

A Panoramic View of The Outer Darkness

By Marty Cauley

5/25/2008

The following material is an overview of the oral and visual presentation I made in a workshop at the 2006 GES Conference. It refers to illustrations in my upcoming book *The Outer Darkness*, which I presented to the group in a Power Point presentation. These illustrations will be available in the book. The current plans are to update that Power Point presentation and provide this discussion below with it in an accompanying CD within the book when it is released. The need for an updated presentation is apparent in that the number of illustrations has grown from the approximately 300 I mentioned then two years ago in the text below to nearly 500 now.

1) Introduction

I was first introduced to the rewards view of the outer darkness in 1985 when I read Hodges' book, *Grace in Eclipse*. At the time I was attending Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, where I graduated in 1988 as a co-recipient of the Advanced Greek Award. My goal was eventually to become a teacher since I thoroughly enjoy biblical research. I found out about GES in 1989 and joined it immediately and began reading everything I could from a Free Grace (FG) perspective, including the older works cited in Hodges' bibliography such as Lang, which in turn led to Govett. I also wrote Arlen Chitwood in 1989 for rewards related material. So from the very beginning, I have had exposure to a cross spectrum of FG related views concerning the outer darkness that ranged from considering it nothing more than a parabolic description of losing rewards to a literal imprisonment in Gehenna during the millennium.

Charles Stanley's book, *Eternal Security*, came out the next year, 1990. Like Stanley, I was a Southern Baptist. I naively thought that if I shared copies of his book with our Southern Baptist congregation that the church would be receptive to my teaching on the outer darkness. After all, he was a Southern Baptist Convention president and had expressed his view that the outer darkness pertained to rewards in his book. So I thought I would be able to do the same in my sermons. I was convinced that the outer darkness was a pivotal GES issue that could be used to distinguish FG from LS in such a way that could be easily understood by the laity but at the same time powerfully urge the laity to submit to the Lordship of Christ from a FG perspective. So I studied the outer darkness and related material intently and preached on it and related themes frequently.

Subsequently, in 1992 while exploring the context of the outer darkness passage in the Mt. Olivet Discourse, I wrote Hodges and stated my preference for disassociating the outer darkness with eternal damnation in all three Matthean passages. He concurred and stated that he had come to the same conclusion as a result of Mike Huber's thesis on the subject. So naturally, I got a copy of that thesis. A similar thesis by Gregory Sapaugh had just been released in 1991, so naturally I also read this thesis. An abridged version of both theses was soon put into print in JOTGES.¹

I was in my second pastorate at this time and began asking our members why God should let them into heaven and providing them with a FG answer. I also urged submission to the Lordship of Christ, warning that the outer darkness was a real (albeit metaphorical) danger for those believers who did not submit to Christ's Lordship. The deacons told me to quit asking why God should let people into heaven and to stop preaching on novel things like the outer darkness. This type of preaching resulted in my termination on Feb 28, 1993. My second child was born the next night. It was a very difficult time, and I have been in the outer darkness of pastoral ministry ever since as a result.

So as I stand here before you on March 1, 2006, to speak on the outer darkness, please note that this marks my thirteenth anniversary of sojourning in the outer darkness of pastoral ministry as a result of preaching on the outer darkness from a GES perspective. It was thirteen years ago today that I embarked upon this nomadic existence outside the pastorate. Despite my efforts to return to the pastorate, I have been unable to do so as a result of that termination. It has been suggested that if I would keep my mouth shut on such controversial matters as the outer darkness that I would be able to

return to the pastorate. For me personally, this is not an option.¹ But during this exile, I have put my seminary and Greek background to use in continuing my research on the outer darkness. And I remain firmly persuaded that my conviction that the outer darkness is a rewards issue is correct.

From my background, it is readily apparent that the outer darkness is not a mere academic interest for me personally. Nevertheless, the nature of my presentation will tend to be academic in that the material I have to share is the result of my interaction with competing and opposing research that I have addressed along the way in these many years of research. I have composed a 2,000 page manuscript that examines the outer darkness in its biblical, historical, hermeneutical, and theological contexts. My manuscript is a systematic *misthology* (which is my coined term for doctrine related to rewards—*misthos*). My research affirms the GES understanding of the outer darkness as a misthological theme. This panoramic overview will highlight some of the more interesting features of this material by browsing a sampling of illustrations from the manuscript. I use about 300 illustrations in the manuscript to make it more comprehensible to the laity. I will summarize my findings here by means of some of the key 50 illustrations.

2) Ventilato's election objection

a) *Election guarantees the results*

i) Soteriological salvation (2Thess 2:13)

Ventilato, who has a long letter on the Internet opposing GES, believes that election unconditionally guarantees our inheritance just as it does our salvation:

Notice too that, according to the inspired words of James 2:5, our inheritance of the kingdom of God is based on His *election* (thus according to grace): for God has “*chosen*” us to be “*heirs of the kingdom.*” Just as every believer has been chosen out of the world by God in eternity past unto salvation (2 Thess. 2:13), likewise has every believer been chosen out by God in eternity past to inherit the kingdom of God. (Emphasis his.)²

ii) Soteriological inheritance (Jam 2:5)

Since my premise is that the outer darkness is the experience of disinherited believers, I must provide a misthological defense of the inheritance and explain why election does not necessarily prevent failure. For example, Eph 1:4 may be taken to mean that God has predetermined that believers *will* (W) be in Christ and that they *should* (S) live holy lives. Does this election mean that it is

¹ Subsequent note: With exquisite detail, Daniel Gracely describes why those who have the gift of prophecy/proclamation do not tend to make good pastors: “Christians with the gift of proclamation may frequently also have some measure of the gift of knowledge into *mysteries* (i.e., included here would presumably be things that at first glance appear contradictory and therefore difficult of perception), so that their warnings have a greater sense of urgency.... This is because the proclaimer senses an immediacy about some divine warning to the church and understands that God is warning the Body against some disastrous course or doctrinal disease.... Most prophets would be lousy pastors because their often blunt and serious approach can leave people feeling they are impatient and unsympathetic” (emphasis his). His whole discussion is worthy of reading for those who would like to understand the pragmatic effects of this gift. In subsequent years, I likewise have come to conclude that my being gifted in the areas of prophecy/proclamation and knowledge/utterance make it difficult to be a pastor. In some ways, the pragmatic effects of the gift of prophecy might even be regard as the curse of prophecy. God's people have a history of killing the prophets sent to them (Mt 23:37). Today, the church just marginalizes the prophets sent to her as the preferred means (although not only means) of silencing them. Gracely, 126-134. See “The Church: Equal Justice For All” at <http://www.xcalvinist.com/207/m-chapter-10/>.

impossible for believers to live unholy lives? If so, then the outer darkness would be a misthological impossibility. But this is not the case since we have both ongoing contingency and non-contingency within this verse.

b) Response

i) Soteriological predestination only guarantees soteriological results

By way of overview, Ventilato's assumption that Jam 2:5 proves **unconditional** soteriological **election** is exceedingly weak. The election in Jam 2:5 is neither unconditional nor soteriological. It does not unconditionally apply to the poor, or to all believers for that matter, nor is it soteriological election. It is dependent upon the richness of our faith. We must conclude from this verse that election is not necessarily soteriological. Our salvation from eternal damnation is not conditioned on our love for God or magnitude of our faith. Rather, it is conditioned on His love for us and the object of our faith.

What about 2Thess 2:13? Does this verse not use talk about election unto salvation? Yes, it does. But the question that must still be addressed is whether or not this salvation and corresponding election is soteriological, that is, does it pertain to eternal damnation? So fundamentally we must answer the question, "What kind of salvation is in view?" The answer to this question will in turn determine what kind of predestination is under discussion. These issues will be addressed below as we investigate the primary passage on the topic of predestination.

ii) Golden Chain (Rom 8:29-30)

(1) Predestination

The golden chain in Rom 8:29-30 is, of course, the classic passage used to defend eternal security from the premise of predestination. Supposedly, predestination unconditionally predetermines the result in this passage. So if there is a text that could be used to prove Ventilato's argument, this should be it. We will address the second verb, predestination, in this chain of events first as a result. Since the time of Calvin's son-in-law and successor, Beza, the five verbs of this passage have been considered an unbreakable chain by Calvinists. See *Illustration 1. Chain of Rom 8:29-30*. Perkins wrote *A Golden Chain* in 1591 and dedicated it to Beza. This chain supposedly assures the elect of perseverance. But Arminius provided a rebuttal in 1612. Reasoner condenses the essential difference between these two camps to a cause-and-effect relationship between predestination and perseverance: "According to both Perkins and Arminius, if the believer does not persevere, such a person proves to be non-elect. The difference is that Perkins taught that believers persevere because they were elected. Arminius taught that God elects believers whom he foresees will persevere."³ According to Perkins, if you are predestined, then you will persevere. See *Illustration 2. Predestined Perseverance*. Arminius' rejoinder was that if you persevere then you are predestined. According to one, predestination causes perseverance, while the other claims the reverse. See *Illustration 3. Perseverance Based Predestination*.

Either view is detrimental to FG soteriology since both views condition one's glorification upon one's perseverance. That is, whether or not you reach heaven is contingent upon your perseverance. Both views are counter to my FG misthology. After all, how can believers wind up in the outer darkness if this golden chain assures their perseverance? Calvinists and Arminians can both agree that those who persevere will be secure when they reach heaven. See *Illustration 4. Unconditional Security for the Perseverer*. But the same objection may be raised to both: Reaching heaven is contingent upon perseverance. But since perseverance in faith is a contributing factor to our rewards in heaven, it is a misthological contingency. Therefore, both systems teach salvation by works. Works are an exegetical requirement to reach heaven. Popular arguments for eternal security fair little better in avoiding this objection.

Advocates of this simplistic approach include Norman Geisler and Gordon Olson.⁴ According to Geisler, perseverance in faith is guaranteed by God and is a *demonstration* or *manifestation* rather than *condition* of one's salvation. But although Geisler denies that you are saved by faithfulness, he

falls into using the adage about works: You are not saved by faith and works but by faith that works. One might summarize his view on faith accordingly: You are not saved by perseverance in faith but by faith that perseveres. This is nothing but useless rhetoric. When it comes down to exegetical consistency, Geisler flounders and claims that we are saved through persevering faith in 1Pet 1:5.⁵

Olson fares little better. To his credit, he acknowledges the punctiliar nature of the condition, so our illustration correctly portrays his position of simplistic security.⁶ But when discussing the golden chain, he says that loving God is a description rather than condition of those who meet the chain's application.⁷ He seems to regard 1Pet 1:5 as a promise of a protected faith rather than condition of protection by faith.⁸ Still, it would appear that if you were to lose your faith then you would lose your salvation, despite Olson's assurance that this is impossible. Despite Olson's supposition, perseverance in faith appears conditional in 1Cor 15:1-2 and Col 1:22-23 and not merely descriptive of true believers.⁹ Olson seeks to divorce faith from assurance so that he can affirm perseverance in faith for those who lose present assurance.¹⁰ But this is an exceedingly awkward arrangement. Of the five warnings in Hebrews, the one he applies to genuine believers is the third one in Heb 6:4-6, which leads us to question his exegetical consistency. Although both Geisler and Olson, to their credit, can acknowledge that this particular warning in Hebrews is to genuine believers, their view on perseverance causes them to shrink back from acknowledging that apostasy is a possibility.

The same basic objection may be raised in response to this simplistic argument for eternal security as was raised above concerning Calvinism and Arminianism. You cannot reach heaven apart from perseverance in faith, not even hypothetically, according to this simplistic securitist view. To be sure, advocates of this position will say that those who fail to persevere were never genuine believers. But this is the same evasive manure used by Calvinists, but it fails to circumvent the problem. As the ruder of the Titanic was too small to save the ship from collision with the iceberg, so this evasive manure is too weak to avoid the conclusion that entrance into heaven is conditioned on perseverance. When this view is examined from right to left in the illustration, that is, from the perspective of entrance into heaven, the only ones who will reach heaven are those who persevere. So we must object to it on the same basis that we object to the other two positions.

But there is another objection to the simplistic view of security. For the moment, let us brush aside the problem outlined above. This simplistic view of predestination will still not work. It fails to adequately deal with Ventilato's comments regarding Jam 2:5 and 2Thess 2:13. And Ventilato's objection fails to take into consideration that God has not unconditionally or irresistibly elected the poor, or certain ones among the poor, to be rich in faith and love Him. The result of God's election in this verse is contingent upon the free response of the poor. In God's election, you get the deciding vote in this verse. The same is true in 2Thess 2:13-14.

Olson correctly perceives that the calling in this verse is not accomplished immediately through irresistible grace but intermediately through faith in the gospel that was preached to them and that this calling is thus conditioned on their free response for its fulfillment.¹¹ Olson is on the threshold of acknowledging that the outcome of election is contingent upon the response of the free agent. But whereas Olson stands on the threshold, Eaton clearly steps across it: "I suspect there is a difference between irresistibile [sic] predestination to salvation, and resistible predestination to inheritance."¹² This is the model of predestination I hold and labor vigorously to defend. Lopez is clearly thinking along the same lines when he identifies the misthological nature of the predestination in the second link of the chain: "God's purpose in foreknowledge and predestination is that suffering believers may share with Christ (i.e. **He**) in **firstborn** privileges (cf. cf. [sic] vv 14-15, 17-22)...will have special status as *firstborn*...who will reign with Christ since they also suffered with Him (v 17; 2 Tim 2:12; Heb 1:9; 3:14; Rev 2:26)."¹³

Illustration 5. Should/Would is the heart of my argument and shows that predestination may incorporate soteriological and misthological contingencies. And **Illustration 6. Predestination** distinguishes soteriological and misthological selection in a manner that does not rule out our free response. God has not only determined what *should* (S) happen but what *will* (W) happen. Once a person believes in Christ, that person is in Christ and *will* (W) necessarily be in the kingdom. I picture the outer darkness as inside the kingdom in the illustration. Some of my friends have asked if I am a *kingdom exclusionist*. The answer is spatially, "No," but experientially, "Yes." I believe that outer

darkness is an experience within the kingdom. From the diagram, you may ascertain that I hold to particular prescient predestination that is contingent upon our free response but that nevertheless affirms eternal security. Therefore, I might be described as a Reformed Arminian Securitist. I agree with the Reformed camp that predestination deals with particular persons, not just a corporate class of people. I concur with Arminians that the outcome of predestination is contingent upon our free response. Nevertheless, I affirm eternal security. Once you are in Christ you are limited to one of two possible outcomes, neither of which involve eternal damnation in the lake of fire. So we see how a misthological view of predestination is genuinely compatible with free agency. Unlike Calvinistic compatibilism, in our model you can act contrary to the desires God gives you and thus end up in either hell or the outer darkness.

(2) Foreknowledge

What about foreknowledge—the first link of the chain? Calvinists argue that foreknowledge is deterministic and renders the future certain in a manner that is incompatible with genuine free agency. In my chapter on pre-temporal election, I give what might be considered a rather standard argument for eternal security that is both Free Grace (FG) and Free Will (FW). The links are sequential and distinctive. Foreknowledge is not causative, but may refer to God's prior knowledge of who will believe.¹⁴ See *Illustration 7. Not Forechosen from a Calvinistic Perspective* and *Illustration 8. Calvinistic Foreknowledge*. Predestination is contingent on our initial free will response but not on our ongoing free will response. God has predetermined that believers will reach glory in heaven. The efficaciousness of the call is based on our punctiliar free intellectual response. But our free response irrevocably results in our justification. And justification will certainly without fail result in our soteriological glorification. After all, if I am going to argue, contrary to Arminians, that apostate believers are thrown into the outer darkness rather than into hell, I must provide a defense for unconditional security. So I could certainly be satisfied with a status quo defense of eternal security from this passage. But I am not satiated with the classic securitist position because there is more to this passage than a simplistic affirmation of eternal security (as indicated above in my discussion of predestination).

Of course, Calvinists will argue that my view of foreknowledge is too simple. For those who prefer a more comprehensive response, I opt for a modification of Craig's view of middle knowledge but reject his view of time. For views of time, see *Illustration 9. Helm: Simply Timeless—Timeless View Of God* and *Illustration 10. Five Views of God and Time*. But as to foreknowledge itself, I take my view of foreknowledge (see *Illustration 11. Foreknowledge is Foresight*) and add a modification of Craig's view. See *Illustration 12. Logical Sequence of Knowledge*. You will note that my modification is an amplification which pictures things as they *could*, *should*, *would*, *will*, and *must* happen. What *would* happen is middle knowledge. But for those who prefer something that is easier to understand, I offer Picirilli's model. He provides an overview based on three words: Certainty, Contingency, and Necessity.¹⁵ See *Illustration 13. Two Types of Certainty*.

(3) Called

Bryson was on the right track in affirming multiple types of calls and that this call in the golden chain is to believers.¹⁶ Although I disagree with him that it is a **call** to simple glorification salvation, the critical element of his argument is valid. In terms of logical sequence, the call is to those who are already believers when they receive the call. In *Illustration 14. Ordo Salutis—Marrowistic*, you will note that the sequence is:

Vociferation—Invitation to misthological co-heirship
Justification—Imputation of Forensic Righteousness

The call in *Illustration 15. Atemporal and Temporal Stairs* likewise is not limited to the gospel of grace but entails the full gospel of the kingdom, that is, the invitation to co-rulership to those who love God and who conform to the moral image of His Son. *Illustration 16. Calvinistic Staircase* and *Illustration 17. Ordo Salutis—Calvinistic* show that the Calvinistic *ordo salutis* is built upon a

foundation of soteriological predestination that poses a two-phased regeneration. This two-phased regeneration allows Calvinists to claim that regeneration precedes faith but that faith precedes new birth.

In contrast, *Illustration 18. Marrowistic Staircase* affirms free agency and regards predestination itself in this chain to be moral and therefore a misthological precursor to the misthological call. Regeneration is single-phased and is grounded in justification, in clear contradistinction to Calvinism. The call is clearly labeled as misthological.

Like Bryson, Lopez correctly affirms soteriological glorification as the conclusion. This is a soteriological chain that affirms eternal security with two misthological links within that chain: predestination and vociferation. This combination of soteriology and misthology as distinct elements are clearly articulated by Paul earlier in this chapter:

¹⁶The Spirit Himself bears witness with our spirit that we are children of God, ¹⁷and if children, then heirs also: on the one hand, heirs of God, but on the other hand, **co**-heirs with Christ, if indeed we **co**-suffer with Him in order that we may also be **co**-glorified with Him. (Rom 8:16-17; TM)

God has *predestined* us to rule with Christ and has *called* (invited) us to do so. But whether or not we will do so is contingent on our free will response. However, our simple glorification—the last link of the chain—is unconditionally assured. I am not insensitive to the argument that the predestination in this passage is to the moral conformation of Christ. I agree. The goal is moral conformity and resulting misthological rulership. Since God has predestined that it should happen, He has taken the steps necessary to make it contingently possible by means of prevenient grace for the unbeliever and enabling grace for the believer. This passage has a special promise to those believers who love Christ but not all believers will do so. Conversion is being persuaded that one has become saved by faith alone in Christ alone. The chain culminates in simple soteriological glorification of all those who experience conversion. Eternal security is thus assured; misthological rulership is not.

iii) Misthological predestination in 1Thess 5:9

So if a passage as fundamental to the topic of predestination as Rom 8:28-30 could conceivably be referring to misthological predestination, as Lopez believes, then how much more could its conceptual parallel in 2Thess 2:13! This passage is talking about salvation through sanctification, and like Eph 1:4, there is no compelling reason to limit this to pre-conversion sanctification. This election appears to be unto moral conformation, just like Rom 8:28-29. In *Illustration 19. Parallelism of 1Thess 5:8-11 and 2Thess 2:13-15*, I unquestionably treat both passages as dealing with misthological themes.

(1) Majority/minority view

However, affirming the misthological nature of the salvation in 1Thess 5:9 does not weaken the defense by Hodges and Edgar of an unconditional full pre-tribulational rapture for all believers.¹⁷ They took the minority view that the passage assures all believers that they will be live with the Lord via the rapture whether they are morally asleep or not. The majority view has not found this position persuasive because it seems to wipe out the grounds for the exhortation. It is as if Paul were saying, “Live for the Lord because whether or not you live for the Lord you will live with the Lord!” On the one hand, Hodges has given a splendid argument and grounded the exhortation in gratitude, but it does seem strange that Paul’s exhortation is based on nothing more than thankfulness according to this view.

(2) Misthological resolution

My mediation strenghtens the argument made by both Hodges and Edgar. A misthological resolution between these two positions removes the majority objection to Hodges’ FG soteriology.

This salvation in 1Thess 5:9 is misthological and is distinct from the tribulational deliverance in 1Thess 1:10.

iv) Misthological *election* does not guarantee misthological realization

The misthological realization of predestination is conditioned on our determination. *Illustration 20. Election (eklego)* has Jam 2:5 charted as dealing with co-glorification salvation. Likewise, Mt 22:14 also deals with misthological *election*. Just as in Rom 8:29 we are called to inherit co-rulership of the kingdom, so likewise in Mt 22:14 we are called (invited) to do so. But few believers will actually be chosen to do so. Whether or not we are chosen to rule with Christ is based on our performance and love for Christ, as denoted by our wedding clothes. Contrary to some, whether or not the host provides that garment is not a crucial detail. Even if the garment refers to imparted righteousness that is available to all believers, it does not necessarily follow that all believers will dress themselves in the practical expression of their faith. In God's election, He has made a positive response by the free agent possible but not certain. The misthological categorization still remains. See *Illustration 21. Unworthy Guest (Mt 22:1-14)*.

v) Misthological *salvation* statistics

Since the phrase *outer darkness* occurs exclusively in Matthew, I have paid special attention to that gospel, providing (for example) a chart that summarizes its statistical use of the word *salvation*. See *Illustration 22. Primary and Secondary References to Salvation in Mt*. Matthew uses *salvation* misthologically just as often as he does soteriologically. Incidentally, you may notice that the chart does not have a separate category for glorification salvation verses co-glorification salvation. The explanation is simple. In terms of linguistic usage, the word *salvation (sozo/soteria)* is never used with the word *glory (doxa/doxazo)* in Matthew (nor in the NT for that matter) to refer to simple unmerited glory. The proleptic aorist in Rom 8:24 is no exception. One may compare *Illustration 23. Analysis of NT salvation* and *Illustration 24. Pie Chart of NT Salvation* for similar findings.

3) Zeller and Brown object to misthological *inheritance*

a) Misthological *inheritance*

Brown's dissertation is indeed a well written piece of research that has even attracted a following from among FG writers such as Bing and Lopez. However, Brown is unable to provide a satisfactory explanation for Col 3:24-25.¹⁸ Zeller's criticism pertaining to the inheritance can be found at the same web site as Ventilato above.¹⁹ But Zeller does not have integrity enough to even point out the potential relationship that Dillow brings out between verses 8 and 9, that is, between brethren being unrighteous and not inheriting the kingdom.

But **you** [Corinthian believers] **are** being **unrighteous** and unfair, doing this even to your own brethren.⁹ Do you not know the **unrighteous** will not inherit the kingdom of God? Do not be deceived; neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor homosexuals,¹⁰ nor thieves, nor the covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor swindlers, will inherit the kingdom of God.¹¹ And such were some of you; but **you were** washed, but **you were** sanctified, but **you were** justified in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, and in the Spirit of our God. (1Cor 6:8-11; TM)

In response to Ventilato, I have pointed out from Jam 2:5 the misthological nature of the inheritance of the kingdom as being conditioned on richness in faith and love of God: "Listen, my beloved brethren: did not God choose the poor of this world to be rich in faith and heirs of the kingdom which He promised to those who love Him?" (Jam 2:5)

b) Inheritance of kingdom conditioned on our degree of faith and love (Jam 2:5)

i) Lopez

As pointed out above, Lopez, in his commentary on Romans, acknowledges that not all believers love God in Rom 8:28 and that predestination in 8:29-30 pertains to co-glorification of those believers who do love God. I agree. Only those believers who love God will achieve the realization of the misthological predestination in Rom 8:29. But Lopez's admission that not all believers love God in Rom 8:28 should have led him to at least address the fact that the inheritance of the kingdom is conditioned on one's love for God in Jam 2:5. And yet he is silent on this verse in his article which claims all believers will inherit the kingdom in the vice list passages.²⁰

However, I understand James to be in complete harmony with Paul. Our inheritance of the kingdom as a believer is conditioned on the richness of our faith in God and our love for God. Like Hodges, I would find the inheritance of the kingdom misthologically limited to those believers who are rich in faith and love God in Jam 2:5.²¹ Therefore, in contrast to Lopez, I take the degree view of faith. See *Illustration 25. Growing Faith*.

Lopez has followed Brown in advocating the inheritance of the world as being a soteriological concept in Rom 4:13. In doing so, Lopez has rejected the notion that there can be degrees of faith in Rom 4:21.²² I counter that this planetary inheritance is misthological (Mt 5:5) and deal with the land promises in doing so. I defend the degree of faith as being a misthological issue.

Both James and Paul teach a justification/righteousness by works (Rom 6:16; Jam 2:21,24). Dillow pointed this out long ago, and Lopez concurs that Paul is referring to moral righteousness.²³ But the agreement between James and Paul goes much deeper than that simple observation. What I am about to share, has been anticipated to a considerable extent by Eaton.²⁴ As pictured in *Illustration 26. Footbridge of Faith*, Romans 4:12 is a misthological footbridge to the misthological imputation of righteousness in Rom 4:22. Those who "follow in the steps of the faith of our father Abraham" will have righteousness misthologically imputed to them as a result. Both James and Paul teach a misthological imputation of righteousness by God. This bema righteousness is conditioned on the quality and quantity of our faith. It was because of the richness of Abraham's faith in v. 21 that righteousness was imputed to him in v. 22.

Also, according to Jesus, it was evidently because of Abraham's great faith that he will rule in the kingdom as a *son of the kingdom* rather than be thrown into the outer darkness as such (Mt 8:10-12). If Abraham had wavered in faith rather than grown strong in faith, Abraham himself would have been cast into the outer darkness.

ii) Keathley IV

In his rebuttal of the GES understanding of the outer darkness, Keathley IV posts a chart which pictures the first passage on the outer darkness in Mt 8:12 as being a distinction between those who have faith and those who do not.²⁵ See *Illustration 27. Keathley's Kingdom Banquet*. I counter that the context is commending "great faith" (Mt 8:10) as the basis for inclusion in the banquet. See my *Illustration 28. Matthew's Kingdom Banquet*. There is a common thread between the rich faith of the poor, the full unwavering persuasion of Abraham, and the great faith of the centurion. They inherit the kingdom and the earth and dine in the banquet because of the magnitude of their faith. The inheritance of the kingdom is a reward contingent upon the richness of your faith. Inheritance of the land is a misthological motif. See *Illustration 29. Achan's Lack of Rest*. Admittedly, this position poses difficulties, such as the land grants to Abraham. I have dealt with those difficulties in the manner suggested by Ross and Dillow in affirming that Abraham was a believer long before he offered up Isaac. My theory is that the land promises to Abraham were expanded to include misthological rulership of the land as a result of his misthological imputation.

4) **Extra biblical**

a) **Brown**

And I am not convinced that those in the FG movement, such as Lopez, who have made concessions to Brown have been able to successfully integrate those concessions without making a misthological compromise. I would urge considerable caution in appealing to intertestamental literature as a hermeneutical filter by which to evaluate our FG exegesis.

b) **Pagenkemper**

i) **Enochian Darkness**

Pagenkemper has written a two-part article opposed to GES view of outer darkness that likewise draws in part upon intertestamental literature. In my research, I devote an entire chapter to dealing with the Enochian background of the outer darkness in which I defend the misthological view of the vice list and outer darkness. Both 1 Enoch and Jude are referring to the same soteriological darkness and eternal damnation. I chart and interact with this material, as may be seen in *Illustration 30. Confinement in Darkness and Fire in 1 Enoch* and *Illustration 31. Confinement in Darkness and Fire in 2 Enoch*. But salvation from the darkness in 1 Enoch is dependent on faith and works? Will we in FG follow 1 Enoch in advocating a soteriology that is conditioned on faith and works? I hope not! Salvation from the darkness in 2 Enoch is plainly conditioned on works. If we are going to adopt Enochian soteriology, we must abandon free grace in order to do so.

c) **Soteriological Darkness of Jude**

This is not to say that Jesus or Jude did not draw upon the imagery of the darkness found in Enoch. Jude certainly did so, and there is no reason to insist that Jesus could not have done so as well. The judgment referred to in Jude 1:14-15 is the same as 1En 1:9. But unlike Enoch, we will contend that salvation from this soteriological darkness is by simple faith.

d) **Misthological darkness of Matthew**

i) **Enoch's misthological palace motif**

It is quite possible that Jesus might have partially drawn upon the dinner motif in 2 Enoch as an interesting background for the Matthean banquet motif found in both the first and second passages on the outer darkness.

When the last [righteous] one arrives, he [the Lord] will bring out Adam, together with the ancestors; and he will bring them in there...just as a person invites his best friends to have dinner with him...and they talk together in front of that man's palace, waiting with joyful anticipation to have dinner. (2En 43:5)

At the consummation of this age, there will be an eschatological dinner in paradise to which all of God's friends are invited. To go outside and to be outside the banquet in paradise does not mean to go out of paradise or to be outside of paradise. There is potential parallel to the outer darkness in Mt 8:11-12 and 22:1-13.

ii) **Misthological Vice List**

And there is another passage in 2 Enoch, which in connection with a vice list, may in fact explicitly denote that the inheritance is a reward (2En 9:1; 10:4-6). In any event, Enoch clearly cannot be used as a soteriological filter since it cannot distinguish its soteriology from its misthology. Although 1 Enoch teaches salvation by faith and works, in contrast to 2 Enoch (which teaches

salvation by works), it would be wrong to assume that this means that 1 Enoch teaches salvation by simple faith. It is simply not there.

5) Ultra-misthologists

There are ultra-misthologists who would equate the darkness of Jude with that of the outer darkness as a picture of Gehenna. I do not. It is not because I object to picturing Gehenna as subterranean soteriological imprisonment. In fact my *Illustration 32. Paradise Removed* is very similar to that of Whipple, who is a Gehenna misthologist.²⁶ Rather, it is my assessment that all OT believers are with the Lord. And Hodges has demonstrated that all NT believers will be with the Lord via the rapture. I picture all believers as being with the Lord in the *Heavenly Jerusalem* until the commencement of the millennial kingdom, at which time unfaithful believers will be excluded from the city. See *Illustration 33. Heavenly Jerusalem* and *Illustration 34. Cast Out and Gathered Out*. And they will be outside the city looking in for eternity. See *Illustration 35. Outside the City* and *Illustration 36. Outside Looking In*. Rewards are eternal. So in one sense of the word, my view is much more severe than that of some Gehenna misthologists who believe that at the end of the millennium, distinction in rewards are nullified.

Conservative misthologists locate outer darkness inside kingdom and hold that all believers will enter the kingdom. Ultra-misthologists, on the other hand, restrict kingdom entrance to faithful believers. My mediating proposal is that a text such as Acts 14:22 refers to experiential rather than spatial kingdom exclusion. See *Illustration 37. Two Doors?* So in *Illustration 38. Kingdom Entrance* I have a chart as to whether *basileia* denotes *kingdom* versus *kingship*. Not all believers will enter the kingship—the experience of rulership. Some believers are experientially excluded from the *basileia*.

6) Concessions

a) Dillow

The arguments by Gehenna misthologists such as Faust are not without their persuasive force.²⁷ In fact, at a GES conference Dillow has now taken what would be akin to a preterist view of Gehenna (focusing on the temporal wrath in 70 A.D. and denying that *aionios* necessarily means eternal), but he has applied a misthological twist to the typical preterist view so that Gehenna now metaphorically refers to the temporal and misthological loss of one's soul in his modified view.²⁸ I do not adopt this concession.

b) Walvoord

However, I do acknowledge Walvoord's limitations. Unquenchable fire does not necessarily mean eternal fire in the OT. *Forever* may be used as a relative term in the OT. And *all* can be used in a relative manner. The arguments are employed by ultra-misthologists, Calvinists, and Universalists. So I have to counter each of their views while making such concessions. In doing so, I concur with Walvoord that *aionios* may still be taken as referring to eternity in the NT, when the *Illustration 39. Three forms of Eternity* is taken into consideration, and I integrate this prospective with time theory.

c) Telescopic Fusion

My resolution is pictured in *Illustration 40. Millennial and Eternal Worms*. Isaiah (66:23-24) saw the worms in the unquenchable fire gnawing the bodies of those within it. This has been pictured in the illustration by a foot in the flames of fire with a worm-infested foot. Isaiah saw the millennial and eternal aspects of this reality merged together. He could not distinguish the short period of time that would have taken place between the millennial state and eternal state in this prophetic picture that the Lord gave him at that time. But the picture becomes progressively clearer in the NT. The same type of fulfillment will be experienced in both states—literal fulfillment. The flames will literally burn and the worms will literally gnaw. However, when it comes to the NT period, the eternal

aspect of this punishment is exclusively in view. Jesus is only pointing to the second mountain peak, not to the first one.

7) **Ventilato's *bridal objection***

Ventilato provides a long refutation of the FG misthological position, the first part of which is based on the premise that the body of Christ and the bride form an organic unity with Christ and as such cannot be divided and part of the bride be put into outer darkness. The body of Christ is one and thus jointly called Christ, just as Adam and Eve were jointly referred to as Adam (1Cor 12:12; Gen 5:2). All believers must share an “**indivisibility, unity, and universality of experience**” (emphasis his).²⁹

This is one of his better counters to GES, and the response by conservative misthologists is not persuasive. Dillow suggests, “**The wedding garment...adorns the bride as a whole and not each individual saint of which she is composed.** Each saint makes various contributions (righteous acts) to the bride's wedding garment, and some may or may not make any at all.”³⁰ But this gives a picture that leads to the logical conclusion that the bride will be half-naked!³¹ “Bikini Believers at the Bema” might be possible, as Radmacher's sermon title suggests but not a Bikini Bride!³² So I reject the *Illustration 41. Conservative Bride of Christ* as a half-naked impossibility. I propose that Ventilato is mistaken in his organic limitation and that there are two bodies actually in view. This allows me to also exegete Eph 5 in a consistent manner. See *Illustration 42. Two Bodies in One*. My arguments do include topology (see *Illustration 43. Topological Bodies*), but I also defend this view exegetically so that the *Biblical Bride* is fully and beautifully clothed, as Revelation demands. See *Illustration 44. Biblical Bride*.

Therefore, in locating my position on the hermeneutical grid, I have identified myself as a moderate misthologist (*Illustration 45. What is a Moderate Misthologist?*) calling myself a Marrowist rather than a Calvinist or Arminian on the soteriological horizontal axis, and advocating bridal misthology on the vertical axis. See *Illustration 46. Bridal Misthology*.

8) **Rosscup objects that all believers will persevere/overcome**

a) ***Perseverance versus eternal security***

Rosscup has written an article that gets cited with some frequency opposing our point of view. In it he argues that all believers are overcomers and persevere.³³ Of course, this is common claim in Calvinistic circles, and it meets counter claims from the Arminian camp. I find it soteriologically and misthologically necessary to distinguish myself from both camps.

i) **Acrostics**

(1) **Calvinistic TULIP**

Total Depravity
Unconditional Election
Limited Atonement
Irresistible Grace
Perseverance of the Saints

In his debate with Hunt, White frequently complains that Hunt has not provided a comprehensive system and response. I give the comprehensive response requested and even deal with his argument for irresistible grace. See *Illustration 47. Jn 6:44 Sentence Diagram*.

(2) **Arminian PEARS**

Prevenient Grace
Election on Condition

Atonement for All
Resistible Grace
Salvation through Perseverance

(3) Marrowistic GRAPE

Gift is Free
Rewards are Earned
Absolute Assurance:
Passive Persuasion
Eternal Security

Assurance has been called our opponents' Achilles heel. I press the attack at this point with numerous illustrations:

Illustration 48. Soteriological Performance Based Assurance

Illustration 49. LS Wrecks Absolute Assurance

Illustration 50. Faith in Christ Takes Care of Doubt.

Illustration 51. Howl of the Wolf

You will note that my FG acrostic pits eternal security against perseverance as the last item in the acrostic. This arrangement is not accidental. Arminians and Calvinists attempt to stand shoulder to shoulder in pointing their fingers at GES as being an extremist position since it does not condition security on perseverance.³⁴ Pointing us as an extreme, however, is logically impossible when you actually look at the direction they point their fingers in the OSAS illustration. See **Illustration 52. OSAS—Whose is It?** Clearly, GES is the mediating position.

ii) Perseverance in *Pisteuo*²

(1) Substantial participles for present tense

In contrast to our camp, the Arminians and Calvinists teach that you must persevere in faith in order to reach heaven. I spend a considerable amount of time refuting this position exegetically, theologically, and aspectually. I counter Shank's aspectual arguments and Wallace's substantial assumptions on Jn 3:16.

(2) Punctiliar appropriation for metaphors

But my defense is not limited to substantial participles in that I deal with every tense of *pisteuo* in John. Not only do I interact with all verbal aspects of *pisteuo* itself, I evaluate the metaphors as well. See **Illustration 53. Metaphors For Believe**. Between the two appendices, there are a hundred pages of material dealing with the abused present tense as opposed to the abused aorist and defending punctiliar soteriological appropriation.

(3) Ontological immutability

Aspectual defenses of eternal security have been attempted before, so this is nothing new. Arminians have also countered that if you stop believing you could no longer be classified as a believer. Securitists have responded with substantial classifications that project the classification long after the action of the verb has been complete. I include those arguments as well, but I also add a number of new ones. For example, my appendix on Johannine anamartology concurs with Hodges that 1Jn 3:9 demonstrates ontological immutability. The Bible presents at least seven types of

² Subsequent note: this material has been removed from *The Outer Darkness* and made a separate book.

sinlessness. This particular text is the centerpiece for ontological sinlessness. See *Illustration 54. Three Parallel Cycles*. Our regenerate trichotomist spirit (tri-spirit) cannot sin.³⁵ Therefore, it cannot cease to believe. But in discussing trichotomy, I am not insensitive to the semantic overlap between spirit and soul. See *Illustration 55. Location of Pri-Spirit*.

I use *Illustration 56. Intermediate Trichotomous Model* to illustrate that Christ may be outside the heart of the believer but cannot be separated from the believer's spirit. I would also suggest that a passage such as Rom 8:16 also indicates that ontological apostasy is impossible. Our trichotomous spirit cannot cease to believe. We can commit soulical apostasy and thereby forfeit the salvation of our souls in the outer darkness, but the salvation of our spirit is assured. There is also a chapter on how we can escape the outer darkness by living victorious lives that uses this type of illustration in more detail. See *Illustration 57. Advanced Trichotomous Model*. Of course, *Illustration 58. The Trinity* is one model I'll use for trichotomy.

iii) Perseverance in Works/Fruit

My chapter devoted to the parable of the vineyard interacts with criticisms by the tragic trio (Pagenkemper, Keathley IV, and Blomberg). It will deal with the claim that all believers work and get the same basic reward regardless of the work they do. The common mistaken mentality is that all believers will persevere to the end and get the same reward in the end. My counter will entail agreement with Ryrie's theory of relativity. See *Illustration 59. Relativity Chart*. And it combines that with a modified adaptation of Niemela's diagrams. See *Illustration 60. Mithological Range of Fruitfulness*.

iv) Apostasy

In pointing out the real danger of apostasy, I prefer Kendall's approach in which mithological apostasy may be irremediable and use this explanation for 2Pet 2:17-22. See *Illustration 61. Falling from Path of Righteousness*. Not all Arminians regard all forms of apostasy as remediable. We can explain such passages similarly but from a mithological vantage point.

b) Overcomer

Another popular argument in favor of perseverance that must be overcome is the Calvinistic view of the overcomer. It is insisted that all believers are overcomers in Rev 2-3, and this is supposedly proven by difficulties in explaining away the warning about the Book of Life in Rev 3:5 or the partial rapture in Rev 2:11.

i) Book of life (Rev 3:5)

(1) Omniscience

The complexity in addressing arguments pertaining to the Book of Life is increased by the debate between the Classic View (CV) and Open View (OV) of God's knowledge. Does God know everything that we as free creatures will do? If so, how can we be free to do otherwise? I interact with certain models of the classic view (such as the *eternal now*) and find them wanting. See *Illustration 62. Timeless View of God*. I pose a counter model that is very similar to Padgett's view.³⁶ See *Illustration 63. Elastically Temporal*.

(2) Formal litotes

I do not find any insurmountable problem in opting for Hodges' litotetic interpretation of Rev 3:5. See *Illustration 64. Not Erased = Litotes*.

ii) *Partial Rapture (Rev 3:10)*

(1) Niemelä's punctuation

In his review of Wong's article, Wilkin counters with an article by Niemelä in which an alternative punctuation of the text is suggested.³⁷ Accordingly, a translation such as the following might be preferred.

⁹ Behold, I will cause those of the synagogue of Satan, who say that they are Jews, and are not, but lie—I will make them to come and bow down at your feet, and to know that I have loved you, ¹⁰because you have kept the word of My perseverance. I also will keep you from the hour of testing that is about to come upon the whole world, to test those who dwell upon the earth. (Rev 3:9-10; TM)

I acknowledge that Niemelä's presentation refutes the grammatical basis for considering this promise a reward. On the other hand, I do not believe that the contextual basis has been nullified and therefore conclude that Rev 2:11 is an informal litotes.

iii) Faust objects to Litotes (Rev 2:11)

As a Gehenna misthologist, Faust objects to Hodges' litotes position and argues that carnal believers can indeed be hurt by the second death. But as for my part, I am content that my chapter in Hodges' defense of litotetic material demonstrates that Hodges is not guilty of special pleading. In a chapter devoted to litotes, I have charted all Johannine litotes. See *Illustration 65. Johannine Litotes*.

9) **Keathley IV objects that the tears of all believers are wiped away**

In Keathley's rejection of the misthological interpretation of the outer darkness, he likewise appeals to this common sentiment that everyone's tears are wiped away:

Another question is the meaning of the banquet imagery. Banquet imagery almost always refers to the kingdom / heaven (cf. Isa 62:4-5, Jer 2:2, 31:2, Eze 16:32 and Hos 2:2, Isa 25:6; 65:8-16 and Ps 22:26-29). Especially compare Isaiah 25:6-9 where it talks about God preparing a lavish banquet for all peoples and "wiping tears away from all faces."...

...Moreover, they contradict the very nature of the joy we are to experience in heaven. In fact, how do we reconcile the fact that God will "wipe away every tear" (Rev 21:4; Isa 25:6) with the idea that there will be "weeping and gnashing of teeth" in heaven.³⁸

Neither Huber nor Sapaugh have reconciled the misthological interpretation with the background passage in Is 25:6 which says that the feast will be for all people, not just faithful believers. Chitwood correctly perceived concerning the earlier occasion in Revelation that "the reference to all tears being wiped away prior to the millennium in Rev. 7:17 is only for a select group of individuals realizing an inheritance in the kingdom."³⁹ But this still leaves Rev 21:4 unexplained. The solution is simple. It is a litotes promised only to bridal overcomers. See *Illustration 66. When are the Tears Wiped Away?*

10) **Lordship Salvationists object that there is no such thing as a carnal Christian**

Lordship Salvation claims that there is no such thing as a carnal Christian. Obviously, if I am claiming in contrast that carnal Christians are thrown into the outer darkness, then I will have to provide sufficient evidence for that conclusion. See *Illustration 67. Lost or Saved* and *Illustration 68. Sheep or Goat*. But my principle argument in this connection is in an appendix dedicated to this topic

in the Corinthian epistles, in which I conclude that those who need reconciliation in 2Cor 5:20 are carnal believers.

11) **Bigalke: Mt. Olivet Discourse is sheep versus goats**

Bigalke follows Ice's lead in breaking up the discussion of the potential time frames for the fulfillment of the Olivet Discourse around the four logical possibilities.⁴⁰ He correctly advocates futurism, but he unfortunately limits the judgment to that of the sheep and goats and favors a soteriological understanding of the outer darkness. Therefore, I would consider him a FG soteriologist, not a FG mishthologist. As seen in *Illustration 69. Four Possible Relationships to Time*, I hold that the bema is also in view in the Olivet discourse. This necessarily leads to a mishthological view of the outer darkness that is demanded by the exegetical details. See *Illustration 70. The Unworthy Slave*.

¹ Michael G. Huber, "The Concept of the 'Outer Darkness' in the Gospel of Matthew" (Th.M. thesis, Dallas Theological Seminary, 1978). Michael G. Huber, "The 'Outer Darkness' in Matthew and Its Relationship to Grace," *Journal of the Grace Evangelical Society* 5:2 (1992): 11-25. Gregory P. Sapaugh, "An Interpretation of Matthew 22:1-14" (Th.M. thesis, Dallas Theological Seminary, 1991). Gregory P. Sapaugh, "A Call to the Wedding Celebration: An Exposition of Matthew 22:1-14," *Journal of the Grace Evangelical Society* 5:1 (Spring 1992): 11-34.

² James M. Ventilato, "A Scriptural Refutation of The Teachings of Zane Hodges, Joseph Dillow and the Grace Evangelical Society, with Respect to the Future Inheritance, Glory, and Destiny of the Church—Christ's Beloved Body & Bride," section III, 23. Available at <http://www.middletonbiblechurch.org/doctrine/hodgesjv.htm>. Accessed on 12 August, 2004.

³ Vic Reasoner, "Golden Chain or Iron Padlock?" Available at <http://www.fwponline.cc/v20n1reasoner.html>.

⁴ Michael S. Horton, Norman L. Geisler, Stephen M. Ashby, and J. Steven Harper, *Four Views on Eternal Security*, ed. Matthew J. Pinson (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2002), 68, 76, 86, 109.

⁵ Ibid, 110.

⁶ Gordon C. Olson, *Beyond Calvinism and Arminianism: An Inductive Mediate Theology of Salvation* (Global Gospel Publishers, 2002), 320, 344.

⁷ Ibid, 302.

⁸ Ibid, 316.

⁹ Ibid, 344-345.

¹⁰ Ibid, 318.

¹¹ Ibid, 233.

¹² Michael Eaton, *No Condemnation: A New Theology of Assurance* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1995), 249, n. 9

¹³ René A. Lopez, *Romans Unlocked: Power to Deliver* (Springfield: 21st Century Press, 2005), 182.

¹⁴ Thomas R. Edgar, "The Meaning of ΠΡΟΓΙΝΩΣΚΩ ('Foreknowledge')," *CTSJ* 44 (Spring 2003): 49.

¹⁵ Robert E. Picirilli, "Foreknowledge, Freedom, and the Future," *JETS* 43:2 (June 2000): 259-271.

¹⁶ George Bryson, *The Dark Side of Calvinism: The Calvinist Caste System* (Santa Ana, CA: Calvary Chapel Publishing, 2004): 212-214.

¹⁷ Zane C. Hodges, "The Rapture in 1 Thessalonians 5:1-11," *Walvoord: A Tribute*, ed. Donald K. Campbell (Chicago: Moody Press, 1982). Thomas R. Edgar, "Lethargic or Dead in 1 Thessalonians 5:10?" *CTSJ* 6:4 (October 2000): 36-51.

¹⁸ William E. Brown, "The New Testament Concept of the Believer's Inheritance" (Th.D. diss., Dallas Theological Seminary, 1984).

¹⁹ George Zeller, "The Theology of Zane Hodges and Joseph Dillow and the Grace Evangelical Society." Available at <http://www.middletonbiblechurch.org/doctrine/theology.htm>. Accessed on 13 August, 2004.

-
- ²⁰ René A. Lopez, "Do [Sic] The Vice List In 1 Corinthians 6:9-10 Describe Believers or Unbelievers?" *Grace Evangelical Society Conference CD*, 2005
- ²¹ Zane C. Hodges, *The Epistle of James: Proven Character through Testing*, eds. Arthur L. Farstad and Robert N. Wilkin (Irving: Grace Evangelical Society, 1994), 51.
- ²² Lopez, *Romans*, 93, 97-98.
- ²³ Joseph C. Dillow, *The Reign of the Servant Kings: A Study of Eternal Security and the Final Significance of Man*. 2nd ed. (Hayesville, NC: Schoettle Publishing Co., 1993), 184-186. Lopez, *Romans*, 137.
- ²⁴ Michael Eaton, *No Condemnation: A New Theology of Assurance* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1995), 176-183.
- ²⁵ Keathley IV, Hampton. "The 'Outer Darkness': Heaven's Suburb or Hell?" Available at http://bible.org/page.asp?page_id=1044. Accessed on 17 September, 2004.
- ²⁶ Gary T. Whipple, *The Matthew Mysteries: A Revelation of the Higher Wisdom Concerning the Church, Israel and the Gentiles in Prophecy* (Hayesville: Schoettle Publishing Co., 1995), 117.
- ²⁷ J.D. Faust, *The Rod: Will God Spare It? An Exhaustive Study of Temporary Punishment for Unfaithful Christians at the Judgment Seat and During the Millennial Kingdom* (Hayesville: Schoettle Publishing Co., 2002).
- ²⁸ Joseph Dillow, "Discipleship in the Sermon on the Mount: A Review of Some Problem Passages." *GES Conference CD*, 2003.
- ²⁹ Ventilato, "Refutation," section I, 10.
- ³⁰ Dillow, 203.
- ³¹ "Bikini Believers at the Bema" is certainly possible, as Radmacher's sermon title suggests ("Bema," 41). But a bikini bride is not possible.
- ³² *Ibid.*, 41.
- ³³ James E. Rosscup, "The Overcomer of the Apocalypse," *GTJ* 3:2 (Fall 1982): 261-286.
- ³⁴ Horton, *Security*.
- ³⁵ The tri-spirit is semantically distinct from the pri-spirit. The latter refers to the phenomenal overlapping of the tri-soul and tri-spirit.
- ³⁶ Paul Helm, Alan G. Padgett, William Lane Craig, and Nicholas Wolterstorff. *Four Views: God & Time*, ed. Gregory E. Ganssle (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2001).
- ³⁷ Robert N. Wilkin, *JOTGES*, 23:107. See John Niemelä, "For you have kept My Word: The Grammar of Revelation 3:10," *CTSJ* 6:1 (January - March 2000): 1-25.
- ³⁸ Keathley IV, "Darkness," 8-9.
- ³⁹ Chitwood, *Olivet*, 291.
- ⁴⁰ Timmy Ice, "The Destructive View of Preterism," *CTS* 3:10 (December 1999): 386-400. Ron J. Bigalke, Jr., "The Olivet Discourse: A Resolution of Time," *CTSJ* 9 (Spring 2003): 106-140.