosoever, on the condition that (an) he/she may/might call for himself/herself on the name of the Lord, will be saved.**

Note the following: 1) the construction here is very strong in calling attention to the unlimited mass of humanity–*everyone*, (*pas*) and *whosoever* (*hos*); so the Atonement is not for a *limited* group from among the masses, but for the masses of the whole world; 2) *might/may call* is in a potential mood, so conditional–*might call*, [*might not call*]; if they do call, they will be saved, if not, no irresistible grace available, no *efficacious call*, no *special inward call*; it is conditioned by a potential mood (subjunctive) on calling for ones self (middle voice), ruling out any *irresistible* grace/force; 3) thus, salvation is for the masses, but they respond individually, conditionally–*might/may*; 4) predestination unto salvation is flatly ruled out. The theory is an absurd man-made doctrine. It is exceedingly dangerous to ones eternal destiny, and blasphemes the God, Who is not willing that any should perish; this is the decree with which His purpose and the extent of the Atonement accords.

[Who] *Will Be Saved?*

The translation of this verse is to be seriously faulted: 1) it does not express the emphatic double nominatives⁴¹, *pas* (*everyone*), and *hos* (*whosoever*), emphasizing the universality of God’s will to save all men; 2) it completely ignores the potential or conditional nature of salvation. The construction with an (*expresses condition*) and *epikalesētai*, (a verb, subjunctive mood, aorist tense, middle voice...action bends back on one’s self), and *might/may call for him/herself*, expressing potential, condition; 3) note carefully that *everyone*, *whosoever might/may call* [collective masses of the universe] and *will be saved* [the individuals that do call] are not the same in number or the same group because all the masses did not exercise the potential available to them; 4) the translation in the text subtly identifies the *whoever will call* and *will be saved* as the same persons, implying “definite redemption” for all for whom Christ died, i.e., limited atonement for the elect only–i.e., the *whoever* and the *will be saved* are implicitly lumped together by ignoring

⁴⁰ Translates the force of *pas* without the article; Herbert Wier Smyth, *Greek Grammar*, § 1174, c.

⁴¹ Actually a triple nominative if we count the *he/she* pronoun on the end of the verb, *epikalesētai*.

the middle voice, the potential/conditional mood, and the emphatic double [or triple] nominative. But the cumulative evidence of grammatical construction flatly deny to the Calvinist his doctrine of irresistible grace extracted out of limited atonement.

Dishonesty it is!

The quote from Joel 2:32 is essentially verbatim. In the LXX, it reads:

“*kai estai pas hos an epikalesētai to onoma Kuriou, sōthēsetai*...and it will be [that] every conceivable one, whosoever, on the condition that he/she may/might call for himself/herself on the name of the Lord, will be saved...”

Steele and Thomas state that:

“One reason for the use of these expressions [of a universal nature] was to correct the false notion that salvation was for the Jew alone.”

Joel speaks of the time of reform and universal salvation moving from the Jewish nation to the world—Jews and Gentiles.

To the Calvinist who claims to be of the elect and does not believe in deliverance from sin in the here and now, some attention should be given to the Theological Note: *ELECTION AND SIN MUTUALLY EXCLUSIVE*.

The Calvinist is invited to harmonize the syntactical elements of Rom 10:13 with the doctrines of an **outward general call, a special inward call, and irresistible grace**. And please do that on the basis of the Greek text of the New Testament.

Everyone Believing

John 3:16 says:

“For the God loved the world so that (*hōste*) He gave (*edōken*) the only-one-of-his-kind (*monogenē*) Son, in order that everyone (*pas*) believing in Him may not perish but may have eternal life.”

the world: The world, [discussed above](#), is a construction in the singular number and is the only such thing of its kind. The world is all humanity separated from God by the Fall, so lost. The world is the direct object, terminus, or end of the action of the verb, “loved.” The world is a construction that cannot be divided into some receiving an **outward general call** and damned regardless of what they do; and others receive **a special inward call** and are irresistibly saved. All are the objects of God’s love—**loved collectively, but respond to that love individually**.

A Calvinist posted his defense of Calvinism on the Forum at www.crisispub.com/calvinism and asked: [Which "World" Did God Love?](#) God loved the object of His love— *ton kosmon, the world*, the only world there is!

He gave: Suggests sacrifice, Personal interest, and so atonement by bloodshed and death.

in order that: The purpose expressed.

everyone believing in Him: ⁴²Everyone translates *pas*⁴³ (*everyone, all*), all, the great mass of humanity considered individually; so there is nobody else—everyone, all. No distinction can be made here as to the *kind of call* that is received—**outward general call/ a special inward call**—with respect to believing unto salvation, and the object is the whole world. God's love is all-inclusive to the world as a whole, but that love is responded to individually, person by person.

Humanity cannot be divided into objects of two different kinds of calls because of the potential moods, which here, cannot yield to Calvinistic irresistibility:

may not perish ⁴⁴ **...may have** ⁴⁵ **eternal life:** ⁴⁶ The benefits of may not perishing and may have eternal life are in the subjunctive mood, expressing desire, potential, probability; the benefits are strictly conditional, conditioned on believing. The two calls, therefore, one call to “irresistible grace” and the other with “no grace in the call,” simply cannot not be brought into harmonize with the potential moods here. The benefits of an “irresistible call,” such as “irresistible grace,” simply **cannot be expressed in potential construction—may not perish...may have**.

In verse 17, we note:

but⁴⁷ **the world may be saved:**⁴⁸ First, it is the world that *may be saved*, not a group in a caste system known as the elect and all others excluded. The statement here is

⁴² The phrase, *to believe in Him*, means “*surrender or submission to*.” It carries the idea of renouncing self to become the life-long servant of Jesus Christ. No “sinning religion” can lay claim to this lofty role of servitude to the Lord.

⁴³ *Pas* is here an all-inclusive pronominal adjective in the singular number used in reference to all humankind, individually.

⁴⁴ *May not perish* is a translation of *apolētai*, an aorist tense, subjunctive mood, middle voice verb, 3rd person, singular: aorist=action as occurring; subjunctive mood=a potential condition; middle voice=the action bends back on the person acting, i.e., the subject, he/she, participates in the results of the action—**may not perish**; 3rd person=he/she; singular=a person.

⁴⁵ *May have* is a translation of *echē* a present tense verb, subjunctive mood, active voice, 3rd person, singular: present=ongoing action; subjunctive mood=a potential state; active voice=the subject is acting; 3rd person=he/she; singular=a person.

⁴⁶ Eternal life is a gift, but as Robert Law says: “The gift is not extraneous to the giver.”

⁴⁷ *But* is a translation of *alla*, a strong adversative.

⁴⁸ *May be saved* is a translation of *sōthē* (from *sōzō*): a verb, subjunctive mood, aorist tense, passive voice, 3rd person, and singular number. It is to be noted that the Calvinist does not believe that the blood saves from sin in

in a **potential mood** as a desire or possibility. The argument for *irresistible grace*, then, brought about by an *efficacious* or *a special inward call* is absolutely out of the question in the light of a potential mood; further, the Calvinistic claim for the decree is invalid, apostate, unregenerate unbelief that the Atonement is for Adam's fallen race.

Rom 1:16...to Jew, to Greek

Steele and Thomas note the following:

“One reason for the use of these expressions [of a universal nature] was to correct the false notion that salvation was for the Jew alone. Such phrases as ‘the world,’ ‘all men,’ ‘all nations,’ and ‘every creature’ were used by the New Testament writers to emphatically correct this mistake. These expressions are used to show that Christ died for all men without *distinction* (i.e., He died for Jews and Gentiles alike) but they are not intended to indicate that Christ died for all men without *exception* (i.e., He did not die for the purpose of saving every lost sinner).”⁴⁹

One cannot read Rom 1:16 without being impressed that God meant to save anyone who would believe:

“...it is power from God unto salvation to *everyone (panti)*⁵⁰ believing, to the Jew...to the Greek.”⁵¹

The terms Jew and Greek are collective nouns that consist of the peoples of the world; their salvation has nothing whatsoever to do with either the Calvinistic “decree” or “irresistible grace.” The Holy Spirit inspired Paul to say: *to everyone believing*.

Yes, salvation is available to all, collectively, but *everyone (panti)* believes individually. There is no **caste system**⁵²

this life. But in the word *save*—or *sōzō*—is the notion that something radical takes place when one is saved; that the one saved has been removed from some danger, or that the danger has been removed in some way, or both.

In the New Testament *sōzō* has to do with various kinds of deliverance. It speaks of:

Peter being *saved (sōzō)* from the billows

The blind man being *saved (sōzō)* from blindness

The possessed man being *saved (sōzō)* from demons

Jesus *saving (sōzō)* His people from their sins

We conclude that the word *save* means a radical deliverance *from* that from which one is saved, and that in no instance is anyone saved *in* his trouble, or saved both in and out of it at the same time, whether some physical danger, a health problem, or sin. Absurd it is that one can be both righteous and sinful, Christian and sinner at the same time.

⁴⁹ David N. Steele and Curtis C. Thomas, *The Five Points of Calvinism, Defined, Defended, Documented*, p. 46.

⁵⁰ *Everyone*, is singular in number.

⁵¹ *To the Jew...to the Greek* are in the dative case, the case of personal interest; Jew, Greek are singular in number and collective nouns, i.e., those peoples making up the world—Jew and Greek.

⁵² “2. One of the hereditary classes into which the society of India is divided. The **caste system** is fundamental in Hinduism, referring, for its origin at least, to the time of the Aryan invasions of India. Orthodox Hinduism ascribes to the invaders four castes: the **Brahman**, or priestly; the **Kshatriya**, warrior or kingly; the **Vaisya**,

similar to heathenism that takes in a group and shuts out all others regardless of what they do.

There is no *irresistible grace* here! The statement of Steel and Thomas is a half-truth to support an attack on the work of the cross, denying the purpose of the God Who gave, and the extent of the Atonement wrought by the Son Who offered Himself for the whole world.

Come...take...freely

Rev 22:17b says:

“...the one thirsting **let him come**,⁵³ the one who wills **let him take**⁵⁴ the water of life freely.”

In this verse note what happens to the person: he thirsts, he wills; further, *he comes*, *he takes*. This action is in the imperative mood, a powerful statement ruling out “irresistible grace” or *a special inward call*. The person willed to “take the water of life freely.” The imperative mood is described as follows:

“The imperative is the mood of command or entreaty—the mood of *volition*. It is the genius of the imperative to express the appeal of will to will. In ordinary linguistic communication the primary appeal is from intellect to intellect, but in the imperative one will addresses another.”⁵⁵

Here the will of the Holy Spirit addressed the will of man. Note that both come and take are in the imperative mood. Implicit to this inescapable imperative laid upon human kind by the Holy Spirit *is His* understanding that man must do something with respect to his salvation—respond or reject.

Thus, the Holy Spirit issues an imperative, calling for a response on the part of His hearers in expectation of a response; accordingly, “irresistible grace” and these *imperatives* are mutually exclusive!

The Spirit’s call to His hearers was on the ground that He knew very well that man has a will, which He addressed; that man *is* active in his salvation; and that destiny was not settled by “irresistible grace” or predestination. Consequently, man must *thirst, will, come, and take*.

The imperatives here and the doctrine of “two calls” and “irresistible grace” are mutually exclusive. The Calvinist is called upon to show from the original language of the New Testament, not philosophized theology, that the “two calls” and

mercantile and agricultural; the *Sudra*, artisan and laboring. The first three of these are known as the *twice-born castes*. Their token is the sacred thread; they are considered as the original Aryan castes, and they have religious rites and privileges denied to the Sudras...” *Webster’s New International Dictionary of the English Language*, Second Edition, Unabridged, s.v. “caste.”

⁵³ *Let him come* translates *erchesthō*, a present, imperative verb.

⁵⁴ *Let him take* translates *labetō*, an aorist, imperative verb.

⁵⁵ H. E. Dana and Julius R. Mantey, *A Manual Grammar of the Greek New Testament*, § 165.

“irresistible grace” can be harmonized with the imperatives laid upon humankind by the Holy Spirit.

**The Antithesis to Damnation of Some—
The Lord...longsuffering ...not willing**

2 Pet 3:9 tells us that the Lord:

“...is longsuffering toward you, not willing/purposing⁵⁶ **any** one to perish, but **all** conceivable⁵⁷ men to come to repentance.”

This inspired statement cannot be harmonized with Calvinistic “irresistible grace” or “He chose to save some and exclude others.”

The Calvinist wants us to believe that a particular kind of call, as opposed to some other kind, brings people to Christ. But the Bible says in 2 Cor 7:10:

“For the **sorrow** [*lupē*] that accords with God accomplishes repentance [*metanoian*] resulting in salvation not to be regretted [*ametamelēton*]: but the **sorrow** [*lupē*] of the world brings about death.”

So, it is “sorrow that is in line with God,” a sorrow or conviction in view of God and His judgment that causes men to repent, not irresistible grace.

F. G. Smith described “godly sorrow” as follows:

“Godly sorrow does not proceed from human exposure of wrong conduct, but is an internal realization of the soul’s guilt in the sight of God, accompanied by a *deep sense of regret* for the wrongs committed.”⁵⁸

This is the need of our time, not irresistible grace. Further, no man can go through this Biblical process of old fashioned Holy Ghost conviction and stand up and fight for a “sinning religion” against Christian perfection, impugned as *perfectionism*.

Finally, the doctrine of irresistible grace is:

- a shameless contradiction to the sincerity of God:
 - no hope of avoiding hell for some
 - the *outward general call*, a call or deception?
- without regard as to Who God IS, His justice, etc.
- an open denial to God’s purpose

⁵⁶ *Willing/purposing* translates *boulomenous*, not essentially different from *thelō*, to will.

⁵⁷ Translates the force of *pantas* without the article; Herbert Weir Smyth, *Greek Grammar*, § 1174, c.

⁵⁸ F. G. Smith, *What the Bible Teaches*, Anderson, Indiana, Gospel Trumpet Company, 1952, p. 79.

I call upon the Calvinists, anywhere in the world, to show a Scriptural distinction between *outward general call* and *a special inward call*. Show the distinction from the Greek text of the New Testament by any means in its pages—construction, tense, meaning, mood, etc.

The integrity of the advocates of such contradictions must be held in question, and the doctrines rejected.

Chapter Three, Point Three

Cumulative Evidence from Greek NT Versus Calvinism in This §:

Col 3:10 no imputation: *anakainoumenon*

Mat 5:48b-48a imperative: *esesthe*

2 Cor 5:20 imperative: *katallagête*

Acts 2:38 imperative: *metanoêsate*

2:40 passive: *sōthēte*

Jn 1:12-13 active voice: *elabon, pisteuousin*

III Total Depravity

III. Note the Potential Moods, and Voices of Action

Total Depravity in Calvinistic terminology means that man is totally unable to act toward his salvation, that it is all God and none of man, but this will be shown as false to the Scriptures, because:

- man responds to commands in the imperative mood
- man exercises his will in order to be saved
- fictitious coinage used to makes a distinction between free agency and free will
- man acts toward his salvation in the active voice
- man acts in the interest of himself in the middle voice

Total depravity is in line with the doctrine of irresistible grace; but is humankind totally depraved in the Calvinistic sense? No, not so, although it certainly is true that man was plunged into a cataclysmic fall by our first parents. One sin plummeted the race into separation from God,⁵⁹ a separation in which man was totally undone in terms of saving himself. But this inability did not destroy man's ability to respond to his Creator.

Man was created in the image of God in the beginning.⁶⁰ We learn from Ephesians 4:24 and Colossians 3:9-10, respectively, that the image of God is a “new man . . . created in **righteousness** and **holiness** of the truth,” and again, “the new man, the one being *renewed again* (*anakainoumenon*) in **true knowledge** after the *image of the One* having called him into being. . . .”

⁵⁹ Rom 5:18.

⁶⁰ Genesis 1:27.

In Psalm 51:5, David traces the iniquity in which he was born to conception itself. The word *iniquity* in the Hebrew means a bent, twist, or a distortion of some kind. Thus, something was interfered with that once was. In this context, the distortion or state has to do with the image of God that once was, resulting in the sin nature or death.

Sin, then, wrought the death of our first parents; hence, onward through the stream of human generations, from the moment of conception, the sin nature, death and separation from God are the human condition.

So, the issue here is not the doctrine of Scriptural depravity itself, or whether man can save himself. No Arminian or Wesleyan, as a system, ever denies the depraved condition of humankind; nor do they ever claim man can save himself from his fallen condition, as lying Calvinists claim.⁶¹

The issue is precisely this:

Is salvation all of God and none of man as Calvinists say? Is man totally depraved to the point of inability to act toward salvation?

We note that the word total is an additive. While the Scriptures affirm the Fall, death, and depravity of humankind, depravity is not perceived in Scripture as total in terms of man's total inability to respond to his Creator. The Fall did not render man unable to *respond* to his Creator any more than it rendered him unable to *reject* his Creator.

The Imperative Mood

The use of the **imperative mood** in Scripture affirms man's obligation and ability to respond to his Creator in order to be saved. The imperative mood is of such a nature—a command or entreaty—that it addresses the volition or will, and not simply the reason. The nature of the imperative, then, expresses an appeal from one will to another will in a summons to action. In ordinary communication our appeal is normally from intellect to intellect.⁶²

⁶¹ I am Wesleyan/Arminian and I know! Packer is quoted as saying, on Calvinism and Arminianism: "The difference between them is not primarily one of emphasis, but of content. One proclaims a God Who saves; the other speaks of a God Who enables man to save himself.... One makes salvation depend on the work of God, the other on a work of man; one regards faith as part of God's gift of salvation, the other as man's own contribution to salvation; one gives all the glory of saving believers to God, the other divides the praise between God, Who, so to speak, built the machinery of salvation, and man, who by believing operated it...." Packer, *Introductory Essay*, pp. 4,5; quoted from David N. Steele and Curtis C. Thomas, *The Five Points of Calvinism, Defined, Defended, Documented*, p. 22.

Packer's statement is a falsification of the facts, and I prefer to think of him as a blind deceiver leading the blind to hell.

Note: The Calvinist give all this glory of lip service to a god that does not even save from sin in this life, and try to tell us that this is the God of the Bible. See [Levitical animal and Christ on removal of sin](#) where the Calvinist reduces the blood of the Saviour to EQUALITY with the Levitical animal if neither removes sin in the here and now.

⁶² See Dana and Mantey, *A Manual Grammar of the Greek New Testament*, §165.

Note Some Imperatives

In Matthew 5:47b-48a, we note four things: 1) *You be perfect* is a predicate adjective construction. *You* and *perfect* refer to the same persons. 2) The construction has a double nominative “you”—*you be* (*esesthe*), *you* (*humeis*)—thus, emphatic. *You be* is in the **imperative mood**, which is an address from one will to another will in a summons to action—*you be . . . !* 3) *Perfect* translates *teleioi*—*perfect, complete, having been brought to the desired end*. Thus, a perfection that is everything that it is intended to be—completed action. Absolute perfection can only apply to *Divinity*; hence, any perfection of the created—beings or things—is both perfection in context and imperfection in some sense, because created. 4) It is of interest to note that in the Calvinistic argument that Christians sin, they set up a standard of *absolute* perfection in an attempt to make the point that none can live above sin.

There is no inability in this passage.

Furthermore, not only does the imperative mood express the **ability** of one to respond to a command, it shows a conditional aspect; one may or may not respond. Paul says:

“ . . . *you be reconciled* to God right now . . . *katallagête tō Theō*”.⁶³

“You be reconciled” is an aorist imperative. The imperative mood is a command from one will to another will in expectation of a response. Neither the doctrine of **inability** nor **predestination** can hold here; both are *explicitly* ruled out! God made the provision for salvation established the conditions in which a response on man’s part is utterly necessary. Reconciliation is therefore an involvement of the parties needing reconciliation—God and man—and not all God as claimed by the advocates of the doctrines of **inability** and **predestination**.

It is not all God here and none of man, as claimed by Calvinists.

Imperative/Active/Passive

“Then Peter said to them, ‘**Repent**, and let every one of you be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins; and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit.’”⁶⁴

Repent translates *metanoêsate* in the aorist tense and **imperative** mood. The aorist tense, as we have noted, is momentary or instantaneous action. The imperative mood is a command. A good translation, then, would be:

“You repent! Do it right now!”

⁶³ 2 Cor 5:20b.

⁶⁴ Acts 2:38. *Repent* is imperative, aorist, active.

The imperative mood is of such a nature that it addresses the volition or will, and not simply the reason. The nature of the imperative, then, expresses an appeal from one will to another will in a summons to action. In ordinary communication our appeal is normally from intellect to intellect.

Thus, by command of superior appeal, the will of God through the Apostle Peter summonsed the hearers—“*You repent! Do it right now!*”

In verse 40 the Holy Spirit through Peter summonsed them—“*You be saved! Do it right now!*” Here the construction is the same, except we have a passive voice rather than the active. They could repent—active voice—but they could not save themselves—passive voice. Thus, these penitent sinners were instructed to now submit their will to the will and work of the Holy Spirit that they might *be saved*.

The Calvinist is invited to show just how these active and passive conditions are not synergistic, rather than monergistic?

Verse 41 says: “. . . *they embraced (apodexamenoi, aorist participle, middle deponent)*⁶⁵ the word *for themselves right then*.” So that historic day might be summed up like this: The will of Almighty God issued forth—“*Repent! Be saved!*”⁶⁶ And the will of man in obedient surrender “*embraced the Word*.” That day three thousand souls were saved.

Here are synergistic actions—God and man participating in man’s salvation. Again, it is not all God; nor did man save himself as proclaimed by Packer. The two were estranged; both acted.

The happenstances of this verse cannot possibly be construed as **total inability**.

The Calvinists of the world, from pulpit, classroom, theologian or any other, are invited to show from the Greek text of the New Testament just how **total inability and the imperative mood** can be brought into harmony with respect to man’s salvation, illustrating that it is all God and none of man, as stated by Packer and other apostates.

Man Exercises Will...Consistent With Imperative

In Mark 1:15, Jesus said:

“You repent and you believe in the gospel...*metanoete*⁶⁷ *kai pisteuete en tō euaggeliō*.”

⁶⁵ See under [Middle Voice](#).

⁶⁶ *Be Saved* translates *sōthēte*, an imperative, passive voice verb.

⁶⁷ Both *metanoete* and *pisteuete* are in the imperative mood of command and active voice.

Note that both *repent* and *believe* are in the imperative mood of command. Implicit to this inescapable imperative laid upon human kind by Jesus is **His** understanding of the following:

- That man *has* a will, and if he has a will, it is *necessarily free*
- That man is *not* passive in terms of the necessity to act
- That man *is* active in his salvation
- That man is *not* brought to salvation by irresistible grace—so called—in a state of total inability

Will/Ability/Meaning Redefined By Fictitious Coinage to a Support a Lie

The stress of the Calvinistic error has driven its advocates to coin all kinds of irrational terminology in order to redefine Scriptural meaning in an attempt to harmonize a corrupt theology with the Scriptures. We note such attempts here. In order to support the false doctrine of Calvinistic **total depravity**, the will has to be dealt with. So, the nonsense distinction between free agency and free will is introduced:

“Free agency we may believe in, but free will is simply ridiculous.”⁶⁸

“Man is a free agent. But man has not a free will.”⁶⁹

“He is free to turn to Christ, but not able.”⁷⁰

“A dead man cannot exercise faith in Jesus Christ.”⁷¹

“A dead man is utterly incapable of willing anything.”⁷²

“Free will is the invention of man, instigated by the devil.”⁷³

And so goes the fictitious coinage to redefine meaning. But this kind of thinking does not accord with the Scriptures: the *imperative mood*, *active voice*, *middle voice*, etc. Further, a dead man does not have the ability to *reject* Christ, either. Nor can the dead, in the sense in which they speak, be dead while living (1 Tim 5:6).

⁶⁸ Laurence M. Vance, *The Other Side of Calvinism*, Pensacola, Florida, Vance Publications, 1999, p. 214. Vance quotes Spurgeon, *Free Will*, p. 3.

⁶⁹ Ibid. p. 214. Vance quotes Bishop, p. 146.

⁷⁰ Ibid. 215. Vance quotes Beck, p. 9.

⁷¹ Ibid. 220. Vance quotes Gordon H. Clark, *The Biblical Doctrine of Man*, (Jefferson: The Trinity Foundation, 1984), p. 102.

⁷² Ibid. 220. Vance quotes Pink, *Sovereignty*, p. 141.

⁷³ Ibid. 203. Vance quotes David O. Wilmoth, in “The Baptist Examiner Forum II,” *The Baptist Examiner*, September 16, 1989, p.5.

The Calvinists forget the Scriptural account of the Prodigal who “was dead, and is alive again; he was lost and is found.” The following is to be noted of this “dead man,” who “has not a free will,” it was said of him:

“And **he came** to himself, **he said**:**I will go** to my father... **I sinned** against heaven...*eis heauton de elthōn ephē...poreusomai pros ton pater...hēmarton eis ton ouranon...*” (Lk 15:17,18).

He came is, (*active, aorist participle*), something the Prodigal did/willed; **he said** (aorist, active), something he did; **I will go...** (*future, middle deponent*; the act of his will), again something he did. **I sinned...**(an act of his will in sinning and forsaking). Now this **dead** man does not fit the description of the one the Calvinists describe—he came...he said...I will go...I sinned; thus exercised his will.

The Calvinists are invited to harmonize their statements with the facts of Scripture. Grammar and syntax bring judgment against them, showing that they are false teachers.

The Active Voice

The use of the **active voice** in Scripture, with reference to man’s response to be saved, shows the falsehood of the doctrine of the **total inability** of man to respond to his Creator with respect to salvation. Man behaving in the active voice simply cannot be brought into accord with the doctrine of total inability.

These points from the Greek text of the New Testament causes the Calvinist to get frantic and irrational, as he tries to harmonize his error with the gospel.

They make a clever move then to prove that we have *nothing* to do with our salvation. It is *all* God, they say. They advance a form of extremism, saying: 1) a dead man is unable to act toward his salvation [then, a dead man is also unable to act in rejecting Christ as Saviour]; and, 2) using salvation terminology that is in the *passive voice*, and then claim that you have nothing to do with it. An occasion for this line of extremism is found in John 1:12-13. This occasions the argument that we have *nothing* to do with *being born*, in either realm—natural *or* spiritual!

Born (*egennêthêsan*; an aorist, passive, third person, plural) is passive. Of course, no one can “*born*” himself. Every birth is by action of some outside force!

But wait! Salvation is not monergistic anyway! It is synergistic—God and man together! Consequently, in verse 12, we have man’s part in salvation—“But as many as *received* Him . . . to the ones *believing* . . .,” in verse 13, we have God’s part—“. . . *were born*.” Man receives . . . believes; but God gives birth.

Thus, God does for us what *we cannot* do for ourselves—gives birth, etc., but it is imperative that we do what God does not and will not—receive, believe,⁷⁴ etc.!

There is no inability in this action.

In John 3:16 God is shown as in the *active voice*—He *loved*; He *gave*. Man is likewise shown in the *active voice*—*the one believing*. Accordingly, neither God nor man is in a state of inability in terms of *action*. Man not only can act, he must act.⁷⁵

The Calvinist is invited to show just how it is that people acting toward their salvation in the *active voice* are in a state of total inability.

Just here we give an instance in which man is not only active in his salvation, but becomes sick of sin and forsakes it. Further, it is impossible for any person to go through the processes of godly sorrow and sin sickness and come out unto salvation, and take a stand in defense of the “sinning Christian.” **There are no Christians defending sin!**

Inasmuch as all humankind are lost, it is obvious that the imperative applies to the lost/unsaved. Paul speaking with reference to an unsaved condition says:

“For the **sorrow** [*lupē*] that accords with God ACCOMPLISHES [*ergazetai*] repentance [*metanoian*] resulting in salvation not to be regretted [*ametamelēton*]: but the **sorrow** [*lupē*] of the world BRINGS ABOUT death.”⁷⁶

Here we have persons under Holy Ghost conviction; on the one hand, there is a sorrow in which the person is sick of sin and wants no more to do with it. This accomplishes salvation. This is sorrow as defined by [F. G. Smith](#) above. On the other hand, there is a person who has sorrow, regrets, but does not want to forsake sin. This is the way it is with the “sinning Christian.” This is death!

Obviously the sorrow is going on in both classes of persons: one unto salvation, and the other unto death. The point is this: The verbs, ACCOMPLISHES and BRINGS ABOUT, are both in the middle voice; this means that sorrow going on in the persons acted in a way that pertained to themselves, i.e., the action bent back on them as described.

In Acts 16:30-31 we have the following:

“And brought them out, and said, Sirs, what must **I do to be saved**? And they said, Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy house.”

⁷⁴ Receive (*elabon*) and believe (*pisteuousin*) are in the active voice.

⁷⁵ The Scriptures abound with passages in the active voice where man acted toward his salvation: Rom 10:11, the one believing; v.14, they believed not; v.16, who believed, etc.

⁷⁶ 2 Cor 7:10; *brings about* is a translation of *katergazetai*, an emphatic form of *ergazetai*, translated *accomplishes*.

Do translates a *present, active, infinitive*.⁷⁷ Here the jailer of the prison had to **do** something in order to be saved; he **acted** with respect to his salvation. Salvation was not irresistible, not monergism,⁷⁸ not all God.

To be saved is a verb in the *subjunctive mood, aorist tense, and passive voice*.⁷⁹ The jailer sees himself as both acting and being acted upon, somehow. Paul and Silas see the necessity of both God and man acting in salvation; they affirm that he must do something and that God will respond.

And they said: you believe right now.⁸⁰ *Believe* is an *imperative, aorist tense, active voice* verb. As noted already the imperative expects response and the active voice **IS** a response. So, what the jailer must do, he did: he **believed!**

Here the *active voice, imperative mood, and passive voice* consist in cumulative evidence on both the part of man and God to show that salvation is synergistic, i.e., both God and man are involved in the salvation of humankind. Thus, the Calvinists stand ruled against and condemned by these facts in the Greek New testament.

The Calvinists, the world over, are invited to show their doctrine of *total inability/irresistible grace/monergism* in the light of the cumulative facts noted above. 1) Show inability in the requirements of the active voice; 2) show inability/irresistible grace in the requirements of the imperative mood in which action is necessary and conditional; 3) show how **both the action of God and man** is all God, and none of man!

The Middle Voice

In Acts 2:41, we read as follows:

“Now they that received His word for themselves⁸¹ were baptized....”
Here is a case in which both God and man act with respect to salvation. Holy Ghost conviction fell that day; the persons involved *received the word for themselves*. It is God and man, not all God; it is synergistic, not monergistic.

⁷⁷ *Poiein*.

⁷⁸ *Monergism* is defined as follows: “[*Mon-*, and Gr. *ergon*, work.] In theology, the doctrine that regeneration is the work of the Holy Spirit alone, and that the depraved human will, having no inclination to holiness, is utterly incapable of assisting or cooperating” (*Webster’s New Twentieth Century Dictionary of the English Language*, Unabridged, Vol. 1., s.v. “monergism”). Obviously no one can move himself out of the **passive voice** and **regenerate, save, or “born again himself.”** Accordingly, regeneration is the work of the Holy Spirit alone; but it is not true that man is incapable of cooperating, as is shown by the **active voice** and the **imperative mood**. See my work on *Atonement that Necessitated the Destruction of the Salvation Vocabulary*, where this issue of Calvinistic fictitious coinage is thoroughly discussed, as they attempt to redefine meaning.

⁷⁹ The verb is *sōthō*.

⁸⁰ *Pisteuson*. *Right now* translates force of the aorist.

⁸¹ *Received for themselves* translates *apodexamenoi*, an aorist tense, middle voice participle. The middle voice, which English does not have, means that these persons are acting in a way that pertains to themselves, as *I wash my face*. The middle is a form of action that bends back on one’s self.

In 2 Cor 7:10, we note as follows:

“**sorrow** [*lupē*]...ACCOMPLISHES **repentance** [*metanoian*] resulting in salvation...
sorrow [*lupē*]...BRINGS ABOUT **death**.”

Sorrow, the subject of ACCOMPLISHES⁸² [*ergazetai*] is represented in the action of accomplishing repentance unto salvation. The Holy Spirit brings on this sorrow that runs in line with the purpose of God; accordingly, it is a sorrow for sin with a true purpose to forsake it. It is a sickness, a loathing, an intense dislike of sin, with an intent, purpose, or will to forsake it. In this matter, the will is firm and fixed! Herein, the resolve is such that sin is out of the question.⁸³ The resolve is such that even if one might sin and get away with it, sin sickness makes sin undesirable. Here one travels God’s way, all the way.

Thus, we emphatically assert that no person can go through the processes of “godly sorrow unto salvation,” as laid down in 2 Cor 7:10, and go on defending the “sinning Christian” as in Calvinism and other systems of false Christianity. The “sinning Christian” is in line with the *sorrow...that brings about death*.

The verbs of the two kinds of sorrow—ACCOMPLISHES and BRINGS ABOUT—are in the *middle voice*.⁸⁴ Since the middle shows the person as acting in a way that the action or act bends back on one’s self, or is of personal interest, it seems better to take these constructions as middle. Both classes made choices in various degrees of sorrow. So, certainly they are much involved with personal interests—some unto salvation, others unto death.

The Calvinists, the world over, are invited to show from the Greek New Testament that fallen mankind is in a state of *total inability*, unable to act toward salvation. The cumulative statements of Scripture that employ *mood, tense, the will of man*, etc., categorically contradict *total inability*, showing that man must act toward his salvation, that salvation is synergistic.

⁸² Accomplishes

⁸³ See *Excursus: On the Possibility that Christians May Sin*.

⁸⁴ See footnote 65 for the meaning of the middle voice. It should also be noted that these verbs under discussion might be either **middle** or **passive deponent**, a deponent translated in the active sense. For the purposes of Calvinistic total inability to act toward one’s salvation, their case is lost either way.

Chapter Four, Point Four

Cumulative Evidence from Greek NT Versus Calvinism in This §:

Rom 8:29...*hous*

Acts 7:51...*antiptete*. Shows Human Ability to Resist the Holy Spirit

Mat 23:37 Shows Human Will Opposing God's Will, *êthelêsa, êthelêsate*

1 Tim 2:4...*thelei, pantas*

Rom 9:11...*elogēn*

Rom 10:13...*pas, hos, epikalesētai*

2 Cor 5:20...*katallagēte*

IV Unconditional Election/Predestination

IV Predestination Not in Accord with the Character/Nature of God

Unconditional election, for the Calvinist, means that God sovereignly decrees the salvation of the elect only. All others of all humankind are damned without possibility of repentance. Even infants who may die before accountability are included in the elect/nonelect scheme; and so, some infants are damned because not chosen to salvation.

The doctrine of "unconditional election," based on "limited atonement," is **loveless to the core**. (And never forget that point.) This is the doctrine of loveless indifferentism toward the millions that are excluded from the Atonement. These are those to whom it is **not given to repent of their sins and be saved**. These are those who are damned for all eternity, regardless of what they may do. It appears to me as a serious thing that this heathen caste system is accepted as a part of Christianity, that denies to God His highest claim, that He—"so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life."

Further, it is blasphemy to vigorously teach and refute the doctrine that Jesus Christ died on Calvary's cross for the sins of the whole world. It is time that these teachings be recognized in Christendom as the apostasy that they are and be proclaimed world-wide that all men may **know that they may repent and be saved, that there is no such thing as this Calvinistic caste system**.

John Calvin says:

"**Predestination** we call the eternal decree of God, by which he has determined in himself, what he would have to become of every individual of mankind. For they are not all created with a similar destiny; but eternal life is **foreordained** for some, and eternal damnation for others. Every man, therefore, being created for one or the other of these ends, we say, he is **predestinated** either to life or to death."⁸⁵

⁸⁵ Ibid. 3.21. .5.

He says on infants:

“I inquire again, how it come to pass that the fall of Adam, independent of any remedy, should involve so many nations **with their infant children in eternal death**, but because such was **the will of God**. Their tongues so loquacious on every other point, must here be struck dumb. **It is an awful decree, I confess**; but no one can deny that God foreknew the future final fate of man before he created him, and that **he did foreknow it because it was appointed by his own decree**”⁸⁶

“And therefore infants themselves, as they bring their condemnation into the world with them, are rendered obnoxious to punishment by their own sinfulness, not by the sinfulness of another. For though they have not yet produced the fruits of their iniquity, yet they have the seed of it within them; even their whole nature is as it were a seed of sin, and therefore cannot but be odious and abominable to God.”⁸⁷

“For the children were so vitiated in their parent, that they became contagious to their descendants: there was in Adam such a spring of corruption, that it is transfused from parents to children in a perpetual stream.”

“Therefore, as Augustine says, ‘Neither the guilty unbeliever nor the justified believer, generates innocent, but guilty children, because the generation of both is from corrupted nature.’”⁸⁸

So, infants are included in damnation. No wonder theologian A. M. Hills was moved to write of the **evils of Calvinism**.

See New Geneva Study Bible above, the Bible that multiplied thousands of laymen use as a study source.

Steele and Thomas make the following observation:

“The doctrine of election declares that God, before the foundation of the world, chose certain individuals from among the fallen members of Adam’s race to be the objects of His undeserved favor. **These, and these only, He purposed to save...** Instead He chose to save some and exclude others. His eternal choice of particular sinners unto salvation was not based upon any foreseen act or response on the part of those selected, was based solely upon His own good pleasure and sovereign will. **Thus election was not determined by, or conditioned upon, anything that men would do, but resulted entirely from God’s self-determined purpose.**

“Those who were not chosen to salvation were passed by and left to their own evil devices and choices....”⁸⁹

⁸⁶ Ibid. 3. 23. 7; emphasis added.

⁸⁷ Ibid., 2.1.8; emphasis added.

⁸⁸ Ibid., 2.1.7; emphasis added.

⁸⁹ David N. Steele and Curtis C. Thomas, *The Five Points of Calvinism,, Defined, Defended, Documented*, Presbyterian & Reformed Publishing Co., Box 817, Phillipsburg, N.J. 08865, pp. 30, 31.

[We note just here that *Scriptural election* is not conditioned upon anything that man does: **Election consists in an unconditional act of God in which He elects a class—the Church of God—to holiness.** Thus, election is to a *certain character* or *standard* established by God from eternity; man did not set it up, but he is destined to walk in it. Thus, the issue of election is not so much who as to what—holiness. See Eph 1:4; 1 Pet 1:2; 2 Thess 2:13; also].

Hermann Cremer shows that predestination has to do with **what**, not **who**.

“The matter to be considered when the word is used is not *who* are the objects of this predestination, but *what* they are predestinated to.”⁹⁰

The Five Points of Calvinism are the walls of hell erected to keep men from the great truths of the Atonement and salvation. Calvinistic predestination/election is clearly a demonic teaching (1 Tim 4:1).

John Wesley on the Decree:

“Sing, O hell, and rejoice ye that are under the earth. For God, even the mighty God, hath spoken and doomed to death thousands of souls, from the rising of the sun to the going down thereof. Here, O death, is thy sting. They shall not, cannot escape. For the mouth of the Lord hath spoken. Here, O grave, is thy victory. Nations yet unborn, or even they had done good or evil, are doomed to never see the light of life, but thou shalt gnaw upon them for ever and ever. Let all those morning stars sing together who fell with Lucifer, sun of the morning. Let all the sons of hell shout for joy. For the decree is past and who shall disannul it.”⁹¹

Charles Wesley on the Horrible Decree:

“O Horrible Decree,
Worthy of whence it came!
Forgive their hellish blasphemy,
Who charge it on the Lamb!
God, ever merciful and just,
With newborn babes did Tophet fill;⁹²
Down into endless torments thrust;
Merely to show His sovereign will.
This is that *Horrible Decree!*
This is that wisdom from beneath!
God (O detest the blasphemy!)

⁹⁰ Hermann Cremer, *Biblico-Theological Lexicon of New Testament Greek*, Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1954 Reprint, p. 462.

⁹¹ Laurence M. Vance, *The Other Side of Calvinism*, Pensacola, Florida, Vance Publications, 1999, p. 293.

⁹² “1. Bible a place near Jerusalem where human sacrifices were made to Moloch 2. hell” [Added]; *New World Dictionary of the American Language*. That there is cause for infants to suffer, Calvinism is on a level with heathenism, not the New Testament. Calvinism and heathenism share a certain commonality on the destruction of infants and a [caste system](#).

Hath pleasure in the sinner's death.”⁹³

This blasphemy is far reaching in its results; it is against the extent of the shed blood that was for the world; it has a dreadful bearing on the matter of urgency on the part of both the church and the lost with respect to salvation, etc. Truly, this is an unspeakably dreadful doctrine.

We invite the Calvinist to explain just how this doctrine can possibly accord with the love of God, and how it does not blaspheme the God that professed to love the world? And how can He punish infants, not having sinned, and still be just?

Some Observations from Romans:

8:29 whom He foreknew⁹⁴ foreordained/predestinated: A good way to translate for the English reader would be: **He foreknew whom (pl.) He also predestinated....** See [ch. 9 on predestination](#).

conformed to the image⁹⁵ of His Son: According to Gen 1: 27; Eph 4: 24; and Col 3: 9-10, the image in which man was created is: *righteousness, holiness, and objective knowledge* [*epignōsin*]; hence, in restoration from the Fall, believers conform to that image, here designated: *the image of His Son*: This is the predestination of Scripture.

THEOLOGICAL NOTE: Predestination—Collective or Individual?

We note several vital issues with respect to predestination: 1) it is collective—whom, (*hous*, plural, v.29); *He...predestinated* the Church of God; 2) the individual is never predestinated; 3) the imperatives⁹⁶ of the NT with which God charges man and predestination are mutually exclusive: The imperative is an address from one will to another will in expectation of a response; therefore, implicit to this expectation, man: 1) has a will; 2) is not passive; 3) is active; 4) is not predestinated, except as above—collectively, to holiness or the image of God to which we conform...; 5) see my work: *The Fallacy of the “Sinning Christian”* on Monadic Constructions, pp. 56-62; 97-98, which show the fallacy of several Calvinistic errors, of which predestination is one.

A large body of Christendom has been sold on this damnable doctrine. Calvin says:

“All are not created on equal terms, but some are preordained to eternal life, others to eternal damnation; and, accordingly, as each has been created for one or

⁹³ Laurence M. Vance, *The Other Side of Calvinism*, Pensacola, Florida, Vance Publications, 1999, pp. 287-288.

⁹⁴ *Foreknew* translates *proegnō*, to know beforehand, to appoint as subjects of future privileges.

⁹⁵ Note that in Gen 1: 27 man was created in God's image, but in the Fall, Adam's son was born in his image (Gen 5: 3). And so, in Christ, there is restoration to the image of God, having been delivered out of the image of Adam.

⁹⁶ See Mt 5: 8, you be perfect; 2 Cor 5: 20, you be reconciled; Jn 8: 11, you stop sinning (from now on apo tou nun). On *apo tou nun* see: Lk 1: 48; 5:10; 2 Cor 5: 16. Other passages on the imperative: Acts 2: 38; Mt 8:22; 9:9; Mk 2:14; Lk 5:27; 9:59; 18:22; Jn 1: 43; 21:19.

other of these ends, we say that he has been predestinated to life or to death.” [See Appendix C](#)

Again Calvin says:

“When he [God] is pleased to save, there is no free-will in man to resist. Wherefore, it cannot be doubted that the will of God . . . cannot be resisted by the human will. . . .” *Institutes*, 3.23.14.

But Acts 7:51 says the exact contrary:

“ . . . you always resist (*antiptete*) the Holy Spirit. . . .”

Jesus does not agree with Calvin and his followers. In Matthew 23:37, lamenting the fate of Jerusalem, He said:

“ . . . how often *I willed* (*êthelêsa*) to gather your children . . . and *you willed* (*êthelêstate*) not.” Two different wills were in operation here.

Paul, the writer of Romans, says in 1 Timothy 2:4:

“ . . . Who (God) *wills* (*thelei*) *all conceivable* (*pantas*, force of construction without the article) men to be saved. . . .” Note the following: “Who” and “He”—God—are in the double nominative, hence emphatic—GOD willed! But all are not saved.

9:11 God’s purpose according to His choice would stand: WRONG! This translation projects choice as God’s act. [*His* not in GK text.] It should read: *that the purpose/will*⁹⁷ [subject] *of God might continue/remain*⁹⁸ [verb] *according to a choice* [object]. *The purpose/will* is an objective, immutable fact from eternity and contemplates obedience. *According to choice* consists of those who act in faith and obedience—not works, not lineage, not sovereignty—and happens in time . . . according to the choice of those who exercise faith and obedience. So, God’s purposes continue in the earth when choices are made that accord with His will.

This, and other passages,⁹⁹ is cited by Calvinists to prove the damnable doctrine of predestination.

WORD STUDY: On Choice or Election

Choice translates *eklogēn*, *choice*, *election*, an accusative noun, the direct object of *might continue*. It is the purpose/will that *might continue*. A *choice* here is not an act of God, but

⁹⁷ *Purpose* translates *prothesis*, *plan*, *purpose*, *will*, *resolve*.

⁹⁸ *Might continue* translates *menē*, *continue*, *remain*, a present subjunctive verb.

⁹⁹ Eph 1:4-5; 2 Tim 1:9; Rom 8:29-30; 9:11-13, 15.

being an objective state, it marks out those who have claimed the promise by faith, renouncing all claim to righteousness by lineage or works; and thus have entered into the *will/purpose* of God that *might continue according to a choice*.

9:12 it was said to her: “Two nations are in your womb; and two peoples will be separated from your body; and one people shall be stronger than the other.”¹⁰⁰ No predestination here. This is a prophecy of the *choice* of the posterity of Esau and Jacob—Edomites in Esau, Israelites in Jacob—and consequently their relative relationships to the purpose/will of God. “And the older shall serve the younger.” This is not a decree of Divine sovereignty in election or predestination, but a prophecy fulfilled in the posterity of the twin brothers.

9:13 is written, “JACOB I LOVED, BUT ESAU I HATED”: Paul here cites Mal 1: 2-3. The reference is to the posterity of the twins. Note that in the original citation: *Edom* in v. 4 is synonymous with *Esau* in v. 3; *Israel* in v. 5 is synonymous with *Jacob* in v. 2.

hated: Since Paul’s original quote is a reference to Mal 1: 2-3, in which God states: “I hated Esau, and laid his mountains waste,” *hate* probably needs no softening here. A just and holy God, apart from malice, shows Edom, a godless and sinful people, as under judgment. Note, as in v. 11 above, *the purpose/will of God* will be maintained and *choice* will be judged by Him Who *willed*. The prophecy concerning Esau and Jacob had nothing whatsoever to do with their personal salvation, but concerned certain temporal matters of their posterity, obviously not without eternal implications. It should not pass our notice that the Edomites, Esau’s posterity, were conquered by John Hyrcanus, B.C. 129, circumcised, and incorporated into the Jewish nation. Accordingly, there is no predestination in this case. “[God] desires all men to be saved.”¹⁰¹ God loves all men collectively, but they must respond to Him individually.

9:16 but on God who has mercy: God’s mercy accords with His will. It is scandalous that churchmen exalt themselves to pervert God’s mercy with the doctrine of predestination as has been done.

9:17 says to Pharaoh, “FOR THIS VERY PURPOSE I RAISED YOU UP”: Predestinarianism would have us believe that God raised Pharaoh up to destroy him, i.e., damn him; but this is false to the Scriptures. The translation here should read: *For this purpose I raised you up [in history, i.e., brought you on the scene]*. This is so for the following reasons: 1) Paul’s reference is to Ex 9:16. The HEB reads: “But for this purpose I have let you live (or stand) to show you my power so that my name may be declared throughout all the earth.” The LXX reads: “And for this purpose you were preserved,¹⁰² in order that I, and no other, might demonstrate”¹⁰³ in

¹⁰⁰ Gen 25:23.

¹⁰¹ 1 Tim 2:4.

¹⁰² *You were preserved translates: dietērēthēs; also means carefully kept.*

you My strength, and so that My Name may be proclaimed far and wide¹⁰⁴—in all the earth.” 2) Pharaoh was the worst sinner in Egypt, of whom God said in the preceding verse, v. 15: “I could have put forth my hand and struck you...and you would have been cut off from the earth,” i.e., “I could have killed you long ago...reason prevailed to spare you for a while.” 3) The translation, “I raised you up”¹⁰⁵ in no way accords with either the HEB—“I have let you live,” or the LXX—“you were preserved.” The translation, “raised you up [in history, i.e., brought you on the scene], reaches agreement with the HEB; also agreement is reached with certain statements that so imply: “I let you live;” and the LXX, “you were preserved,” and “demonstrate in you.” There is no predestination here, either for eternal damnation or life. God, however, used him for His Name’s sake.

9:18 He hardens whom He desires:¹⁰⁶ This is a judicial act against rebellion, not a decree of damnation. God hardens no one for His glory, as claimed by the perverted extremism in Calvinism. God’s efforts are to redeem, not damn; and the proof of that is the cross. **But did God harden Pharaoh? Yes! God’s act of hardening was judicial.** But let it be noted that the Almighty God only did so after the SIXTH PLAGUE!

The omniscient God spoke to Moses as follows: “I know that the king of Egypt will not let you go, unless compelled by a mighty hand” (HEB);¹⁰⁷ thus, judgment was called down. Five (5) times it is recorded in Holy Writ that Pharaoh hardened his own heart.¹⁰⁸

First plague: “nor will I let Israel go;”¹⁰⁹ **second** plague: he hardened his heart and [he] did not heed;”¹¹⁰ **third**: “he did not heed...just as the Lord had said;”¹¹¹ **fourth**: Pharaoh hardened his heart;”¹¹² **fifth**: “heart of Pharaoh became hard;”¹¹³ **sixth**: “the Lord hardened the heart of Pharaoh...he did not heed...just as the Lord said;”¹¹⁴ **seventh**: etc.

¹⁰³ Translates force of *intensive middle voice*, which means that, *God, and no other*, acted in a way that pertained to Himself—I, and no other, might demonstrate.

¹⁰⁴ *May be proclaimed far and wide* translates *diaggelē*, an aorist tense, passive voice, subjunctive mood verb.

¹⁰⁵ *I raised up* translates *exēgeira*, to awaken from sleep, raise from the dead, cause to appear; cause to appear in history; to call into existence.

¹⁰⁶ *Desires* translates *thelei*, will, wish, desire; will here is not to be understood as a “sovereign decree” of predestination, but is a judicial act of judgment on one who rebelled once too many and crossed over the line of extended mercy—judgment fell!

¹⁰⁷ Ex 3:19.

¹⁰⁸ Note that in these instances Pharaoh is the subject of action, not God.

¹⁰⁹ Ex 5:2.

¹¹⁰ Ex 8:15.

¹¹¹ Ex 8:19; 3:19.

¹¹² Ex 8:32.

¹¹³ Ex 9:7.

¹¹⁴ Ex 9:12; 3:19.

Paul quotes from the LXX,¹¹⁵ which reads: “And the Lord said to Moses, ‘When you go and return into Egypt, you take heed with respect to all the omens’¹¹⁶ which I have put in your hands; you do these [omens] before Pharaoh; and¹¹⁷ I will harden his heart, and **he may not**¹¹⁸ **send the people away**¹¹⁹ under any circumstance.” And so, it came to pass that, notwithstanding the many omens done before Pharaoh, probation ended and God struck in judicial judgment; a mighty hand thus compelled Pharaoh, **conditionally**—obedience to the omens, if not judgment!

9:22-23 vessels of wrath...vessels of mercy: *Wrath* is not God’s predestinated purpose, but is a just necessity against rebellion; *mercy* is always God’s purpose where His conditions are satisfied.

9:22 willing...endured with much patience: God is *willing* to demonstrate His wrath in view of His holy character, but in *patience* the same holiness gives ample opportunity before the day of grace runs out, in hope that there may be repentance. Note that God’s patience has no secret agenda of damnation as in Calvinistic predestination. See note at 9:13.

9:23 He prepared beforehand: God is the Subject of the preparation for *glory*, not for wrath. God acts in our salvation, men act in their own damnation.

“Ah, truly, if the last word of the christian [*Sic*] revelation is contained in the image of the potter and the clay, it is a bitter derision of all the deep needs and legitimate desires of a soul aspiring toward its God. This would be at once a satire of reason upon herself and the suicide of revelation.”

WORD STUDY:

He [God] prepared beforehand translates *proētoimasen*, *to prepare beforehand*. We note: 1) The *preparation* was *for glory*, and so, certain qualitative conditions suited to the state of *glory* must be met; 2) *glory* is an objective fact or state from eternity and this obviously necessitates a prepared or redeemed people, so *prepared beforehand* as required by the state; 3) the verb used here is not *proorizō*, *to predestinate or foreordain*; 4) the context is clearly qualitative or preparation, a prepared people for a certain state.

¹¹⁵ Ex 24:21.

¹¹⁶ *Omens* translate *terata* (from *teras*), meant to be warnings to turn Pharaoh to obedience. But the Calvinist says God’s will cannot be resisted. Note that Jesus lamenting the fate of Jerusalem said: “...how often I *willed* (*ēthelēsa*) to gather your children...and you *willed* (*ēthelēsate*) not” (Mt 23:37; and 1 Tim 2:4).

¹¹⁷ *And* translates *de*, used in the continuative sense.

¹¹⁸ Not under any circumstance translates the force of the emphatic negating particles, *ou me*—a grim reminder of omens designed to change hardness of heart, but failed.

¹¹⁹ *Exaposteilē*, he may [not] send away, is an aorist subjunctive, a potential or uncertainty, and conditional. There is no Calvinistic predestination here. Note that Pharaoh’s will alternated between obedience and rebellion—Ex 5:2; 8:8,15.

10:13 whoever will call...will be saved: No: “everyone, whosoever, [that] might/may call for him/herself...will be saved.” Note the following: 1) the construction here is very strong in calling attention to the unlimited mass of humanity—*everyone*, (*pas*), *whosoever* (*hos*); so atonement is not for a *limited* group from among the masses, but for the masses of the whole world; 2) *might/may call* is in a potential mood, so conditional—*might call*, *might not*; if they do call, they will be saved, if not, no unconditional election, no irresistible grace; 3) thus, salvation is for the masses, but they respond individually, conditionally—*might/may*; 4) predestination unto salvation is flatly ruled out.

WORD STUDIES: [Who] *Will Be Save*?

The translation of this verse is to be seriously faulted: 1) it does not express the emphatic double nominatives, *pas* (*everyone*), and *hos* (*whosoever*), emphasizing the universality of God’s will to save all men [actually triple* nominative counting *he/she* on the end of the verb, *epik...*; 2) it completely ignores the potential or conditional nature of salvation. The conditional construction here is emphatic: (1) *an* expresses condition (2), *epikalesētai*, a verb, subjunctive mood, aorist tense, is potential/conditional, and (3) the middle voice...action bends back on one’s self, *might/may call for him/herself*, shows the person must act; 3) note carefully that *everyone, whosoever, he/she* [collective masses of the universe] *might/may call ... will be saved* [the individuals that do call] are not the same in number or the same group. All the masses did not exercise the potential available to them; 4) the translation in the text subtly identifies the whoever will call ...will be saved as the same persons, implying “definite redemption” for all for whom Christ died, i.e., limited atonement for the elect only, i.e., the *whoever* and the *will be saved* are implicitly lumped together by ignoring the emphatic double [or triple*] nominatives, the potential/conditional mood, and the middle voice. But the cumulative evidence of grammatical construction flatly deny to the Calvinist his doctrine of irresistible grace extracted out of limited atonement.

11:23 if they do not continue in their unbelief: *Continue* is again in a *potential mood*. There is no election in which one’s destiny is fixed in either belief or unbelief by a Divine decree. One may move out of unbelief by obedience to God...*if they do not continue in their unbelief*.

remnant: That is, *remainder, residue, few* who received God’s grace.

according to God’s gracious choice: No. It should read: “...remnant [subject] has come into being [verb] according to a choice [object], out of grace [ablative of source].” The word, *God’s*, does not occur in the original. It is added to support the doctrine of Calvinistic election; cf. note at 9:11. (11:2-5)

renewing of your mind: *Renewal* or *anakainōsis* means a complete change for the better. *Anakainōsis* is compounded of *ana*—*up, back, again* and *kainos*—*new kind*

or species that never previously existed. Thus, the new man in Christ is renewed after the image of God, (Genesis 1:27; Ephesians 4:24; Colossians 3:10) or a renewal or restoration from the Fall. So, the mind of Christ is by renewal or restoration. (12:2).

See the [Five Points of Calvinism](#) under the scrutiny of the Greek New Testament. The Five Points are *Penal Atonement*, *Perseverance*, *Irresistible Grace*, *Total Depravity*, and *Unconditional Election*. It will be shown from the Scriptures that the system is false to the core; further, [that it has no more saving essence than do the heathen religions](#).

The success of Calvinism is in the lust of sinful man for the works of the flesh (Gal 5:19-21) and the love for *heresies* (*haireseis*, v. 20)-*a peculiar opinion*. And the Calvinist tell that us that both "the works of the flesh" and "the fruit of the Spirit" exist in the "sinning Christian." They make no claim that Christians are free from Paul's list of iniquity.

So, the heresy of Penal Atonement is particularly attractive to professors of religion who claim that it is not possible to be free from sin in this life. They actually fight for some sense of continuation of the sin that Christ died on the cross to remove.

Calvinism is heresy, for it is truly a peculiar opinion that His precious blood is *equal* in RESULT to that of the Levitical animal, if as the Calvinist claims, neither removes sin in the here and now.

Unconditional Election Cannot Demonstrate By the Scriptures:

- that God loved the world He *professed* to love—[Jn 3:16](#)
- that there are no infants in hell—see [Calvin](#)
- that election applies to *all* humankind—some saved, and that God willed the rest to be damned...[1 Tim 2:4](#).

The Calvinistic doctrine of unconditional election stands condemned by the Scriptures. The Calvinist is invited to demonstrate his doctrine of *unconditional* election from the Greek text of the New Testament, no theologized philosophy.

It is no wonder that **theologian A. M. Hills was compelled by the evils of Calvinism to say:**

[Calvinism] "...holds up a self-centered selfish, heartless, remorseless tyrant for God, and bids us worship Him. King Theebau of Burmah, some years ago, ordered seven hundred young men and women to be buried alive that his majesty might have better health! But such a pitiless human autocrat is as gentle as a ray of early morning sunshine compared with the God of Calvinism, —who is represented as

creating countless billions of men and angels on purpose to send them to a hell of eternal torment, ‘*as he pleaseth, for the glory of his sovereign power over his creature!*’ He sits on His throne and, ‘*according to the good-pleasure of His will,*’ causes them to pour like a niagara tide of life, into the yawning abyss of hell, with as little compunction as we would kill a few flies, which we have not even created!

“We do not wonder that this wicked caricature of God, was called by Henry Ward Beecher ‘a horrid nightmare of human reason!’ The sentiment of the missionary, Bishop Wm. Taylor, of holy memory, was infinitely more Scriptural when he wrote:

‘At the funeral of every lost soul the procession of mourners will be headed by the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.’

“It holds up a self-centered selfish, heartless, remorseless tyrant for God, and bids us worship Him. King Theebau of Burmah, some years ago, ordered seven hundred young men and women to be buried alive that his majesty might have better health! But such a pitiless human autocrat is as gentle as a ray of early morning sunshine compared with the God of Calvinism, —who is represented as creating countless billions of men and angels on purpose to send them to a hell of eternal torment, ‘*as he pleaseth, for the glory of his sovereign power over his creature!*’ He sits on His throne and, ‘*according to the good-pleasure of His will,*’ causes them to pour like a niagara tide of life, into the yawning abyss of hell, with as little compunction as we would kill a few flies, which we have not even created!

“We do not wonder that this wicked caricature of God, was called by Henry Ward Beecher ‘a horrid nightmare of human reason!’ The sentiment of the missionary, Bishop Wm. Taylor, of holy memory, was infinitely more Scriptural when he wrote:

‘At the funeral of every lost soul the procession of mourners will be headed by the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.’”¹²⁰

Well-stated Dr. Hills.

¹²⁰ A. M. Hills, *Fundamental Christian Theology*, Salem, Ohio: Schmul Publishing Co., Vol. 2, 1980 Reprint, pp. 148.

Chapter Five, Point Five

Cumulative Evidence from Greek NT Versus Calvinism in This §:

Lk 1:74-75... *en hositêti, dikaiosunê*

Col 1:13...*errusato, metestêsen*

Mat 1:21...*apo*

Heb 7:25/Lk13:11... *eis to panteles*

Rom 6:15...*hamartêsōmen, mê genoito*

Mat 1:21... *sōsei ton laon autou apo tōn hamartiōn*

Jn 1:29 *airōn tēn hamartian tou kosmou*

1 Jn 1:7 *athakrisê hēmas; 1:9 aphê tas hamartias... katharizei hēmas*

Jn 8:11... *apo tou nun, hamartane*

1 Jn 3:9... *ou dunatai*

Rom 5:16...*henos*

Rom 5:17...*lambanontes*...active voice

Rom 5:19... *katestathêsan, katastathêsontai*

Rom 5:20...*hupereperisseusen*

V. Perseverance/Eternal Security/Once in Grace, Always in Grace

V. Calvinistic Security Not in Accord With Scriptures

The New Testament is clear on the truth that there is no such thing as *security* or *grace* combined with sin as claimed by false teachers, Calvin, Luther and others. Sin is a hostile, lawless, and rebellious disposition against God:

“The one who does the sin is an *offspring*¹²¹ [or child] of the devil. . . ” (1 Jn 3:8, and 9, and 5).

This passage makes it abundantly clear that sin is *incompatible* with grace and righteousness at any stage of Christian experience; that sin is of the devil and not of God. Thus, if one commits sin, that one is of the devil both in *standing* and *state*. The Calvinist thinks the clever terminology of men— *standing, state*—will save him.

Sin is a *state* of spiritual death. Spiritual death means that when one is cut off from God, death continues until there is *godly sorrow* for sin and it is both repented of and forsaken.

In Genesis 2:17, as rendered by the LXX, God said of the tree of knowledge of good and evil:

“ . . . now ***in whatever day*** you may eat from it, ***in death (thanatō), you will die (apothaneisthe)***.”

The day Adam and Eve sinned, they were in a state of spiritual death. The noun, death, in the locative case, expresses this. Spiritual death or the death of the soul was immediate—***in whatever day***. The statement *you will die* is a verb in the future

¹²¹ Translates force of the preposition (*apo*, from, out of) as to source.

tense. This is an imminent physical death that will occur—*you will die*. Thus, death—spiritual and physical—passed upon *all* men.

Ezekiel 18:20 says:

“But the soul who sins will die.”

James 1:15 says:

“... and the sin, when finished brings forth death.”

Calvin denies, as do all Calvinists, the solemn truth that sin brings death and separation from God to the believer. He says:

“... the sins of believers are venial [not causing death of the soul], not because they are not deserving of death, but because, through the mercy of God, ‘there is no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus;’ because they are not imputed to them, but obliterated by a pardon.”¹²²

Nevertheless, sin brings spiritual death to the believer, the continuation of which results in the second death. Revelation 21:7-8¹²³ makes it plain that the ones not overcoming and inheriting all things:

“... [will have] their part in the lake, the one being caused to burn with fire and brimstone, which is the second death.”

From the second death there is no recovery, nor is there hope of any. This is sin in its end result. This is separation from God—eternally, forevermore, world without end.

Venial sins? Nonsense! Let it not escape our notice that the great Apostle Paul, in Romans 5:18, informs us that:

“... by **one** sin [judgment came] unto all conceivable men unto condemnation. . . .”

And then, in the same verse, he tells us of another act that brought recovery from that Fall of death. It was one righteous act of the Son of God in sacrificial death—Life for life—unto righteousness of life extending to all conceivable men!

¹²² *Institutes*, (Trans.: J. A.) 3.4.28; brackets added. But see Ezekiel 18:24-28 where it is clearly stated that sin brings death, and that to do righteously is to live. See Appendix C, p. 241.

¹²³ The advocates of the “sinning Christian” argue that the only sin that sends one to hell is the sin of unbelief. Note that verse 8 gives a list of sins, including unbelief, in which all the sins are connected by *and—kai*—and have the same article as their antecedent, except *the liars*. This is a construction used to show the effect of a SINGLE result with respect to all these sins—*the second death*! All sin brings death *now*, and eternally *if not forsaken*! So, on the authority of the Word of God, Calvin is found to be a liar! See Herbert Weir Smyth, *Greek Grammar*, §1143.

1a) Sin brings separation from God. There is no such thing as grace that gives security from guilt and condemnation while still in sin. One person cannot be two different ways at the same time—in grace and sin, righteous and sinful, in light and darkness; nor can one serve two masters. Sin is of the devil, not God, and the one sinning is not in Christ (1 Jn 3:8-9; see also v. 5).

In *unbelief* Reformation and Calvinistic systems of theology reject the power of the blood of Jesus Christ to save from all sin in the here and now. These zealots vehemently deny the possibility of living above sin in this life; thus, essentially the religious world believes *their* doctrine of extremism. And if this is doubted, ask your neighbor, “Is it possible to live free from sin in this life?”

These false teachers contend for an “unconditional security” in which the believer is saved, though *in* sin. But that sin and *faith* (noun form of believe) can never coexist in the life of the believer, we note the following:

- A corpse, one dead in sin, cannot partake of the *in Christ* life
- Reconciliation while *in* sin stands as an impossibility

It is impossible that a corpse could be *in Christ*! One sin in the Garden of Eden brought death to the human race. The Apostle Paul affirms this truth in Romans 5:18. He says:

“... by one sin [judgment came] unto all conceivable men unto condemnation. . .”

From the Fall, three mighty truths come to view.

First, sin and condemnation cannot be separated as the advocates of the “sinning Christian” attempt—saved from condemnation, but not saved from sin. Sin and condemnation stand together as cause and effect, act and penalty.

Second, one sin was cause for removal from Eden; likewise, no sinner can be *in Christ* though he may claim to be under grace. A holy God can neither countenance sin nor fellowship a fallen, disobedient nature; though He is propitious and merciful.

Third, sin in Eden brought death. This death was immediate or spiritual, and imminent or physical. Thus, separation from God came upon the whole race. Since sin necessarily brings death, it is not possible then that a corpse may be *in Christ* as the Theological Morticians would have us believe!

But their unbelief in the *merits* of the blood of the Saviour to remove sin now would have a corpse or a sinner unchanged *in Christ*. Amazingly such is called faith, grace, security; and yet, the absence of truth is so utterly pronounced. This is deception, unbelief! But unbelief in the merits of the shed blood to save completely in the here and now would have it so.

Unbelief in the *merits* of the blood to transform sinners to life in Christ and righteous living is grounded in their erroneous view of the *purpose* of the atonement. They tell us what Christ did for us, while being in *unbelief* that He does anything IN us. Certainly Christ did something *for* us, but just as certainly, He did something *in* us! Thus, it is not either/or; it is both/and!

Of those in Christ, New Testament terminology could not be more explicit with respect to the change wrought IN them: “newness of life,” “new man,” “new creation,” “born from above,” “in Christ,” etc.

The New Testament speaks of that miraculous, utter change wrought as a passage from death into life:

- A passage out of one state into another—from death into life ¹²⁴
- A passage out of one sphere of action into another—to serve Him **in** holiness and **in** righteousness ¹²⁵

Those *in Christ* then have passed over into another sphere, another kingdom and necessarily another way of life, where sin is not a part of life. No unbeliever or unclean person, whatever the claim, may be partaker of this life in Christ; for this is life wrought from death by no other than the mighty hand of God! The *in Christ* life is not grounded in mere forensic pronouncements; but in the transcendent merits of the shed blood of the Son of God. The *in Christ* ones are “delivered out of the authority of darkness and *transferred* (*metestêsen*) into the kingdom of the Son. . .

”¹²⁶

¹²⁴ John 5:24; 1 John 3:14.

¹²⁵ Luke 1:74b-75. Note that “*in holiness* (*en hosiotêti*) and *in righteousness* (*dikaïosunê*)” are in the locative case. Hence, the sphere of service in the Messianic age is “in holiness and righteousness . . . all **the days** of us.” In this age, then, those who serve God rest from sin. To deny that the Messianic age is now is like denying that the Christ is the Messiah, along with the Jew; or denying that His blood is efficacious to save now, along with the Jew, Calvinist and Reformation advocates.

The Messiah has come! The Atonement stands finished! The plan of salvation thus stands in place—present, perfect, now or never.

¹²⁶ Colossians 1:13. In this context, the believer is translated into the *kingdom* now. In verse 12, we read: “. . . the Father *having made* (*hikanôsanti*, an aorist participle) us *fit* for the part of **the share in the inheritance of the saints in the light**. . . .” Note, we are fit now—“. . . having made us fit. . . .” already! And we are “in the light” now!

Verse 13 has two verbs that are aorist indicative or past tense—*errusato* (*delivered*) and *metestêsen* (*transferred*). Note two things: 1) We are already delivered and there is a **spatial** relation between us and the authority of darkness; 2) We are already in the kingdom, “the kingdom” is the object, extremity, or terminus of our transfer.

Thus “saints in the light,” and “delivered . . . out of the darkness,” and “into the kingdom” speak of the kingdom life in the here and now. Paul speaking of it in another place as a present reality, says: “. . . the kingdom of God IS . . . righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Spirit” (Romans 14:17). It should be noted that righteousness, peace, and joy stand in the predicate nominative position.

This is that transforming, enabling righteousness in which the believer lives in harmony with the kingdom of which he is a subject. This is an answer to the prayer that Jesus gave the disciples to pray in Matthew 6, “. . . Thy kingdom come . . .” that God’s will be done on earth as in heaven. Now that the Holy Spirit may indwell the Church, since the Day of Pentecost, believers may be purified and empowered to do God’s will on earth.

Thus, we do not have here a *heterosis* of tenses, i.e., one tense used for another, in which circumstance, the *past tense* is used *for the future*, projecting “the kingdom” and salvation realities to some *future* experience.

This was not the transfer of the sinful person that was, only now part sinner, part saint; but these were made fit for the kingdom into which they were transferred.

What a Saviour, Who by the miracle and power and merits of His own blood, inducts a new creation *in Christ!*

This is the *merit* of the blood!

Not only would the Theological Morticians join a corpse to Christ, they would have “sinners unchanged” reconciled to God! They tell us that in reconciliation sins are not held against us anymore; we are thus saved from the wrath to come, but not sin. So a holy God, Who cannot countenance sin, though He is propitious and merciful, nevertheless, is said to be reconciled to “saved sinners.” But if “saved,” how a “sinner?” If a “sinner,” how “saved?”

This is absurd; blatant unbelief it is! This is unbelief in the purpose of Christ’s sacrificial death, and the merits of His blood as the provision for the removal of all sin now. This is unbelief in the moral necessity for righteousness in the here and now; unbelief that reconciliation constitutes the removal of the sin that necessitated it in the first place!

It is not possible to be both reconciled to God and be in sin. Sin brought about the necessity for reconciliation. Hence, sin has come between God and man. Man is in a state of enmity and rebellion against God.¹²⁷ Thus, he stands before Him a condemned sinner with wrath abiding upon him until sin is removed.¹²⁸

Reconciliation, a benefit of the atonement, takes place when the cause that necessitated it is removed—SIN. So, until sin is removed, there can be no reconciliation. On the ground of sin, a mutual hostility stands between God and man. God’s wrath is upon sinners, and sinners are in rebellion against God, for sin is rebellion! On the ground of the cross, a Divine provision, actual reconciliation stands as the imperative to the world: “. . . you be reconciled to God now.”¹²⁹

John said: “. . . that we may be called children of God—and **we are!**” *And we are* is an emphatic reflection. Thus, God’s children are the subjects of the kingdom in which Christ reigns right now—“*nun tekna theou esmen*... **now** we are children of God” (1 John 3:1-2).

¹²⁷ Romans 8:7.

¹²⁸ John 3:18, 36.

¹²⁹ 2 Corinthians 5:20. *Reconciliation* here is in a potential mood—the imperative—and is therefore future and conditional. So, implicit to a *potential mood* is the futurity and conditionality of a given aspect of salvation. Again Reformation and Reformed theology are shown as false and destructive to the work and provision of the cross.

On *katallagê* (reconciliation) Arndt and Gingrich say, in their *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*: (Chicago, Illinois: The University of Chicago Press, 1952) “. . . [reconciliation] acc. to Paul, is brought about by **God alone**; he ‘reconciles men to himself.’ . . . Since **men are not active** in this dispensation fr. God, they are said . . . to *receive reconciliation* Ro 5:11” (Brackets and bold print added).

The cross, then, is the ground or locus on which God is propitious or merciful, on which sinners may repent and forsake sin, on which rebellion and wrath may be resolved. This is reconciliation.

Thayer remarks in his lexicon on *reconciliation*:

“ . . . the restoration of the favor of God to sinners that repent. . . . ”¹³⁰

Reconciliation, then, consists in conjoint conditions—the *removal of sin* and the *absence of Divine wrath*. The estrangement between God and man is thus absolved.

1b) Righteousness brings separation from sin. Since God has exalted Jesus to be a Prince and a Saviour, dare fallible man tamper with the transcendent Soteriological Office of the Son of God, and *impugn* the efficacy and power of His blood to completely take away *all* sin in *this* life and thus save His people?

Just as surely as Christ is Saviour, salvation is freedom from sin. Righteousness is real and not a positional fiction; thus, the believer is able to live free from sin.

In Matthew 1:21 we read:

“And she will bring forth a Son, and you will call His name JESUS. Mark it well:¹³¹ He, Himself, will **save** His people *from their sins*.”

Note the following:

- Jesus is the Saviour
- Jesus saves in some sense
- Jesus saves His people

First, Jesus has been declared by the angel to be the Saviour. If He is in reality the Saviour, as the angel says, then, He must in reality save. It is not possible to be the Saviour and, at the same time, not carry through as the Saviour. That would be like a reformation in which nothing is reformed.

Jesus is actually the Saviour, and the Saviour actually saves despite the effort of Calvinists and others to take away His Stereological Crown!

Second, in what sense is Jesus the Saviour? He is declared to be the Saviour *from sins*. Note, then, that this passage pictures Jesus as the Mighty to save by the removal of sins—“ . . . He, Himself (i.e., no other), will save His people *from* their sins.” In the Original, the word translated *sins* is in the ablative case, the case of

It is true that we *receive reconciliation*, but it is not true that “men are not active” in that reception! Thus, their definition is false to the truth of Scriptures. They have, apparently, a monergistic theology to project into their lexicon.

Here Paul says: “*Katallagête tō Theō . . . You be reconciled to God now.*” *Reconciled* is an aorist imperative. The imperative is the mood of the volition or will. It is thus an appeal from one will to another will to action. That Paul made such an appeal is evidence that the ability to carry it out existed and was expected! That “men are not active . . .” does not sound Pauline to me! See [Appendix B](#), p. 230.

¹³⁰ J. H. Thayer, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*, Fourth Edition, Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1955, s.v. “reconciliation,” i.e., *katallagēte*.

¹³¹ Translates force of explicative *gar*.

separation. Thus, Jesus' role as Saviour is that sins may be removed, i.e., a separation of *people* and *sins*.

This is further affirmed by adding the preposition *from* (*apo*, an ablative) to the text to help the noun, sins, affirm more vividly and emphatically the removal of sins. But despite this good news of the gospel, there are those who declare that we are saved even while living in sin; that it is impossible to be delivered from it in this life.

Third, Jesus will save *His people*. Under the old system His people, the Jews, were not delivered from sin,¹³² except ceremonially as their system anticipated the cross. But at the cross both Jew and Gentile were made one, the middle wall of partition between them having been abolished.¹³³

In the new order then, the provision for salvation is *universal* and *from* sin: for Jesus will save all who will come; all whom He saves, He saves *eis to panteles* (*completely*), according to Hebrews 7:25. In Luke 13:11, we have the same phrase. Hebrews used *eis to panteles* (*completely*) of being saved; Luke uses this phrase of being healed *completely*, i.e., standing up straight. Thus, *eis to panteles* is as thorough and complete in salvation as it is in healing. So, healed of a disease, saved from sin!

Thus, His people are saved *from* sin, i.e., the bent, the disposition of rebellion, or the sin nature is removed; for

“... the Lamb of God *takes away* (*airō*) the sin of the world,” i.e., sin as a fact.¹³⁴

But, tens of thousands of professors and preachers pretentiously tell multiplied millions that they are still saved while living *in* their sins. The sense, then, in which Jesus saves is in sin and not from it. But the claim that we cannot be saved from sin in this life is a blatant and absurd contradiction of the heavenly messenger who did assert:

“... He, Himself, will save His people *from* their sins.”¹³⁵

Now either these professors and preachers are wrong or the angel is wrong. To claim that people are saved while living in their sins is to impugn the high Soteriological Office of the Son of God as Saviour and to blaspheme the God Who declared that He sent a Saviour!

Since Jesus *is* declared to be the Saviour of the world, how then shall we live? Shall we not live as the saved? This is precisely the issue in Romans 6:15 where we read:

¹³² In Hebrews 10:11 we read of the sacrifices: “... which could never completely take away sins.” And verse 4 says: “For it is impossible for the blood of bulls and goats to take away sins.”

¹³³ Ephesians 2:14.

¹³⁴ It should be noted that “... He, Himself, will save His *people* (object) from *their* sins” and “... the One taking away the *sin* (object)” are a reversal. In Matthew “the people” are the object of the action; in John “the sin” is the object of the action. Thus, “... taking away the *sin*...” and “... saving His *people*” are inseparable in salvation. Hence, salvation is a restoration from the Fall—*people* saved from *sin*! The references are respectively: Matthew 1:21 and John 1:29.

¹³⁵ Matthew 1:21.

“What then? *Shall we sin even once*¹³⁶ *hereafter* because we are not under law, but under **grace**? NO, NEVER!”

The translation *shall we sin even once hereafter* translates (*hamartēsōmen*). This verb is an aorist tense and subjunctive mood and first person plural. So, to fully represent all of the grammatical aspects in a translation, it runs:

“Shall we sin even once (aorist tense) hereafter (sub-junctive mood). . . .”¹³⁷

Note that the mood here is potential and, therefore, future; hence, the translation *hereafter*. So Paul raises the question—because believers are under grace and not under law—“Shall we sin even once hereafter?”

Now, indeed, we are under grace. But grace must not be viewed in an antinomian sense with the false assumption that the believer is eternally secure and now it is possible to live in sin and still be saved. Grace is not license to sin, but enablement to forsake it; grace enables us to live free from sin in a way that the law never could.

Note that antinomianism is the belief that *faith alone*¹³⁸ is necessary for salvation, apart from human effort in obedience to the moral law of Almighty God. But, however inadequate human effort may be, it is, nevertheless, indispensable.

The question raised based upon grace versus the law—“Shall we sin even once hereafter”—was met with an emphatic “NO, NEVER!” “No, Never” translates (*mê genoito*).¹³⁹ This is a statement in the optative mood and is one step further removed from reality than is the subjunctive mood and means something like: “No, may it never happen! or certainly not! or never! or no, never!”

Thus, the Apostle prohibited sin as emphatically as is possible in a mood that removed the probability of it as far from reality as the language afforded, except the imperative mood.

¹³⁶ Or once-in-a-while.

¹³⁷ For discussion on the aorist tense, see p. 90, footnote 55, and p. 96, footnote 64. Dana and Mantey say: “The main idea of the aorist tense, as has been indicated, is to express punctiliar action” (§288, [1]). “The purpose of a prohibition, when expressed by the aorist subjunctive, is to forbid a thing *before it has begun*; i.e., it commands to never do a thing” (§290). “. . . concerning the potential moods: ‘This fundamental idea of *simple occurrence* remains the essential characteristic of the aorist through all the dependent moods, however indefinite they may be with regard to time . . .’” (§ 179, i; *A Manual of the Greek New Testament*).

¹³⁸ Or *sola fide*: by *faith alone* as Calvinists and all advocates of the “sinning Christian” say. “Antinomian, *n* . . . *Eccl. Hist.* One who holds that, under the gospel dispensation, the moral law is of no use or obligation, on the ground that faith alone is necessary to salvation. The term has been applied to certain Gnostics of the 2d and 3d centuries A.D. . . .” (*Webster’s New International Dictionary*, Second Edition, s.v. “antinomian.”)

The doctrine that sin does not hurt one’s spirit, does not bring spiritual death and separation from God, that “there is safety and security for the Father’s child even while he is sinning” is plain old 1st century Gnosticism. Albeit, we contend neither that it has been static nor that it has been ineffective.

¹³⁹ In I Corinthians 6:15 we have this same construction—*mê genoito*. Here Paul posed the question: “. . . shall I then take the members of the Christ, [and] make [them] members of a harlot? No, NEVER! (*mê genoito*).”

That “the members of Christ” should be made the members of a harlot; that “. . . we sin even once hereafter”—utterly and emphatically—*mê genoito*!

Of course Christ’s body, the Church, should not be joined to a harlot!

Of course the Church should not use grace as an excuse to sin!

Finally, the Church of this last decade of the twentieth century must come to share the *same* conviction about sin as did St. Paul and first century Christians; otherwise, it will never deliver the message to its generation that saves from the wrath to come. For this is the *only* message that is consistent with the voice of Divine inspiration.

2) The accusative of the thing and the accusative of the person show deliverance from sin in the here and now.

The accusative Of the Person/Thing shows that sins are removed in the here and now. Penal atonement has no way whatsoever of either showing or denying this from the Greek New Testament.

This mighty New Testament affirmation of the removal of sin is found in Matthew 1:21 and John 1:29. The Matthew passage says:

“...autos gar sōsei ton laon autou apo tōn hamartiōn autōn. . . for He, Himself, will save the people of Him from the sins of them.”

Note that the verb—will save—takes the accusative of the person—*the people* are saved.

The John passage says:

“...ho amnos tou Theou ho airōn tēn hamartian tou kosmou...the One taking away the sin of the world.”

Here the participle—taking away—takes the accusative of the thing—*the sin* is taken away. The point is this: The objects of action are *the people* and *the sin*. The people are the object of the **saving**, and their sin is the object of the **removal**. Thus, saved *people* and their *sin taken away* cannot but be a *restoration* (*iaomai*) from the Fall! For more complete discussion click: [Restoration From All Sin](#), p. 165.

This same issue is discussed in 1 Jn 1:7, 9:

In verse 7, *katharizei* takes the accusative of the person—*hēmas . . . us*. So, people are cleansed from all sin in the here and now. In 1 Jn 1:9, *aphē* takes the accusative of the thing—*tas hamartias...the sins*; and *katharisē* takes the accusative of the person—*hēmas...us*. So, *agreement* with God with respect to our sins constitutes a mighty work in which dealing with it goes full circle: the thing—*sins* are removed; and the persons—*us* undergo cleansing. Consequently, *nothing further may be done* with respect to the sin issue. As we noted earlier then, this is the reason “there is no longer an offering concerning sins!” [For more complete discussion click: [aphiēmi](#)] p. 218.

So, sinless perfection?¹⁴⁰

¹⁴⁰ *Sinless perfection* is a phrase upon which Wesleyan-Arminianism seems to frown. Thus we are reminded of Wesley’s statement: “. . . *sinless perfection* is a phrase I never use. . . .” (John Wesley, *A Plain Account of Christian Perfection*, Kansas City, Missouri: Beacon Hill Press, 1966, Unabridged Reprint, p. 54.)

3) Salvation is conditional, not irresistible, not by the decree—predestination/election.

Monadic Constructions Proof of Conditional Salvation

Monadic Constructions Proof that Sin and Righteousness Cannot Mix

We note here two constructions that show that sin **cannot** continue or exist in the **new** life of the person who is under Divine mandate to stop sinning, or who has **experienced** God in a creative sense. These constructions are, respectively—*apo tou nun* (from now on) and *ou dunatai* (not able).¹⁴¹

In John 8:11, we have the first construction:

“And she said ‘no one, Lord,’ and Jesus said to her, ‘neither do I condemn you; go and *stop sinning* (*hamartane*; present imperative) *from now on* (*apo tou nun*)”¹⁴²

Two great truths are evident here: 1) Jesus commanded this woman to *stop sinning*; 2) while the present tense may refer to continuous action, here Jesus commanded that the action of sinning that had been in motion, STOP—stop sinning! Dana and Mantey state the following:

“A prohibition in the present imperative demands that the action then in progress be stopped.”¹⁴³

But surely Wesley’s cultural context must be considered. The doctrine of *Christian perfection* had not been so spread in more than 1500 years; and Wesley was in constant theological debate—and he only used the phrase *Christian perfection*, just think if he had used *sinless perfection*! Because it is said that all Christians sin.

But is the term *sinless perfection* to be avoided? In this particular phrase, “perfection” is a noun; “sinless” is adjectivally descriptive of perfection. If we have Christianity in mind, perfection can only be “sinless.” *Sinless perfection* then is simply a statement as to *kind*—*sinless*; i.e., it is a perfection without sin.

So, the phrases “sinless perfection, Christian perfection, perfection, without sin,” etc., if we have Christianity in mind, all have the same value in meaning—a kind of perfection that is *without sin*.

Scholars who advise us against this dreaded term, get into considerable irrelevance as they inveigh against it. But this phrase has nothing to do with the possibility of sinning, the impossibility of sinning; whether we are tempted, not tempted, etc. Thus, the phrase “sinless” is adjectivally descriptive of the noun “perfection” as to *kind*—*sinless perfection*.

So, what is the matter with this phrase in the vocabulary of a people who believe that the blood of Jesus Christ *cleanses* from all sin in this life? NOTHING!

Finally, the Calvinist has a “sinning perfection” in which God is said to *see* the “sinning believer” as perfect. We are thus told that the believer “is clothed in perfect holiness . . . even though the believer is still sinful . . . [and] judged by God as blameless.”

So while the Calvinist brazenly proclaims this shameless, presumptuous lie, until essentially the church world believes it, the Wesleyan-Arminian must be careful of this phrase—*sinless perfection*. But God created man holy and thus in *sinless perfection* in the beginning; and on the ground of the atonement, God brought forth a *new creation* in Christ.

Precisely how is it that this *new creation* can be other than in a state of *sinless perfection*?

¹⁴¹ Constructions from Rev. R. L. Lavender, *The Distinctives of the In-Christ Life*, a manuscript in preparation for publication.

¹⁴² See Luke 1:48; 5:10; 2 Corinthians 5:16 on *apo tou nun* (from now on).

How long was the woman to **stop sinning**? Both Jesus' imperative and the construction agree that she was to stop **then . . . from now on**. The Calvinist will claim that it is impossible to **stop sinning from now on while in the body**, which is, of course, a continuation of first century Gnosticism. But Jesus knew very well that it is utterly impossible to simultaneously bring together both sin and righteousness in the same life. Thus, His approach to sin and its separation **from** righteousness clearly acknowledges that two different moral states cannot be conjoined. They are clearly perceived or marked off as distinct from each other.

By nature sin and righteousness stand in antithesis to each other and **function** in opposite morals and move in opposing directions:

1) **Opposite** morals cannot function in the same life—**sin** and **righteousness**—at the same time; 2) a life cannot travel in **opposing** moral directions—in sin and righteousness. Accordingly, both the **distinctive** and the **distance** between sin and righteousness are forever fixed. **Sin and righteousness are monadic constructions and can never be otherwise!**

So, when a person meets Jesus, the imperative stands: **stop sinning—then . . . from now on**.

In 1 John 3:9 we have the second construction:

“Everyone having been born out of God does not go on sinning, because His seed remains in him; and **ability** to sin **does not continue** (*ou dunatai*), because he has been born out of God.”

In this construction, God has been experienced in a creative sense—**has been born out of God**—hence a new creation or a spiritual experience. Two reasons are stated as to this person's **cessation** from sin—because His [God's] **seed remains in him**, and **because he has been born out of God**.

But in what sense is it that the **ability** to sin **does not continue** for this person? As noted above, the **reasons** for the cessation of sin also **account for the inability** to sin—**His seed remains . . . has been born out of God**.

Clearly, as in Eden, sin and a relationship with God cannot mix. The very claim to birth, as here, constitutes a radical change—out of God into a **new** birth. The laws of reproduction according to kind prevail here as truly as in the natural world.¹⁴³ Again, sin and righteousness (birth out of God) cannot mix. It is not once saved that one cannot sin; but it is impossible to mix **His seed** and **birth out of God** with sin. Thus, the effect of sin is not mixture with righteousness, but death and separation from God **as in Eden**.

¹⁴³ Dana and Mantey, *A Manual Grammar of the Greek New Testament*, § 289, (2); and Matthew 7:1; Luke 10:7; James 3:1; Revelation 5:4, 5. On *ou dunatai* references see John 14:17; Romans 8:8; 1 Corinthians 3:1; 10:21; 15:20; 2 Timothy 2:13; Hebrews 3:19; James 4:2; 1 John 4:20.

¹⁴⁴ Genesis 1:11-12, 21; John 3:6.

The principle of alteration of possibilities into impossibilities occurs when regenerative change takes place and the **old** person that used to be is now **new**. John discusses this principle here; Paul discusses it in Romans 6. With this in mind, we note the following inabilities:

“... the Spirit of truth, Whom the world **is not able** (*ou dunatai*) to receive. . .
”¹⁴⁵

The world cannot receive the Spirit of truth in the sinful state—an impossibility; but if the world will receive Christ as Saviour, it may also receive the Spirit as Sanctifier.

And again:

“So those who are in the flesh [carnal nature] **are not able** (*ou dunatai*) to please God.”¹⁴⁶

This truth stands; but it does not state the impossibility of pleasing God while in the flesh or natural life. It is impossible, however, to be carnal and please God.

And so, for the believer:

“... **ability to sin does not continue** (*ou dunatai*).”

The reason is obvious.

Consequently, monadic constructions—as do other factors—prove the utter impossibility of bringing sin and righteousness together in the same life.

4) Romans Proof that Sin Brings Death and Separation from God:

5:16 The Judgment arose [or came]¹⁴⁷ by one transgression: Adam’s one sin plunged the whole human race into the Fall, death and separation from God. *One* (*henos*) sin brought judgment. Note: 1) judgment of sin is already in place; accordingly, sin was not judged in the person of Christ on the cross by God punishing God, the Son, so that sin no longer brings death to the believer; 2) Sin brings death and separation from God today, as in Eden. But where sin abounds, grace does much more abound.

5:17 those who receive: These persons are in the active voice, and receive (*lambanontes*) *the abundance*, described as *of the grace and of the gift of the righteousness*. Grace and righteousness are not an imputed positional fiction, but a

¹⁴⁵ John 14:17.

¹⁴⁶ Romans 8:8.

¹⁴⁷ Understood from context.

fact in which those receiving *will reign in [this] life*. Clearly **human effort cooperates with Divine provision**. Man does something with respect to his salvation.

in life: The sphere of the reign, in life, not after death.

5:18 through one¹⁴⁸ transgression: One act is emphasized...still plummeted the race into sin and separation from God.

Through one¹⁴⁹ righteous act: Here it is one righteous act that is emphasized, i.e., the Atonement, the benefit of which may be restoration from the Fall¹⁵⁰

5:19 the many were made¹⁵¹ sinners: Note that the *many* were not *considered* to be sinners, but not really. They were made sinners, actually, factually, historically, really; hence, the necessity of the atonement.

the many will be made¹⁵² righteous: Here "righteous" is not simply positional, declared, or imputed, but not in fact, anticipating some future event, death, etc. *Were made* and *will be made* translate the same word, except tense. Both have the same causative force to produce, by a single act, persons after their kind. Adam produced *sinners*; Christ produced the *righteous*. And this causative force cannot yield a mix of kinds whatsoever, for there is no righteousness in Adam and no sinners in Christ. Accordingly, the one righteous act of Christ conditionally reverses the Fall in Adam.

5:20 the grace abounded:¹⁵³ Here Paul puts forth a very strong construction to show the enabling power of grace over the sin in Adam, that we are no longer partakers of Adam, but of Christ. But despite the super abounding grace of Christ, Calvinists, as do many others, impugn grace to a law level by their **unbelief** that super abounding grace enables one to live free from sin. The saved, however, believe this of which Paul speaks.

¹⁴⁸ *Henos, one*, as used in this v. of the two Adams, emphasizes single acts of far-reaching results. The act of the first Adam resulted in judgment; the act of the second Adam resulted in righteousness as a fact, not positional.

¹⁴⁹ *Henos, one*.

¹⁵⁰ Gen 1:26-27; Eph 4:24; Col 3:9-10.

¹⁵¹ *Katestathēsan—were made*—is an aorist tense, indicative mood, passive voice, i.e., "the many *were made* sinners" by Adam's sin. Now "the many" certainly are not merely *considered* to be sinners, but not really! They WERE MADE sinners—actually, factually, historically, really! hence, the necessity of the atonement.

¹⁵² *Katastathēsontai—will be made*—is a future tense, indicative mood, passive voice, i.e., "the many *will be made righteous*" by Christ's obedience as they are saved throughout the Gospel Day. As certainly as in Adam's action the many *were made sinners*, just as certainly, through Christ's action, the many *will be made righteous*, hence, the reality of the atoning benefits!

Note that these verbs of the text are from *kathistēmi*, meaning *to make, to cause* (someone to become something). Note also that *righteous*, of "the many will be made righteous," is a predicate adjective and affirms the true righteousness as a state or quality of "the many."

¹⁵³ *Abounded all the more* translates *hupereperisseusen*, a very strong word. The verb, *perisseuō*, *be more than enough*, is prefixed with the preposition, *hyper*, *over-and-above, beyond, more than* (in context). Cf. Eph 3:20.

5:21 the sin reigned in the death: Where there is no death, sin cannot exist, reign; sin necessarily exists and reigns in death. Death is the end of life in relation to context. Here death is the fall from holiness,¹⁵⁴ the image of God in which man was created.¹⁵⁵ But saved persons are restored from the Fall, and sin still brings death, despite the efforts of the Calvinists to defend sin as consistent with the *in Christ life*.

grace would reign: In super abounding enablement over sin.

through righteousness: Here grace reigns through righteousness. The reign of death has come to an end in the life of the righteous, consequent upon the destruction of the condition that brought death in the first place—sin. The believer is now as free from sin’s reign, through Christ, as was Adam in Eden. And when sin takes place death results, whether Adam or the believer.

to life eternal: This life IS a state, through Christ, in Christ, and in Him there is no sin, no death; only holiness, righteousness, life...the opposite of sin and death. This life in Him is eternal.

In conclusion, Calvinism is as Theologian A. M. Hills said:

“...the most unreasonable, incongruous, self-contradictory, man-belittling and *God-dishonoring scheme of theology* that ever appeared in Christian thought.”

The Five Points of Calvinism are the walls of hell barring humankind from the sin-liberating truths of Divine revelation. If this “sinning Christianity” is believed and *lived*, it is a sure ticket to hell. On the sin issue, the Calvinistic view of the Christian religion is no higher than that of the heathen of long ago.

The Greek Stoic philosopher Epictetus said:

“How, then: is it possible to be sinless? It is impossible; but *this* is possible, to strive not to sin.”¹⁵⁶

Earlier the Greek philosopher, Plato, had articulated these words:

“But having become good, to remain in a good state and be good, is not possible, and is not granted to man. God only has this blessing; but man cannot help being bad when the force of circumstances overpowers him.”¹⁵⁷

¹⁵⁴ Gen 2:17.

¹⁵⁵ Gen 1:26-27; cf. Eph 4:24, Col 3:9-10 refer to restoration through Christ.

¹⁵⁶ *Epictetus*, iv., 12, 19, cited by Marvin R. Vincent, *Word Studies in the New Testament*, 4 Vols., Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1946, Vol. 2., p. 319.

¹⁵⁷ Plato, *Protagoras*, 344, cited by Ibid.

Note the corresponding kinship between Greek philosophy and false Christianity . . . that both despair of all hope for deliverance from sin in the body. Hear the outbreak of hopelessness in what we call the Christian Church as the advocates of the “sinning Christian” speak about sin.

Calvin says:

“We maintain, therefore, that sin always exists in the saints, till they are divested of the mortal body. . . .”¹⁵⁸

This is a mutation of Gnosticism.

Hear best-selling author and radio speaker, John F. MacArthur, he says:

“Perhaps the classic example of a sinning believer is the apostle Paul.

“Paul? Yes. The more he matured in Christ, the more the apostle became aware of his own sinfulness. . . . Near the end of his life, when he wrote to Timothy, Paul spoke of himself as ‘foremost of all [sinners]’ (I Tim. 1:15).”¹⁵⁹

Thus, the gospel of the “sinning Christian” has no more saving essence than the philosophy of Epictetus or Plato.

¹⁵⁸ *Institutes*, (Trans.: J. A.), 3.3.10.

¹⁵⁹ John F. MacArthur, Jr., *Faith Works: The Gospel According to the Apostles*, Dallas•London•Vancouver•Melbourne: Word Publishing, © 1993, p. 129.

GLOSSARY OF TERMS ON ATONEMENT

See Priestly-Sacrificial Atonement: *The Fallacy of the “Sinning Christian”*

ATONEMENT TERMS IN USE

New Testament Atonement is Priestly-Sacrificial, i.e., Christ offered Himself. The typical Atonement of the OT—priest and sacrifice—are brought together in the Person of Christ as Priest and Sacrifice; for further discussion click above.

Atonement: “3. *Theol.* . . . St. Anselm (d. 1109) introduced the conception of *substitutional*, or *vicarious*, *atonement*, that Christ took on Himself the punishment due to sin, and by his sacrifice offered adequate satisfaction to the offended infinite majesty of God. This view was, in substance followed by the theologians of the Middle Ages, and prevails in Catholic theology today. Early Protestant leaders accepted this view of the redemptive character of Christ’s death. . . .”¹⁶⁰

AN IMPORTANT NOTE ON ATONEMENT: Calvin credited the all-sufficiency of Christ’s merit (*meritum Christi*) to the divine decree, not Christ’s Person.

Calvin could say, therefore:

“If Christ had merely died a corporeal [bodily] death, no end would have been accomplished by it; it was requisite, also, that he should feel the severity of the Divine vengeance, in order to appease the wrath of God, and satisfy his justice. Hence it was necessary for him to contend with the powers of hell and the horror of eternal death.”¹⁶¹

So, Calvin erroneously credited the all-sufficiency of Christ’s merit to the divine decree, removing sufficiency from the Person Who wrought Atonement. Accordingly, in the Calvinistic system Atonement is extrinsic, outside of Christ, not intrinsically in Him, of Him, by Him, through Him—in Christ alone!

Calvinistic atonement is pagan, not Christian; it removes Atonement from Divinity to the decree.

Atonement then, in this system, is in the *divine decree* and *penal satisfaction*, *not blood . . . and so removed from the Person of Christ*. In this atonement “infinite merit” is not in the “infinite value” of His “divine-human work;” *merit* and *value* are in the divine decree and punishment. But *infinite merit* and *value* are clearly shown to be in the Person of Christ—***Solus Christus . . . Christ alone***, page 9 and Jn 10:17-18, page 13 above.

Guilt: In Calvinistic teaching, since Christ fulfills the law for us vicariously and then accepts, vicariously, the punishment for sin required under the law, the

¹⁶⁰ Webster’s New International Dictionary of the English Language, Second Edition, Unabridged, s.v. “atonement.”

¹⁶¹ *Institutes*, 2.16.10; (Trans.: J. A.); bold print added.

believer is said to be free from guilt while sinning. So, the Calvinist claims freedom from guilt and punishment, but not from the sin.

Penal Atonement: Penal atonement means that Christ was punished for our sins on the cross; this is stated in other ways: He took our punishment, He took our place, He died in our stead, etc. We here note three issues:

- The Punisher and punished cannot be one; God is one God. The God of oneness cannot punish God, the Son.
- Punishment is always a moral issue, involving the one punished when inflicted in justice. It is never just to punish the guiltless, innocent, or sinless.
- Suffering, as in Atonement, is not a moral issue. Suffering in itself is not a moral issue.
- The spotless, sinless, innocent Christ suffered, but He was not punished.

Propitiation: “2. *Theol.* That which propitiates; atonement or atoning sacrifice; specif., the self-sacrifice and death of Christ, viewed as appeasing divine justice and effecting reconciliation between God and man.

“He [Jesus Christ] is the *propitiation* for our sins. 1 *John* ii.2.”¹⁶²

“*theol.* the atonement or atoning sacrifice offered to God **to assuage his wrath and render** him propitious to sinners.”¹⁶³ [This is placation whatever the denial of the Calvinist.]

Hilasmos, Some Scholars on

Arndt and Gingrich **give:**

“1. *expiation, propitiation*.... But mgn. 2 is just as possible. 2. *sin-offering*. . . .”¹⁶⁴

Louw and Nida, against *hilasmos* as propitiation, say:

“... Though some traditional translations render **il[asth]<rion** [*hilastērion*] as ‘propitiation,’ this involves a wrong interpretation of the term in question. Propitiation is essentially a process by which one does a favor to a person to make him or her favorably disposed, but in the NT God is never the object of propitiation since he is already on the side of the people. **il[asmo]<j** [*hilasmos*] and **il[asth]<rion** [*hilastērion*] denote the means of forgiveness and not propitiation.”¹⁶⁵

Cremer says:

“**il[asmo]<j, o[** [*ho hilasmos*] **reconciliation, expiation**,... Now Chris in like manner, 1 John ii. 2, iv. 10, is called **il[asmo]<j** [*hilasmos*], as it is He by who, as

¹⁶² Webster’s New International Dictionary of the English Language, Second Edition, Unabridged, s.v. “propitiation.”

¹⁶³ Ibid., s.v. “atonement.”

¹⁶⁴ Arndt and Gingrich, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*: (Chicago, Illinois: The University of Chicago Press, 1952), s.v. *hilasmos*.

¹⁶⁵ Johannes P. Louw and Eugene A. Nida, *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament Based on Semantic Domains*, s.v. *hilasmos*.

a sacrifice, sin is covered, *i.e.* expiated.... By the use of the abstract form, it is indicated that in Christ the person and work (priest and sacrifice) **are one**; cf. the abstract expressions in John xiv. 6, 1 Cor. I. 30, and others.”¹⁶⁶

The Atonement is an unconditional act of God. Romans 3:25 reads, “. . . Whom God, and no other, *set forth (proetheto)* as an *atonement (hilastêrion)* by His blood, through faith. . . .” The force of the *intensive middle* construction (*proetheto*) stresses the Agent producing the action, *i.e.*, *God, and no other!* The Atonement did not evolve out of God’s need for *appeasement* or *pacification*. Atonement was not to satisfy wrath; rather, so it would not be necessary to pour out wrath. The punishment of sin was in place long before the death of Christ. Atonement is to restore man from the Fall, and consequently from the necessity of punishment through the shed blood of Christ. (See full discussion at Priestly-Sacrificial Atonement in *The Fallacy of the “Sinning Christian”*).

Substitute: Christ died *in our behalf*, not in our place. Man was dead in sin; Christ did not take our place there; Man was under punishment of the Fall and eternal punishment eminently; Christ did not take our place there.

Christ, a being of another order, took His place in Atonement in the sphere of His being—the God man. He did not condescend to our place in any sense—to be made sin, to take our punishment due to sin, etc. He was truly Incarnate, but in no sense did He take, or partake of, our *fallen* nature or *punishment*, the result of the fallen nature. He effected Atonement in the merit of His Person, by Divinity and humanity in bloodshed and death! The doctrine of substitution as held in theology is blasphemy. (See discussion at Isaiah 53 and the Suffering Servant in *The Fallacy of the “Sinning Christian”*.)

The place that Christ took at Calvary was uniquely His—the Holy of Holies of the NT; the cross He bore was His—the place of Atonement in our behalf. The judgment of sin was set, in place. This lofty place He took potentially reversed the judgment of sin for *whosoever* of the world.

Vicarious: A vicarious sacrifice or punishment in Five Point Calvinism is understood to mean that:

“. . . Christ’s satisfaction includes and implies the *obedientia Christi* . . . [*obedience of Christ*] through which Christ both fulfills the law for us vicariously and then accepts, vicariously, the punishment for sin required under the law, death.”¹⁶⁷

So then, according to this reasoning, Christ was *righteous* for us and *punished* for our sins; accordingly, neither righteousness nor punishment may now be required of the believer inasmuch as total satisfaction is fulfilled in Christ. This is false to the Scriptures.

There is no such thing as being good for another or being punished for another!

¹⁶⁶ Hermann Cremer, *Biblico-Theological Lexicon of New Testament Greek*, Edinburgh: T.& T. Clark, 1954 Reprint, p. 321, *s.v.* *hilasmos*.

¹⁶⁷ Richard A. Muller, *Dictionary of Latin and Greek Theological Terms*, p. 272.

All these terms are fictitious coinage to usurp the lofty place of Priestly-Sacrificial Atonement—Christ died *in our behalf*, offered Himself, etc. The *Person*, Christ, was involved in atonement. But Divinity cannot be punished; punishment then cannot be beneficial to Divinity for atonement. Punishment or satisfaction can only exist when the Person of Christ is *divided* in atonement. Punishment cannot become a complement in atonement. Any true complement is able to properly relate to the *Person*, Christ, in atonement without contradiction. Penal satisfaction can punish the body of Christ in bloodshed, but it makes no complement to the Divine side of Christ in atonement. Priestly-Sacrificial Atonement offers humanity for bloodshed and death, Divinity for efficacy. The Person, Christ, is thus vital to atonement. (See EXTRINSIC ATONEMENT and SIN MUST BE PUNISHED in *The Fallacy of the “Sinning Christian*).

Summary Report of This Document:

This summary report was generated by Copernic Summarizer. See our Web site at www.crisispub.com/greek then click on <http://www.copernic.com/>

CONCEPTS:

atonement, Calvinists, irresistible grace, sin, God, penal atonement, Greek, purpose, John, Calvinism, death, salvation, whosoever, faith, life, predicate, imperatives, construction, predestination, theologian, Holy Spirit, Scriptures, Christian, according, righteousness, punishment, testament, divine decree, active voice, potential mood

SUMMARY:

Greek Grammar and Syntax Versus Calvinism

The Demands of Intrinsic Atonement Not Satisfied, in Which...

Christ is both Subject and Predicate in Atonement	5
Penal Atonement Not Coextensive with the Needs of Fallen Man	12
Calvinistic Atonement a Caste System	13
II. Irresistible Grace or Efficacious Call Perverts the Spirit's Purpose	18
Theologian John Miley	20
IV. Predestination Not in Accord With the Character/Justice of God	
John Calvin on Predestination	40
Rom 5:16 Proof that Sin Brings Death	67

In the New Testament Atonement is expressed in predicate nominative construction as follows: kai autos hilasmos estin periton hamartion hemon...and He, Himself, is an Atonement concerning the sins of us (1 John 2:2).

We here cite several Scriptures that show Christ as both Subject and Object in Atonement:

Accordingly, Calvin and Reformed Calvinism cannot remove infinite merit from the Person of Christ to the "divine decree" as done.

Penal atonement, commonly called penal satisfaction, is grounded in punishment and/or the decree, not the blood of Christ:

Hence it was necessary for him to contend with the powers of hell and the horror of eternal death."

Because of Who Christ is, He can both lay down His life and take it up again.

Death and resurrection are thus inseparable, indivisible, belonging to the Person in the salvation work thus wrought.

Christ did not punish Himself, and He and the Trinity were in oneness of essence and purpose when He offered Himself.

Calvinists, or whomsoever else, are invited to show from the Greek New Testament, in predicate nominative construction, that Atonement is penal!

One's view on the Atonement has destiny fixing potential, for an atonement theory will determine the nature of the Christian walk—to sin, to not sin, necessity of regenerative change, real righteousness, the nature of the Trinity, etc.

If Christ did not die in an efficacious sense for all, how can anyone, not knowing for whom He died efficaciously, be capable of exercising faith?

The Calvinist will, of course, lay this lie or secret agenda on the Holy Spirit and claim that He calls the elect in an effectual sense, but the non-elect in a general invitation, to which call it is actually impossible to respond.

Calvinistic limited atonement is grounded in the decree and punishment, and so necessarily presupposes predestination or salvation for the elect only, while the rest of the world are powerless to act toward salvation.

Thus, according to the New Geneva Study Bible, Christ never intended to die for the world, just the few of whom the Calvinistic elect are a part.

This is nothing short of a caste system and pagan in nature, devoid of Christianity, devoid of the universal thrust of Christianity—the gospel to the entire world that whosoever may believe.

It will be evident to any honest Christian that instead of establishing a distinction between sufficient and efficient,

Note the following: 1) the construction here is very strong in calling attention to the unlimited mass of humanity-everyone, (pas) and whosoever (hos); so the Atonement is not for a limited group from among the masses, but for the masses of the whole world; 2) might/may call is in a potential mood, so conditional-might call, [might not call]; if they do call, they will be saved, if not, no irresistible grace available, no efficacious call, no special inward call; it is conditioned by a potential mood (subjunctive) on calling for ones self (middle voice), ruling out any irresistible grace/force; 3) thus, salvation is for the masses, but they respond individually, conditionally-might/may; 4) predestination unto salvation is flatly ruled out. The imperatives here and the doctrine of "two calls" and "irresistible grace" are mutually exclusive.