One Salvation, Three Tenses: Justification, Sanctification, and Glorification in Word of the Kingdom Theology

Paper 1 in a 12 Part Series

by Escape the Mustard Tree

Introduction

Ask most Christians what it means to be "saved," and you'll get a fairly uniform answer: a person believes in Jesus Christ, and from that moment forward, they possess eternal life — full stop, one event, one unchanging status. Word of the Kingdom theology doesn't deny that a person is saved the moment they believe (Eph. 2:8-9; Acts 16:30-31). But it insists that Scripture describes salvation as something larger and more textured than a single event — a work of God that touches the whole of man, spirit, soul, and body (1 Thess. 5:23), across three distinct tenses of time: a past that is finished (Eph. 2:8; 2 Tim. 1:9), a present that is still being worked out (1 Cor. 1:18; Phil. 2:12-13), and a future that has not yet arrived (Rom. 5:9).

This is not a doctrine of "two salvations," as if a person could be saved twice, or as if grace were somehow insufficient the first time. It's one salvation, unfolding in three aspects — initial justification, ongoing sanctification, and future glorification — each corresponding to one part of the tripartite man, each occupying its own tense. And "justification" itself, as the section on that word below sets out, is not confined to the first of the three: because to justify is to render a judgment, and because death has affected all three parts of man distinctly, a judgment falls due for more than one part, and the two are not rendered at the same time. Initial justification is where justification *begins*, not the whole of it. That first judgment is secured the instant a person believes, and it's irrevocable (Rom. 11:29). The second, the soul's at the Judgment Seat, which carries the body with it, is not.

This distinction is the hinge on which nearly every other divergence between Word of the Kingdom theology and mainstream Christian belief turns: the nature of the coming kingdom (Rev. 20:4-6), the meaning of "eternal life" (Matt. 19:16, 29), the purpose of the Judgment Seat of Christ (2 Cor. 5:10), and even the vocabulary used for the afterlife (Matt. 10:28; Rev. 20:14-15). Get this doctrine wrong, in either direction, and the rest of the system becomes unintelligible. This paper lays out the doctrine itself, sets it against the major streams of mainstream Christian soteriology, and marks where they meet, where they part ways, and why.

The Mainstream Landscape

Why these three traditions

This paper is the first in the series to set Word of the Kingdom theology against the major streams of mainstream Christian belief, and the choice of conversation partners needs explaining first. Most

Christians today have little sense of how "the church" arrived at its present, fractured shape — how one body became many, and why the particular divisions that exist are the ones that exist. A brief trajectory helps explain why Reformed/Calvinist, Wesleyan/Arminian, and Catholic theology, specifically, are the three traditions this paper and its companions engage.

For roughly its first thousand years in the West, there was substantially one institutional church. A first major fracture came in 1054, when the Western (Latin, Rome-centered) and Eastern (Greek, Constantinople-centered) churches formally split — the root of today's Roman Catholic/Eastern Orthodox divide. Orthodoxy is not one of the three traditions this series engages doctrine by doctrine; it enters only where the question is authority itself, as it does in the introductory paper. Its distinct theological vocabulary (theosis, the essence-energies distinction) puts it outside the frame this project uses for everything else, and it's reserved for its own separate treatment in a companion paper. What matters for this paper is the branch that remained: the Roman Catholic Church, which continued as the unbroken institutional trunk of Western Christianity for another five centuries.

The second major fracture is the one that produced the other two traditions surveyed here. The Protestant Reformation, beginning in 1517, broke Western Christianity a second time — not merely into "Catholic" and "Protestant," but, within Protestantism itself, into streams that soon disagreed sharply with one another.

Luther's break from Catholicism in Germany came first, and the churches that followed him kept his name. The stream this paper engages, though, runs through Switzerland — Zwingli in Zurich, Bucer in Strasbourg, and above all John Calvin in Geneva. These were men who worked with the backing of civil governments to reshape existing state churches rather than break away and start new ones from scratch, and what they built became Reformed theology. It was formally consolidated at the Synod of Dort (1618-19), an official assembly of church leaders called in response to a rival Dutch movement. That movement took its name from Jacobus Arminius, who had argued for a more conditional view of grace and perseverance; his followers, the Remonstrants, published five articles the year after his death, and Dort answered them point for point. Those five answers hardened the Reformed and Arminian positions into the two poles they remain today.

Roughly a century later, John Wesley's eighteenth-century revival took up and systematized the Arminian side of that older dispute, giving it the lasting institutional form — Methodism, and much of the broader evangelical revival tradition that followed it — in which most people now encounter it, generally without ever hearing the name Arminius.

The result is that these three traditions map the whole field. Catholicism represents the unbroken pre-Reformation trunk; Reformed/Calvinist theology represents one pole of the Reformation's internal split; Wesleyan/Arminian theology represents the other. Together, whether by name or simply by inherited assumption, they supply the theological DNA of the overwhelming majority of professing Christians alive today — including many who could not name a single one of these traditions but hold, unknowingly, to a version of one of their positions on exactly the question this paper addresses.

None of this makes any of the three traditions a monolith in its own right — Reformed churches range from strict five-point Calvinism to looser confessional Presbyterianism, Wesleyan/Arminian

theology spans from classical Methodism to much of the broader Pentecostal and evangelical world, and Catholicism contains real internal schools of thought. But across all three, on the specific question this paper addresses, one assumption holds nearly universal: **justification, sanctification, and glorification are all guaranteed outcomes of the same, singular act of saving faith.** They differ on the mechanics, but not on the destination. To avoid strawmanning any of these traditions, what follows draws directly from their own confessional and catechetical documents.

- **Reformed / Calvinist tradition.** The *Westminster Confession of Faith* (1646) devotes an entire chapter to this question — Chapter XVII, "Of the Perseverance of the Saints." It states that those whom God has effectually called and sanctified by His Spirit "can neither totally nor finally fall away from the state of grace, but shall certainly persevere therein to the end, and be eternally saved" (WCF 17.1, citing John 10:28-29; Phil. 1:6). Crucially, the Confession locates the *ground* of this certainty not in a Christian's own faithfulness but in "the immutability of the decree of election" and "the efficacy of the merit and intercession of Jesus Christ" (WCF 17.2, citing Heb. 7:25; Rom. 8:33-39) — meaning a Christian's assurance rests on what God has already decided and done, not on how consistently that Christian manages to live afterward. Good works and a sanctified life are not absent from this system — they're expected (Eph. 2:10) — but they function as the fruit that necessarily follows from an unbreakable root (John 15:1-5), not as a condition that could fail to be met.

> So what happens, on this view, if someone professes faith but never shows any real, lasting change — no growth, no fruit, unrepentant sin across an entire lifetime? The Reformed answer is direct: such a person was never actually regenerate, whatever they once professed. This is not someone truly saved who slips and loses salvation later; it's someone in whom the new birth never took place at all, and whose end is the same as anyone who never believed. Perseverance guarantees that everyone who *is* truly saved will show real fruit and will be glorified in the end (Rom. 8:29-30; Phil. 1:6), so a fruitless lifetime is not read as a saved person's stumble but as evidence about what that person always was.

- **Wesleyan / Arminian tradition.** John Wesley's *Articles of Religion* (adapted from the Anglican Thirty-Nine Articles and still foundational to Methodism) take a more conditional view. Article XII, "Of Sin After Justification," states plainly that a Christian, " after we have received the Holy Ghost, we may depart from grace given, and fall into sin," though repentance remains open to "such as truly repent." This tradition takes real apostasy seriously (Heb. 6:4-6; Heb. 10:26-29) — closer, in that respect, to Word of the Kingdom theology than Reformed thought is.

> So what happens here if someone truly saved stops bearing fruit and persists in disobedience? Unlike the Reformed answer above, this tradition doesn't say the fruitless person was never really saved — it says a truly saved person can, in fact, walk away from that salvation entirely, losing it as a whole rather than losing some smaller, later piece of it while an earlier part stays intact. The divergence from this paper sits exactly there. Departure is from grace given as a whole (Gal. 5:4 — a verse taken up in the objections below, where this paper reads it as condemning law-keeping as the method of securing a verdict rather than as the loss of a standing), not the forfeiture of a *later* reward while an earlier justification remains untouched. Salvation, in this system, is still one indivisible possession — held onto or lost as a single unit — since Wesley's own Article X, "Of Good Works," treats good works as what "follow after justification" (citing Eph. 2:10; Jas. 2:20; Matt. 5:16), evidence and fruit of that one possession, not the condition of some separate, later stage of it.

- **Catholic tradition.** The *Catechism of the Catholic Church* treats justification not as a single completed transaction but as the start of an ongoing process, sustained by grace along with the person's own cooperation with it. Justification is "conferred in Baptism" (CCC 1992) and oriented toward "the gift of eternal life" (CCC 1992), but what follows isn't treated as automatic: "moved by the Holy Spirit and by charity, we can then merit for ourselves and for others the graces needed for our sanctification... and for the attainment of eternal life" (CCC 2010) — "merit" here meaning a person's own Spirit-enabled good works actually earn a real increase of grace, not that grace itself was ever earned in the first place. Eternal life itself is described as "the promised inheritance," obtained through a merit that is itself God's own gift (CCC 2009).

> So what happens if someone baptized and justified later falls into serious, unrepented sin? On this view the stakes are real and immediate in a way neither tradition above quite matches: grave, unrepented sin (mortal sin) can sever the grace-relationship altogether, placing that person's eternal life at real risk unless it's restored, ordinarily through confession. And the matter is settled at death rather than left open: on this account each person meets a particular judgment the moment he dies, which fixes his destiny, with a general judgment at the end of the age making publicly manifest what was decided there (CCC 1021-1022, 1038-1041). This tradition shares Word of the Kingdom theology's instinct that eternal life is, in some real sense, a future inheritance connected to a life of merit (Col. 3:24; 1 Pet. 1:4) — but it locates that entire merit-bearing process within one continuous, single justification sustained by sacramental grace, rather than splitting it, as Word of the Kingdom theology does, into an already-secured past tense and a separately conditioned future one.

One further piece belongs here, because it's Catholic theology's own answer to a question this project keeps returning to: what happens to a real Christian whose sanctification simply isn't “finished” by the time he dies? For anyone who dies in a state of grace — meaning short of mortal sin, not cut off from that grace-relationship — but still imperfectly purified, the Catechism holds that "all who die in God's grace and friendship, but still imperfectly purified... undergo purification, so as to achieve the holiness necessary to enter the joy of heaven" (CCC 1030). This is purgatory: not a second chance at salvation, and not a punishment in the sense "hell" is, but a completing of what sanctification left unfinished, before that person enters God's presence forever. How purgatory compares with the Judgment Seat of Christ as this paper teaches it is taken up under "Where They Diverge, and Why" below.

What unites all three, despite their real and serious disagreements with one another — including real disagreement over what happens to a fruitless or disobedient Christian — is this: none of them treats justification, sanctification, and glorification (Rom. 8:29-30) as *separable outcomes* that one man might receive some of and permanently forfeit others (Rom. 11:29 vs. 1 Cor. 9:24-27). Word of the Kingdom theology does.

The Word of the Kingdom Position

Man's created purpose: the goal salvation restores

Before any of this can function as a structure, one prior question needs an answer: saved *for* what? Genesis states it in the clearest terms available to it, at the very moment of man's creation — twice, in fact, bracketing the creation itself: once just before God makes man (Gen. 1:26) and once immediately after (Gen. 1:28). "Let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, over the birds of the air, and over the cattle, over all the earth and over every creeping thing that creeps on the earth" (Gen. 1:26), and "Then God blessed them, and God said to them, 'Be fruitful and multiply; fill the earth and subdue it; have dominion over the fish of the sea, over the birds of the air, and over every living thing that moves on the earth'" (Gen. 1:28). This repetition, at the very outset of Scripture, functions as a first-mention principle: what is stated this early and this deliberately sets the pattern for everything that follows, and nothing later in Scripture retracts it.

A common objection anticipates itself here: isn't man's purpose simply to glorify God (Isa. 43:7)? Man is indeed called to glorify God, but Isaiah 43:7 specifically is not a general statement about mankind's creation — read in its own context (Isa. 43:1-7), the passage is addressed to Israel, gathered at the end of the Tribulation, not to Adam's race as a whole. Genesis 1:26 and 28 remain the first and plainest statement of the purpose behind man's creation itself, and that purpose is rulership.

The word matters here, and Scripture is careful to keep it distinct from a related but different word introduced only after the Fall. "Have dominion" and "rule" in Genesis 1:26 and 28 translate the Hebrew *radah* — man's original, creation-purpose authority over the created order. After the Fall, God tells the woman that her husband "shall rule [*mashal*] over you" (Gen. 3:16) — a different Hebrew word entirely, describing a consequence of sin, not a continuation or expansion of Genesis 1's dominion mandate. The two shouldn't be conflated: one is the purpose man was made for; the other is a penalty introduced afterward. The woman herself, formed from the man specifically to be "a helper comparable to him" (Gen. 2:18), was created for the same purpose already stated — not a separate one — so that the two together, as one, might carry it out.

Scripture never revisits or revises this purpose; it simply notes, repeatedly, that it remains unrealized. Psalm 8 restates it in almost identical terms centuries later: God has made man "a little lower than the angels," crowned him "with glory and honor," and made him "to have dominion over the works of Your hands," putting "all things under his feet" (Ps. 8:5-6). Notice what is paired there — dominion and a crown of glory. That pairing returns later in this paper, and it carries weight there. The writer of Hebrews quotes this same psalm and adds the detail that makes the whole matter turn: "in that He put all in subjection under him, He left nothing that is not put under him. *But now we do not yet see all things put under him*" (Heb. 2:8). The purpose was stated at creation; it has never been fulfilled; and Hebrews places its fulfillment specifically in "the world to come" (Heb. 2:5) — not in what popular usage calls "heaven" as a final destination, but in a coming reign over a restored earth, developed at length in the companion paper "The Bema."

This is what gives the three-tense structure of salvation its actual point. Justification, sanctification, and glorification are not simply successive legal statuses; they're the successive undoing of what the Fall broke, precisely because that purpose — rulership, stated at the very beginning and never rescinded — is what salvation as a whole is restoring man to. That is why the goal named in

Scripture is the same regardless of which tense of salvation is under discussion, spirit, soul, or body, past, present, or future (Eph. 2:8-9; 1 Cor. 1:18; Heb. 1:14) — one purpose, realized in stages, corresponding to the three-part structure of man himself, which the next section takes up.

The premise: a triune God, man in His image, and the animal/man distinction

The case for man's tripartite nature — spirit, soul, and body — does not begin with 1 Thessalonians 5:23; that verse confirms the doctrine rather than founding it. It begins earlier, with the nature of God Himself and the specific wording of man's creation.

Genesis 1:26 records God saying, "Let **Us** make man in **Our** image, according to **Our** likeness." The verb is plural and so are the pronouns, spoken by the one God — Father, Son, and Spirit, three distinct persons who are nonetheless one (John 1:1-3, 14; 1 Cor. 8:6; John 10:30; John 17:22; Matt. 28:19; John 4:24). The Hebrew noun for God in the verse, *Elohim*, is plural in form as well. That by itself would settle nothing, since a plural noun can be read as a plural of majesty; it is the plural verb and pronouns that carry the weight here.

The form does say one more thing, though, and English readers miss it because English can't say it. English has two numbers, singular and plural, and its plural means anything from two upward. Hebrew has three: singular, dual, and plural. The dual is a form of its own, used for pairs — two eyes, two hands, two days — so a Hebrew plural is reaching *past* a pair. Where the plurality of *Elohim* is taken as real rather than honorific, the word is therefore pointing at more than two, which is exactly what the New Testament passages above go on to name. The dual has a limited range in Biblical Hebrew, attaching mostly to natural pairs, measures, and units of time, so this supports the reading rather than establishing it on its own.

One verse commonly cited at this point is deliberately absent. The trinitarian formula printed at 1 John 5:7 in some English Bibles appears in no Greek manuscript before the sixteenth century, and a project that makes as much of translation decisions as this one does cannot lean on it.

Man was then created *in that image and likeness* (Gen. 1:26-27), patterned after a triune God. If the pattern is three-in-one, so is the copy.

This is then confirmed by a close reading of the creation account itself, which draws a specific distinction between animals and man. The animals are repeatedly described in Genesis 1 with the paired Hebrew terms *chay* ("living") and *nephesh* ("soul" or "life") — they're *chay nephesh*, "living souls" or "living beings" (Gen. 1:20, 21, 24, 30). Man is called by that same phrase. What Genesis 2:7 adds is not a different name but a distinct act: "the LORD God formed man of the dust of the ground, and **breathed into his nostrils the breath [*neshamah*] of life**" (Gen. 2:7). Only after receiving this *neshamah* — a Hebrew word carrying the same double sense of "breath" and "spirit" that the New Testament's Greek word for spirit, *pneuma*, also carries — does the verse say "man became a living being."

The distinctive is the *act*, not the phrase. Genesis 7:22 describes the creatures that perished in the flood as those "in whose nostrils was the breath of the spirit of life" — the same word, applied to animals. So the claim is not that *neshamah* is a term reserved for man. The claim is narrower and survives that verse intact: God is never once described as breathing directly into the nostrils of any

other creature. The animals are spoken into existence (Gen. 1:20, 24); man alone receives something by a direct, personal act of God (Gen. 2:7), and only after receiving it is he alive, a “living being.” *That act* is what sets man apart and establishes him — uniquely among creation — as a three-part being: spirit, soul, and body.

Once this structure is established from Genesis, Jesus Himself supplies its clearest confirmation — not merely as one more proof text, but as the capstone of the foundational case, since Jesus was fully God and fully man (John 1:1, 14). If man is triune, and Jesus was fully man, then Jesus' own death should display the same three-part structure. Scripture bears this out precisely. At the moment of death, Luke records Jesus saying, "Father, into Your hands I commit My **spirit**" (Luke 23:46) — and only then does He breathe His last (Luke 23:46). Peter's sermon in Acts 2 explains that Jesus' **soul** was not left in Hades, quoting David's prophecy that God wouldn't abandon His Holy One there (Acts 2:27, 31; cf. Ps. 16:10). And Luke separately records that Joseph of Arimathea took Jesus' **body** down and laid it in the tomb (Luke 23:52-53). Three distinct destinations — the Father, Hades, and the tomb — for three distinct parts of the same man (Luke 23:46, 52-53; Acts 2:27, 31). This is not incidental detail; it is presented as direct evidence that the man Jesus was Himself constituted of the same three parts as every other human being, and that these three parts truly separate at death.

Only after establishing the doctrine this way — from God's triune nature, from the animal/man distinction in Genesis, and from the three-part separation of Jesus at His own death — do 1 Thessalonians 5:23 and Hebrews 4:12 come in, as New Testament passages that name all three parts (spirit/*pneuma*, soul/*psuche*, body/*soma*) explicitly and together, confirming that the same three-part distinction runs consistently through the whole of Scripture.

Life and death: the terms defined

Before justification, sanctification, and glorification can be understood, two prior terms have to be defined carefully, because the entire framework depends on getting them right: **life** and **death**. Mainstream usage tends to treat "death" as cessation — the stopping of a heartbeat, the end of biological function — and "life" as its simple opposite. Scripture means something more specific, and the case for it is built directly from the Genesis narrative.

God's warning to Adam about eating of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil was direct: "in the day that you eat of it you shall surely die" (Gen. 2:17). Yet Adam didn't stop breathing that day he ate of it (Gen. 3:7) — his body continued functioning for centuries afterward (Gen. 5:5). If "death" meant biological cessation, the warning would have been false. Instead, Scripture shows what actually happened the moment sin entered: Adam and his wife heard the Lord walking in the garden and **hid themselves** (Gen. 3:8). When God called out "Where are you?" (Gen. 3:9), the question is not asked because God lacked information — He is omniscient — but because something had actually changed in the relationship: sin now stood between the parties, and they could no longer stand in His presence unashamed (Gen. 3:10). This hiding, this rupture of fellowship, is what death actually is: **separation from God**, not the end of existence.

This reading is reinforced by a second observation: prior to the Fall, death could not have existed for man in any form — physical, spiritual, or soulical — because death is explicitly the wage of sin

(Rom. 6:23), and sin had not yet occurred (Rom. 5:12). The warning of Genesis 2:17 shows that the penalty was real and stated in advance; it doesn't show death already at work in the man. Death had no claim on an unfallen man. It gained one the moment sin did.

If death is separation, then **life — its exact opposite — is fellowship and togetherness with God**, not mere biological animation. This is why death had to affect all three parts of man distinctly rather than as a single undifferentiated event: the spirit becomes "dead" (separated from God entirely), the soul becomes "corrupted" (still functioning, but no longer rightly ordered toward God), and the body begins to decay and falls short of the glory required to stand in God's presence (Rom. 3:23; 1 Cor. 15:43). Each part's relationship to God has been broken in its own way, which is precisely why each part requires its own, separately-timed restoration to life — the past, present, and future tenses of salvation already introduced (Eph. 2:8; 1 Cor. 1:18; Rom. 5:9).

This definitional groundwork changes what "justification" is doing in everything that follows. If death is fundamentally *relational* rather than legal-in-the-abstract, then justification is not best pictured as a court settling a debt on a ledger and closing the book. It's God **restoring a relationship** — bringing a separated party back into fellowship — through a legal act, certainly, but one whose entire purpose is relational reconciliation rather than mere acquittal. Paul's own language bears this out: "God was in Christ reconciling the world to Himself, not imputing their trespasses to them" (2 Cor. 5:19). Reconciliation, not merely pardon, is the operative category.

Having answered the previous question, “What is man saved *for*,” this raises a methodological question the rest of this paper also depends on: what, exactly, is a person being saved *from*? The word "salvation" itself carries little inherent content — it simply means to be freed, rescued, or delivered from something (Luke 1:71; 2 Tim. 4:18) — so its meaning is supplied entirely by context. So that question has to be asked freshly at every occurrence: saved from what, and when? Applied to the spirit, the answer is separation from God, settled permanently and in the past (Eph. 2:8; 2 Tim. 1:9). Applied to the soul, the answer is a *different* danger — the present, ongoing pull of the flesh and the forfeiture of what that walk was meant to produce (1 Cor. 1:18; Matt. 16:24-27). Applied to the body, the answer is different again, and still future (Rom. 5:9). Three parts, three dangers, three answers. One more term has to be further defined before any of them can be described, because it is the term that makes three answers necessary rather than one.

Righteousness and justification: a judgment rendered

Two terms have now been defined — life and death — and a third has to be defined before the three tenses can be described at all, because it's the term that makes three tenses necessary rather than merely convenient. That term is **justification**, and the words behind it in both Testaments say more than the English carries.

The Hebrew. The noun for "righteousness" is *tsedhaqah*, and it's a legal term describing relationships — an arrangement in which the parties involved are expected to be faithful to what each is owed by the other. Rightness, justice, fairness, between parties. The verb is *tsadaq*, the primitive root the noun grows out of, and it means to make or declare righteous. The relational character already set out above is not something imported into the doctrine from the Genesis narrative. It is sitting inside the vocabulary.

The Greek. The noun for "righteousness" is *dikaiosune* — literally conformity to what is right or just. The noun for "justification" is *dikaiosis*, the act of establishing a person as righteous. The verb is *dikaioo*, which means either to bring out the fact that a person is righteous or, if he is not, to make him so; the word itself doesn't specify the method. All three grow from one root: *dike*. And that root, in its four other New Testament appearances, is never rendered as anything mild. It comes into English as "judgment" (Acts 25:15), "justice" (Acts 28:4), "vengeance" (Jude 7), and "punishment" (2 Thess. 1:9). One note on the count: the first of those four rests on the Greek text underlying the King James and New King James versions, where Acts 25:15 reads *dikēn*; the text behind most modern versions has a compound form there instead. Three occurrences or four, the character of the word does not change.

Put the two languages together and the shape is unmistakable. *Dike* carries the idea of an expected behavior measured against an imposed standard, with a prescribed penalty for falling short. To be justified is to have **a judgment rendered in one's favor** — the inequality between two parties rectified, the standard met, the penalty not applied.

Which raises the question of who must meet whose standard. In the relationship between God and man the answer is settled: God does not conform to man's standard. Man is sinful, God is perfect, and man must be made righteous in order to meet a standard he did not set and cannot reach. Where he doesn't meet it, he incurs judgment — and how much that matters to God, Scripture says over and over. His eyes are on the righteous and His ears open to their cry, while His face is against those who do evil (Ps. 34:15-16). He knows the way of the righteous, while the way of the ungodly perishes (Ps. 1:6). He tests the righteous, and He loves righteousness (Ps. 11:4-7). He upholds the righteous, while the arms of the wicked are broken (Ps. 37:17). He preserves all who love Him, and destroys all the wicked (Ps. 145:20). The whirlwind passes and the wicked is no more, while the righteous stands on an everlasting foundation (Prov. 10:25). Whatever else in Scripture may be hard to make out, this is not. God has said what He requires, and He has said what becomes of the man who does not have it.

And man cannot supply it. Nothing done by man's own hand or on his own terms produces the righteousness God requires. God alone imparts holiness, righteousness, and life — and before He can, the sin standing between the parties has to be dealt with, and *dealt with in a specific way* because "without shedding of blood there is no remission" (Heb. 9:22).

Scripture shows this the first time it's needed, in Eden. Upon finding themselves separated from God, Adam and his wife sewed fig leaves together and made themselves coverings (Gen. 3:7) — man's own hand, on man's own terms — and it didn't answer the problem, because when God came walking in the garden they hid anyway (Gen. 3:8). What did answer was supplied for them: "Also for Adam and his wife the LORD God made tunics of skin, and clothed them" (Gen. 3:21). The LORD made them, and the LORD put them on. Skins come off a living creature, so the covering that worked cost a life that was not theirs. Man's covering did not answer; God's covering did, and it was provided at the cost of another. That pattern is in place before the third chapter of Genesis closes.

The Passover is where the same pattern is worked out for a whole nation. Israel as a nation is God's firstborn son — "Israel is My son, My firstborn" (Exod. 4:22) — which is precisely why the sentence of the tenth judgment that was rendered unto Pharaoh and all the households of Egypt that held

firstborn sons in them *also stood over every Hebrew household*. The whole people stood under one sentence. And the escape provided was a substitute: a lamb without blemish, killed, its blood placed on the doorposts, with the promise attached — "when I see the blood, I will pass over you" (Exod. 12:13). God didn't waive the judgment. He saw blood, determined that a death had already taken place in that household, and passed over. Judgment rendered; penalty applied to a substitute.

That those lambs had any efficacy at all is itself explained, and the explanation reaches backward past Egypt entirely. Peter says the blood of Christ was that of a lamb "foreordained before the foundation of the world, but was manifest in these last times for you" (1 Pet. 1:19-20). Revelation says the same thing in fewer words, calling Him "the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world" (Rev. 13:8). The Old Testament sacrifices worked because they embodied something that had not yet happened in Israel's timeline but was already settled in God's.

Paul states the whole mechanism in one passage, and it is the New Testament's central treatment of the doctrine:

> But now the righteousness of God apart from the law is revealed, being witnessed by the Law and the Prophets, even the righteousness of God, through faith in Jesus Christ, to all and on all who believe. For there's no difference; for all have sinned and fall short of the glory of God, being justified freely by His grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, whom God set forth as a propitiation by His blood, through faith, to demonstrate His righteousness, because in His forbearance God had passed over the sins that were previously committed, to demonstrate at the present time His righteousness, that He might be just and the justifier of the one who has faith in Jesus. (Rom. 3:21-26)

Every element is there. Righteousness apart from law, available to anyone because everyone alike has fallen short. Justification given freely, by grace — and given *through* something: "the redemption that is in Christ Jesus." The word is *apolutrosis*, a ransom, a price paid on another's behalf. God set forth Christ's blood as the propitiation, and on that basis passes over sins previously committed. And the last clause states the point this section has been building toward: God acts so that He might be **just** and the **justifier**. Not mercy at the expense of judgment. Judgment satisfied, and mercy extended through it.

Why this requires more than one judgment. Here is where the definition really comes into play.

If justification is a judgment rendered, and if death — separation from God — has affected all three parts of man distinctly, then the parts can’t all be answered at once. Justification of all three parts of man does not happen at once.

The spirit's judgment has already been rendered, favorably and irrevocably, at the moment faith was exercised in Jesus Christ (Rom. 11:29; Acts 16:30-31; 1 Cor. 2:11-13). This is the Passover exactly: when we first believe, God sees the blood of Jesus Himself, reckons that a death has taken place, and passes over; we are saved from death and made alive (Eph. 2:8-9). The verdict is entered, and a verdict entered *is not revisited*. Israel, once brought out, was never sent back to Egypt, however often that generation asked to go (Num. 11:5; 14:4). Two things are true of those same people at once, and this paper needs both. They never returned to Egypt. And most of them

never entered Canaan. The first is a verdict already rendered and closed; the second is an entirely different question, and the Exodus pattern below is where it gets taken up.

The body's condition demonstrates that the rest of the verdict hasn’t yet been rendered. A person who believes today doesn't thereby become immune to injury or disease; the body remains on its course, and Paul still calls it "this body of death" (Rom. 7:24). The soul, whose life God binds to the body's blood (Lev. 17:11 — a link taken up in its own section below, because it is what ties the soul's outcome to the body's), remains corrupted and still sins — which is why the New Testament addresses so much of its instruction to Christians who are doing exactly that.

Paul names the completion and dates it: "may your whole spirit, soul, and body be preserved blameless **at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ**" (1 Thess. 5:23). Not at the moment a person believed. At His coming. All three parts, made complete, at a future event.

So "justification" in this paper carries a precise sense, and the reader should hold it throughout. It names the act of a judgment rendered — and it’s rendered twice: for the spirit the moment a man believes, and for the soul at the Judgment Seat of Christ, where the body’s redemption follows from that same verdict. The soul's judgment is future, at the Judgment Seat of Christ (2 Cor. 5:10). The body's follows from that same verdict (Rom. 8:23; Phil. 3:20-21). Where this paper speaks of justification as the settled, past-tense first stage, it means specifically **the spirit's judgment** — the initial and permanent one — not the whole of what the word covers.

That is the terminological point to carry forward, and it's the seed of everything that follows: initial justification is not the whole of justification. It is where justification begins.

A first type: the days of creation

Two working models follow, and they don't carry equal weight. The creation-week reading in this section has no New Testament warrant behind it and is offered as illustration rather than proof — useful for seeing the shape of the structure, not for establishing it. The Exodus pattern in the section after it is anchored by Paul and the writer of Hebrews themselves, who apply it to Christians explicitly (1 Cor. 10:1-11; Heb. 3:16-4:2). A reader who finds the creation reading unconvincing should not conclude the Exodus one falls with it.

The first model is available in Genesis's own creation account. On the first day, God said "Let there be light," and light shone into the midst of the darkness — but the darkness itself was not eliminated; it was named "Night" and continues alongside the light through every day that follows (Gen. 1:3-5). Paul draws this exact image directly into the language of salvation: " the God who commanded light to shine out of darkness, who has shone in our hearts to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ" (2 Cor. 4:6) — the same light-out-of-darkness act, applied to the moment of initial salvation, the spirit's own justification. But exactly as in Genesis, this first division of light from darkness doesn't remove the darkness from the scene entirely; it persists alongside the light through everything that follows, a fitting picture of a justified Christian who is not yet free of the ongoing presence and pull of sin (Rom. 7:14-25; 1 John 1:8). The five days that follow — separating the waters, forming dry land and vegetation, setting the greater and lesser lights in their courses, filling the sea, sky, and land with living creatures — picture the further work still required after that first division: the soul's present, unfinished sanctification, still

being formed and filled out (Phil. 1:6; 2:12-13). Only on the seventh day does God rest from His work (Gen. 2:1-3) — a pattern this project elsewhere reads as the template for Scripture's own larger timeline, 6,000 years of labor followed by a 1,000-year Sabbath rest still to come (2 Pet. 3:8), and, within this paper, the picture of a coming kingdom rest still ahead, and of glorification as its own distinct, later stage.

A second type: the Exodus pattern

The Exodus narrative offers a second, more detailed type. The Passover in Egypt — the blood applied to the doorposts, the household spared the moment the angel of death saw it (Exod. 12:13, 22-23) — pictures initial justification: a once-for-all, backward-looking act that settles a person's standing permanently and is never repeated. What follows in the narrative — the crossing of the Red Sea, the wilderness wandering, and the long, uneven journey to the promised inheritance (Exod. 14; Josh. 1-24) — pictures the remaining two tenses: a present walk that could be, and often was, unfaithful (1 Cor. 10:1-11), and a future inheritance that had to be entered and possessed, not merely assumed (Heb. 3:16-19; Heb. 4:1-2). The generation redeemed at Passover was the very generation that failed to enter the inheritance (save two, Joshua and Caleb)— not because their redemption was ever in question, but because the inheritance was a separate matter, conditioned on faith and obedience along the journey (Num. 14:20-23; Heb. 3:19).

This is the second half of the pair noted earlier. That generation could not go back and did not go forward. Both are true of the same people, and neither cancels the other: Egypt behind them, permanently closed by a judgment already rendered; Canaan ahead of them, forfeited by a walk that failed, resulting in a permanent judgment rendered by God regarding it. Holding those two facts together is not a difficulty this paper has to manage. It's the whole point, stated in one generation's history — and it's why Hebrews reaches for that history when warning Christians rather than for any picture of people who were never redeemed at all (Heb. 3:16-19; 4:1-2). The same pattern runs through the whole of the New Testament's own vocabulary of salvation.

The spirit's judgment — past tense

This is the first of the two judgments named above, and the only one already rendered. The moment a person believes on the finished work of Christ, their spirit is made alive and permanently justified before God (Eph. 2:8-9; Rom. 11:29). This is not a process. It's a completed legal fact, sealed the instant faith is exercised (Acts 16:30-31), and it can't be lost, earned, or added to — a point held here as firmly as any Reformed confession holds it. Paul makes the gift-character of it plain in his comparison with Adam: condemnation came through one man’s offense, while justification comes as a gift through one Man, given where many offenses had piled up (Rom. 5:15-19). He states the works question in a sentence that shuts it out by name: God "has saved us and called us with a holy calling, not according to our works, but according to His own purpose and grace which was given to us in Christ Jesus before time began" (2 Tim. 1:9). Saved and called, past tense, works excluded.

The security rests on something other than the man's performance, and Scripture locates it in God's own character: "the gifts and the calling of God are irrevocable" (Rom. 11:29). Paul says that of Israel, and the reason it holds for Israel is the reason it holds at all — the verse reaches back to

what God says of Himself through Malachi: "For I am the LORD, I do not change; therefore you are not consumed, O sons of Jacob" (Mal. 3:6). The unchangeableness is God's. Israel is where it's being demonstrated, not the boundary of where it applies. A God who does not change does not un-render a verdict He has rendered. On this point the system is not merely compatible with mainstream evangelical soteriology; it is nearly identical to it.

A note on the term itself. "Salvation of the spirit" is this paper's shorthand, and Scripture does not use the phrase. What Scripture does supply is the substance, in vocabulary of its own: being made alive when dead in trespasses (Eph. 2:1, 5), being joined to the Lord as "one spirit with Him" (1 Cor. 6:17), and having the Spirit bear witness "with our spirit" (Rom. 8:16). The part is named in those verses even where the phrase is not. The objections section below takes up the challenge this raises directly, because it is a fair one.

Sanctification — present tense, the soul

Here the system departs sharply from the mainstream consensus. Sanctification is treated here as a process with an outcome of its own, rather than as the automatic fruit of justification or as evidence of it. It's the **ongoing, real, and uncertain process** of a Christian "working out" salvation (Phil. 2:12-13) — walking by the Spirit rather than the flesh (Rom. 8:5-14), confessing sin (1 John 1:7-9), enduring discipline (Heb. 12:5-11), and persevering under trial (Jas. 1:2-4). This process pertains specifically to the soul, and its outcome is not settled in advance (Heb. 10:39; Jas. 1:21; 1 Pet. 1:3-11). A justified Christian can, through unfaithfulness, fail to be sanctified in the sense meant here — not losing their initial justification, but forfeiting what sanctification was meant to produce (Matt. 25:14-30; Luke 19:11-27).

The soul and the body: why the second and third tenses travel together

Why should the soul's outcome and the body's outcome be linked at all? If they are two parts, why is one verdict rendered over both?

Scripture answers it in a single verse, with repetition marking its importance:

> For the life of the flesh is in the blood, and I have given it to you upon the altar to make atonement for your souls; for it is the blood that makes atonement for the soul. (Lev. 17:11)

The word rendered "life" in the first clause and "soul" in the next two is the same Hebrew word, *nephesh*, used three times in one sentence. The soul/life is reckoned to be *in the blood*. Blood is bodily. Which means the soul is not a free-floating part sitting alongside the body — it's bound to it, through the blood, by God's own stated arrangement. Moses repeats the point so no one can miss it: "the blood is the life; you may not eat the life with the meat" (Deut. 12:23).

That is why the sacrificial system works the way it does. The animal's blood is drained and poured out (Lev. 17:13), and what is poured out is the *nephesh* — the life, the soul. The offering is not the animal's death in the abstract. *It is a life poured out*, bodily, *physically* at an altar. This symbolism is what gets carried forward.

Christ performs the antitype in exactly that vocabulary. Isaiah does not say He died. He says, "He poured out His soul unto death" (Isa. 53:12). The same word, the same action, the reality the animals had been picturing for fifteen centuries.

And the Christian is called to the same thing, in the same terms. Paul states it bodily, because after Leviticus 17:11 it can't be stated any other way: "present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable to God, which is your reasonable service" (Rom. 12:1). A living sacrifice is a contradiction in the old system and the whole point in the new one — a life poured out without the pouring-out ending it.

Jesus put the matter as directly as it can be put, and the passage is the hinge of this entire section:

> If anyone desires to come after Me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow Me. For whoever desires to save his life [soul] will lose it, but whoever loses his life [soul] for My sake will find it. For what profit is it to a man if he gains the whole world, and loses his own soul [life]? Or what will a man give in exchange for his soul [life]? For the Son of Man will come in the glory of His Father with His angels, and then He will reward each according to his works. (Matt. 16:24-27)

Four occurrences of *psuche* — "life," "life," "soul," "soul," all one word in the Greek — and then, in the very next breath, the Son of Man coming in glory and rewarding each according to his works. The soul saved or lost, and the recompense at His coming, in one continuous sentence from Christ's own mouth. He is not describing how a person first comes to God; He is describing what a man does with the life he already has, and what is rendered to him for it.

John records the same teaching with the outcome named: "He who loves his life/soul will lose it, and he who hates his life/soul in this world will keep it for eternal life... If anyone serves Me, him My Father will honor" (John 12:25-26). The *psuche* poured out; age-lasting life kept; honor from the Father. (The English "eternal life" renders the Greek *zoe aionios*, which reads more literally as life belonging to an age. The section on *aion* and *aionios* below works out what that means and why the difference matters; for now it's enough that the life John names here is the one kept by the man who let his soul go.) And the overcomers of Revelation are described by precisely this refusal to hold onto the soul: "they did not love their lives/souls to the death" (Rev. 12:11).

Jesus states the pairing itself in one other place, and it belongs here even though its vocabulary belongs to a separate discussion. Sending out the Twelve, He tells them not to fear those who kill the body but can't kill the soul, but rather to fear Him "who is able to destroy both soul and body in hell" (Matt. 10:28). Men can reach the body and cannot reach the soul. God deals with both together. That is the link this section has been drawing out of Leviticus, stated by Christ in a single sentence — and Luke records the same teaching on a different occasion, spoken to the disciples first while a crowd of thousands pressed in around them (Luke 12:1), where Jesus names His hearers before He warns them: "And I say to you, My friends, do not be afraid of those who kill the body, and after that have no more that they can do" (Luke 12:4). What "destroy" means there, and what Gehenna is, are questions belonging to the vocabulary of the afterlife and are taken up separately in this project. The pairing is the point here.

Now the connection this section exists to make. If the soul's life is bound to the body, then a future verdict rendered on the soul can't leave the body untouched. The two are evaluated together and awarded together. A soul saved for the coming age requires a body fit to live in that age: a body transformed, and "conformed to His glorious body" (Phil. 3:20-21).

Glory is not decoration. It's the covering necessary to stand in the presence of the One whose glory it is, and to reign alongside Him. That is why the same conditional attaches to both in the same sentence — "joint heirs with Christ, **if indeed we suffer with Him**, that we may also be glorified together" (Rom. 8:17) — and why Paul states the pairing again as a couplet: "If we died with Him, we shall also live with Him. If we endure, we shall also reign with Him" (2 Tim. 2:11-12). Suffering with, glorified with. Enduring, reigning. The condition is one; the outcomes come together.

The bridal imagery says it once more, in the vocabulary of covering: at the marriage of the Lamb "Let us be glad and rejoice and give Him glory, for the marriage of the Lamb has come, and His wife has made herself ready. And to her it was granted to be arrayed in fine linen, clean and bright, for the fine linen is the righteous acts of the saints" (Rev. 19:7-8). She *made herself* ready – she did the righteous acts necessary, she lost her life to pick it up again. And because of that it was “granted” to her to be “arrayed” with a wedding garment — a covering supplied, not possessed automatically, based on actions done by the one receiving it.

So the second and third tenses are not two separate awards. They are one verdict with two effects. The man who poured out his life finds it — soul saved for the age, body raised in the glory required to stand and reign with the Son as a co-heir. The man who spent his life saving it keeps it, and keeps it in the state he saved it in. Receive the one, receive the other. That is the whole of what the Judgment Seat renders, and it is why this paper has treated the soul's sanctification and the body's glorification as a single conditional rather than two.

Glorification — future tense, the body

With that link established, the third tense can be stated for what it is. It has to be stated in two steps, though, because collapsing them into one is what makes this doctrine sound like something it is not.

Everyone is raised. That comes first. Every Christian is resurrected into a body, and it's in that body that he stands at the Judgment Seat of Christ (2 Cor. 5:10). Resurrection is not the reward; it's what puts a man on his feet to be judged. Nothing in this system leaves the unfaithful Christian unraised or bodiless.

Not everyone is raised out. Paul names the second step with a word he uses nowhere else. Writing to the Philippians about knowing Jesus and the power of His resurrection, he adds: "if, by any means, I may attain to the resurrection from the dead" (Phil. 3:11). The Greek behind "resurrection" in that verse is *exanastasis* — an out-resurrection, a raising out from among — and it's not the word he had used one verse earlier for resurrection in general (*anastasis*, Phil. 3:10). The prefix is the whole point: raised *out* from among a larger company that was raised.

Everything around the verse says the same thing. "If, by any means, I may attain" is not how a man speaks of what he already holds, and Paul was not a man whose standing before God was in question. He says so himself in the next breath: "Not that I have already attained, or am already perfected; but I press on, that I may lay hold of that for which Christ Jesus has also laid hold of me" (Phil. 3:12). Something is being pressed toward, by a justified man, decades in.

What is given to those raised out is a covering of glory, and Paul states the differing before he states the raising:

> There is one glory of the sun, another glory of the moon, and another glory of the stars; for one star differs from another star in glory. So also is the resurrection of the dead. The body is sown in corruption, it is raised in incorruption. It is sown in dishonor, it is raised in glory. (1 Cor. 15:41-43)

One star differs from another star in glory — *so also* is the resurrection of the dead. The differing comes first and the sowing and raising follow, which is why "raised in glory" cannot be read as one flat outcome handed out to all alike.

This is why Scripture speaks of glory as a **hope** rather than a possession. "Christ in you, the hope of glory" (Col. 1:27). "For we were saved in this hope, but hope that is seen is not hope; for why does one still hope for what he sees? But if we hope for what we do not see, we eagerly wait for it with perseverance" (Rom. 8:24-25) — hope, with perseverance attached to it in the same sentence. God renders "eternal life" ("age-lasting life" or “life for the age”) to those who "by patient continuance in doing good seek for glory, honor, and immortality" (Rom. 2:7), and gives "glory, honor, and peace to everyone who works what is good" (Rom. 2:10). Present affliction "is working for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory" ("age-lasting glory" — the same adjective, here attached to the glory rather than to the life; 2 Cor. 4:17). God ordained a hidden wisdom "before the ages for our glory" (1 Cor. 2:7), and calls Christians to "walk worthy of God who calls you into His own kingdom and glory" (1 Thess. 2:12). Hoped for, sought, worked out, walked worthy of. None of that vocabulary belongs to something already in hand.

All have "sinned and fall short of the glory of God" (Rom. 3:23). That falling short is the deficiency the third tense answers, and it is answered at the resurrection or not at all.

So the third tense stands like this. Glorification is not "what happens to everyone's body at the resurrection." It is a **reward**: the out-resurrection, and the covering of glory given with it, granted to those whose souls are saved at the Judgment Seat of Christ (2 Cor. 5:10) and necessary for them to reign bodily with Jesus during the thousand-year kingdom (Rev. 20:4-6; 2 Tim. 2:11-13). The Christian who was justified but never sanctified in this sense keeps the spiritual life given at initial justification, secure and untouched (Eph. 2:1, 5). He is raised. He stands at the Judgment Seat in a body. But he is not raised out, no covering of glory is given him, and without it there's no standing with Christ and no reigning (Matt. 25:14-30; 1 Cor. 6:9-10). Scripture describes what follows for such a man in language this paper doesn't attempt to define — the darkness outside, weeping and gnashing of teeth (Matt. 25:30; 22:13). Those terms belong to the companion paper on the vocabulary of the afterlife, and this paper defers to it rather than settling them here.

One event, and Scripture pictures it more than one way. "Taken out" is how the first bride came to be, through a deep sleep and a side opened (Gen. 2:21-23), and the fine linen granted at the marriage of the Lamb is the covering side of that same picture (Rev. 19:8). A raising out, a covering supplied, a bride taken from among the raised — one event under several vocabularies. Who the Bride is, and why she is taken out rather than identical with the body, is set out in the companion paper on the Judgment Seat.

One of the citations above is routinely read as a description of the unsaved, and its context doesn't carry that reading. Paul tells the Corinthians that "the unrighteous will not inherit the kingdom of God," lists the behaviors, and then says, "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 and by the Spirit of our God" (1 Cor. 6:9-11). He builds the same warning twice more, to the Ephesians whom he has just called dear children and saints (Eph. 5:5; cf. 5:1, 3), and to the Galatians in a passage addressed to brethren that opens "walk in the Spirit" (Gal. 5:21; cf. 5:13, 16). Three passages, one construction, each addressed to Christians, and each using the vocabulary of **inheritance** — which decides the matter, because an inheritance is what an heir receives, not what makes him one. The grammatical and lexical case for that reading, including what Paul does with *adikeo* and *adikos* in consecutive verses, is worked out in full in the companion paper on the Judgment Seat.

The walk that decides it: Romans 8 and Galatians 5

The three passages just examined all name the same deciding factor, and Paul names it outright rather than leaving the reader to infer it. In both of the letters where he sets this out at length, he makes the question a question about **walking** — and he builds the whole structure this paper has been describing, in order, inside a single stretch of text.

Galatians runs the shorter version. The passage opens with an instruction to the church he is writing to (Gal. 1:2): "Walk in the Spirit, and you shall not fulfill the lust of the flesh" (Gal. 5:16). It lists the works of the flesh against the fruit of the Spirit (Gal. 5:19-23). It closes on forfeiture: those who practice such things "will not inherit the kingdom of God" (Gal. 5:21). And one chapter later Paul states the outcome in the vocabulary this paper has been tracking throughout: "he who sows to his flesh will of the flesh reap corruption, but he who sows to the Spirit will of the Spirit reap everlasting life" (Gal. 6:8). Everlasting life ("age-lasting life") is **reaped**, from sowing — which is not how anyone describes a gift already received.

Romans 8 runs the same ground at greater length, and the order in which he lays it out is the order this paper has been setting out:

Paul here is also writing to the church, “saints” “beloved of God” (Rom. 1:7). He begins with the walk. Those who live according to the flesh set their minds on the things of the flesh; those who live according to the Spirit, on the things of the Spirit (Rom. 8:5). Then, addressing his readers as brethren, he states the stakes in life-and-death language: "if you live according to the flesh you will die; but if by the Spirit you put to death the deeds of the body, you will live" (Rom. 8:12-13). Given how this paper has defined those terms — death as separation, life as fellowship — that is a statement about the soul's present condition, addressed to men whose initial justification Paul never once puts in question.

From the walk he moves to sonship: "For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, these are sons of God" (Rom. 8:14). From sonship to heirship, with a condition attached: "and if children, then heirs — heirs of God and joint heirs with Christ, **if** indeed we suffer with Him, that we may also be glorified together" (Rom. 8:17). And from there to what is still outstanding: Christians who already have the firstfruits of the Spirit, still "eagerly waiting for the adoption, the redemption of our body" (Rom. 8:23).

Walk, then sonship, then conditional heirship, then a bodily redemption still awaited. Four steps, in that sequence, in one chapter, in Paul's own hand — and it's the same sequence this paper has

assembled from across the canon. Two letters, written to different churches about different problems, arriving at the same structure by the same route.

One verse from the end of that chapter is regularly set against all of it: "whom He justified, these He also glorified" (Rom. 8:30), read as proof that glorification is already complete and unconditional for everyone initially justified. That reading leans on an assumption English grammar imports and Greek doesn't require. The aorist tense encodes the shape of an action rather than necessarily its timing, and grammarians label uses like this one *gnomic* (a timeless general truth) or *proleptic* (a certain future event spoken of as already complete). Since Paul treats glorification as still future thirteen verses earlier and again seven verses later (Rom. 8:17, 23-25), the aorist here more likely expresses certainty of outcome than a completed past event. Grammar alone doesn't settle the passage — the objections section below takes up the fuller case, and concedes as much. What it does show is that verse 30 does not settle it either.

The hinge in Romans is verse 14, where the walk produces a designation — *sons* — that Paul doesn't apply automatically to everyone born of God. The New Testament's vocabulary for this is more precise than English lets on.

Sons, not merely children: the vocabulary of reward

New Testament Greek doesn't use one word for "child of God" — it uses two, and the distinction is important to see. Every Christian, without exception, is a **child** (Gk. *teknon*) of God, from the moment he's made alive, unconditionally, and this is as true of the newest Christian as of the most mature (Eph. 2:5; Rom. 8:16). But **son** (Gk. *huios*) is used more narrowly.

Three passages state the narrowing directly. Paul writes, "as many as are led by the Spirit of God, these are sons of God" (Rom. 8:14) — not "all who are initially born of God," but those *presently* walking in Spirit-led obedience. Jesus says the same in His own teaching: "blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called sons of God" (Matt. 5:9) — sonship attached to a present-tense characteristic rather than announced as the automatic standing of everyone born into God's family. And Hebrews puts it in the vocabulary of the household, telling its readers that "God deals with you as with sons" in the context of present discipline: "for what son is there whom a father does not chasten?" (Heb. 12:7). That passage goes on to warn that a Christian who refuses the discipline is, with respect to it, not being treated as a son at all (Heb. 12:8).

Galatians is sometimes brought in as a fourth example, but its context doesn't fit. "For you are all sons of God through faith in Christ Jesus" (Gal. 3:26) is universal and faith-based; a reader who checks it may think it's pointing the other way, contradicting what was said above. However, what Galatians contributes is something different, and the section below depends on it: *an order*. The letter moves from slavery under law to heirship, names the son-placing as the purpose of Christ's coming (Gal. 4:5), and then sets the sequence out in one line — "you are no longer a slave but a son, and if a son, then an heir of God through Christ" (Gal. 4:7). Slave, then son, then heir. The inheritance sits at the end of that line rather than at the start of it, and each term rests on the one before. That is why Galatians stands with Romans 8 and Hebrews 12 in what follows — not for the narrowing, and not as a claim about what any particular reader presently holds, but for the order itself.

So there are three states here, not two, and collapsing them is where the confusion starts. A person is a **child** from the moment he's made alive, and that is unconditional and permanent. He is a **son** now to the degree the spirit of adoption has actually reordered how he thinks and behaves — "you received the Spirit of adoption by whom we cry out, 'Abba, Father'" (Rom. 8:15), which is why the verse just before it speaks of being *led* (Rom. 8:14). And he is **placed as a firstborn son** later, at a future event, which is the subject of the rest of this section. The middle state is the one a man has a hand in. It is not the placement; it is the arrangement that qualifies a man for it, so that the title conferred later is conferred on someone already living as one.

This is not a threat to salvation itself — the "children" designation never disappears — but it's a real present-tense distinction with future consequences. Three separate New Testament passages (Rom. 8:14-23; Gal. 3:26-4:7; Heb. 12:5-8, 23) use "sons" in contexts paired with a still-future **adoption** (Gk. *huiothesia*, literally "son-placing" — Rom. 8:15, 23; Gal. 4:5; Eph. 1:5), the very term mainstream traditions typically read as synonymous with initial salvation itself.

Read as *son-placing*, the word names something a Christian doesn't yet possess: a future placement into the full standing of "firstborn" (cf. Jesus as God's firstborn by begetting, Heb. 1:6, and Israel as God's firstborn by a prior son-placing, Exod. 4:22-23; Rom. 9:4). Why is son-placement so significant? Because only sons rule in God's household, firstborn sons in particular. Children do not. Son-placing is placement into the position from which a man reigns, which is why Paul can move from sonship to heirship to being glorified together inside three verses (Rom. 8:14-17), and why Hebrews ties sonship to whether a man endures the Father's child-training, rather than to whether he was born into the family at all (Heb. 12:5-8).

Paul then names the son-placing and the body's redemption in one breath, as one thing: Christians "groan within ourselves, eagerly waiting for the adoption [son-placement], the redemption of our body" (Rom. 8:23). That is the equation this paper has been building toward, and it should be put in a single line. **Adoption, son-placement, the covering of glory, and the redemption of the body are one event under four names** — the out-resurrection described above, rendered at the Judgment Seat to those whose souls are saved there. They are not four benefits handed out separately, and not one of them is automatic.

The pattern is the one running through the whole of this paper: a permanent, unconditional standing (child / spirit / initial justification/initial salvation/born into the family) sits alongside a real, conditional one (son / salvation of the soul/ redemption of the body / sanctification and glorification) — and the New Testament's own vocabulary, not merely its logic, keeps the two apart. (This son-placing, and its connection to the Judgment Seat's verdict, is taken up more fully in the companion paper on the Judgment Seat.)

The mechanism: the Judgment Seat of Christ

All of this converges at a single future event — the Judgment Seat of Christ (2 Cor. 5:10; Rom. 14:10-12) — where the Christian's works, not their initial justification, are evaluated (1 Cor. 3:11-15). This judgment is not about sin's penalty, already paid at the cross (Col. 2:13-14), but about reward: whether the ongoing sanctification of the soul was faithfully carried out, and so whether

the salvation of the soul — age-lasting life, life for the age to come — and the glorification-as-reward bound to it will follow (Heb. 10:39; Jas. 1:21; Rev. 22:12; Col. 3:24).

Read in full, rather than as the half-verse it's often quoted as, Paul's own statement in Romans 8:1 actually supports this conditional structure rather than standing against it: "There is therefore now no condemnation to those who are in Christ Jesus, who do not walk according to the flesh, but according to the Spirit" (Rom. 8:1). The promise of no condemnation is not issued without qualification — it's explicitly attached to those presently walking according to the Spirit. That scoping is the point, and it should be stated carefully rather than pushed further than it goes. The verse does not say that condemnation falls on the Christian who walks according to the flesh; it says the promise of no condemnation is issued to the one who does not. Those are different claims, and only the second is Paul's. What the qualifying clause establishes is that the promise has a boundary — not that a threat lies on the other side of it. This is precisely the soul-level, conditional judgment the Judgment Seat evaluates — not a re-litigation of the spirit's already-settled justification, but the very thing Romans 8:1, read whole, already anticipates.

Several widely used modern translations print only the verse's first clause and drop the qualifier entirely. They are not being careless. The qualifying clause is absent from the earliest surviving manuscripts and most textual scholars judge it to have been carried up from Romans 8:4, where the same words appear undisputed. So this is not simply a case of translators omitting something Paul wrote; it's a genuine disagreement about what Paul wrote, and it should be presented as one — exactly as the companion paper "Let God Be True" presents the comma at Luke 23:43. What can be said without depending on the disputed clause is that Romans 8:4 states the same qualification in the same chapter, in text no one disputes, and Romans 8:5-14 spends ten verses drawing the distinction between walking after the flesh and after the Spirit. The conditional structure is in the chapter whether or not it is in verse 1.

The linguistic hinge: aion and aionios

Aion and *aionios* — the Greek words underlying most of the New Testament's "eternal" language — carry one sense, and it's not the sense the English carries. *Aion* is an age. *Aionios* is its adjective: pertaining to an age, or to the ages. That is what the word says wherever it stands, and this paper reads it that way at every occurrence rather than trading it for a second meaning when a verse turns difficult.

What varies from verse to verse is not the word but what it modifies. Scripture's own stated subject matter, laid out from the seven-day structure of Genesis 1 forward, is a bounded story — 6,000 years of "Man's Day" followed by a 1,000-year "Day of the Lord," seven thousand years in total (Gen. 1:1-2:3; 2 Pet. 3:8). This is the stage the whole of Scripture is narrating. A life, a kingdom, a punishment, an inheritance, a reward are things that happen on that stage, so where *aion* or *aionios* modifies one of them, the age in view is what measures it (Matt. 12:32; Eph. 2:7). God is not on the stage. He built it. The single verse that calls Him *aionios* is taken up later in this section, and read plainly it says exactly that.

This reading is reinforced by how ancient Hebrew and Greek actually conceived of time in the first place. Neither language was built around "endless duration" as a default category the way modern

Western English is; both organized time around bounded, successive periods — *olam* in Hebrew, *aion* in Greek — with genuine endlessness, where present, expressed by repetition “unto the ages of the ages,” Gal. 1:5; 1 Tim. 1:17) or by the nature of the subject rather than supplied automatically by the word itself.

Paul's doxology at 1 Timothy 1:17 does it twice in one breath, and the English hides both. It reads "King eternal... forever and ever," but the Greek contains neither *aionios* nor any word meaning endless. It opens *basilei tōn aiōnōn* — King of the ages — and closes *eis tous aiōnas tōn aiōnōn*, unto the ages of the ages. Where a writer wanted to reach past every bound, this is how he reached: by piling ages on ages, in a sentence where the adjective that supposedly means "endless" would have done the job in one word had it meant that. Reaching for "eternal = forever and ever" as the default translation is therefore itself a modern, imported assumption rather than a neutral rendering of the underlying language.

Read this way, "eternal life" as a fixed New Testament phrase names the age-bound, reward-oriented life of reigning with Jesus during the coming kingdom (Matt. 19:29; Luke 18:30; Gal. 6:8; 1 Tim. 6:12, 19) — the very distinction that lets Matthew 19's rich young ruler passage read the way it does. John's use of the phrase is the one most often raised against this reading, and it's taken up among the objections rather than passed over here. The permanent spiritual life given at initial justification is real and immediate, but Scripture describes it with different vocabulary: a man is made alive the moment he believes — "even when we were dead in trespasses, made us alive together with Christ" (Eph. 2:5; cf. Col. 2:13), which the King James renders "hath quickened us together with Christ." The whole phrase is one compound verb in the Greek, *synezoopoiesen* [made alive together with], and it stands in these two places and nowhere else in the New Testament. That is a completed, past-tense transition from spiritual death to spiritual life, not the same phrase used for the future, conditional reward.

This reading gains independent support from the pattern of the phrase's own arrival in Scripture. Search the Old Testament for "eternal life" as a fixed phrase and it surfaces, in substance, exactly once — Daniel's vision of a coming resurrection, "many of those who sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life [Heb. *chayei olam*], some to shame and everlasting contempt" (Dan. 12:2), a text Jesus Himself echoes directly in describing "the resurrection of life" (John 5:28-29) and Paul explicitly invokes before Felix (Acts 24:14-15). Elsewhere the Old Testament gestures toward the same hope without ever naming it this way — Job's confidence that his Redeemer would one day stand upon the earth and that he would see God "in my flesh" (Job 19:25-27), David's trust that God wouldn't abandon him to Sheol (Ps. 16:10; cf. Acts 2:27, 31), Isaiah's promise that the dead would live again (Isa. 26:19). Then, after Christ's own resurrection — described as "firstfruits" of exactly this reality (1 Cor. 15:20, 23) — and after Paul's disclosure of what had been kept hidden "in other ages" but was "now revealed unto His holy apostles and prophets" (Eph. 3:5; cf. Col. 1:26), "eternal life" becomes one of the New Testament's most repeated phrases, anchoring John's Gospel and running through Paul's letters and the general epistles alike. This is the same type-and-antitype pattern already at work in this paper's Exodus parallel above: Daniel's singular, undeveloped anticipation is the type; the New Testament's fully unpacked phrase is the antitype, arriving only once its own antecedent event — a witnessed resurrection, and a formerly hidden mystery disclosed — had actually occurred. Were "eternal life" instead a flat, timeless truth simply

true of the redeemed as such, its near-total absence from the Old Testament would be difficult to explain; its late, dateable arrival is exactly what this paper's reading of *aionios* would predict.

"The eternal God": one verse, and one sentence that settles it.

The obvious challenge to everything above is "the eternal God." If *aionios* means pertaining to an age, does calling God eternal make Him age-bounded?

Start by counting. Romans 16:26 — *tou aioniou theou*, "the everlasting God" — is the **only** verse in the New Testament where the adjective *aionios* takes God Himself, *theos*, as its grammatical subject. Not one of several. The only one.

Romans 1:20 is often produced as a second instance and is not one. "His eternal power and Godhead" uses a different Greek word altogether — *aidios*, which appears just twice in the New Testament, here and in Jude 6's everlasting chains. It is a real second witness pointing the same direction, but anyone treating it as an *aionios* datum has made a mistake, and this paper does not build on it as though it were.

Now read the one verse in its own sentence, because Paul uses the adjective **twice** there and the first use decides the second. Romans 16:25-27 is a single sentence in Greek. Verse 25 speaks of the mystery "kept secret since the world began" — *chronois aioniois*, age-times, times pertaining to the ages. Nobody renders that "eternal times"; it's plainly and unavoidably age-vocabulary. Then verse 26 calls God *aionios*. The same adjective, a few words apart, from one pen in one breath.

Read it consistently and the sentence says one thing: the mystery was held silent through the ages, and is now made known by the command of **the God of the ages** — the God to whom the ages belong, who appointed them and presides over them. That reading takes the adjective at its plain sense in both places. The alternative asks the word to abandon its own meaning once, in the second half of the sentence where it had just carried it in the first.

Paul says the same thing elsewhere in noun form, and so does Hebrews. "Now to the King of the ages" is his own construction (1 Tim. 1:17), and Hebrews says God made "the worlds" through His Son — *tous aionas*, the ages (Heb. 1:2; cf. Heb. 11:3). Behind all of it stands Abraham calling on *El Olam*, God of the age or ages, by the very Hebrew word the Greek *aion* translates (Gen. 21:33).

So there's no exception to carve out, and no second rule. **The word means one thing everywhere: pertaining to the age or the ages.** What differs is how the thing named stands to those ages. A kingdom, a covenant, an inheritance, a glory, a judgment, a life — all of these are things that happen *inside* the ages, so the age in view bounds them (2 Pet. 1:11; Heb. 13:20; Heb. 9:15; 2 Tim. 2:10; Heb. 6:2). God stands to the ages as their Maker and Lord. Making a thing does not put you inside it. One rule, applied the same way every time, rather than two rules stitched together.

English does this constantly, and no one stumbles over it. A *musical evening* is an evening filled with music; a *musical director* is not a director who is musical, but the director set over the music. A *criminal act* is an act that is criminal; a *criminal lawyer* is not a criminal, but a lawyer whose work is over criminal matters. A *moral man* is a man who is moral; a *moral philosopher* may or may not be, since he is a philosopher of morals. In every pair the adjective holds still and means one thing — having to do with music, with crime, with morals. What decides the relation is the noun it lands on: a thing that the subject fills and characterizes, or a person set over it.

That is the whole of what happens between "eternal life" and "the eternal God." The life is filled and measured by the age it belongs to. God is set over the ages He made. No one hearing "criminal lawyer" concludes the man is a criminal — and no one should hear "God of the ages" and conclude He is bounded by them.

Kittel's *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, in Hermann Sasse's article on *aion*/*aionios*, sorts the New Testament's uses into three groups — of God (Rom. 16:26); of divine possessions and gifts (2 Cor. 4:18; Heb. 9:14; 1 Pet. 5:10; 2 Thess. 2:16); and of the kingdom, inheritance, body, and judgment (2 Pet. 1:11; Heb. 9:15; 2 Cor. 5:1; Heb. 6:2). One entry in the first group; everything else in the second and third. That is the shape this reading predicts.

And none of this makes God a creature of time. Calling God the God of the ages says the ages are His, not that He is inside them. Scripture teaches His timelessness on other ground entirely, and never leans on this adjective to do it: "I AM WHO I AM" (Exod. 3:14); "Before Me there was no God formed, nor shall there be after Me" (Isa. 43:10); "Before the mountains were brought forth, or ever You had formed the earth and the world, even from everlasting to everlasting, You are God" (Ps. 90:2). Look closely at that last one, because it does exactly what this paper has already described: where the psalmist wants to say *without any bound at all*, he does not reach for a single word meaning endless — he doubles the age-word, from age to age.

Genesis says the same thing from the other direction. The measures by which men reckon time are themselves things God made and handed to us: the lights in the firmament were set "for signs and seasons, and for days and years" (Gen. 1:14). Days, years, and seasons are appointments — established on the fourth day, for man's use, by One who was already there to establish them. The One who hung the clock is not governed by it.

Two sets of texts press hardest against this rule — Matthew 25:46, which puts the same adjective on both sides of a single sentence, and Hebrews 5:9's "eternal salvation" alongside Hebrews 9:12's "eternal redemption." Both are taken up in the objections section below, where the rule stated here is tested against them.

Where They Align

Set the position back alongside the three traditions — Reformed/Calvinist, Wesleyan/Arminian, and Catholic — and the common ground runs wider than the disagreements suggest. Four points:

- **Salvation by grace through faith alone**, for the initial, unrepeatable act of justification (Eph. 2:8-9; Acts 15:7-11) — this is common ground with the Reformed and broader evangelical tradition, not a point of departure.
- **Man's inability apart from grace** — that a man is spiritually dead before faith, and cannot move toward God on his own, is affirmed across all these traditions, though not on identical terms: the Wesleyan account supplies a prevenient grace that restores the ability to respond, and the Catholic account works through baptismal grace (Eph. 2:1-3; Rom. 5:12).
- **The seriousness of the Christian life** — the conviction that how a Christian lives matters, and is not a matter of indifference, is shared, though for different reasons, with the Wesleyan-Arminian and Catholic traditions (2 Cor. 5:10; Gal. 6:7-8).

- **The vocabulary itself** — "justification," "sanctification," and "glorification" are not invented terms. They are drawn from the same theological lexicon mainstream Christianity has used for centuries (Rom. 5:1; 1 Thess. 5:23; Rom. 8:30). The disagreement is over whether all three are *guaranteed* to the same person (Rom. 8:29-30), or whether the second and third are *conditional* upon a faithfulness that can fail (Ezek. 18:24; 2 Pet. 1:10).

Where They Diverge, and Why

The root: what salvation is happening to

Every account of salvation answers one question before it answers any other. Salvation is happening to something, and what that something is decides the shape of everything said afterward.

Across all three traditions the answer is a man. He is saved, and what is saved is him — one person, one thing received, held as a unit. The Westminster Confession says the effectually called can neither totally nor finally fall from the state of grace and shall certainly persevere to the end (WCF 17.1). Wesley's Articles say a Christian may depart from grace given and fall into sin, with repentance open to such as truly repent (Article XII). The Catechism describes a justification conferred in Baptism and sustained by grace in cooperation with it, oriented toward eternal life (CCC 1992, 2010). Three different accounts of what can happen to the thing. One shared account of what the thing is.

And that shared account settles in advance where the New Testament's conditional language can go. If salvation is one possession belonging to one man, then every text that hangs an outcome on a Christian's faithfulness has only three places to land: the works are evidence of a possession already secure, or they're the measure of whether the possession is kept or walked away from, or they're cooperation with a grace still completing its work. Reformed theology takes the first, Wesleyan-Arminian the second, Catholic the third — and the three-way argument between them, real and old and sharp as it is, happens entirely inside the one assumption none of them examines: that what is saved is one man, and that whatever is done for him is done to all of him at once.

Word of the Kingdom theology answers that prior question differently, and the answer is where the divergence begins. Man is three parts, made so by a direct act of God at his creation (Gen. 2:7) and named as three when Paul prays that "your whole spirit, soul, and body be preserved blameless at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ" (1 Thess. 5:23), and when Hebrews describes the word of God as "piercing even to the division of soul and spirit" (Heb. 4:12). Death came by sin (Rom. 5:12) and is what sin pays (Rom. 6:23), and it took each of the three in its own way. Justification is a judgment rendered. So a judgment falls due for more than one part, and the two are not rendered at the same time.

Everything else in this comparison hangs off that one answer. The tense question, the vocabulary question, the Judgment Seat, the reward — none of them arises at all for a reading that holds man to be a unit, and every one of them is unavoidable for a reading that doesn't. The whole structure therefore rests on a case the objections section below concedes is cumulative rather than decisive.

Dichotomy is a serious position, held by serious readers, and this is where the disagreement should be pressed rather than anywhere downstream of it.

What the root does to the vocabulary

Both sides read the same words, and the answer to that prior question decides what the words are able to mean. "Saved," "eternal life," "inherit," "enter the kingdom" — these appear on every page of the argument, quoted by both sides, and usually neither side stops to ask which sense it's using. If salvation is one thing happening to one man, the words have one referent wherever they stand, and a text that sounds conditional has to be fitted into one of the three slots above. If salvation touches three parts on three timetables, the question has to be asked fresh at each occurrence: saved from what, and when?

Mainstream theology's single referent is not merely an assumption carried in from elsewhere. It rests on texts preached constantly and quoted for good reason — Jesus' own promise that "I give them eternal life, and they shall never perish" (John 10:28), and John's stated purpose in writing his first epistle, "that you may know that you have eternal life" (1 John 5:13). Given, present tense, and knowable now. Read that way, "eternal life" names a settled possession, and every future-tense or conditional use of the phrase has to be brought into line with it.

Word of the Kingdom theology reads the same vocabulary the other way. "Eternal life," and the phrases traveling with it, name the age-bound reward of the coming kingdom (Matt. 19:29; Luke 18:30; Gal. 6:8; 1 Tim. 6:12, 19), while the permanent life given the moment a man believes is described in vocabulary of its own — made alive, quickened, born of the Spirit (Eph. 2:1, 5; Col. 2:13). Two sets of words for two things, rather than one word stretched over both.

Neither of those Johannine texts is being set aside; both are taken up directly in the objections below, where the answer is given and its limits are marked. But notice how early the disagreement has already happened. A reader arrives at John 10:28 having decided what kind of thing Jesus is giving when He gives eternal life, and he decided it back at the question of whether man is one part or three. The verse doesn't settle that question. It inherits the answer.

James 2 and Ephesians 2

Every tradition has to reckon with the tension between Paul's "not of works" (Eph. 2:8-9) and James's "faith without works is dead" (Jas. 2:14-26). Mainstream theology resolves it by making works the *evidence* of a faith already fully saving — leaning heavily on James's own illustration, "show me your faith without your works, and I will show you my faith by my works" (Jas. 2:18), read as proof that genuine faith simply cannot help but produce works, not as a condition attached to a separate stage of salvation. Word of the Kingdom theology resolves the same tension by making works the *determinant* of a second, later, and truly conditional aspect of that same salvation — sanctification and its reward, glorification (Jas. 1:21; Heb. 10:39). Same tension, same texts, structurally different resolution.

Purgatory and the Judgment Seat

Catholic teaching and Word of the Kingdom theology both put a real evaluation between a Christian's death and his final condition, and both take unfinished sanctification seriously enough to do something about it. They part on what that evaluation does. Purgatory completes: it finishes what sanctification left undone, so that the person is fit to enter the joy of heaven (CCC 1030), and heaven once entered is unconditional. The Judgment Seat determines: what it renders is not only a measure but a verdict, the salvation of the soul and the covering of glory to some and to others neither (1 Cor. 3:11-15; 2 Cor. 5:10). The question between one Christian and another is not only how much, but whether.

Both accounts reach for the same passage, and the companion paper on the Judgment Seat works out the comparison at length there.

The downstream shift: from assurance to incentive

Perhaps the most practically significant consequence is this: mainstream soteriology is organized, pastorally, around the question "How can I know I am saved?" (1 John 5:13). Word of the Kingdom theology, having already answered that question permanently and simply at initial justification (Rom. 11:29), reorganizes the Christian life around a different question — the one Jesus Himself put to anyone who would follow Him, in the terms of a life poured out or held onto (Matt. 16:24-27, treated above): what do I stand to gain or lose? (cf. Rev. 22:12). Assurance and incentive sit together comfortably enough, but they produce very different spiritualities.

Case Study: The Rich Young Ruler (Matthew 19:16-29)

This passage is the clearest test case for the whole system, because both readings use the same words. Here is the encounter itself:

> Now behold, one came and said to Him, "Good Teacher, what good thing shall I do that I may have eternal life?" So He said to him, "Why do you call Me good? No one is good but One, that is, God. But if you want to enter into life, keep the commandments." He said to Him, "Which ones?" Jesus said, "'You shall not murder,' 'You shall not commit adultery,' 'You shall not steal,' 'You shall not bear false witness,' 'Honor your father and your mother,' and, 'You shall love your neighbor as yourself.'" The young man said to Him, "All these things I have kept from my youth. What do I still lack?" Jesus said to him, "If you want to be perfect, go, sell what you have and give to the poor, and you will have treasure in heaven; and come, follow Me." But when the young man heard that saying, he went away sorrowful, for he had great possessions. (Matt. 19:16-22)

What follows in the chapter is the disciples' astonishment, Jesus' saying about the rich and the kingdom, and the promise about those who have left all to follow Him (Matt. 19:23-29).

Read through the mainstream lens, this is a soteriological question in the ordinary sense — how does one become saved at all (Rom. 3:20) — and Jesus' answer is read as exposing the ruler's false trust in his own righteousness (Phil. 3:9), driving him toward the need for grace (Eph. 2:8-9). On this reading, the ruler's claim to have kept the commandments (Matt. 19:20) is itself part of the problem: he has kept the law only outwardly, blind to its deeper spiritual demands (cf. Matt. 5:21-

22, 27-28), and Jesus' command to sell everything is meant to expose an idolatry — trust in wealth rather than God — that the ruler's own self-assessment had missed (Matt. 19:22; Gal. 2:16).

Read through Word of the Kingdom theology, the ruler's claim to have kept the commandments is not treated as self-deception to be exposed. It's taken at face value, consistent with Mark's detail that Jesus, hearing it, "looking at him, loved him" (Mark 10:21) rather than rebuking him. On this reading, the ruler is a just man being invited to a further level of obedience, not someone whose righteousness needed exposing. He is addressed as a man already within the covenant community, and the question concerns *entering the kingdom* (Matt. 19:23-24) — the future, reward-bearing aspect of salvation, not the initial one. Jesus' instruction to sell all he has (Matt. 19:21) is read not as a universal condition of initial salvation but as this particular man's path to the kind of sanctified, self-denying obedience that leads to inheriting — that is, to glorification and rulership in the age to come (Matt. 19:29; cf. Luke 18:30, "age-lasting life"). Nor does this instruction set aside the commandments Jesus had just affirmed; the call to sell everything and follow Him is not a pivot away from the law-keeping already discussed, as though continued obedience to it could now be dispensed with, but an additional, further step built directly on top of it — the commandments remain the floor, not a stage now superseded. The disciples' astonished question, "who then can be saved?" (Matt. 19:25), and Jesus' answer about the impossible being possible "with God" (Matt. 19:26) are read, in this system, as being about entering the *kingdom* (Matt. 19:23-24), not about initial justification.

Same text. Same Greek. Two entirely different doctrines of what is actually being offered and withheld.

Answering the Objections

The case has now been stated, compared, and tested against a passage both sides claim. What follows is what the other side says back, in the strongest form it can be put. Seven objections matter. The first is the one most often raised.

"Romans 8:29-30 is an unbroken chain"

The charge. Paul writes five verbs in a row, and carries the same group through every one of them: whom He foreknew, He predestined; whom He predestined, He called; whom He called, He justified; "whom He justified, **these** He also glorified" (Rom. 8:29-30). The pronoun does the damage. Not *some* of these — these. Every link holds the same people. A system requiring that some of the justified are never glorified breaks the chain Paul welded shut, and the grammatical observation offered above about the aorist tense doesn't touch the problem, because the problem is not when the glorifying happens. It is who it happens to.

The answer. The concession made earlier stands: the aorist alone is not sufficient. Grammar can establish that "glorified" need not describe a completed past event. It cannot by itself establish that the group narrows.

What can establish it is Paul, in the same chapter, thirteen verses earlier. "And if children, then heirs — heirs of God and joint heirs with Christ, **if indeed we suffer with Him, that we may also be**

glorified together" (Rom. 8:17). There is the condition, in the same passage, in the same breath, attached to the same word. Being glorified together with Christ is stated as contingent on something. If verse 30 meant unconditional glorification for every justified person, Paul contradicted himself inside one chapter — and he did it in the space of thirteen verses, which is not the behavior of a careful writer.

Six verses after the condition, Paul describes his readers — people already justified, already indwelt — as those who "groan within ourselves, eagerly waiting for the adoption, the redemption of our body" (Rom. 8:23). Still waiting. Still ahead. Said of the justified, by the same author, in the same chapter as verse 30. And on the reading set out above, that adoption is the *son-placing*, which is the covering of glory, which is the body's redemption — one event under several names. Verse 23 therefore has the justified still waiting on the very thing verse 30 is quoted to prove they already have.

So the passage contains three data points, not one: a stated condition (v. 17), a stated future expectation (v. 23), and a chain in the aorist (v. 30). Any reading has to hold all three. The question is only which verse interprets which. Reading verse 30 in light of verses 17 and 23 yields a chain describing God's purpose — Paul's own stated subject at verse 28 is "those who are the called according to His purpose," and verse 29's stated goal is conformity to the image of the Son — expressed with the certainty of something God has determined, not a headcount guaranteeing that no individual within the called forfeits anything along the way. Reading verses 17 and 23 in light of verse 30 requires explaining away an explicit conditional and an explicit "not yet."

This answer is not a knock-down, and it shouldn't be presented as one. It's a claim about which verses govern, and a reader may weigh that differently. But the objection as usually stated — that Paul leaves no room for a conditional glorification — cannot survive verse 17 sitting where it sits.

"John 10:28 and 1 John 5:13 settle the matter"

The charge. Christ says of His sheep, "I give them eternal life, and they shall never perish" (John 10:28) — given, present tense, and secured against perishing. And John states the purpose of his first epistle outright: "These things I have written to you who believe in the name of the Son of God, that you may **know that you have** eternal life" (1 John 5:13). Have. Present tense. Knowable now. If eternal life is a future, conditional, age-bounded reward that a Christian might forfeit, then John wrote an entire letter to give his readers assurance of something they cannot actually be assured of, and the letter's stated purpose collapses.

The answer. The two verses need separate handling, and only one of them yields easily.

John 10:28 is the more straightforward. Read the whole sentence and the next one: "neither shall anyone snatch them out of My hand. My Father, who has given them to Me, is greater than all; and no one is able to snatch them out of My Father's hand" (John 10:28-29). The danger named twice, in successive verses, is external seizure. The claim is about God's keeping power against anything that would take His sheep from Him — and that claim is affirmed here without qualification or reservation. Nothing in the passage addresses whether a kept sheep receives the same recompense as every other kept sheep.

First John 5:13 needs the Greek on the page, because the English hides what the letter is doing.

"To you who believe" translates *tois pisteuousin* — a **present** participle. Not *to those who once believed*, but *to the ones believing*, ongoing. The verse then closes by naming its second aim: "and that you may continue to believe in the name of the Son of God," *pisteuete*, present subjunctive. The verse is addressed to people currently in the act of believing, and part of what John wants for them is that they stay there. Verse 12 is built the same way: "He who has the Son" is *ho echon*, present participle — *the one having*.

That is not a peculiarity of chapter five. It's how the whole letter is written. "Now by this we know that we know Him, if we keep His commandments" — *teromen*, present subjunctive, *if we keep on keeping* (1 John 2:3). Then a run of present participles, each naming a man by what he is doing now: the one saying he knows Him, the one not keeping His commandments, the one loving his brother, the one hating his brother (1 John 2:4-11). John is not sorting people into classes they entered once. He is describing what a man is doing at present, and what follows from it at present.

And John attaches the phrase "eternal life" to that same conditional structure himself, in the same letter, in one continuous sentence: "Therefore let that abide in you which you heard from the beginning. If what you heard from the beginning abides in you, you also will abide in the Son and in the Father. **And this is the promise that He has promised us — eternal life**" (1 John 2:24-25). An abiding condition, then the promise of eternal life hung directly off it. A promise, moreover, is a thing not yet in hand.

Four verses later he names where the payoff falls: "abide in Him, that when He appears we may have confidence and not be ashamed before Him at His coming" (1 John 2:28; cf. 4:17, "boldness in the day of judgment"). Confidence *at His coming*, conditioned on abiding now. And he can speak of eternal life as something that may or may not be present in a man already inside the family: "Whoever hates his brother is a murderer, and you know that no murderer has eternal life **abiding** in him" (1 John 3:15) — *menousan*, present participle, written to Christians about Christians.

This is the same structure Jesus gives in the vine: "Abide in Me, and I in you... if anyone does not abide in Me, he is cast out as a branch and is withered... By this My Father is glorified, that you bear much fruit" (John 15:4-8). Believing and abiding are not two different things in John's vocabulary; they are one continuing faith described from two sides, which is why he moves between them without explaining himself.

So the assurance of 5:13 is real, and it's exactly as wide as John made it: **the ones presently believing may know that they presently have.** That is not the announcement of a possession no walk can touch. It is the letter's own conditional structure, stated in the letter's own vocabulary — and the confidence it produces is confidence at His coming, which is precisely where this paper has located the second and third tenses all along.

Two limits belong on the record. A present participle can serve as a plain designation — "believers" — without pressing its aspect, so the participle alone wouldn't carry this. What carries it is 2:24-25, 2:28 and 3:15, where John states the conditionality in so many words. And the closing clause of 5:13, "that you may continue to believe," stands in the Greek text behind the King James and New King James versions; most modern versions end the verse a few words earlier. The case above does not depend on it.

"This is works-salvation with extra steps"

The charge. The paper affirms grace loudly at justification and then makes everything a Christian actually receives — glorification, reigning, inheritance, the thing the New Testament calls eternal life — depend on his own performance. Calling the conditioned part "reward" rather than "salvation" is a relabeling, not a distinction. The substance is the same: work hard enough and you get the good outcome; fail and you don't. That is the arrangement Paul spent Galatians demolishing.

The answer. The distinction holds because Scripture makes it, and makes it in the same letters to the same congregations without any sense of strain.

Paul tells the Ephesians they're saved by grace through faith, "not of works, lest anyone should boast" (Eph. 2:8-9). Paul tells the Corinthians that "we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ, that each one may receive the things done in the body, according to what he has done, whether good or bad" (2 Cor. 5:10). If works-evaluated-for-outcome were a contradiction of grace, the same apostle held both positions simultaneously and never noticed.

He puts them in a single paragraph at 1 Corinthians 3:11-15. The foundation is laid and cannot be relaid. The work built on it is tested by fire. Some of it burns. And the builder "will be saved, yet so as through fire." Loss and security in four verses, with no suggestion that the second is threatened by the first.

The structural answer is this: what is conditioned here is never entrance into God's family, and never standing before Him. It’s the outcome of a life lived inside a family he already belongs to. No degree of failure returns a child of God to the position of a stranger.

Galatians is where the charge has to be met, though, because Paul's language there's sharper than a summary can carry: "You have become estranged from Christ, you who attempt to be justified by law; you have fallen from grace" (Gal. 5:4). *Justified* — the paper's own word, used by Paul against the very thing the paper is accused of teaching. Three things in the passage settle what he means.

First, the tense. "Who attempt to be justified" is *dikaiousthe*, present — *who are seeking to be justified*, an ongoing program rather than a past transaction. Paul is not describing men trying to get in. He is describing men already in, who have taken up law-keeping as the way to secure a favorable future verdict, and he says the method has severed them from Christ's supply. The verb for that severing is *katergethete*, from the word Paul elsewhere uses for something rendered inoperative or made of no effect (Rom. 7:2, 6). Two verses earlier he had said it plainly: "if you become circumcised, Christ will profit you nothing" (Gal. 5:2). Profit nothing. That is a supply cut off, not a family membership revoked.

Second, the very next verse. Paul doesn't follow "fallen from grace" by denying that any verdict lies ahead. He names one: "For we through the Spirit eagerly wait for the hope of righteousness by faith" (Gal. 5:5). Eagerly wait. Hope. A righteousness still ahead, awaited by men who already have the Spirit. That is precisely the structure this paper teaches, stated by Paul in the sentence immediately after the one quoted against it. What he condemns is not the future verdict. It is the attempt to reach it by law.

Third, what he says about them afterward. A man who believed his readers had forfeited their standing wouldn't write, five verses later, "I have confidence in you, in the Lord, that you will have no other mind" (Gal. 5:10), nor keep calling them brethren through the rest of the letter (Gal. 5:11, 13; 6:1, 18), nor describe himself as laboring in birth again "until Christ is formed in you" (Gal. 4:19). Formation, in those already his children.

So the letter draws its line between two **methods**, not between working and not working. "Having begun in the Spirit, are you now being made perfect by the flesh?" (Gal. 3:3) — *epiteleisthe*, being brought to completion, which is the ongoing work rather than the entrance. Circumcision is barred not because effort has no place in a Christian's ongoing life but because it belongs to a Law he is not under, and taking it up obligates him to the whole of it (Gal. 5:3). In Christ "neither circumcision nor uncircumcision avails anything, but faith working through love" (Gal. 5:6; cf. 6:15). Faith *working* — Paul's own phrase, in the same breath in which he forbids the work of the Law.

And the letter that forbids circumcision commands strenuous effort forty verses later: walk in the Spirit, put off the works of the flesh, and know that those who practice them "will not inherit the kingdom of God" (Gal. 5:16-21), sowing to the Spirit and reaping accordingly (Gal. 6:7-8). Both are Galatians. What is taught here is what Paul taught there, and if it were the other thing, the anathema would apply.

No tradition surveyed in this paper actually denies differentiated outcome. Catholic theology has merit; Reformed teaching has long affirmed degrees of reward in glory; the Wesleyan tradition takes forfeiture more seriously still. The disagreement is over scope and mechanism, not over whether a Christian's works are ever weighed.

The pastoral risk, though, is real and shouldn't be waved off. A doctrine organized around incentive can drift, in the hands of a careless teacher, into a functional second gospel — a message that leaves a Christian unsure whether grace was ever enough. That drift is a failure of teaching rather than a consequence of the doctrine, but it is a common enough failure that the warning belongs in the paper rather than in a footnote.

"The tripartite anthropology is assumed, not proved"

The charge. The entire three-tense structure rests on man being three parts rather than two, and the case for three is weaker than the paper lets on. Genesis 2:7 calls man a *nephesh chayyah* — the identical phrase used of the animals in Genesis 1:20 and 1:24 — so it can't establish a distinction. First Thessalonians 5:23 is rhetorical accumulation, the same kind of piling-up found in "heart, soul, mind, and strength" (Mark 12:30), from which nobody constructs a fourfold anthropology. And Hebrews 4:12 describes the word piercing to the division of soul and spirit precisely because that division is beyond human reach — an image of penetration, not an inventory of parts. Strip the anthropology away and the three tenses have nothing to attach to.

The answer. The first point is conceded outright, and the paper above reflects it: *nephesh chayyah* is the same phrase, man is called by it, and no version of this case that depends on man being given a different label should be defended. Genesis 7:22 goes further and applies *neshamah* to animals as well. The vocabulary will not carry the distinction.

What carries it is an act. God speaks the animals into existence (Gen. 1:20, 24). God forms man from dust and then breathes into his nostrils personally (Gen. 2:7), and only after that does man live. Scripture never describes that act being performed for anything else. That is evidence from the text, and it stands whether or not the word *neshamah* is exclusive.

The 1 Thessalonians objection is answered by the paper's own structure: 5:23 is not where the case begins, and if it were the only support the objection would win. The case begins with the triune God whose image man bears (Gen. 1:26), runs through the personal inbreathing of Genesis 2:7, and is confirmed at the cross. That confirmation is the part the objection doesn't touch. At His death Christ commits His **spirit** to the Father (Luke 23:46), His **soul** is not left in Hades (Acts 2:27, 31), and His **body** is taken down and laid in a tomb (Luke 23:52-53). Three destinations, three separate texts, one man, one moment.

That is where the Mark 12:30 comparison breaks. The Great Commandment lists faculties of loving inside a single prepositional string, and no one of them is given a separate location. The death narratives assign three different destinations to three named parts of one person. Rhetorical accumulation does not do that.

The limit: dichotomy is a serious position held by serious readers, and the case here is cumulative rather than decisive. What it's not is circular. Genesis 2:7 and the passion narratives are evidence gathered from outside the system they support, which is the only thing the charge of circularity actually requires answering.

"'Salvation of the spirit' is not a biblical phrase"

The charge. Scripture names the salvation of the soul outright and repeatedly — "the salvation of your souls" (1 Pet. 1:9), "the saving of the soul" (Heb. 10:39), the implanted word "able to save your souls" (Jas. 1:21). It never once names the salvation of the spirit, in those words or any others. A three-part structure carrying express biblical vocabulary for one member and a supplied label for another is not a structure Scripture built; it's a symmetry an interpreter tidied up. And the supplied member happens to be the one the whole system leans on — the settled, unlosable tense that makes every conditional claim elsewhere safe to make.

The answer. The absence is real and gets conceded without hedging. Scripture does not use the phrase. Four things follow, and none of them requires pretending otherwise.

The test is the substance, not the label. No tradition applies the rule this objection proposes. "Trinity" appears nowhere in Scripture, nor "incarnation," nor "omniscience," nor "sola fide." Each names something the text teaches without supplying the word. A critic who disqualifies a doctrine for lacking a verbatim phrase has disqualified a great deal he intends to keep.

The substance is present, in vocabulary the New Testament does use. Paul's fullest statement of initial salvation describes it as life given to something dead: "you He made alive, who were dead in trespasses and sins" (Eph. 2:1), "even when we were dead in trespasses, made us alive together with Christ (by grace you have been saved)" (Eph. 2:5). That is the Genesis 2:7 pattern repeated — God breathing life into what was not alive — and what He breathed there's what this paper has already identified as the part unique to man. Jesus states the principle in a conversation with Israel's teacher: "That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit"

(John 3:6). That conversation is about seeing and entering the kingdom, spoken to a man who already belonged to God's people (John 3:3, 5, 10), and Chapter 6 takes it up on those terms. The principle reaches past its first setting, though: what the Spirit produces is spirit, and Paul applies that to the man with no life toward God at all — "he who is joined to the Lord is one spirit with Him" (1 Cor. 6:17) — and locates a man's assurance at that level: "The Spirit Himself bears witness with our spirit that we are children of God" (Rom. 8:16). Spirit to Spirit. The label is this paper's; the location is Scripture's.

First Corinthians 2 explains why it has to be the spirit. Paul draws an analogy about how knowing works: "For what man knows the things of a man except the spirit of the man which is in him? Even so no one knows the things of God except the Spirit of God" (1 Cor. 2:11). Like is known by like. Then he applies it, and the vocabulary is decisive: "But the natural man does not receive the things of the Spirit of God, for they are foolishness to him; nor can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned" (1 Cor. 2:14). The word rendered "natural" is *psuchikos* — soulish, soul-man — set against *pneumatikos*, the spiritual man, in the very next verse (1 Cor. 2:15). Other writers divide men by the same word, and always in the same direction: Jude marks off "sensual persons, who cause divisions, not having the Spirit" (Jude 19), and James calls a wisdom that is not from above "earthly, sensual, demonic" (Jas. 3:15). Both render *psuchikos*.

So Scripture's own diagnosis is that a man operating at the level of soul and body can't receive the things of God — not that he refuses, but that he *cannot*, the faculty being absent. Something has to change at the level of the spirit before communion with God is possible at all. That is not a symmetry supplied to complete a pattern. It is the reason the pattern has to be completed that way.

And the asymmetry the objection notices is what this reading predicts. Scripture names the soul's salvation repeatedly and the spirit's never — correct, and expected. Scripture names what is still in play. Every one of those soul-salvation verses is written to press something on a reader: receive the implanted word, don't draw back, keep believing. A verdict already rendered and closed needs no recurring formula urging it; an outcome still outstanding does. If the spirit's standing were equally at risk, the same drumbeat of exhortation should appear about it, and no such drumbeat exists.

One verse sits closer to that phrase than any other. Paul tells the Corinthians to deliver a man to Satan for the destruction of the flesh, "that his spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus" (1 Cor. 5:5) — a spirit, saved, at a future date. That is the nearest thing in the New Testament to the phrase this objection says is missing, and one occurrence is not a drumbeat. What the word carries there is a further question, since "spirit" in the New Testament is not always the third part of man; it's often the *direction* a man is facing (Rom. 8:15; 1 Cor. 4:21; 2 Cor. 12:18; Gal. 6:1). This paper rests nothing on settling that. What survives either way is the proportion: many passages press the soul's outcome on the reader, and none presses the spirit's. The silence the objection points at is not a gap in the structure. It is the structure showing through.

"Your reading of *aionios* makes eternal life temporary"

The charge. Matthew 25:46 puts both uses in one sentence: "these will go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into eternal life." Same adjective, same verse, both sides. If *aionios* is

age-bounded, then the righteous receive an age-bounded life, and the Christian's hope has an expiry date. Hebrews compounds it — "the author of eternal salvation" (Heb. 5:9), "having obtained eternal redemption" (Heb. 9:12). Is redemption age-bounded too? And more damagingly: a word whose meaning is set by context can be made to yield whatever the interpreter needs at each occurrence, which is not exegesis but a blank cheque.

The answer. The last part of the charge is the serious part, and it gets answered first, because a method that cannot be checked is not a method.

The rule stated in this paper is not "*aionios* means whatever the interpreter needs." It is one meaning, stated in advance, and applied the same way at every occurrence: **pertaining to the age or the ages.** What changes from verse to verse is not the word but the thing it modifies. A kingdom, an inheritance, a judgment, a life are things that take place inside the ages, so the age in view bounds them. God is not inside the ages; He made them, which is why Romans 16:26 can call Him the God of the ages in the same sentence that calls the silent centuries *chronois aioniois*, age-times (Rom. 16:25).

That formulation is checkable in a way a looser rule wouldn't be. It doesn't depend on an interpreter's judgment about which things feel weighty enough to escape the story's bounds, and it doesn't give the word a second meaning in reserve. It depends on what each verse actually says, which anyone can examine. If this paper is found reading the word one way in one place and another way in another, a real error has been found and the reader is entitled to say so.

Matthew 25:46, tested against that rule, comes out where the rule predicts. Both halves are scoped to the age in view, and the symmetry is not a difficulty — it's the expected result. What the verse actually requires is that the two outcomes be equivalent in scope, and on this reading they are. Nothing in the sentence requires either side to be endless; that requirement is supplied by the reader.

Hebrews 9:12's "eternal redemption" is answered by Hebrews itself, without appeal to any special rule. The whole chapter is built on a contrast of frequency: the high priest entered "once a year, not without blood" (Heb. 9:7), and offered "often" (Heb. 9:25), and those sacrifices were repeated "year by year continually" (Heb. 10:1) precisely because they never finished the work. Against that, Christ "entered the Most Holy Place once for all, having obtained eternal redemption" (Heb. 9:12). A redemption that carries through the ages without ever being redone is exactly what that contrast calls for, and it's the full force of the word in its plain sense. Nothing here shortens the cross; the sufficiency of Christ's work is the passage's own point, and reading the adjective plainly is what lets the passage make it.

Hebrews 5:9's "eternal salvation" is settled the same way, from the letter's own stated subject. The writer says outright what he is discussing: "He has not put the world to come, **of which we speak**, in subjection to angels" (Heb. 2:5). The world to come is the announced topic of the book. And 5:9 attaches a condition in the same sentence as the promise — Christ became "the author of eternal salvation to all who **obey** Him." A salvation conditioned on obedience, in a letter about the coming age, is the salvation of the soul for that age. The verse and its book say it without help from anywhere else.

One clarification the charge deserves, because it identifies a real fear rather than a technicality. Saying the reward is scoped to an age is not saying the Christian's standing before God expires. Justification was settled permanently and separately, and nothing in this reading of *aionios* touches it. What is scoped is the reign, the inheritance, the recompense — the things Scripture attaches to a named and bounded age (Rev. 20:4-6). What lies beyond that age, Scripture says comparatively little about, and this paper claims no more certainty there than the text supports.

"Romans 10:9 already says how to be saved"

The charge. Paul states the terms in one sentence and leaves nothing out: "that if you confess with your mouth the Lord Jesus and believe in your heart that God has raised Him from the dead, you will be saved" (Rom. 10:9). Confess, believe, saved. No three tenses, no soul held back, no verdict waiting at a tribunal. The most quoted evangelistic verse in the New Testament gives a whole and sufficient account of the matter, and a system that needs two more tenses to complete what Paul completed in a single line has added to him.

The answer. Nothing in this paper stands against a man being saved by believing, and the verse says what it says. What is at issue is the practice of lifting it out of the paragraph it sits in and reading it as a formula.

Paul names his subject in the chapter's first line, and he names it as a burden: "Brethren, my heart's desire and prayer to God for Israel is that they may be saved" (Rom. 10:1). Then he says what ails them, and it isn't indifference. "For I bear them witness that they have a zeal for God, but not according to knowledge. For they being ignorant of God's righteousness, and seeking to establish their own righteousness, have not submitted to the righteousness of God" (Rom. 10:2-3). These are men devoted to the God of Israel and working hard at it.

Which answers the question this paper asks at every occurrence of the word: saved from what? Paul gives it in his next sentence: "For Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to everyone who believes" (Rom. 10:4). The deliverance in view is off a righteousness of their own construction, which never arrives, and onto His. That is the danger the chapter has in front of it, and the confession of verse 9 is what turns a man from the one to the other.

The word rendered "confess" is *homologeo*, to say the same thing, to agree. Paul is not adding a spoken performance to belief; he's describing belief from the outside. Verse 10 puts both halves in one line and treats them as one motion: "For with the heart one believes unto righteousness, and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation" (Rom. 10:10). A man who has come to agree that the crucified Jesus is Lord says so, because that is what agreement does. And for the men Paul has in view, the agreement is costly and specific; it concerns the One their own nation handed over.

The future tense in "you will be saved" carries no weight on its own either. It's the back half of an *if*, and it follows the condition rather than pointing off toward some distant day (Rom. 10:9).

So the verse settles what it settles. What it doesn't do is take up the questions this paper has been asking. There is nothing in the paragraph about a soul still being saved along the way, nothing about a judgment seat, nothing about an inheritance in the age to come. Paul raises none of it here, and a passage that never asks a question can't be the passage that closes it. Verse 13 then widens the door rather than narrowing it, "whoever calls on the name of the LORD shall be saved" (Rom.

10:13), and verse 12 has already said there's no distinction between Jew and Greek in the matter (Rom. 10:12).

Where the popular use of the verse does go wrong is downstream of all this. Turning verse 9 into a two-step transaction, with a spoken sentence as the second step, fastens a performance onto the one judgment Scripture says is by grace through faith and not of works (Eph. 2:8-9). The error is not that confession is out of place. Paul wrote it, and it belongs. The error is treating it as something a man does *in addition to* believing, rather than as believing, spoken.

None of these seven answers asks to be taken on trust, and several of them concede real ground: the aorist at Romans 8:30 doesn't by itself narrow the group, a present participle can't on its own carry the weight the Johannine answer puts near it, the pastoral drift toward a functional second gospel is a real risk, and the tripartite case is cumulative rather than decisive. Each answer can be checked against the passages it cites, which is the only kind of answer a paper teaching this has any right to give.

Why It Matters — Downstream Effects

This doctrine seeds nearly every other distinctive covered elsewhere in this project:

- **Kingdom timing** — a literal, future, thousand-year kingdom (Rev. 20:4-6) only needs to exist as a distinct reward if glorification is conditional rather than automatic.
- **The Judgment Seat of Christ** (2 Cor. 5:10) — its entire weight and purpose depends on sanctification being a real, at-risk process rather than a guaranteed outcome.
- **Heaven and hell vocabulary** — reading Gehenna, the outer darkness, Hades, and the lake of fire as terms to be defined from their own contexts rather than flattened into one word for one place (Matt. 18:9; Mark 9:47; Rev. 20:14-15) — only becomes possible once justification and glorification have been separated as this system separates them. The companion paper on the vocabulary of the afterlife works those terms out one at a time.
- **Ecclesiology** — the sharp critique of institutional Christianity found in the mustard-seed and leaven parables (Matt. 13:31-33) is, at bottom, a critique of a church that (in this system's view) has collapsed these three aspects of salvation into one (Heb. 5:12-14; Heb. 6:1-3), and so lost the urgency of sanctification altogether.

Conclusion

The disagreement mapped out in this paper is not, at its root, a disagreement about grace, about the sufficiency of Christ's death (Rom. 5:10; 1 Cor. 5:7), or about whether good works matter (Eph. 2:10; Jas. 2:20-24). On all of those questions, Word of the Kingdom theology and the mainstream traditions it's being compared against are far closer than either side's harshest critics tend to admit. The real disagreement is narrower and more technical than it first appears: whether "eternal life" and its synonyms name one thing or two (Matt. 19:16, 29), whether a word meaning *a judgment rendered* can be rendered more than once for a man whose separation from God ran through three parts, and and whether *aionios* means what it says — pertaining to an age — at every occurrence, with the thing it modifies deciding whether an age bounds it, rather than being assumed by default

to mean unending duration. Everything else in this comparison — the vocabulary of heaven and hell (Rev. 20:14-15), the nature and timing of the kingdom (Rev. 20:4-6), the purpose of future judgment (2 Cor. 5:10), even the sharp critique of institutional church life (Matt. 13:31-33) — is downstream of that one fork. And the fork itself is downstream of a way of reading Scripture that takes it plainly and follows it chronologically from Genesis forward.

Works Cited

Brown, Francis, S. R. Driver, and Charles A. Briggs. *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1906. [Lexical basis for *radah* ("have dominion," Gen. 1:26, 28) and *mashal* ("rule," Gen. 3:16); *Elohim* and the Hebrew dual; also *tsedhaqah* and *tsadaq* ("righteousness," "justify").]

Canons of Dort. 1618-19. The Synod of Dort, Dordrecht, Netherlands.

Danker, Frederick William, ed. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature.* 3rd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000. [Lexical basis for *dike*, *dikaiosune*, *dikaiosis*, *dikaioo*, *apolutrosis*, *anastasis*, and *exanastasis*.]

Catechism of the Catholic Church. Libreria Editrice Vaticana. [Part One, Section Two, Chapter Three, Article 12, "I Believe in Life Everlasting," §§1021–1022, 1030, 1038–1041; Part Three, Section One, Chapter Three, Article 2, "Grace and Justification," §§1992, 2009–2010.]

Kittel, Gerhard, and Gerhard Friedrich, eds. *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament.* Translated and abridged by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1985. [Hermann Sasse's article on *aion*/*aionios* — the source for the three-part classification of New Testament usage.]

Wallace, Daniel B. *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament.* Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996. [Basis for the gnomic and proleptic uses of the aorist, Rom. 8:30.]

Wesley, John. *The Articles of Religion of the Methodist Church.* Article X, "Of Good Works"; Article XII, "Of Sin After Justification." Adapted from the Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England, 1784.

Westminster Confession of Faith. 1646. Chapter XVII, "Of the Perseverance of the Saints."

Scripture quotations are from the New King James Version.