The Bema: Judgment, Reward, and Rulership at the Coming of Christ

Paper 2 in a 12 Part Series

by Escape the Mustard Tree

Introduction

Every major Christian tradition agrees that Christians will, in some sense, stand before Christ and give an account of their lives (Rom. 14:10-12; 2 Cor. 5:10). What they disagree about is what that accounting actually is. Is it a formality, a final unveiling of a verdict already settled the moment a person believed, with nothing real left at stake? Is it the moment eternal destiny itself gets decided, sin by sin? Or is it something else entirely: a real evaluation, with real and lasting consequences, that nonetheless has nothing to do with whether a person is eternally secure?

This paper answers with the third option, and gives it a name drawn directly from the Greek text: the *bema* (2 Cor. 5:10). What follows examines that claim in detail. What the Judgment Seat of Christ is, who appears there, what it evaluates, what it does not evaluate, when it occurs, and how all of this compares with the way the major mainstream traditions understand judgment, reward, and the Christian life's final accounting.

The governing question throughout is the one this whole project keeps returning to: what are we saved from, and when? A judgment that has already settled a person's destiny cannot also be the judgment that decides his reward, unless reward and destiny are the same thing. Scripture treats them as two different questions, asked at two different times, and answered on two different grounds.

The Mainstream Landscape

Before setting out what Scripture says about this judgment, here is what the Reformed, Wesleyan, and Catholic traditions teach about it, in language a reader who has never picked up a confession of faith can follow. Those three are the ones this series engages wherever the question is salvation and doctrine, because on that question they give three different answers; Eastern Orthodoxy differs from Rome chiefly on the question of authority and is taken up in a companion paper of its own. Each of the three has a settled, published position, and each one deserves to be stated at its strongest rather than in caricature.

The Reformed tradition

The *Westminster Confession of Faith* devotes its final chapter to a single, universal Last Judgment: "God hath appointed a day, wherein He will judge the world, in righteousness, by Jesus Christ... all persons that have lived upon earth shall appear before the tribunal of Christ, to give an account of their thoughts, words, and deeds; and to receive according to what they have done in the body, whether good or evil" (WCF 33.1, citing 2 Cor. 5:10; Eccl. 12:14; Rom. 14:10, 12).

The key words there need unpacking. The Confession divides all humanity into two groups. The first it calls the *elect*, meaning those God chose before the foundation of the world to save, whose salvation is therefore certain and can't fail. The second it calls the *reprobate*, meaning those not so chosen, who are left in their sins. Chapter 33 then puts both groups at one event, on one day, before one tribunal, encompassing both "the eternal salvation of the elect" and "the damnation of the reprobate" together (WCF 33.2). One proceeding does double duty: it's the moment the lost are condemned and the moment the saved have their works reviewed.

Reformed theology does have a doctrine of reward. The Confession says that the good works of Christians, though imperfect, are accepted in Christ, and that God "is pleased to accept and reward that which is sincere" (WCF 16.6). But reward here is a benefit added to a salvation that was never at risk, and the review that distributes it happens inside the same proceeding that condemns everyone else, as one of that proceeding's purposes.

What happens, on this view, to a professing Christian who shows no fruit and lives in ongoing, unrepented disobedience to the end? The answer is neither a lost salvation nor a reduced reward. He was never regenerate to begin with. Perseverance is treated as the necessary evidence of true election (WCF 17.1-2), so a life that never produces it is read backward as proof that the person was never truly in Christ at all. His end is the same as the unsaved man's, because on this reading he always was one. The reading leaves no room for a truly saved person who fails badly and lastingly. Every serious failure must be reclassified as evidence of a false profession.

The Wesleyan and Arminian tradition

John Wesley's most extensive treatment of the final judgment is his sermon *The Great Assize* (1758), which takes as its text the same verse this paper opens with, "we shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ" (Rom. 14:10), and describes one comprehensive judgment of all people at Christ's return. In a companion sermon, *The Reward of the Righteous* (1777), Wesley goes further than either the Reformed or Catholic position by explicitly describing degrees of reward among Christians at this judgment, based on their works.

But the reward is not detached from the question of destiny. Wesleyan theology holds that salvation itself can be forfeited. Wesley's *Articles of Religion*, Article XII, "Of Sin After Justification," teaches that a person who sins after being justified may fall from grace, and may also rise again by repentance. The word for that falling is *apostasy*: a real departure from a salvation once truly possessed, not the unmasking of a profession that was never real.

So what happens to the Wesleyan Christian who shows no fruit and persists in disobedience to the end? He does not merely lose reward. He loses salvation, because on this reading salvation was always something that could be walked away from. The same Assize that hands out differentiated crowns to the faithful is the proceeding at which that forfeiture is confirmed. Reward and destiny remain bound together in one event and one stake, even where Wesley's own vocabulary comes closest of the three to describing graded reward for Christians.

The Catholic tradition

The Catechism teaches a **particular judgment** occurring for each individual immediately at death, prior to any general judgment: "each man receives his eternal retribution in his immortal soul at the very moment of his death, in a particular judgment that refers his life to Christ" (CCC 1022). Three outcomes are possible at that moment: direct entrance into heaven, purification in purgatory followed by heaven, or "immediate and everlasting damnation" (CCC 1022).

Two terms here need plain definition. *Purgatory* is not a second chance at salvation; it's a state of purification for those who die in God's friendship but are "still imperfectly purified," so as to "achieve the holiness necessary to enter the joy of heaven" (CCC 1030-31). *Merit*, in Catholic usage, means that God graciously credits the Christian's cooperation with grace, so that good works performed in a state of grace really do earn an increase of grace and of heavenly glory (CCC 2006-2011). Catholic theology therefore has both a reward concept and a purification concept, which no other tradition surveyed here holds together in quite this way.

What happens, then, to the Catholic who lives in serious, unrepented disobedience? The answer runs through the distinction between mortal and venial sin. Venial sin weakens charity but doesn't destroy the life of grace, and is among the things purgatory addresses. Mortal sin, which requires grave matter, full knowledge, and deliberate consent, severs sanctifying grace altogether (CCC 1855-57), and if a person dies in that state without repentance, the outcome is hell (CCC 1861). Ordinarily grace is restored through the sacrament of penance. So here too the judgment in view determines destiny. Purgatory looks superficially like a proceeding that touches something other than salvation, but its function is to fit a person for a heaven he's already certain to enter.

What the three share

They disagree sharply on timing, on structure, and in Wesley's case even on vocabulary. What they hold in common is that the judgment in view functions to settle or confirm *destiny*: whether a person's ultimate outcome is salvation or condemnation, immediate blessedness or purification, a persevering faith or a forfeited one. Wesley's differentiated rewards notwithstanding, in all three the judgment and the question of destiny belong to the same proceeding. Whether they have to is what the rest of this paper takes up.

The Word of the Kingdom Position

The position set out here pulls apart two questions those three traditions answer together. The first is whether a man belongs to Christ. That was settled the moment he believed, on grounds that had nothing to do with his performance, and nothing reopens it. The second is what he does with the life that follows. That one is put to him at a second proceeding, and what's at stake there is not heaven but a position in Christ's coming kingdom. None of the three traditions has a category for a judgment like that, which is why the disagreement runs deeper than emphasis. Everything below is an account of that second proceeding.

The bema: a reward tribunal, not a courtroom

Two passages name this judgment seat, and this is the one that says what happens there:

> For 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)

"Judgment seat" there renders the Greek *bema*, and precision matters about what that word does and does not prove, because the case is often overstated.

Bema means a raised place, a platform, a step. Its basic sense shows up in Acts 7:5, where God gives Abraham no inheritance in the land, "not even enough to set his foot on," where the Greek is literally the step of a foot. From there it comes to name the raised platform an official speaks or rules from. In the New Testament that official is usually a magistrate: Pilate sits on the *bema* while Jerusalem shouts for Barabbas (Matt. 27:19; John 19:13), Gallio hears Paul's case from the *bema* at Corinth (Acts 18:12, 16-17), and Festus does the same at Caesarea (Acts 25:6, 10, 17). In ordinary New Testament usage, a *bema* is a magistrate's tribunal, and any argument that leans on the word alone to mean "prize platform, not courtroom" is leaning on more than the word can carry.

The athletic sense is real, but it comes from the setting, not the dictionary. Corinth hosted the Isthmian games, and Paul writes to that city using the vocabulary of the stadium at length: runners in a race, one prize, strict training, a perishable wreath against an imperishable one, a fighter who does not beat the air, a competitor who could himself be disqualified (1 Cor. 9:24-27). He tells Timothy that a man who competes in athletics "is not crowned unless he competes according to the rules" (2 Tim. 2:5), and describes his own end in exactly that register: "I have fought the good fight, I have finished the race, I have kept the faith. Finally, there is laid up for me the crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous Judge, will give to me on that Day" (2 Tim. 4:7-8). That is a competitor anticipating a prize, not a defendant awaiting a verdict on guilt.

The lexical detail that settles something here is not *bema* at all. It's the word for the crown. Greek has two: *diadema*, the royal band of a reigning monarch, worn by right of who one is; and *stephanos*, the victor's wreath, given by a judge to someone who competed and won. Every crown promised to the Christian in the New Testament is a *stephanos* (1 Cor. 9:25; 2 Tim. 4:8; Jas. 1:12; 1 Pet. 5:4; Rev. 2:10; Rev. 3:11). Jesus, when He returns to reign, wears *diademata* (Rev. 19:12). The distinction is exactly the one being drawn here. A *diadema* belongs to a man by virtue of what he is; it names a standing. A *stephanos* is awarded on the outcome of a contest, and Revelation says in so many words that one can be forfeited: "Hold fast what you have, that no one may take your crown" (Rev. 3:11).

So the argument rests on what the passages themselves say is at stake, and on who is standing there, rather than on the word *bema*.

Who appears, and who says so

Both passages that name this judgment seat state their audience with unusual clarity, and both of them do it in the first person plural.

Romans 14 is not a passage about the afterlife at all. It's a passage about Christians judging one another over disputable matters, food and days and personal conviction. Paul's argument against that habit is that there's a tribunal already scheduled, and the brethren doing the judging have no seat at it:

> But why do you judge your brother? Or why do you show contempt for your brother? For we shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ. For it is written: "As I live, says the LORD, every knee shall bow to Me, and every tongue shall confess to God." So then each of us shall give account of himself to God. (Rom. 14:10-12)

The people told to stop judging are brethren. The people who will stand at the judgment seat are the same brethren. Paul places himself among them, twice, in three verses.

Second Corinthians 5:10 does the same:

> For 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.

Three details in that verse repay attention.

First, "we must all." Paul, an apostle, includes himself, and he's writing to a church he has just addressed as those who have the Spirit as a guarantee (2 Cor. 5:5). Nothing here suggests a mixed crowd of saved and lost being sorted. The verse addresses a group already defined, and tells them that every last one of them is going.

Second, "appear" translates *phaneroo*, which does not mean merely to show up. It means to be made manifest, brought into the open, disclosed for what one actually is. The same verb describes what will happen to Christ's own people when He appears (Col. 3:4). Hebrews says the same thing in blunter language: "all things are naked and open to the eyes of Him to whom we must give account" (Heb. 4:13). This is not a queue at a window. It is exposure.

Third, "whether good or bad." This is where most readers assume sin is on the table, and the word Paul chose points somewhere else. The word is not *kakos* or *poneros*, the ordinary words for moral evil. It is *phaulos*, which carries the sense of worthless, good-for-nothing, of no account. Paul's contrast is between work that amounts to something and work that amounts to nothing, which is precisely the contrast he draws at length in 1 Corinthians 3. The verb translated "receive," *komizo*, carries the sense of receiving back what is properly one's own, or being paid what is due. The whole sentence is the vocabulary of settling accounts on work performed, not of arraignment.

None of this rests on the pronoun alone, and it shouldn't, since a preacher can say "we" to a mixed room. It rests on how these passages name the people in view. They are *brethren* (Rom. 14:10). Jesus tells the same reckoning as a story — a master coming home to settle accounts with his own household — and the people called in there are named the same way. They are *servants* entrusted with their own master's goods (Matt. 25:14). They are a *steward* set over the household (Matt. 24:45). They are *friends* (Luke 12:4). Every one of those names a relationship already in place — family, household, service, friendship — and each of them describes someone already inside, not someone being considered for entry. They carry the point without help from grammar.

One further distinction keeps this in bounds, and it will matter again later: the difference between an audience a book is *addressed* to and an audience it *describes*. Scripture describes a great many people who are not saved. The passages gathered in this paper describe no one. They're second-person address, to recipients the writers themselves identify in their opening lines.

What is judged here, and what was judged at the cross

The penalty for sin was fully and finally dealt with at the cross (Col. 2:13-14; Heb. 9:12). Jesus' own words from the cross carry this weight in the original language: "It is finished!" (John 19:30) translates a single Greek word, *tetelestai*, in the perfect tense, a tense calling attention to a work completed in past time whose results continue in a finished state into the present. This is the same tense Paul uses of the Christian's own salvation in Ephesians 2:8, "by grace you have been saved," pairing the completeness of Christ's finished work with the completeness of the Christian's present possession of that salvation. Since the spirit's verdict is already rendered, secure, permanent, and unconditional (Rom. 5:1; Rom. 11:29), there is no remaining sin-debt for the Judgment Seat to adjudicate.

None of that means sin has stopped mattering. It means the debt is closed and can't be reopened. Sin still weighs heavily on how a Christian fares at this judgment — not as a bill still owed, but through the life it produced.

Past sin was fully passed over at the cross, once for all, the moment a person is made a new creation (2 Cor. 5:17). Sin committed afterward is meant to be dealt with now, at the mercy seat, through Christ's ongoing work as High Priest (1 John 1:9). Whatever is left unaddressed there doesn't stay unaddressed. It surfaces instead at the Judgment Seat. A Christian who neglects that walk stays saved and arrives unready. Revelation pictures the Bride's readiness at Christ's return as being arrayed in "fine linen, clean and bright," explicitly identified as "the righteous acts of the saints" (Rev. 19:7-8), a wedding garment that gathers up a lifetime of that same walk, not the verdict already rendered on the spirit. Who the Bride is, and when she is taken, is set out below.

This dual claim, settled once for all yet still requiring ongoing cleansing, rests on a distinction Scripture itself draws in the blood's own application. Jesus' blood was applied once, at the cross, in the pattern of the Passover lamb (Exod. 12:13, 22-23; 1 Cor. 5:7): a sacrifice offered a single time, covering the one who takes shelter under it completely and permanently, never to be repeated. But that same blood also has a second, ongoing application, pictured in the Day of Atonement's sprinkling of blood on the mercy seat (Lev. 16:14-15). Christ, having "entered... into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us" (Heb. 9:24), functions continually as High Priest and "always lives to make intercession" for those who come to God through Him (Heb. 7:25). This is the priestly ministry in view when John writes, "if anyone sins, we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous. And He Himself is the propitiation for our sins" (1 John 2:1-2): the same blood, a second and ongoing office, continually available for present-tense sin, without in any way reopening the settled, past-tense question of the spirit's judgment. The Passover application answers the question of debt. The mercy-seat application answers the question of fellowship and readiness. Two distinct functions of one finished work.

This is a real point of agreement with Reformed soteriology's insistence that Christ's atonement fully satisfies sin's penalty (WCF 8.5). The disagreement is over what remains to be evaluated once sin has been dealt with.

Works, and the reward that follows

What remains is an evaluation of works, the quality of the life lived after salvation (Rom. 14:10-12). Paul sets the whole process out in one passage:

> For no other foundation can anyone lay than that which is laid, which is Jesus Christ. Now if anyone builds on this foundation with gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, straw, each one's work will become clear; for the Day will declare it, because it will be revealed by fire; and the fire will test each one's work, of what sort it is. If anyone's work which he has built on it endures, he will receive a reward. If anyone's work is burned, he will suffer loss; but he himself will be saved, yet so as through fire. (1 Cor. 3:11-15)

Four things are stacked in that passage. One foundation, laid by someone else, not in question at any point. Six building materials on top of it, three that survive fire and three that do not. A day on which the fire is applied. And then two outcomes, stated one after the other. If a man's work endures, he receives a reward. If it burns, two verdicts land in the same breath on the same man: the work is lost, but he himself is saved. Either way the man and the fate of his work are settled separately. Reward really gained or really lost, with eternal security left entirely untouched.

Peter describes the same fire in the same terms and adds the timing: "the genuineness of your faith, being much more precious than gold that perishes, though it is tested by fire, may be found to praise, honor, and glory at the revelation of Jesus Christ" (1 Pet. 1:7). Notice what that verse holds together. Fire, testing, an outcome of praise and honor and glory, and a date, which is the revelation of Jesus Christ. Two verses on, Peter names what all of it is for: "receiving the end of your faith – the salvation of your souls" (1 Pet. 1:9).

Several other passages fill in the same picture from different angles, and they belong together, because no one of them carries the argument alone.

Paul tells the Corinthians to stop passing premature verdicts on one another, "until the Lord comes, who will both bring to light the hidden things of darkness and reveal the counsels of the hearts. Then each one's praise will come from God" (1 Cor. 4:5). Motive is in view, not just visible output.

John writes that reward can be diminished as well as gained: "Look to yourselves, that we do not lose those things we worked for, but that we may receive a full reward" (2 John 8). A full reward implies a partial one, and a partial one implies something lost that could have been kept.

Paul tells slaves in a Colossian household, some of the least powerful Christians in the empire, that "from the Lord you will receive the reward of the inheritance," and in the very next breath that "he who does wrong will be repaid for what he has done, and there is no partiality" (Col. 3:24-25). Both halves are said to the same Christians in one sentence: a reward to receive, and a wrong to be repaid. Paul sets them side by side without hinting that the repayment puts their standing in Christ in question.

And John, writing to people he calls little children, gives the reason for abiding in Christ: "that when He appears, we may have confidence and not be ashamed before Him at His coming" (1 John 2:28). Shame at Christ's appearing is a possibility held out to Christians by the apostle most associated with assurance. He is not warning them about "hell." He is warning them about what it will be to stand in front of Him ashamed.

The salvation of the soul: what the verdict is about

No drumbeat runs through Scripture about a verdict on the spirit still awaiting a hearing. The nearest thing to one is a single verse, where Paul hands a man over to Satan "that his spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus" (1 Cor. 5:5); What “spirit” carries there is a further question, and nothing here rests on settling it. One occurrence is not a drumbeat. The salvation of the soul is another matter, spoken of constantly as something still in play. Peter names it as what faith is aiming at (1 Pet. 1:9). The writer of Hebrews contrasts drawing back to perdition with "the saving of the soul" (Heb. 10:39). James tells Christians to receive the implanted word, "which is able to save your souls" (Jas. 1:21). None of these is addressed to the unsaved. All of them are addressed to people already in Christ, about something not yet finished.

This is the subject matter of the Bema. And it explains why the body's glorification belongs to that same verdict, because Scripture ties soul and body together at the most basic level: "For the life of the flesh is in the blood... for it is the blood that makes atonement for the soul" (Lev. 17:11). The Hebrew word rendered "life" there and "soul" a clause later is the same word, *nephesh*, appearing three times in that one verse. A sacrifice was made by pouring out the blood, which is to say by pouring out the life, which is to say by pouring out the soul. Isaiah describes the antitype in exactly that vocabulary: Jesus "poured out His soul unto death" (Isa. 53:12).

Jesus then applies the identical logic to His followers, and does it in a single continuous statement that ends at this very judgment: "whoever desires to save his life will lose it, but whoever loses his life 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? Or what will a man give in exchange for his soul? 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. 16:25-27). Four occurrences of *psuche*, soul or life, and then the coming and the reward, in one breath. Paul asks the same of the body in Romans 12:1, a living sacrifice, which is by definition something offered bodily.

So the verdict on the soul and the glorification of the body are one verdict with two effects, not two awards granted on separate grounds. Receive one, receive the other. This matters for what follows, because glory is not decoration. It's the covering required to stand and reign with the Son (1 Cor. 15:43; Phil. 3:21), and Paul states the condition and the outcome in a single sentence: heirs of God and joint heirs with Christ, "if indeed we suffer with Him, that we may also be glorified together" (Rom. 8:17).

Inheritance, not admission

There's a cluster of three passages, in three different letters to three different churches, that is routinely read as a test of who is saved and who is not. Read carefully, all three are about this judgment instead.

The first of them runs like this, and the sentence before it belongs with it:

> No, you yourselves do wrong and cheat, and you do these things to your brethren! Do you not know that the unrighteous will not inherit the kingdom of God? Do not be deceived. Neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor homosexuals, nor sodomites, nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor extortioners will inherit the kingdom of God. 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. 6:8-11)

Paul tells the Ephesians the same thing in different words: no one practicing such things "has any inheritance in the kingdom of Christ and God" (Eph. 5:5). And the Galatians: "those who practice such things will not inherit the kingdom of God" (Gal. 5:21).

Five things establish that all three are addressed to Christians about conduct, not to the unsaved about destiny.

The Corinthian passage links the two groups itself, in consecutive verses. "You yourselves do wrong" in verse 8 is *adikeo*. "The unrighteous" in verse 9 is *adikos*, the noun of that same verb. Paul has just named the brethren as the ones doing the wrong; he then says the doers of that wrong will not inherit. He is not changing subject between the two sentences. He's changing tense, from what they're doing to what it will cost them. A reader who takes verse 9 as a description of the unsaved has to explain why Paul supplied the verb one line earlier and attached it to church members suing each other.

The audiences are named. Ephesians 5:5 lands on people Paul has just called dear children and saints in the same paragraph (Eph. 5:1, 3). Galatians 5:21 sits inside a passage that opens, "Walk in the Spirit, and you shall not fulfill the lust of the flesh" (Gal. 5:16), addressed to brethren (Gal. 5:13). First Corinthians 6 is about Christian conduct from beginning to end: brothers suing each other in pagan courts (6:1-8), the body as a member of Christ (6:15), the body as a temple of the Holy Spirit (6:19).

The order in 1 Corinthians 6 runs differently from any account of initial salvation. When Scripture narrates that, it's one step and it's short: the Philippian jailer asks what he must do to be saved and is told, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and you will be saved" (Acts 16:30-31). Paul's sentence here has three items instead of one, and it puts justification last — washed, then sanctified, then justified. That's offered as an observation rather than a proof, since Paul may not be narrating a sequence at all, but a reader who takes the verse as a summary of how a person is initially saved has to account for the arrangement.

The order only raises the question. The grammar of that same clause answers it. "You were washed" renders *apelousasthe*, an aorist middle, carrying the sense "you washed yourselves," and it stands beside two unambiguous passives, "you were sanctified" and "you were justified." One middle set against two passives in a single clause is a distinction being drawn, not three ways of naming one moment. Middle form alone wouldn't settle it, since Greek has verbs that are middle in form without a reflexive sense; what settles it is the contrast inside the sentence.

The same verb form appears in a scene that shows exactly what it describes. Ananias tells Saul to "arise and be baptized, and wash away your sins" (Acts 22:16). Saul was already a man who believed God — a Hebrew of the Hebrews, a Pharisee, blameless as to the righteousness of the law by his own account (Phil. 3:4-6) — and what he had just received on the road was his Messiah. He is not being told how to obtain standing before God. He's a man who already has it, being told to wash. The washing is in the manner of the baptism John had been preaching: repent and be washed clean, the old put to death and the new brought up living. That's what the middle voice in 1

Corinthians 6:11 describes, demonstrated on a named man. A Christian availing himself of the cleansing Jesus provides when he finds himself doing the things on that list.

One clause in that quotation has to be read with the rest of the sentence rather than on its own. "And such were some of you" sounds like a line drawn between an old life and a new one, closed for good the day they believed. But Paul has just charged these same men with wronging and cheating their brethren, which is on the list he has only now finished reciting, and the washing he names in the very next breath is the middle-voice verb, something they are to keep doing. The clause says what they were. It doesn't say the list has stopped being a danger to them, and the sentence it sits in ends in a warning about inheritance rather than in congratulation. The behaviors named there are ones the saved can fall into, which is why Paul puts them in front of men who already have a standing before God and tells them to watch themselves.

And the vocabulary decides it. All three passages say *inherit*. Not one of them says *believe*, and not one of them describes how a person came to be in Christ in the first place. An inheritance is what an heir receives; it is not what makes him an heir. Paul gives the order himself: "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, and the inheritance sits at the end of that line rather than at the start of it. These three passages are asking about the end of the line. How a man came to be in the household at all is a different question.

That is the difference between admission and inheritance in one word, repeated three times, in three letters, to three churches. An objection that reads any one of these as a salvation test has to account for all three, and for the fact that Paul never once switches to the vocabulary of initial salvation when he wants to make that point.

Every Christian appears, and no outcome is left open

This evaluation excludes no one. Revelation's opening chapters address the whole Church through seven named congregations, the faithful at Smyrna and Philadelphia together with the lukewarm at Laodicea (Rev. 1:11, 20; Rev. 3:16), and Jesus is described standing among all seven lampstands at once, "girded about the chest with a golden band" (Rev. 1:13), which is how a figure of authority is described when about to act in judgment.

The findings themselves resolve into two categories. In the parable of the talents Jesus gives the master's response as either "Well done, good and faithful servant" (Matt. 25:21) or "You wicked and lazy servant" (Matt. 25:26). The same binary appears in 1 Corinthians 3, where the work either endures and earns a reward or is burned and the man suffers loss.

That binary needs one clarification, because taken loosely it overstates what 1 Corinthians 3 actually says. The passage plainly allows a mixed portfolio: a man may have built with gold in some places and straw in others, and the fire sorts it item by item. So the grading of works runs by degree, and the parable of the minas puts numbers on it. Every servant in that story starts with the same amount, one mina apiece, and each is told, "Do business till I come" (Luke 19:13). The nobleman then leaves, receives a kingdom, and comes back to find out what each man earned with what he was handed.

> Then came the first, saying, 'Master, your mina has earned ten minas.' And he said to him, 'Well done, good servant; because you were faithful in a very little, have authority over ten cities.' And the second came, saying, 'Master, your mina has earned five minas.' Likewise he said to him, 'You also be over five cities.' (Luke 19:16-19)

Ten minas earned, ten cities. Five earned, five cities. The reward tracks the return exactly, and what these men are given is real territory in the kingdom their master has just received. Then a third servant comes forward and hands back the mina he was given, wrapped in a handkerchief, having done nothing with it at all. The master takes it from him and gives it to the man who has ten (Luke 19:20-24). He is set over nothing.

So the extent of a man's rule is measured out, city by city. Whether he is set over anything at all is not. A servant either enters into the joy of his lord and is given cities, or he doesn't. This distinction resolves what would otherwise be a real inconsistency in the doctrine.

The negative outcome is described in the same parables, and this paper won't soften it. The unprofitable servant is cast into the outer darkness, where there is weeping and gnashing of teeth (Matt. 25:30). The servant who knew his master's will and did not do it is beaten with many stripes, while the one who did not know is beaten with few (Luke 12:47-48). Whatever else is said about that language, three things about it must be held: it's said to servants, by their own master, in the context of an accounting for work assigned; the vocabulary of stripes is corrective, and Luke's account grades it by knowledge; and none of these passages uses the terms Scripture reserves for the unsaved. The full treatment of that vocabulary belongs to the companion paper on heaven, hell, and the language of the afterlife, and this paper defers to it rather than settling it here.

The same sorting appears at "the end of the age" in the parable of the tares, where angels "gather out of His kingdom all things that offend, and those who practice lawlessness" (Matt. 13:41). Two features of that sentence matter. What is removed is removed *out of His kingdom*, which is to say from among those already inside it. And what is named is a practice, an ongoing pattern of life, not sins already brought to God and cleansed (1 John 1:9). The language is exclusion from the reign, not condemnation of the person.

Man's purpose: created to rule

The reward under evaluation is not abstract praise. It's rulership, a return to man's own created purpose. Genesis states that purpose twice, once before man's creation and once immediately after: "let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, over the birds of the air, and over the cattle, over all the earth" (Gen. 1:26), and "God blessed them, and God said to them... 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).

The Psalms echo it: God has made man "a little lower than the angels," has "crowned him with glory and honor," and has "made him to have dominion over the works of Your hands," putting "all things under his feet" (Ps. 8:5-6). The writer of Hebrews quotes that psalm and adds the qualification everything turns on: "For 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). Man's rule, promised from the beginning, is not currently in effect. It's a purpose stated but not yet fulfilled, and Hebrews names the setting where it will be: "the world to come, of which we speak"

(Heb. 2:5). That phrase is the letter's own statement of its subject, and it governs everything else in the letter: the whole book of Hebrews announces the coming age as what it's about.

Firstborn sons: a triad of rulership

Scripture does not merely say that sons rule. It specifies that only *firstborn* sons hold regal position in the human realm, and it names exactly three. Christ is God's firstborn Son by begetting: "when He again brings the firstborn into the world, He says: 'Let all the angels of God worship Him'" (Heb. 1:6; cf. John 3:16).

Israel's sonship follows a related but more layered pattern. Adam was created directly and, for that reason, called "the son of God" (Luke 3:38), and had the fall not intervened, that sonship could have passed to his descendants by ordinary procreation. The fall broke exactly that. From Adam onward his descendants are described not as sons of God but as bearing the likeness of a fallen man rather than God's own (Gen. 5:3; Luke 3:23-38). To establish a sonship that could still be passed on by procreation, God later performed a separate creative act, this time in Jacob, after the fall, and one that concerned the natural, physical man rather than the spiritual man: "thus says the LORD, who created you, O Jacob, and He who formed you, O Israel" (Isa. 43:1; cf. 43:7, 10). Because this second creation was natural rather than spiritual, it could pass to Jacob's descendants by ordinary procreation regardless of their own spiritual condition, in a way Adam's own sonship, once broken, no longer could.

Creation, though, established standing only as a child. Whether a person is also presently recognized as a *son* is a further and conditional question, worked out from Paul's own narrowing in the companion paper on the three tenses, and whether he is given *firstborn* status is a third and later step still. It is at that last point, not before, that the name "Israel" enters: "Israel is My son, My firstborn" (Exod. 4:22-23; cf. Rom. 9:4, where "the adoption" heads the list of Israel's national privileges). And the Church, presently comprised of "children" (Gk. *teknon*) by new creation in Christ (2 Cor. 5:17), is a third firstborn son still awaiting that same final step, the company in view when Paul calls Christ "the firstborn among many brethren" (Rom. 8:29). Being God's child is universal among those in Christ already. Firstborn status, conferred only by adoption [*huiothesia*, the placing of a son], is what remains outstanding and conditional.

This is why the Judgment Seat's outcome is described using the vocabulary of sonship rather than the vocabulary of ownership or citizenship. Paul pairs "the revealing of the sons of God" directly with "eagerly waiting for the adoption, the redemption of our body" (Rom. 8:19, 23), which is the same future event this paper identifies as glorification. What is revealed at that moment is not merely who was saved. It's which sons, those presently led by the Spirit as distinct from children generally (Rom. 8:14), are placed into the firstborn standing that makes rulership possible.

Paul names what makes that difference in the very next verse: "you received the Spirit of adoption by whom we cry out, 'Abba, Father'" (Rom. 8:15). The Spirit of adoption is not the placement. It's the arrangement that precedes the placement — a man ordering his thinking and his conduct as a son now, so that the title conferred later is conferred on someone already living as one.

The reward, concretely: crowns and thrones

Scripture describes this future rulership in consistent, concrete imagery, and it does so across both testaments and in the mouths of several different writers.

Jesus tells the Twelve that "in the regeneration, when the Son of Man sits on the throne of His glory, you who have followed Me will also sit on twelve thrones" (Matt. 19:28), and promises the overcomer a share in a throne of His own that He doesn't yet occupy (Rev. 3:21). Paul tells Timothy plainly, "If we endure, we shall also reign with Him" (2 Tim. 2:12), and asks the Corinthians, "Do you not know that the saints will judge the world?... Do you not know that we shall judge angels?" (1 Cor. 6:2-3). Daniel sees the same thing from the other end of the canon: judgment made in favor of the saints of the Most High, and "the time came for the saints to possess the kingdom" (Dan. 7:22), a kingdom later described as given to them "under the whole heaven" (Dan. 7:27).

That last phrase carries weight, because the coming reign is regularly flattened in one direction. What is in view is a specific, future, heavenly and earthly reign, with two portions and two sets of rulers, not a single earthly administration. A separate paper in this series works out how that division came about. Here it's enough to note that when Scripture describes the reward, it does not confine it to one sphere.

The reward is repeatedly pictured as a crown, and always the victor's wreath, always awarded to the faithful rather than possessed by right:

- "an imperishable crown" for the one who competes with self-control (1 Cor. 9:25);
- "the crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous Judge, will give to me on that Day, and not to me only but also to all who have loved His appearing" (2 Tim. 4:8);
- "the crown of life" for the one who endures temptation (Jas. 1:12) and for the one who is "faithful until death" (Rev. 2:10);
- "the crown of glory that does not fade away," for the faithful shepherd, given specifically "when the Chief Shepherd appears" (1 Pet. 5:2-4);
- and the "crown of rejoicing," which for Paul is other people, the ones he brought to Christ, "in the presence of our Lord Jesus Christ at His coming" (1 Thess. 2:19).

Notice how each of those names its recipients, and names them by something done rather than by something possessed: the one who competes with self-control, all who have loved His appearing, the one who endures, the one faithful until death, the shepherd who tended the flock willingly. Paul doesn't even keep his own crown to himself — he widens it to everyone who has loved the appearing, which is precisely the thing the crown is dated to. Every one of these is dated to Christ's appearing rather than to death.

Revelation says something in the same register about another group entirely. John sees thrones, and judgment committed to those who sat on them, and then the souls of the Tribulation martyrs, beheaded for their witness and for refusing the beast and his image (Rev. 20:4). The martyrs aren’t the Church, whose own judgment has already taken place by that point in the book. Of them John writes: "Blessed and holy is he who has part in the first resurrection. Over such the second death has no power, but they shall be priests of God and of Christ, and shall reign with Him a thousand years" (Rev. 20:6).

That verse fixes two things at once. The first is a term: a thousand years. The second is that the promise about the second death attaches to that group rather than being said of Christians generally. It's stated again in the letters, and there it's explicitly an overcomer's promise: "He who overcomes shall not be hurt by the second death" (Rev. 2:11). A promise held out to the overcomer is not a promise held out to everyone, and a promise of exemption implies something to be exempt from. On the reading taken here, what the non-overcomer faces is not a separate proceeding carried out afterward. It's what this judgment itself does: the fire that tests each one's work, and burns what will not stand, while the man himself is saved (1 Cor. 3:13-15). Where that leaves him is a question this paper doesn't answer, and the vocabulary belongs to the companion paper on heaven, hell, and the language of the afterlife.

Revelation 3:21 names two thrones in one sentence: "To him who overcomes I will grant to sit with Me on My throne, as I also overcame and sat down with My Father on His throne." The Father's throne is where the Son sits now. The Son's own throne is still future, and it's a share in that one the overcomer is promised, along with authority over the nations (Rev. 2:26-27). A third arrangement follows the thousand years, when the throne named is "the throne of God and of the Lamb" (Rev. 22:1, 3). The overcomer promises are attached to the middle of those three, which means they're attached to a term, and the term is the one Revelation 20:6 just named.

This bounds the loss as well as the reward, and the two have to be bounded together. If the reward were unending, the forfeiture would have to be unending too, since they're the two sides of one verdict. Scripture associates that forfeiture with death, and says so to Christians: "if you live according to the flesh you will die" (Rom. 8:13), written to brethren about the walk, not about biology. And death itself doesn't run past the thousand years. It is the last enemy put down, and it is put down at the end of that term: "The last enemy that will be destroyed is death" (1 Cor. 15:26). What follows the term is a state in which the thing no longer exists at all — "there shall be no more death, nor sorrow, nor crying" (Rev. 21:4). So whatever forfeiture Scripture attaches to death for a Christian is attached to something with an expiration date on it, and that date is the close of the thousand years. What is at stake at the Judgment Seat is therefore both entirely real and bounded to the age it concerns.

This reading of a differentiated, faithfulness-contingent reward is not a modern development. It traces at least to the second and early third centuries, when Irenaeus, the *Shepherd of Hermas*, and Tertullian all taught some form of graded standing among Christians based on faithfulness, a theme still being defended by Jerome two centuries later. The historical line is traced in the companion paper on the genealogy of the kingdom.

The reward and the phrase "eternal life"

One further passage belongs here, because it's regularly cited against everything set out above and in fact supports it. Paul tells the Romans that God "will render to each one according to his deeds: eternal life to those who by patient continuance in doing good seek for glory, honor, and immortality" (Rom. 2:6-7), set directly against "indignation and wrath" for the self-seeking and disobedient (Rom. 2:8).

Read as a description of how a person becomes saved, that verse is unintelligible in the mouth of the man who wrote Ephesians 2:8-9. Read within the narrative scope this project applies to the phrase "eternal life" throughout, it is straightforward: life for the age, sought after and rendered according to deeds. The phrase is the object of a search here, not the description of a possession. Which is exactly what makes the Judgment Seat meaningful rather than redundant. John does the same thing in a letter written to reassure. He hangs the promise on a condition and then dates the payoff: "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, and a promise, in one sentence. A promise names what is still owed. Four verses later he says where it lands: "abide in Him, that when He appears, we may have confidence and not be ashamed before Him at His coming" (1 John 2:28). And he speaks of eternal life as something that may or may not be abiding in a man he is addressing as a Christian: "no murderer has eternal life abiding in him" (1 John 3:15). That is not the vocabulary of a possession issued once and filed away.

The companion paper on *aion* and *aionios* sets out the linguistic case in full; the point needed here is only that the passage is doing reward vocabulary, not initial-salvation vocabulary, and that Paul and John both say so themselves.

The adoption: why glorification is not the resurrection itself

One clarification keeps this reward from collapsing back into a generic "everyone gets a new body at the resurrection." The adoption is a different event from the resurrection, and the two are dated apart.

Paul lists them in sequence, not as synonyms. "The redemption of our body" is something still being *waited for* by people who already possess "the firstfruits of the Spirit" (Rom. 8:23). Philippians describes a still-future change, when Christ "will transform our lowly body that it may be conformed to His glorious body" (Phil. 3:20-21), using a Greek word, *metaschematizo*, for an outward change of form, distinct from and later than the inward transformation already underway (cf. Rom. 12:2, where the word is *metamorphoo*).

It follows that adoption, the placing of a son, the covering of glory, and the redemption of the body are four names for one event rather than four events. And that event is dated: it occurs at the Judgment Seat, at the same time as the soul's own verdict, and before the kingdom begins rather than during or after it.

Jesus' own resurrection illustrates the gap between resurrection and glory. The two disciples on the Emmaus road walked and talked beside the risen Jesus and noticed nothing outwardly unusual about Him (Luke 24:13-16, 30-31). Only at the ascension, when "a cloud received Him out of their sight" (Acts 1:9), was His body enswathed in visible glory, the glory later described to Paul on the Damascus road as light "brighter than the sun" (Acts 26:13; cf. Acts 9:3). The pattern for the Christian runs the same course. Resurrection in "a spiritual body" (1 Cor. 15:42-44) comes first; glorification follows, and specifically follows the Judgment Seat's verdict, since it's that verdict which determines who is placed into the firstborn standing.

Resurrection itself is not conditional. Everyone is raised, "both of the just and the unjust" (Acts 24:15), and it is in a raised body that a person stands to be judged (John 5:28-29). What is conditional is what happens to that body afterward. Paul strains toward a raising *out* from among the raised — *exanastasis*, "if, by any means, I may attain" (Phil. 3:11) — and the companion paper on the three tenses works out that word and its context. What matters here is where it's granted. Being raised puts a man in front of this tribunal; being taken out from among the raised is what the tribunal decides.

Which is why Scripture speaks of glory as a hope rather than a possession — "Christ in you, the hope of glory" (Col. 1:27). Hope is not the word for what a man already holds. A thing hoped for is a thing awaiting a day, and this is the day it awaits. The wider run of that vocabulary, glory sought and worked for and walked worthy of, is gathered in the companion paper on the three tenses.

So the soul's verdict and the body's glory travel together in both directions. Receive one and receive the other; fail of one and fail of the other. This is the same linkage set out earlier from Leviticus 17:11, now arriving at its outcome. And it's why the negative side of this judgment is not simply a smaller pile of prizes. The covering of glory is what makes standing with the Son possible at all, since a body "sown in dishonor" is "raised in glory" for a purpose (1 Cor. 15:41-43; Phil. 3:21). Without it there is no place in the reign, and no reign to take a place in.

This is also why the two-stage pattern of clothing runs through Scripture from Genesis forward. Adam and Eve's own fig leaves were replaced by a covering God Himself provided at the cost of a life (Gen. 3:7, 21), and the same two-stage shape recurs at the end: a covering given now, and a further clothing in glory reserved for later, at the Judgment Seat, for those who will rule (Rev. 3:5, 18; Rev. 19:8). Whether Adam and Eve possessed a literal covering of glory before the fall and lost it is a separate question, argued from the two different Hebrew words for nakedness in Genesis 2:25 and 3:7, and this paper doesn't rest anything on it. It's enough that the covering required for rule is future, is granted rather than owned, and is granted at this judgment.

The Bride: taken out at this judgment

Revelation's wedding garment has come up twice already. Scripture is specific about who wears it, and about when she is taken.

Begin with the mandate, because rule and marriage are joined there before anything else is said about either. Genesis states man's dominion as a plural before there is a plural to state it of: "let *them* have dominion over the fish of the sea, over the birds of the air" (Gen. 1:26). Between that sentence and its repetition two verses later sits the detail that makes the plural possible, "male and female He created them" (Gen. 1:27), and the blessing that follows joins two things in one breath: "Be fruitful and multiply; fill the earth and subdue it; have dominion" (Gen. 1:28). Fruitfulness and rule are not two mandates laid side by side. They're one mandate, and a man cannot carry out either half of it alone, which is why God says of the man what He says of nothing else on those opening pages: "It is not good that man should be alone; I will make him a helper comparable to him" (Gen. 2:18). Rule requires a marriage relationship. That is the arrangement from the first page of Scripture, and it never changes.

Then the manner of it. The woman was not formed separately and brought over to the man. God caused a deep sleep to fall on him, took from his side, and made the woman out of what He had taken (Gen. 2:21-23). She came out of the man, and she came out through a wound.

Paul is the one who reads it forward. He says Adam "is a type of Him who was to come" (Rom. 5:14) and calls Jesus "the last Adam" (1 Cor. 15:45). Then he quotes this very passage — Genesis 2:24, the man leaving father and mother and being joined to his wife — and states outright what he is doing with it: "This is a great mystery, but I speak concerning Christ and the church" (Eph. 5:31-32). The warrant for reading the first marriage as a picture of the second is Paul's, in writing, on this verse.

Take that warrant to the cross and the details answer each other. A deep sleep, and a death. An opened side, and a pierced one: "one of the soldiers pierced His side with a spear, and immediately blood and water came out" (John 19:34).

Two things came out of that side, and both are what a bride is made of. The blood is the blood of the mercy seat, answering sin along the walk (Lev. 16:14-15; 1 John 1:9). The water is the washing named in the same passage that gave us the warrant, where Christ loved the church and gave Himself for her, "that He might sanctify and cleanse her with the washing of water by the word, that He might present her to Himself a glorious church, not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing, but that she should be holy and without blemish" (Eph. 5:25-27). That is the mercy-seat walk described earlier in this paper, stated in marriage vocabulary rather than priestly vocabulary. Neither the blood nor the water applies itself. A person keeps availing himself of both by walking in the light and agreeing with God about what the light shows him (1 John 1:7-10). Not everyone does, and a man who lets it go arrives at this judgment with nothing made ready.

Notice who does the building in that picture. Adam built nothing; he slept, and God made the woman out of what came from his side. The Spirit and the High Priest do the building here, out of the blood and water that came from Jesus' own side. Which is why Revelation can say both things about the same garment in two consecutive verses — that the Lamb's wife "has made herself ready," and that "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).

Put those together and the Bride is not another word for everyone in the body of Christ. She is taken out of the body, as the woman was taken out of the man, and the taking out is what this judgment does. The names have been accumulating through this section and the last: the out-resurrection, the placing of sons, the covering of glory, the crown, and now the Bride. They are not separate awards handed out on separate grounds. They're one outcome described from several sides, and the Judgment Seat is where every one of them is settled. Scripture has a second marriage in view as well, an earthly one, and the two together are why the coming reign has two portions rather than one; that belongs to the paper on Israel and the Church and isn't developed here.

When the Bema occurs

The timing matters, because a reward tribunal that met after the kingdom began would have nothing to award.

Every crown text in the New Testament is dated to Christ's appearing rather than to the moment of death: "on that Day" (2 Tim. 4:8), "when the Chief Shepherd appears" (1 Pet. 5:4), "at the revelation

of Jesus Christ" (1 Pet. 1:7), "at His coming" (1 Thess. 2:19), "until the Lord comes" (1 Cor. 4:5). Not one of them locates the award at death, which is the single clearest structural difference between this reading and the Catholic particular judgment.

Revelation then places the results before the return in glory rather than after it. By chapter 19 the Lamb's wife "has made herself ready," and "to her it was granted to be arrayed in fine linen, clean and bright," which the text immediately defines as "the righteous acts of the saints" (Rev. 19:7-8). A verdict on righteous acts has to precede a garment made of them. The sequence inside the chapter says the same thing: the marriage of the Lamb has come and the wife is ready by verse 7, the marriage supper is announced by verse 9, and the rider on the white horse does not appear until verse 11. And by chapter 20 thrones are set and the reign begins (Rev. 20:4).

The sequence, then, runs in this order: resurrection and the gathering of Christ's own; the Judgment Seat, where the soul's verdict is rendered and the body glorified together; the marriage of the Lamb; the return in glory; the kingdom. Reward is settled before the reign it's a reward for.

Four judgments, not one

Much of the confusion this paper is answering comes from collapsing several distinct proceedings into one. The four below are counted by who stands before Him. Counted for one man, the answer is two: his spirit was judged when he believed, and his soul, with his body, is judged at the Judgment Seat.

Scripture describes judgments that differ in *who* is judged, *when*, and *what is at stake*. Not one of them is a proceeding in which a saved person's destiny is reopened.

The Judgment Seat of Christ judges the Church (Rom. 14:10; 2 Cor. 5:10; 1 Cor. 3:11-15). Its subject matter is works, its outcome is reward or loss, and it occurs before the kingdom begins.

The judgment of Israel comes after the Tribulation and before the kingdom, and the seventieth seven is what prepares the nation for it. Daniel is told the seventy weeks are determined on his people and his holy city "to finish the transgression, to make an end of sins, to make reconciliation for iniquity, to bring in everlasting righteousness" (Dan. 9:24). Those seven years do that work. Driven to the end of every other refuge, the nation turns back to the God of her fathers, and when the Deliverer comes she looks on Him: "they will look on Me whom they pierced. Yes, they will mourn for Him as one mourns for his only son" (Zech. 12:10). That is a nation at last applying the blood of a Lamb she slew and never appropriated.

Only then is she gathered — angels sent out to bring in the elect from the four winds (Matt. 24:31), and the dead among them raised, so that those who died outside the land come into it with the living (Dan. 12:1-2). The proceeding itself follows, in "the wilderness of the peoples," where God pleads His case with the nation "face to face," makes her "pass under the rod," and purges out the rebels, so that those who remain come into the land (Ezek. 20:34-38).

Everyone standing there has already believed. The proceeding gathers the nation's dead and living together, and the sorting runs through both. Israel's own history is full of men who belonged to God and died in rebellion against Him, and this is the judgment where that is finally dealt with; the rebels put out of the land are not strangers to the covenant but sons of it found unfit for the

kingdom. What is decided is not the destiny of individuals but whether each is found fit for what the nation was made to be, "a kingdom of priests and a holy nation" (Exod. 19:6). Daniel is given his own portion in exactly those terms: he will rest, and "arise to your inheritance at the end of the days" (Dan. 12:13). That is the same question the Judgment Seat puts to the Church, asked of another people at another time, in the same vocabulary.

The judgment of the nations in Matthew 25:31-46 occurs when "the Son of Man comes in His glory," at the end of the Tribulation, and gathers "all the nations" before Him. What is at stake there is stated in the King's own words: "inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world" (Matt. 25:34). That's inheritance vocabulary again, addressed to people already in the family, and the criterion is treatment of "these My brethren" (Matt. 25:40).

Scripture reckons three groups — Jew, Gentile, and the church of God (1 Cor. 10:32) — and this scene rules out two of them. Not the Church, whose judgment is the Judgment Seat, and which by this point in the sequence has already been through it. Not Israel, who is never counted among the nations; Balaam saw "a people dwelling alone, not reckoning itself among the nations" (Num. 23:9), and the word Matthew uses of those gathered, *ethnos*, is the word for the Gentiles. Israel is in the scene, but as the measure rather than the accused, since "these My brethren" are the Jewish people and the question put to each Gentile is how he treated them. Whatever else that scene decides, it decides entrance into the coming kingdom on the basis of works, for living Gentiles who came through the Tribulation.

The Great White Throne (Rev. 20:11-15) comes after the thousand years, and its subjects are the unsaved dead. Every man is born separated from God, dead in trespasses and sins (Eph. 2:1), and these never took the provision God made to change that. They come to the throne in the condition they were born in and they leave it in the same condition. What the books record is works, and the judgment is by degree.

Notice what this structure preserves. Each judgment has its own people, its own time, and its own subject matter. Collapse them into one event and the questions have to be answered together, which is precisely what forces reward and destiny into the same proceeding.

The mechanism: a judgment built into justification's own vocabulary

The Greek words for "righteousness" (*dikaiosune*) and "justification" (*dikaiosis*) share the root *dike*, a word elsewhere translated "judgment," "vengeance," and "punishment" (Acts 25:15; Acts 28:4; Jude 7; 2 Thess. 1:9). To justify is to have a judgment rendered in one's favor. That is what the word means.

Which raises the question the mainstream framework has no room for. If death affected man in three respects, and justification means a judgment rendered, is there any reason a single judgment must cover all three at once? Scripture answers by dating them separately. The spirit's verdict was rendered once, favorably and permanently, at the moment of faith (Rom. 5:1; Rom. 11:29). The verdict on the soul, and the body's glorification that travels with it, are dated to the coming of Christ (1 Thess. 5:23; 2 Cor. 5:10). The Judgment Seat is not a re-litigation of the spirit's settled case. It's the judgment proper to what was never settled at the moment of faith in the first place.

Romans 8:1 belongs here, because it's quoted constantly in this connection and usually quoted only halfway. In full it reads, "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." Whether Paul wrote that qualifying clause is a real textual question, and the companion paper on the three tenses takes it up. Nothing here depends on the answer, because Romans 8 supplies the same qualification in text nobody disputes. Verse 4 states it directly, of those "who do not walk according to the flesh but according to the Spirit." Verses 5 through 14 then spend ten verses on the difference between walking after the flesh and walking after the Spirit, addressed to brethren, ending at sonship: "For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, these are sons of God" (Rom. 8:14). Three verses later comes the condition on glory itself (Rom. 8:17).

What that establishes is a boundary, and only a boundary. The promise of no condemnation is issued to the one walking by the Spirit, and it doesn't extend past that description. It does not follow that condemnation falls on the man who walks otherwise; that inference is a formal fallacy. The promise is scoped, and that is enough. A blanket assurance covering every Christian in every condition would leave nothing for 2 Corinthians 5:10 to do, and Paul wrote both.

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:

- All three traditions affirm a real, future accounting before Christ for the Christian's life (Rom. 14:10-12; 2 Cor. 5:10). None treats the Christian life as inconsequential or unexamined.
- All affirm that Christ's atonement fully and finally deals with sin's penalty (Heb. 9:26; 1 Pet. 2:24). Reformed theology in particular shares this emphasis closely and states it forcefully.
- The language of reward is not distinctive to this position. Reformed, Wesleyan, and Catholic writers alike speak of crowns, rewards, and degrees of glory (2 Tim. 4:8; 1 Cor. 3:14).
- All three, and this position with them, hold that Scripture speaks of a coming day on which what was hidden is disclosed, and that this should shape how a Christian lives now.

The disagreement is therefore narrower and sharper than it first appears. It is not about whether there is a judgment, whether sin was paid for, or whether reward exists. It is about what the judgment is *for*.

Where They Diverge, and Why

One judgment or two purposes

The Reformed position treats the Last Judgment as a single event serving two purposes at once, condemning the unsaved and reviewing the saved, because it doesn't distinguish between a judgment that determines destiny and one that determines reward (WCF 33.1-2). The position taken here is that these are structurally different acts: one settles whether a person belongs to Christ, which is already true and was settled at the spirit's judgment; the other evaluates what that person did with the life that followed (2 Cor. 5:10; 1 Cor. 3:11-15). The four-judgment structure set out above is the alternative, and each of those judgments has its own text, its own timing, and its own named subjects.

Closer language, same underlying fusion

Wesley's own vocabulary, the judgment seat of Christ and differentiated reward for Christians, sounds closer to this position than either the Reformed or Catholic account. But the resemblance is verbal, not structural. Because Wesleyan soteriology allows salvation itself to be forfeited through apostasy, the Assize that hands out differentiated reward to the faithful is the very same proceeding that would confirm a fallen-away Christian's loss of salvation altogether. Reward is never actually separated from destiny; it merely sits alongside it in the same event. The distinctive claim here is not that reward is graded, since every tradition surveyed agrees on that much. It's that reward can be lost entirely while destiny remains completely untouched, because the two were never the same question.

Destiny-determining versus reward-determining

The Catholic particular judgment (CCC 1021-22) still functions to determine ultimate destiny, heaven, purgatory, or hell, even though it introduces a second and earlier judgment beyond the Reformed single event. The Judgment Seat as set out here determines neither "heaven" nor "hell"; that question was closed at the spirit's judgment. What is determined is participation in the coming reign. That is a real and consequential outcome, and it is not a soteriological one.

Purgatory needs one further word, because it's the mainstream doctrine that most resembles what this paper describes and is most often assumed to be the same thing. It is not. Purgatory is purification for a heaven already guaranteed, and it addresses the residue of sin. The Judgment Seat is an evaluation of works, and what it distributes is standing in a kingdom. One is remedial and backward-looking; the other is evaluative and forward-looking.

The historical root

This divergence traces back to the same foundational claim examined elsewhere in this project: that the spirit's judgment, the soul's sanctification, and the body's glorification are three separable outcomes rather than one guaranteed unfolding. A tradition that treats salvation as a single indivisible event has no conceptual room for a judgment that touches reward without touching destiny. The possibility depends on the three-tense structure, and everything in this paper stands or falls with it.

Case Study: 1 Corinthians 3:11-15

This passage, already examined above for what it establishes about the Judgment Seat, is taken up again here for what it reveals about *how* the two readings diverge, not just what each concludes.

Read through the mainstream lens, the passage supports a picture of degrees of heavenly reward layered on top of an otherwise uniform salvation. Real, but secondary. A matter of more or less rather than one thing or another.

Read as it's set out here, the passage draws a sharper line. It distinguishes the person, whose foundation and therefore whose salvation is never in question, from the work, which may be entirely consumed. And it states outright that a man can be saved while suffering total loss: "he himself will be saved, yet so as through fire" (1 Cor. 3:15). The mainstream reading treats this as a difference of degree. This reading treats it as a difference of kind, mapping onto the spirit and soul distinction and onto the distinction between the spirit's judgment and the soul's.

There is one feature of the passage that neither reading should pass over. The building is not the man himself. Paul has already called them God's building (1 Cor. 3:9), and in the verse right after the fire he asks, "Do you not know that you are the temple of God?" (1 Cor. 3:16) — one temple, many people. So the work being tested includes what a man builds into other Christians, which is the half most often left out when this passage is read as an audit of private habits. It doesn't exclude the inward work; the transformation the Spirit carries out in a man is what he has to build with. It only means the fire finds him where he has spent himself on others as well as where he has been changed himself, which is why Paul can call a congregation his own crown of rejoicing (1 Thess. 2:19).

Answering the Objections

Eight objections are taken up here, each stated at full strength before it's answered.

"The bema was a courtroom, and you know it"

The charge. Every other appearance of *bema* in the New Testament names a magistrate's tribunal. Pilate, Gallio, and Festus all sit on one. The athletic reading is a modern preacher's illustration retrofitted onto a judicial word, and the whole reward framework is built on that retrofit.

The answer. The lexical half of this charge is correct and is conceded above without qualification. In ordinary New Testament usage a *bema* is a tribunal, and there was a literal judicial *bema* in the agora at Corinth, where Paul himself had stood before Gallio. Anyone who leans on the word alone is overreaching.

But the argument was never resting there. It rests on what the two *bema* passages say happens. Nobody is arraigned. Nobody's guilt is established. What Paul describes is work being tested, some surviving, some burned, with reward received or loss suffered and the person saved either way (1 Cor. 3:12-15). It rests further on the crown vocabulary, which belongs to the games rather than the courts: *stephanos* throughout, the victor's wreath, awarded and forfeitable (Rev. 3:11). And it rests on the audience, which in both passages is a first-person plural that includes an apostle. If the word were the argument, this objection would end the discussion. Since the word is only the label, the objection removes an illustration and leaves the case standing.

"Whether good or bad means sin is judged after all"

The charge. Second Corinthians 5:10 says each one receives according to what he has done, whether good or bad. That is sin, plainly stated, being brought up at this judgment. The claim that sin is not in view contradicts the verse the doctrine is named after.

The answer. The Greek word is *phaulos*, worthless or good-for-nothing, rather than *kakos* or *poneros*, the standard words for moral evil. Paul is contrasting work that amounts to something with work that amounts to nothing, which is exactly the contrast the parallel passage draws with gold against straw.

More decisively, the outcome settles the question. If sin's penalty were being adjudicated, the sentence would have to fall on the person. Paul says the opposite in the clearest terms available to him: the work is burned, the man is saved (1 Cor. 3:15). A judgment where the guilty party is guaranteed acquittal in advance is not a judgment of guilt. It is an assessment of output.

Sin is at the Judgment Seat. Not the sins committed before a man believed — those were passed over at that moment, in the pattern of the Passover lamb. What is there is the sin of the walk since, the sin he never brought to the mercy seat. It is there in what his life came to, rather than as a debt charged against him a second time, because sin left to run consumes a life, and Scripture states the wage plainly to brethren: "if you live according to the flesh you will die" (Rom. 8:13). That death is not the loss of a standing already fixed. It is the loss of the life itself in the age to come, which is the very thing this judgment awards. So the objection is half right. Sin is on the table. A man's standing is not.

"First Corinthians 3:15 caps the loss, and you have built far more on it"

The charge. Even granting everything above, Paul names exactly one consequence: loss of reward. He then reassures the man that he's saved. Outer darkness, weeping and gnashing, stripes, and exclusion from a reign are nowhere in that passage. Reading them in is building a doctrine of severe consequence on a text whose whole point was reassurance.

The answer. This is the strongest objection on the list, and the answer runs in three parts.

First, 1 Corinthians 3 is not the only picture given, and no doctrine ought to be built from one passage. The parables of the talents and the minas are accounts of servants and their master, and they end in loss of what was held, exclusion from the master's joy, and the outer darkness (Matt. 25:24-30; Luke 19:20-26). Luke 12:47-48 describes servants beaten with stripes, graded by knowledge. John warns Christians about shame at Christ's appearing (1 John 2:28) and about losing what they had worked for (2 John 8). Paul warns about being disqualified after having preached to others (1 Cor. 9:27). These are not stray verses; they're the consistent tone of apostolic address to Christians about the coming day.

Second, the passage does not present itself as exhaustive. Paul's aim in 1 Corinthians 3 is a specific one: to correct a church dividing over teachers by telling them the work will be assessed by someone else, later. What he needed to establish for that argument was that the assessment is real and that the foundation is secure. He was not writing a catalogue of outcomes.

Third, the concession. Reward loss is the consequence 1 Corinthians 3 names, and it names it in terms far gentler than the parables use. Anyone who quotes only the parables is misrepresenting the tone of the New Testament, and anyone who quotes only 1 Corinthians 3 is doing the same in the other direction. The position taken here holds both, and admits that exactly how the harsher images cash out is the part of this doctrine held with the least certainty.

"This is a second-class Christianity"

The charge. Dividing Christians into rulers and non-rulers creates two tiers in the body of Christ, contradicting the plain teaching that there is neither Jew nor Greek, slave nor free, and that all are one in Christ (Gal. 3:28).

The answer. Galatians 3:28 concerns access, not outcome. It says who may come and on what terms, and it says the terms are identical for everyone. Paul, who wrote it, is the same man who told the same churches that runners compete and one receives the prize (1 Cor. 9:24), that he disciplines his body lest he be disqualified (1 Cor. 9:27), and that a full reward can be reduced (2 John 8, John's phrasing of the same idea).

Every family with more than one child understands the distinction without difficulty. Standing as a child is not earned, is not graded, and is not lost. Responsibility given within the household is assigned according to demonstrated faithfulness. Jesus Himself framed it that way repeatedly: "You were faithful over a few things, I will make you ruler over many things" (Matt. 25:21). If differentiated responsibility were incompatible with equal standing, that parable could not have been told.

"Nothing is really at stake, so this changes nothing"

The charge. From the other direction: if a person is eternally secure no matter what, then reward is a bonus, and no one lives differently because of a bonus. The doctrine can't bear the weight of the exhortation attached to it.

The answer. Paul disagreed, and said so in the same breath as the doctrine. Two verses after naming the judgment seat he writes, "Knowing, therefore, the terror of the Lord, we persuade men" (2 Cor. 5:11). John attached shame to it (1 John 2:28). Paul attached his own possible disqualification to it (1 Cor. 9:27). These men did not treat it as a bonus.

The deeper answer is that this objection assumes rewards are prizes external to the person, so that losing them costs nothing that matters. What Scripture describes being lost is not a trophy. It is the saving of the soul (1 Pet. 1:9), the covering of glory required to stand with the Son (Rom. 8:17), and a share in what man was made for in the first place (Gen. 1:26-28; Heb. 2:5-8). Whether that motivates a given person is a pastoral question. Whether it is trivial is not.

"You are reading Hebrews 10:14 out of existence"

The charge. "For by one offering He has perfected forever those who are being sanctified" (Heb. 10:14). Perfected, forever, already. That leaves nothing for a later judgment to assess.

The answer. Quote the verse in full and both halves are there. One clause says perfected forever, in the perfect tense, describing something done and standing done. The next clause says "those who are being sanctified," a present participle describing something still in progress. The writer put a completed act and an ongoing process in a single sentence, about the same people, without any sense of contradiction. That is the three-tense structure stated in one verse.

The verse settles what it settles: the offering will never be repeated and never needs to be. Hebrews uses that verb of more than one completion, and it names which one each time. Where

the writer says the old sacrifices perfected nobody, he says what they failed to reach — the worshiper's conscience (Heb. 9:9), which is why the same sacrifices came back year after year while the men bringing them went on conscious of their sins (Heb. 10:1-2). That's the lack the one offering closes, and 10:14 is the sentence that closes it. A chapter later the same verb turns up attached to something else entirely: men who died in faith and are not "made perfect apart from us" (Heb. 11:40). What they lack there is not a cleared conscience but a promise they have not received. So the verse doesn't address what becomes of a life lived afterward, and the same letter takes that up at length in the very same chapter.

Twelve verses later comes the hardest warning in the book, and the writer puts himself inside it: "For if we sin willfully after we have received the knowledge of the truth, there no longer remains a sacrifice for sins" (Heb. 10:26). Thirteen verses after that, the identical "we" lands on the other side of the same question: "But we are not of those who draw back to perdition, but of those who believe to the saving of the soul" (Heb. 10:39). One writer, one chapter, one pronoun, holding a completed offering, a real warning, and a soul still being saved. Whatever else Hebrews 10:14 does, it does not stand alone in its own chapter, and it didn't stop the man who wrote it from saying the rest. The chapter that follows is the roll call of those who died without receiving the promise and are still waiting for it (Heb. 11:39-40).

"Hebrews says you have already come to the church of the firstborn"

The charge. The writer tells his readers they have arrived. Not that they will come, not that they are hoping to — "you have come to Mount Zion and to the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem... to the general assembly and church of the firstborn who are registered in heaven" (Heb. 12:22-23). The verb is a completed one, and so is the registration. This paper has spent pages holding firstborn standing out as something conferred later and conditionally, and here is Hebrews handing it to every reader as a matter already on the books. The same sentence carries a second problem. It speaks of "the spirits of just men made perfect," which sounds like a perfecting still being carried out at the level of the spirit, in a paper that treats the spirit's verdict as the one question already closed.

The answer. The tense is exactly what the objection says it is. *Proseleluthate* is a perfect — a coming that happened and stands accomplished — and the registration is perfect as well. Whatever that sentence hands its readers, they have it now.

What it hands them is the question. One verb governs a long list:

> But you have come to Mount Zion and to the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, to an innumerable company of angels, to the general assembly and church of the firstborn who are registered in heaven, to God the Judge of all, to the spirits of just men made perfect, to Jesus the Mediator of the new covenant, and to the blood of sprinkling that speaks better things than that of Abel. (Heb. 12:22-24)

A reader has come to an innumerable company of angels. He is not an angel. He has come to God the Judge of all, and he doesn't possess the Judge. He has come to the spirits of just men made perfect, and those men are dead and he isn't one of them. The list names the company and the place a man has been brought to. It is not an inventory of what he has become.

The setting says the same thing. Four verses earlier the writer set Sinai in front of these readers — a mountain that burned, that could be touched and must not be, where the people begged that the voice would stop (Heb. 12:18-21). Israel came to that mountain and couldn't go up it. The Christian has come to a different one, and he can. That's what the perfect tense is doing here. It fixes where a man now stands and what he may approach, and access is not what this paper has ever put in question.

Then the register. "Registered" translates a word Scripture otherwise uses only of a census — the enrollment that sent Joseph to Bethlehem, "that all the world should be registered" (Luke 2:1, 3, 5). A name on the citizen roll is what makes a man a citizen of the city. What he will be given to do in it is a second question, and an enrollment doesn't answer it.

Hebrews puts that second question seven verses earlier, and puts it in the word this objection rests on:

> lest there be any fornicator or profane person like Esau, who for one morsel of food sold his birthright. For you know that afterward, when he wanted to inherit the blessing, he was rejected, for he found no place for repentance, though he sought it diligently with tears. (Heb. 12:16-17)

"Birthright" there is *prototokia*, the rights of the firstborn; "church of the firstborn" is *prototokon*. One root, one passage, seven verses apart. What Esau could not get back was the blessing his father had already spoken over another man, rather than forgiveness withheld from him by God. And he did not cease to be Isaac's son; years later Genesis has him standing beside Jacob at their father's burial (Gen. 35:29). He kept the relation and lost the portion, and the word Hebrews uses for what he wanted back is *inherit*. That man is on the page immediately before the assembly of firstborn ones is described.

On the spirits, the grammar answers before the theology has to. "Made perfect" follows "just men" rather than "spirits," so what Hebrews says is that the men have been perfected, and it names their spirits as what is present in the city. Nothing in the clause is being done to anyone's spirit. And the writer has already said what that perfecting is and is not, in a sentence carrying both halves: these men "obtained a good testimony through faith" and "did not receive the promise," because God "provided something better for us, that they should not be made perfect apart from us" (Heb. 11:39-40). Their course is finished and their record is closed. The promise is still out. They are waiting on the same day the reader is waiting on, which is why they are an assembly he comes to rather than a rank he holds.

"You have assumed your readers are saved, which is the whole argument"

The charge. Every warning passage in this paper is read as addressed to Christians because the audience is assumed to be Christian from the start. Change the assumption and the same passages read as warnings to the unsaved. The conclusion sits in the premise. And the first-person plurals prove nothing, since a preacher says "we" to a mixed congregation without asserting anything about any particular hearer.

The answer. The charge would land if the presupposition were the interpreter's. It is not. The writers state it themselves, in their opening lines, before any warning appears. Paul addresses the Corinthians as "those who are sanctified in Christ Jesus, called to be saints" (1 Cor. 1:2), and the Romans as "beloved of God, called to be saints" (Rom. 1:7). Peter writes to those "elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father" (1 Pet. 1:1-2). Jude writes to those "called, sanctified by God the Father, and preserved in Jesus Christ" (Jude 1). The audience is documented, not assumed, and it's documented by the men who wrote the warnings.

Grant the point about the homiletical "we" anyway, because it costs nothing. Even granted, it fixes the writer's own posture, since he places himself inside the warning and inside the reassurance both. And Hebrews states the same thing without any "we" at all. Immediately after the warning of Hebrews 6:4-6 about falling away, the writer turns to the very readers he has just warned: "But, beloved, we are confident of better things concerning you, yes, things that accompany salvation, though we speak in this manner" (Heb. 6:9). He expects better of them. That sentence is unintelligible if the warning was aimed at unbelievers.

Finally, the distinction noted earlier holds here. Scripture *describes* many people who are not saved. It does not *address* them in these passages. The difference between the audience a letter is written to and the people a narrative reports on is plain enough, and every passage this paper leans on falls on the addressed side of it.

Why It Matters — Downstream Effects

Where a judgment is located, and what it's for, decides a good deal of what stands downstream of it. Four consequences run directly out of what has been set out above.

- **The vocabulary of the afterlife.** If the Judgment Seat is a reward tribunal rather than a destiny-determining court, then the language used of unfaithful servants at that judgment cannot be the language of final condemnation, and the terms have to be sorted out accordingly. That sorting is the work of the companion paper on heaven, hell, and the afterlife's vocabulary, which takes up Gehenna, outer darkness, the lake of fire, and the second death in detail. What this paper establishes is the constraint that paper works under: at the Bema, the person is saved (1 Cor. 3:15).
- **Kingdom timing.** A literal future reign is the concrete content of the reward being adjudicated. Without a coming kingdom to rule in, reward has nothing to attach to, and the crowns become metaphors for nothing in particular.
- **Faith and works.** The Judgment Seat is where the conditional, works-evaluated aspect of salvation actually cashes out. It is the mechanism that keeps the second tense from being an abstraction, and it's why the New Testament can hold grace and accountability together without embarrassment. Both halves have to stay in place. Without the real stakes, the New Testament's exhortation is theatre; without the bounds, a reward tribunal becomes the destiny court it is not.
- **How Christians treat each other now.** This is the use Paul himself makes of the doctrine, twice. Stop judging your brother, because there's a tribunal and it is not yours (Rom. 14:10-12). Stop ranking your teachers, because the assessment comes later and from someone else (1 Cor. 4:5). A doctrine of future judgment that produces present judgmentalism has been inverted.

These are not four separate implications. They're one implication seen from four sides. A judgment whose subject is reward rather than destiny changes what a Christian is waiting for, and a man who knows what he's waiting for lives differently while he waits.

Conclusion

Every tradition compared in this paper holds that Christ's death fully paid for sin, and that the Christian life carries real consequences. They hold both firmly. The disagreement lies elsewhere.

It is a disagreement about structure. Either judgment and reward belong to the same event that determines a person's eternal destiny, or destiny was settled once, permanently, at the moment of faith, leaving a separate and later reckoning to determine something else entirely.

Scripture's own vocabulary points to the second. It says *inherit* rather than *believe*. It says *stephanos*, the wreath given to a competitor, rather than *diadema*, the crown worn by right. It says a man's work can be burned to nothing while the man himself is saved. It says a full reward can be reduced and a crown can be taken. And it dates all of it, not to death, but to the day Christ appears.

What is decided at the Judgment Seat of Christ is therefore not whether a person belongs to Him. That question was answered, and closed, long before. What is decided is what he will do, and who he will be, when His kingdom comes.

Works Cited

Bauer, Walter, William F. Arndt, F. Wilbur Gingrich, and Frederick W. Danker. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature.* 3rd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000. [Lexical basis for *bema*, *phaneroo*, *komizo*, *phaulos*, *stephanos*/*diadema*, *tetelestai*, *huiothesia*, *teknon*, *huios*, *psuche*, *dikaiosune*/*dikaiosis*/*dike*, *adikeo*/*adikos*, *exanastasis*, *meno*, *metaschematizo*/*metamorphoo*, *hilasmos* ("propitiation"), *parakletos* ("advocate"), *prototokia*/*prototokos*, *apographo*, *teleioo*, and *proserchomai*.]

Brown, Francis, S. R. Driver, and Charles A. Briggs. *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1907. [Lexical basis for *nephesh* in Lev. 17:11 and for the two terms for nakedness in Gen. 2:25 and 3:7.]

Catechism of the Catholic Church. Part One, Section Two, Chapter Three, Article 12, "I Believe in Life Everlasting," §§1021-1022, 1030-1032; Part Three, Section One, Chapter One, Article 8, §§1855-1861; Chapter Three, Article 2, §§2006-2011.

Chitwood, Arlen L. *God's Firstborn Sons: A Triad of Firstborn Sons.* Cottonwood, AZ / Westville, OK: Lamp Broadcast, Inc., 2004; rev. 2013, 2019. [Source for the Christ/Israel/Church firstborn-sons framework, the *teknon*/*huios* distinction, and the adoption/redemption-of-the-body timing argument.]

Chitwood, Arlen L. *The Judgment Seat of Christ.* Norman, OK: The Lamp Broadcast, Inc. [Source for the bema-as-reward-tribunal framework, the crowns catalogue, and the binary-outcome argument developed throughout this paper.]

Chitwood, Arlen L. *The Second Death.* Pamphlet. Norman, OK: The Lamp Broadcast, Inc. [Source for the argument tying the scope of both reward and loss to the millennial term, and for the succession of throne arrangements in Revelation 3:21 and 22:1-5.]

Chitwood, Arlen L. *Salvation of the Soul: Saving of the Life.* Norman, OK: The Lamp Broadcast, Inc. [Source for the *psuche* word study and the Matt. 16:24-27 material.]

Metzger, Bruce M. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament.* 2nd ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1994. [Basis for the manuscript situation at Rom. 8:1.]

Vine, W. E. *Vine's Expository Dictionary of New Testament Words.* Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1985. [Supplementary lexical reference for Greek word studies throughout.]

Wallace, Daniel B. *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament.* Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996. [Grammatical basis for the perfect-tense readings of *tetelestai* (John 19:30) and *sesosmenoi* (Eph. 2:8), for the aorist middle *apelousasthe* (1 Cor. 6:11), and for the participle agreement at Hebrews 12:23.]

Wesley, John. *Articles of Religion*, Article XII, "Of Sin After Justification." Sermon 15, "The Great Assize" (1758); Sermon 118, "On the Reward of the Righteous" (1777). In *The Works of John Wesley*.

Westminster Confession of Faith. 1646. Chapter XVI, "Of Good Works"; Chapter XVII, "Of the Perseverance of the Saints"; Chapter XXXIII, "Of the Last Judgment."

Scripture quotations are from the New King James Version.