

The Lordship of Christ

Or

Can a person be saved without receiving
Christ as Lord?

By

Arend J. ten Pas

“. . . if you confess with your mouth Jesus as Lord, and believe in your heart that God raised Him from the dead, you shall be saved”

Copyright 1978 Ross House Books

Reprinted 1986

CONTENTS

I. Introduction	1
II. Statement of the Two Positions	2
III. Definition of the Word "Lord"	3
IV. Biblical Data Associating the Term "Lord" with Salvation	5
V. The Lordship of Christ and Repentance	7
VI. The Lordship of Christ and Faith	13
VII. The Lordship of Christ and the "Carnal Christian" ..	15
VIII. The Biblical Doctrine of Self-Examination	19
IX. Counseling Compared	23
X. Why Dr. Ryrie's View of the Lordship of Christ is Dangerous	24
XI. Excerpts	25
Bibliography	28

THE LORDSHIP CONTROVERSY

“What use is it, my brethren, if a man says he has faith, but he has no works? Can that faith save him?” (James 2:14, New American Standard Bible is used throughout this paper).

No true Christian welcomes controversies and schisms. Schisms among professing Christians afford the world an excuse to question whether or not Christ was sent from the Father (John 17:21). Christians worthy of the name are concerned to be perfected in unity that the world “may know that Thou didst send me” (John 17:23). In recent months, however, an old controversy has been revived. The debate is between those who insist that a person must surrender to Christ as Lord in order to be saved, and those who insist that the Lordship of Christ has nothing whatever to do with salvation. Some would brush off the matter as being of no consequence, and see here no more than a problem of semantics. They say that the dispute is not caused by diverse conceptions of the contending parties but by the diverse wording of the arguments. Others view the debate as one that involves heresy on the opposing side. For example, Charles Ryrie writes:

The importance of this question cannot be over-estimated in relation to both salvation and sanctification. The message of faith only and the message of faith plus commitment of life cannot both be the gospel; therefore, **ONE OF THEM IS A FALSE GOSPEL AND COMES UNDER THE CURSE OF PERVERTING THE GOSPEL OR PREACHING ANOTHER GOSPEL (Gal. 1:6-9) (Balancing the Christian Life, p. 170, emphasis mine).**

If Dr. Ryrie’s evaluation is correct it behooves us to carefully examine the Scriptures and the issues involved so that we do not expose ourselves to God’s anathema. Heresy is to be avoided at all cost. Harmony may not be pursued at the expense of truth. Love does cover a multitude of sins, but it is never to bury the truth.

As in most controversies, so in this one the fire seems to thrive on the fuel of misunderstanding and “straw men.” This research was undertaken with the hope that it will help clear up the confusion so that the issues will be more clearly ap-

prehended and greater unity in the faith may be attained. May the reader search the Scriptures to see "whether these things were so" (Acts 17:11). **Sola Scriptura!**

I. STATEMENT OF THE TWO POSITIONS

A. Christ must be acknowledged as Lord if one is to be saved. This view is well represented by Henry Thiessen, who writes:

The thought of surrender is also implied in the exhortation to "believe on the **Lord Jesus Christ**" (Acts 16:31), and the declaration that we must confess "**Jesus as Lord**" (Rom. 10:9). **IF WE WOULD BE SAVED, TO BELIEVE IN HIM AS LORD IS TO RECOGNIZE HIM AS LORD; AND WE CANNOT RECOGNIZE HIM AS LORD UNTIL WE OURSELVES ABDICATE.** This note in faith is today often overlooked or even referred to a later time of consecration; **BUT THE SCRIPTURES CONNECT IT WITH THE INITIAL EXPERIENCE OF SALVATION (Introductory Lectures in Systematic Theology, p. 359, emphasis mine).**

Several points concerning this quotation are noteworthy:

1. The controversy is not a recent development. Dr. Thiessen died before 1949.
2. The position espoused by Dr. Thiessen cannot be branded as a peculiarity of what is sometimes called "Hyper-Calvinism." Dr. Thiessen is Arminian in his soteriology, whereas Ryrie is Calvinistic. On the point in question Thiessen's position is shared by Arminianism and historical Calvinism.
3. Recognition of Christ's Lordship is in Scriptures connected with the initial experience of salvation, and this recognition involves abdication.
4. Surrender is the essence of true faith.
5. **NOTICE:** Dr. Thiessen says nothing about how perfectly or imperfectly this surrender is carried out in the subsequent life (it is clear that he is not an advocate of attainable sinless perfection, cf. pp. 380-384), nor does he say that a person must know all the rules for Christian living in order to be saved. All he maintains is that there must be surrender if faith is to be saving faith.

- B. The Lordship of Christ has nothing to do with salvation. This view is represented by Charles C. Ryrie. In a chapter entitled "Must Christ be Lord to be Saviour?" Dr. Ryrie says, "Simply stated the question is this: Must there be a commitment to Christ as the Lord of one's life in order to be saved?" His answer is:

The message of faith only and the message of faith plus commitment of life cannot both be the gospel; therefore, one of them is a false gospel and comes under the curse of perverting the gospel or preaching another gospel (Gal. 1:6-9). As far as sanctification is concerned, if only committed people are saved people, then where is there room for carnal Christians? (**Balancing the Christian Life**, p. 170).

OBSERVATIONS: According to Ryrie:

1. Commitment is an addition to faith, and is not regarded to be of the nature of saving faith.
2. A man may be saved (initial experience) while he is rebelling (refusal to commit one's self is rebellion).
3. There must be "room for carnal Christians."
4. "Carnal Christians" cannot be committed Christians.

II. DEFINITION OF THE WORD "LORD" (Kurios)

- A. The word "lord" is "properly an adjective, signifying having power (**kuros**) or authority" (W. E. Vine, **Expository Dictionary of New Testament Words**, III, 16).
- B. "In the Koine . . . **kurios** is the owner of slaves and property." The noun is connected with the adjective "in the sense of 'one who has full authority'" (Gerhard Kittel, **Theological Dictionary of the New Testament**, translated by Geoffrey W. Bromily, III, 1042, 1044).
- C. In a number of places the word "Lord" is applied to Christ where it is the Greek rendering of the Hebrew YHWH (cf. Ps. 34:8 and 1 Pe. 2:3; Isa. 8:13 and 1 Pe. 3:15). What is understood by YHWH in the Old Testament? William Childs Robinson comments:

As applied to God in the Old Testament, LORD denotes the active exercise of His power over the world and men, as the Creator and Ruler, the giver of life and death. Thus, LORD is a term expressive not of the metaphysical nature of deity, but of the sovereign authority of the Most High . . . Lord carries with it more expressly the idea of Sovereign rulership in actual exercise, evoking obedient service (**Baker's Dictionary of Theology**, Everett F. Harrison, ed., pp. 328, 329).

- D. Even the term "Christ" expresses lordship. It should not be forgotten that Christ was anointed Prophet, Priest, and King. The word "Christ" comes from the verb which means "to anoint" and is the translation of the Hebrew "Messiah."

John Reid makes the observation that "To the Jewish Christians, Jesus was the 'Messiah,' to the Hellenistic Christian Jew He was 'the Christ,' and to the Gentile Christian He was 'the Lord.' The Hellenistic and Gentile terms are combined in our familiar name 'the Lord Jesus Christ.' The interpretation of 'Christ' as 'Lord' enables us to understand that the essential idea of the first term is that of Sovereignty or Lordship. The Saviour is the Lord, the Possessor and Ruler of the Kingdom of God" (**Hasting's Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels**, II, 56).

NOTE: Dr. Ryrie's notion that the word "Lord" when applied to Christ demands no more of anyone than that he acknowledge that He is the "Jehovah-God" of the Old Testament (Ibid., pp. 173-176) is self-destructing (see definition "C" above). When applied to God the word "lord" is not impoverished, but enriched. It does not lose its usual meaning, but rather, its usual meaning is dignified and exalted to do justice to Him who is so named. If "lord" means "master" and "owner" when applied to man, it means that and much more when applied to Jesus Christ.

That the idea of obedience and service is suggested by the word "lord" is plain from our Lord's usage: "Why do you call Me, 'Lord, Lord,' and do not what I say" (Lu. 6:46; cf. John 13:16; Mt. 7:21; 1 Pe. 3:6, "Sarah obeyed Abraham, calling him lord").

III. BIBLICAL DATA ASSOCIATING THE TERM "LORD" WITH SALVATION

A. Jesus Christ:

1. "Not every one who says to Me, 'Lord, Lord,' will enter the kingdom of heaven; but he who does the will of My Father, who is in heaven" (Mt. 7:21). Our Lord is here teaching that it is not sufficient to pay verbal respect to Him by calling Him "Lord, Lord." There must be the accompanying obedience (the evidence of saving faith) if one is to enter into the Kingdom.
2. As long as the Rich Young Ruler refused to give up mammon, and obey Christ he could not be saved (Mt. 19:16-26). Although the word "lord" is not used in this passage, it is implied by the command in 19:21. As long as the young man clung to his idol he had not truly repented. Spurgeon warns his students that, "If the professed convert distinctly and deliberately declares that he knows the Lord's will but does not mean to attend to it, you are not to pamper his presumption, but it is your duty to assure him that he is not saved. Do you imagine that the Gospel is magnified or God glorified by going to the worldlings and telling them that they may be saved at this moment by simply accepting Christ as their Saviour, while they are wedded to their idols and their hearts are still in love with sin? If I do so, I tell them a lie, pervert the Gospel, insult Christ, and turn the grace of God into lasciviousness" (cf. **The Soul Winner**, 1963, p. 38).
3. The slave who was unfaithful to his Lord did not just lose his reward; he was a professing servant who was never saved, (like Hophne and Phineas who were priests of the Lord but did not know Him, 1 Sam. 1:3; 2:12) and shared his destiny with the wicked (Mt. 24:48-51; cf. 25:24-30; Lu. 12:45-48).

B. Peter

1. "God has made Him both Lord and Christ—this Jesus whom you crucified" (Acts 2:36). When the audience heard this "they were pierced to the heart," whereupon Peter commanded them to repent (2:37, 38).

2. In the house of Cornelius, Peter was concerned to present Christ to the Gentiles as Lord of all (Acts 10:24-46).
NOTE: In the Book of Acts Christ is called "Saviour" only twice (Acts 5:31; 13:23), while He is mentioned by the title "Lord" 92 times. It appears that the preachers in the early church were concerned to present Jesus as Lord, first and foremost.

C. Paul:

1. When the convicted jailer asked what he must do to be saved, Paul instructed him to believe in the **Lord Jesus** (Acts 16:31). To the jailer who regarded Caesar as lord this was a revolutionary idea.
2. " 'The word is near you, in your mouth and in your heart' —that is, the word of faith which we are preaching, that if you confess with your mouth Jesus as **Lord**, and believe in your heart that God raised Him from the dead, you shall be saved. . . . For there is no distinction between Jew and Greek; for the same Lord is **Lord of all**, abounding in riches for all who call upon Him; for 'Whoever will call upon the name of the Lord will be saved' " (Rom. 10:8-13). NOTE: If Dr. Ryrie is right in maintaining that the term "Lord" simply points to the deity of Christ (as he does, cf. p. 176), then consistency would demand that the term "Deity" would be an acceptable substitute in the above phrase, "Lord of all." Is that all Paul had in mind in this salvation passage? To Paul Christ was certainly "Deity," and because He is Deity He was and is "Lord of all." And because Christ is Lord of all the rebel must come to terms with Him, forsake his rebellion if he is to enjoy forgiveness. Regardless of the dispensation, a sinner in rebellion against God is not going to have forgiveness until he repents of his rebellion; without forgiveness he will not have remission; without remission of sin there is no salvation. **Those who contend that a person may be saved without submitting to the Lordship of Christ are contending that there is forgiveness without repentance, a concept entirely without Biblical foundation** (Luke 17:3). The Prodigal Son who in the context represents the publicans and sinners was not given the kiss of

reconciliation while he was in the hog pen; first he had to come to his senses and confess that he had sinned against heaven, and resolve to a mere servant (Luke 15:1, 19).

3. "For we do not preach ourselves but Christ Jesus as Lord" (2 Cor. 4:5).

NOTE: To the Orientals the name of a person described his character. To believe in that name meant to be persuaded of that character and to respond accordingly. Paul presented Christ as "Lord of all" (Rom. 10:12). Would it not be an incongruity of the worst kind for a sinner to ask the Lord of all for salvation, while at the same time he reserves the right to continue in a life of insubordination? Anyone with such reservation has not yet learned the truth that only those who confess and **forsake** their sin shall find mercy (Proverbs 28:13).

IV. THE LORDSHIP OF CHRIST AND REPENTANCE

Few would deny that the matrix of all sin is the heart in a state of rebellion against its sovereign Creator. Rebellion is simply a refusal to submit to authority. Those who assert that a person can be saved without submitting to Christ as Lord are saying that one may be saved **WHILE HE IS REBELLING**, that he can be forgiven while he perseveres in sin. Such a notion must invariably lead to a dilution of the doctrine of repentance. Dr. Ryrie's view of repentance is an example of such dilution. Note the difference between his view on the one hand, and that of Vine, Vincent, Kent, Bass, H. A. Ironside, John Colquhoun, and Bancroft on the other.

A) C. C. Ryrie: "The content of repentance which brings eternal life, and that which Peter preached on the day of Pentecost, is a change of mind about Jesus Christ. Whereas the people who heard him on the day formerly thought Jesus as a mere man, they were asked to accept Him as Lord (Diety) and Christ (promised Messiah). To do this would bring salvation," (**Balancing the Christian Life**, p. 176).

B) W. E. Vine: "METANOEO, lit., to perceive afterwards (**meta**, after, implying change, **noeo**, to perceive; **nous**, the mind, the seat of moral reflection) . . . signifies to change one's mind or purpose, always, in the N. T. involving a change for the

better, an amendment, and always, except in Luke 17:3, 4, of repentance from sin" (**An Expository Dictionary of New Testament Words**, III, 279-281).

C) M. R. Vincent: "A word compounded of the preposition **meta**, 'after,' 'with'; and the verb **noeo**, 'to perceive,' and 'to think,' as the result of perceiving or observing. In this compound the preposition combines the two meanings of time and change, which may be denoted by 'after' and 'different'; so that the whole compound means to think differently after. **Metanoia** (repentance) is therefore, primarily, an 'after-thought, different' from the former thought; then a 'change of mind' which issues in regret and in change of conduct . . . 'Repentance,' then, has been rightly defined as 'Such a virtuous alteration of the mind and purpose as begets a like virtuous change in the life and practice' " (**Word Studies in the New Testament**, I, 23, **Matt. 3:2**).

D) Homer A. Kent: "**Repent** means 'to change the mind,' but implies more than mere change of opinion. As a religious term in Scripture, it involves a complete change of attitude regarding sin and God, accompanied by a sense of sorrow and a corresponding change in conduct" (Comment on Matt. 3:2 in **The Wycliffe Bible Commentary**, edited by Charles F. Pfeiffer and Everett F. Harrison, p. 933).

E) Charles B. Bass: Repentance is "that divinely wrought conviction of sin in the heart that the soul is guilty before God, and a resolute turning away from sin in which the sinner identifies himself with the gracious act of God in redeeming him. Repentance involves both a change of mind about sin, and a change of heart attitude toward sin. It is at the time a renunciation of sin and an acceptance of the Holy Spirit's enablement to holy living. . . . The act of repenting involves sorrow for both the fact of sin and the acts of sin in the life of the sinner. It precipitates decisive conviction of sin and resolution to change. The act of repentance, however, leads to the state of penitence in which the whole nature of man is changed so that he becomes identified with the grace of God, living in abhorrence of sin, with continual renunciation of it in his life" (**Zondervan Pictorial Bible Dictionary**, edited by Merrill C. Tenney, pp. 711-712).

F) H. A. Ironside: "**Metanoia** . . . means a change of mind. This is not simply the acceptance of new ideas in place of old

notions. But it actually **IMPLIES A COMPLETE REVERSAL OF ONE'S INWARD ATTITUDE . . . TO REPENT IS TO CHANGE ONE'S ATTITUDE TOWARD SELF, TOWARD SIN, TOWARD GOD, TOWARD CHRIST**" **Except Ye Repent**, p. 15, emphasis mine). "No man can truly believe in Christ, who does not first repent" (p. 11).

G) John Colquhoun: "The repentance then which is in the New Testament required of sinners is such an entire change of mind, or of views and sentiments respecting sin and salvation, **AS DISCOVERS ITSELF BY A GENUINE SORROW FOR SIN, A FIRM RESOLUTION TO HATE AND FORSAKE IT, and a sincere endeavor so to return to God in Christ as to walk with Him in newness of life: THE SINCERITY OF WHICH IS TO BE EVIDENCED BY FRUITS MEET FOR REPENTANCE. . . .** And as it is the gift of God, the purchase of Christ, and the work of the Holy Spirit, it is a saving grace . . . it is so inseparably connected with salvation, as to constitute an essential part of it. In the Scriptures it is called 'repentance to salvation,' and repentance unto life" (**Repentance**, p. 27, cf. Acts 5:31; 11:18; II Tim. 2:25; Acts 26: 18-20) (emphasis mine).

H) Emery H. Bancroft: "Repentance is that voluntary change in the mind of the sinner in which he turns from sin. Being essentially a change of mind, it involves a change of view, a change of feeling, and a change of purpose. . . ."

1. **An intellectual element**,—change of view—recognition of sin as involving personal guilt, defilement, and helplessness (Ps. 51:3,7,11). If unaccompanied by other elements, this recognition may manifest itself in fear of punishment, although as yet there is no hatred for sin. NOTE: The confession, "I have sinned," is made by hardened Pharaoh (Ex. 9:27), doubled-minded Balaam (Num. 22:34), despairing Judas (Mt. 27:4); but in not one of these cases was there true repentance. Cf. remorseful Achan (Josh. 7:20), insincere Saul (I Sam. 15:24,30).
2. **An emotional element**,—change of feeling—sorrow for sin as committed against goodness and justice, and therefore, hateful to God, and hateful in itself (Ps. 51:1, 2,10,14; II Cor. 7:10). NOTE: True repentance takes God's part against ourselves, has sympathy with God, feels how unworthily the Ruler, Father, Friend of men has

been treated. It does not ask, "What will my sin bring me?" but, "What does my sin mean to God?"

3. **A voluntary element**,—change of purpose—inward turning from sin and disposition to seek pardon and cleansing (Ps. 51:5,7,10; Jer. 25:5; Acts 11:18). This includes and implies the two preceding elements and is, therefore, the most important aspect of repentance. . . .

Further considerations and qualifications of repentance.

1. Repentance, in each and all of its aspects, is wholly an inward act, not to be confounded with the change of life which proceeds from it. True repentance is, indeed, manifested and evidenced by confession of sin before God (Luke 18:13), and by reparation for wrongs done to men (Luke 19:8). But these do not constitute repentance; they are rather fruits of repentance. Between 'repentance' and 'fruit worthy of repentance,' Scripture plainly distinguishes (Mt. 3:8).
2. Repentance is only a negative condition, and not a positive means of salvation. This is evident from the fact that repentance is no more than a sinner's present duty, and can furnish no offset to the claims of the law on account of past transgressions. A truly penitent man feels that his repentance has no merit. Apart from the positive element of conversion, namely, faith in Christ, it would be only sorrow for guilt unremoved. This very sorrow, moreover, is not the product of the human will, but is the gift of God (Acts 5:31; 11:18; II Tim. 2:25)

. . . **THAT DEGREE OF CONVICTION OF SIN IS ESSENTIAL TO SALVATION, WHICH CARRIES WITH IT A FORESAKING OF SIN AND A TRUSTFUL SURRENDER TO CHRIST**" (*Christian Theology*, pp. 230-232, emphasis mine).

OBSERVATIONS: Each definition of repentance comes to grips with the problems of sin except Ryrie's. The fact is that Ryrie cannot come to grips with sin in his definition because by his presupposition man can continue in the most glaring sin of all and still be saved. Is not the refusal to commit oneself to the Lord rebellion, and is not rebellion as the sin of witchcraft, and insubordination as iniquity and idolatry (I Sam. 15:22, 23)?

Biblical repentance, whether at the time of conversion or subsequently in the Christian's life, always comes face to face with God, self and sin (cf. Job 42:5,6; Ps. 51; Is. 6:5; Luke 15:18,19; Acts 26:18-20). And if it does not evidence itself in a resolve to turn from sin, it is not genuine repentance. Now, all will grant that the old nature in the convert will keep that resolve from being carried out perfectly, but the desire will be there, and that desire is the evidence that the repentance is genuine. To insist that "Lordship preachers" hold that a man must be sinlessly perfect before he can be saved is a misrepresentation.

Dr. A. Ray Stanford from Florida Bible College writes in much the same vein as Dr. Ryrie. We must all appreciate the fact that these men are zealous to maintain the purity of the doctrine of salvation by grace without any admixture of meritorious works but in doing so they have sadly emptied repentance and faith of their moral content. Dr. Stanford, commenting on Luke 13:1-5, writes:

Even if one does not know Greek, it is obvious from the passage itself that the meaning of "repent" here cannot be "sorrow for, or turning from, sin." These people obviously needed, above all else, to **think differently**—in this case—to think differently about themselves, about others, and about God (**Handbook of Personal Evangelism**, p. 86).

The flaw in Dr. Stanford's reasoning is obvious. How can one think differently about himself, others and God without sorrowing over sin and resolving to turn from it? It is readily admitted that "sorrow" is not tied up in the etymology of **metanoia**, but as Broadus correctly points out, ". . . in all moral uses of the term there will of course be grief at the previous wrong course that one now determines to abandon. Whenever this Greek word is employed in the New Testament. . . , the reference is to changing the mind, purpose, from sin to holiness, and no one will do this who does not feel deep sorrow for the sin he has already committed. Sorrow is thus not expressed by the word itself, but in the New Testament use is always suggested from the nature of the case, and thus becomes associated with the word" (**Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew**, p. 34).

On Acts 20:20,21 Dr. Stanford comments: "Notice, that the Bible states here that we are to proclaim repentance

TOWARD GOD. Nothing here about turning from sin" (*op. cit.*, p. 87). Here Dr. Stanford is arguing from silence—a common but fallacious practice. A person cannot turn to God sincerely without resolving to turn away from what he knows to be hateful to God. The Thessalonians turned to God from idols (I Thes. 1:9).

Again Dr. Stanford comments: "Any teaching that demands a change of conduct for salvation either toward God or man is to add works or human effort to faith" (*op. cit.*, p. 89). Again, we appreciate Dr. Stanford's zeal in maintaining the doctrine of justification by faith, but insisting on repentance unto salvation is not adding meritorious works to faith, for repentance itself is a gift from God, and nothing that is a gift can ever be a meritorious condition to salvation (cf. Acts 5:31; 11:18; II Tim. 2:25), but that both repentance and faith are absolute conditions to salvation is clear from the Bible. Dr. Ironside says:

No man can truly believe in Christ, who does not first repent. Shallow preaching that does not grapple with the terrible fact of man's sinfulness and guilt, calling on "all men everywhere to repent," results in shallow conversions; **AND SO WE HAVE MYRIADS OF GLIB-TONGUED PROFESSORS TODAY WHO GIVE NO EVIDENCE OF REGENERATION WHATEVER.** Prating about salvation by grace, they manifest no grace in their lives. Loudly declaring they are justified by faith alone, they fail to remember that "faith without works is dead" (**Except Ye Repent**, p. 11).

Some contend that since John's Gospel does not mention the word "repentance" we need not concern ourselves with preaching repentance. Let it never be forgotten that the same Author who gave us the Gospel according to John that we might believe, also gave us the Gospel according to Luke that men might know their duty to repent. The attempt to see how little we can preach and still preach the gospel is the curse of our age. We need the "maximizing mentality" of Paul who did not consider himself pure from the blood of all men unless he had preached the **whole counsel of God** (Acts 20:27). Failure to preach repentance is failure to comply with the great commission as set forth by Luke: "Thus it is written, that the Christ should suffer and rise again from the dead the third day; and that RE-

PENTANCE FOR FORGIVENESS OF SINS SHOULD BE PROCLAIMED IN HIS NAME TO ALL NATIONS—BEGINNING FROM JERUSALEM” (24:46,47). To neglect the preaching of repentance is to neglect the preaching of the whole counsel of God (Acts 20:19-21, 27) and is disobedience to the heavenly vision received by Paul who responded by keeping on declaring “both to those of Damascus first, and also at Jerusalem and then throughout all the region of Judea, and even to the Gentiles, that they should REPENT AND TURN TO GOD, PERFORMING DEEDS APPROPRIATE TO REPENTANCE” (Acts 26:20).

NOTE: All Dispensationalists are not opposed to the view here set forth. Homer A. Kent, H. A. Ironside, and Emery H. Bancroft were Dispensationalists. It is the Dallas Seminary variety of Dispensationalism that is antagonistic towards it.

V. THE LORDSHIP OF CHRIST AND FAITH

Dr. Henry C. Thiessen states that, “The voluntary element includes the surrender of the heart to God and the appropriation of Christ as Saviour. . . . This note in faith is today often overlooked or even referred to a later time of consecration; but the Scriptures connect it with the initial experience of salvation” (**Introductory Lectures in Systematic Theology**, pp. 358,359).

On the other hand, Dr. Ryrie says, “The message of faith plus commitment of life cannot . . . be the gospel” (**Balancing the Christian Life**, p. 170).

Dr. Ryrie’s predecessor, Lewis Sperry Chafer, former president of Dallas Theological Seminary, writes: “To impose a need to surrender the life to God as an added condition of salvation is most unreasonable” (**Systematic Theology**, III, 385). Chafer’s argument is that the sinner is incapable of surrendering, so it should not be required of him. That is a very strange argument indeed, in light of his adherence to the doctrine of Total Inability. According to that doctrine the sinner cannot believe, even in Chafer’s sense of the term, yet Chafer does not keep from teaching that sinners in their state of total inability ought to believe.

Both Ryrie and Chafer make a serious mistake at this point by misrepresenting the orthodox position on the matter. The

Reformation position is **not** that a man is saved by faith **plus** commitment, or surrender, but rather a man is saved by faith **that** commits and surrenders. Faith that does not commit and surrender is not saving faith. There is not evidence that either Ryrie or Chafer takes James 2:14-26 into account. James teaches in no uncertain terms that faith that does not work is dead useless and cannot save. The demons believe that Jesus is God, but that does not save them (James 2:19; cf. Mark 1:24, 5:7-13).

Dr. Stanford's interpretation is out of harmony with the analogy of Scripture and readily lends itself to perverting the grace of God into lasciviousness. In answer to James' question, "What use is it, my brethen, if a man says he has faith, but he has no works? Can that faith save him?" (James 2:14) Stanford quotes Romans 4:5, "But to him that worketh not, but believeth on Him that justifieth that ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness." Stanford insists that faith that does not evidence itself in fruit will save (**Handbook of Personal Evangelism**, pp. 102,103). His application of Romans 4:5 to James 2:14 is a violation of sound principles of interpretation. Paul is explaining the fact that justification comes by faith, not works; James is explaining the nature of saving faith—that it manifests itself in works. Each epistle must be understood in the light of its own purpose.

It is of utmost importance to realize that the biblical concept of saving faith has as its basic ingredient a disposition to obey. Note how the words "believe" and "obey" are used interchangeably in John 3:36 (Greek or NASB): "He who **believes** in the Son has eternal life; but he who **does not obey** the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abides on him." The first word is **pisteuon**, the second **apeithon**. Concerning these words, Vine remarks: "**Peitho** and **pisteuo** (obey and believe) are closely related etymologically; the difference in meaning is that the former implies the obedience produced by the latter, cp. Heb. 3:18,19, where the disobedience of the Israelites is said to be the evidence of their unbelief. Faith is of the heart, invisible to men; obedience is of the conduct and may be observed. **WHEN A MAN OBEYS GOD HE GIVES THE ONLY POSSIBLE EVIDENCE THAT IN HIS HEART HE BELIEVES GOD. . . . Peitho** suggests an actual and outward result of the inward persuasion and consequent faith" (W. E. Vine, **Expository Dictionary of New Testament Words**, III, 124).

For other references that show that saving faith manifests itself in a disposition to obey see Mt. 7:21; Heb. 5:9; 11:8. This is not to be confused with sinless perfection, for the regenerate man, though no longer under the dominion of his sinful nature, is constantly in conflict with it, and sometimes overcome by it. Sinless perfection will not be realized till the day of glorification (cf. Rom. 6,7; I John 1:8; 3:2).

VI. THE LORDSHIP OF CHRIST AND THE CARNAL CHRISTIAN

Dr. Ryrie's chief reason for arguing against the orthodox view of faith seems to be that he must make room for "carnal Christians." He writes, "As far as sanctification is concerned, if only committed people are saved people, then where is there room for carnal Christians?" **Balancing the Christian Life**, p.170.

Is Dr. Ryrie correct in assuming that a "carnal Christian" cannot be a committed Christian? What is a "carnal Christian" according to the prevailing opinion? Dr. Lewis Sperry Chafer defines him as follows: "Though saved, the carnal Christians are 'walking according to the course of this world.' They are carnal because the flesh is dominating them" (**He That is Spiritual**, p.10). Bill Bright, in his booklet **Have You Made the Wonderful Discovery of the Spirit-Filled Life?**, p. 6, represents three classes of people, natural, carnal and spiritual, by diagrams. The diagram that represents the "carnal Christian" is identical to the diagram that represents the natural man, with the exception that the cross is inside the circle of the diagram of the "carnal Christian" (showing that he has made a decision for Christ). Also, the sins listed for both diagrams are the same. According to Chafer and Bright, therefore, the "carnal Christian" is no different from the unregenerate in life and conduct.

These definitions must be challenged because they contradict the Scriptures. First, when a person lives and acts like the world, no one, including himself, can be sure that he is a converted man. A tree is known by its fruit (Mt. 12:33-35). John says, "By this the children of God and the children of the devil are obvious; any one who does not practice righteousness is not of God" (I John 3:10 NASB). Chafer's assumption, therefore, that a carnal man who walks according to the course of this

world is saved is fallacious because it is assuming what no one knows and what the evidence contradicts. Secondly, these definitions are out of harmony with what Paul says about the relationship between justification and sanctification (Rom. 6-8). According to Paul, "to be carnally minded is death" and involves more than the loss of a few rewards (Rom. 8:5,9,13). Yet both Bright and Chafer make that precarious assumption, an assumption that is fraught with the danger that the mere professor will relax in a false assurance that will keep him from seeking God with all his heart. This kind of professor runs the risk of hearing the Lord say in the day of judgment, "I never knew you; depart from Me, you who practice lawlessness" (Mt. 7:23).

Perhaps the reason this definition is so common is due to the fact that many people take for granted that the man who lived in incest in the Corinthian church was a saved man. The question must be asked whether Paul included this man under the designation "carnal" in I Cor. 3:1: "And I, brethren, could not speak unto you as unto spiritual, but as unto carnal, even as unto babes in Christ." The evidence is strongly to the contrary. It is clear that Paul did not assume that the man was saved for the following reasons: (1) Paul instructs the Corinthians to excommunicate this man, "that his spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus." The reason for excommunication is pointless if he is already saved (5:5). (2) Paul instructs the Corinthians not to associate with any "so-called brother if he should be a immoral person" (5:11). The leading commentators agree that Paul did not assume the "so-called brother" was saved: (a) Charles Hodge: "The command is not to associate with any one who is **called a brother**, and yet a fornicator, or covetous, or an idolator, or a railer, or a drunkard, or an extortioner. A man in professing to be a Christian professes to renounce all these sins; if he does not act consistently with his profession, **HE IS NOT TO BE RECOGNIZED AS A CHRISTIAN**" (*Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*, p. 90). (b) Leon Morris: "His point had been that they must not maintain intimate fellowship . . . with one who professes to be a Christian (that is called a brother), but denies his profession by his manner of life. He is not really a brother, but a fornicator or the like" (*The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians*, pp. 91,92). (c) F. W. Grosheide: "The man has the name of a brother, he is a member of the congregation but

in reality he is a public sinner” (**Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians**, p. 129). (d) R. C. H. Lenski: “He cannot merely say ‘if one be a brother,’ for men of this type, although they outwardly belong to the congregation, are not really ‘brethren.’ He must add: one who is called a brother, who has the **onoma** or name of ‘brother’ but is lacking what the name implies” (**The Interpretation of St. Paul’s First and Second Epistle to the Corinthians**, p. 228). (e) Herschel H. Hobbs: “The man’s actions suggest that he is not a Christian as yet. He did not belong in this fellowship” (**The Epistles to the Corinthians**, p. 31). (f) A. T. Robertson: “Paul’s motive is not merely vindictive, but the reformation of the offender. . . . The final salvation of the man in the day of Christ is the goal and this is to be attained by not condoning his sin” (**Word Pictures in the New Testament**, IV, 113). (3) Paul instructs the Corinthians to “remove the wicked man from among yourselves” (5:13). The Greek word for “wicked” is **poneron**. This word is used in Matthew 13:49,50 with reference to the lost: “So it will be at the end of the age; the angels shall come forth, and take out the **wicked** from among the righteous, and will cast them into the furnace of fire; there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth.” (4) Finally, Paul says that anyone who assumes that the man living in incest (not just **falling** into sin as David did, whereof he soon repented, but **living** in sin) is saved is deceiving himself: “Do you know not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God? Do not be deceived; neither fornicators, nor idolators, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor homosexuals, nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor swindlers, shall inherit the kingdom of God” (I Cor. 6:9,10). NOTE: Our Lord equates entering the kingdom with eternal life (cp. Mt. 19:16, 23-26).

What then is a carnal Christian? Negatively, he cannot be a man who is totally dominated by carnality, for according to Paul “to be carnally minded is death. . . . Now if any man have not the Spirit he is none of his” (Rom. 8:6,9). (It should be borne in mind, however, that no man is so qualified that he can infallibly diagnose the heart of a man who shows neither positive nor negative evidences in his life. Such a man may or may not be saved, but assurance of salvation cannot be had when there is no sign of spiritual life.) The least that can be said about a carnal Christian is that he evidences **both** the fruit of the

Spirit and the fruit of the flesh (cf. Rom. 7:15-25). In that sense every Christian is in varying degrees **both** carnal and spiritual, depending on his growth in sanctification. "Babes in Christ" (I Cor. 3:1), generally speaking, manifest more carnal characteristics than mature Christians, who, generally speaking, manifest the characteristics of spiritual maturity. That this conclusion is correct is apparent from the Christians at Corinth. Along with their carnality which manifested itself in strife and division, they manifested the fruit of the Spirit (I Cor. 1:5,7; 3:1-5; 11:2; 14:12). The common notion, then, the "carnal Christian" is a person whose life and conduct is identical to that of the worldling must be rejected. If there be saved people in the world whose lives show no sign of conversion, it is a matter known to God alone. In such cases His discipline will not be long delayed (Heb. 12:6-8). The point is that no counselor has any business assuring such an individual that all is well with his soul. Assurance that does not have subjective evidence (a changed life) as well as objective evidence (God's promises) for its foundation is an opium that lulls people to sleep on the brink of hell.

Note some of the criteria that John gives by which a person may know whether or not he has been born again:

1. "No one who is born of God practices sin" (I John 3:9 NASB). He no longer sins with his heart and will and whole inclination, as an unregenerate man does.
2. "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God" (I John 5:1. As Messiah He was anointed to the offices of Prophet, Priest and King, and true faith will submit to Christ in those offices).
3. "Every one that doeth righteousness is born of God" (I John 2:29).
4. "We know that we have passed from death unto life, because we love the brethren" (I John 3:14).
5. "Whatsoever is born of God overcometh the world" (I John 5:4).
6. "By this the children of God and the children of the devil are obvious; any one who does not practice righteousness is not of God, nor the one who does not love **his** brother" (I John 3:10).
7. "The one who practices sin is of the devil" (I John 3:8).

VII. THE BIBLICAL DOCTRINE OF SELF-EXAMINATION

“EXAMINE YOURSELVES, whether ye be in the faith; prove your own selves. Know ye not . . . that Jesus Christ is in you, except ye be reprobates” (II Cor. 13:5).

According to a survey the majority of professing Christians have never had Paul’s admonition urged upon them. Yet, in a day of superficial evangelism and false profession there is a great need for healthy Biblical self-examination. (The opposite extreme of morbid, endless introspection should be avoided). The great soul-winner George Truett observed that 80% of professing Christians had never been born again. Evangelist Ron Comfort concluded after ten years of evangelism that 50% of the people in Fundamentalist churches had never experienced the new birth.

UNAVOIDABLE IMPLICATIONS IN PAUL’S ADMONITION TO SELF-EXAMINATION

- A. Paul did not assume that all professors were possessors (cf. I Cor. 6:9,10).
1. He was infallible when writing Scriptures but he had no access to the Book of Life.
 2. He had no other way of knowing about a man’s salvation than we do (I John 3:10).
- B. Self-examination is a apostolic injunction. Why is it prevalently neglected?
1. Wrong counseling: Often it is said that if a person has doubts about his salvation he is calling God a liar, or that the doubts are caused by the devil. Such counseling has no warrant in the Bible. The doubts of those 50% who are mere professors are certainly not inspired by Satan; they may be caused by the conviction of the Holy Spirit. (It should be taken for granted that Satan does try to inspire doubts in the hearts of **true** Christians.)
 2. Warped emphasis on the doctrine of Eternal Security.
 - a. Examples: R. B. Theime: “You can even become an atheist; but if you once accepted Christ as your Savior, you can’t lose your salvation” (**Apes and Pea-**

cocks, p. 22). "Do you know that if you were a genius, you couldn't figure out a way to go to hell? . . . You can blaspheme, you can deny the Lord, you can commit every sin in the Bible, plus all the others; but there is just **NO WAY!**" (*A New Species*, p. 9). Thieme is not alone in teaching this view.

- b. Refutation: The emphasis of the Bible is entirely in the other direction: ". . . by which also you are saved, **if you hold fast** the word which I preached to you" (I Cor. 15:2; cf. Heb. 3:6; John 15:6; Mt. 24:13). "The true doctrine is **not** that salvation is certain if we have **once** believed; but that **perseverance in holiness** is certain if we have **truly** believed. The certainty of an individual's salvation is known to him only through the fact of his perseverance in holiness" (A. A. Hodge. *The Confession of Faith*, p. 235).
3. Unbiblical conception of the "carnal Christian." (See "The 20th Century Carnal Christian Doctrine.") Example: Young man: "I am a Christian, but I do not mind sitting in the bleachers. I choose to go to heaven the carnal way." Answer: J. O. Buswell: "I am not denying that a regenerate child of God may fall into carnality. . . . But my point is that so long as a professing Christian is in a state of carnality, no pastor, no Christian friend, has the slightest ground for holding that this carnal person has ever been regenerated" (*Systematic Theology*, II, 147).
4. Misapplication of the phrase, "saved, yet so as by fire" (I Cor. 3:14). Not a reputable commentary applies this verse to the layman. From the context it is clear that this is addressed to those who have office-bearing capacity in the church. The apostles and pastors are builders (3:4-15). The building consist of professors. "**Ye** are the building." "**Ye** (plural) are the temple (singular)" (3:9,16). Gold, silver and precious stones represent true converts (cf. I Pt. 2:5). Wood, hay and stubble represent the mere professor (cf. Mt. 3:12; 13:30; John 15:6). (See R. L. Dabney, *Discussions*, I, 551-574.)
5. Misapplication of the parable of the Prodigal Son. According to the context the prodigal represents publicans and sinners and the older son the Pharisees and scribes

(Luke 15:1,2). **The fact that they are called sons does not prove that they are saved.** The Israelites were called God's sons nationally when they were not his sons spiritually (cf. Deut. 32:5,6; Is. 1:2-4). Backsliders can find comfort in this parable, but those who live like the two sons should be faced with the warnings of Matthew 5:20 and I Corinthians 6:9,10.)

6. The presumption that those who are called servants must be saved people (Mt. 25:24-30). That presumption has no biblical basis. Hophni and Phinehas were called the priests of the LORD, but they knew Him not (I Sam. 1:3; 2:12). Sennacherib and Cyrus were servants of God, too, but there is evidence that they were not saved men (Is. 10:5; 44:28). It is possible to be called a servant and go the place of hypocrites and unbelievers (Mt. 24:48-51; Luke 12:46).

C. Self-examination is a personal responsibility. "Examine yourselves."

1. The counselor can judge only by appearance, and Satan is good at counterfeiting.
2. The counselor may not usurp the office of the Holy Spirit (Rom. 8:16). He may show how assurance can be found (I John 5:13), but he cannot give it.

D. A person can know that he is saved.

1. Catholics deny this: "Believer's assurance of pardon of his sins is a vain and ungodly confidence" (Council of Trent). Cardinal Bellarmine: "error of heretics."
2. Saints have had assurance: Job, "I know that my redeemer liveth" (19:26). Isaiah, "The work of righteousness shall be peace; and the effect of righteousness quietness, and assurance forever" (32:17). Cf. II Tim. 1:12; II Pe. 1:10.
3. Pursuit of assurance is commanded. Make your calling and election sure" (II Pe. 1:10).
4. How assurance of salvation may be attained.
 - a. Assurance of salvation does not come at the end of a syllogism, unless the minor premise is put to the test.

The possibility of temporal faith (Mt. 13:21; Luke 8:13), or historical faith (James 2:19) that does not save must be considered.

Major premise: "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life."

Minor premise: "I believe on the Son."

Conclusion: "I have everlasting life."

- b. How the minor premise may be tested. See James 2:14-26; John 15:1-7; etc.
5. Biblical assurance of salvation rests on **three** pillars.
- a. It rests upon the infallible promises of God (Heb. 6:17-19).
 - b. It rests upon the evidence of a changed life (II Cor. 1:12; 5:17).
"No one who is born of God practices sin" (I John 3:9 NASB).
"Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ (anointed as Prophet, Priest and King) is born of God" (I John 5:1).
"Every one that doeth righteousness is born of Him (I John 2:29).
"We know that we have passed from death unto life, because we love the brethren" (I John 3:14). "The one who practices sin is of the devil" (3:8).
 - c. It rests upon the witness of the Spirit (Rom. 8:16). The Spirit confirms that what our spirit says about ourselves conforms to His Word (Williamson, 133).
6. Tests by which true assurance may be distinguished from the false (Hodge, 239):
- a. True assurance begets unfeigned humility; the false begets spiritual pride and presumption (I Cor. 15:10; Gal. 6:14).
 - b. The true leads to increased diligence in the practice of holiness; the false leads to sloth and self-indulgence (Ps. 51:12,13,19).
 - c. The true leads to candid self-examination and to a desire to be searched and corrected by God; the false

leads to a disposition to be satisfied with appearance and avoids accurate investigation (Ps. 139:23,24).

- d. The true leads to constant aspirations after more intimate fellowship with God (I John 3:2,3; Ps. 42:1,2).
- E. It is possible to be saved and not have assurance of salvation.
1. The Reformers, in their reaction to Rome, believed that assurance was of the essence of saving faith. However, "Those who make assurance the essence of faith, generally reduce faith to a mere intellectual assent" (Chas. Hodge, III 106) .
 2. **Westminster Confession XVIII, 3:** "This infallible assurance doth not so belong to the essence of faith, but that a true believer may wait long, and conflict with many difficulties, before he be partaker of it" (I John 5:13; Is. 50:10; Mark 9:24; Ps. 88; 77:1-12).
- F. It is possible for a man to think all is well when in actuality he is going to hell. "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven. Many will say to me in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name? and in thy name done many wonderful works? And then will I profess unto them, I never knew you: depart from me, ye that work iniquity" (Mt. 7:21-23).

VIII. COUNSELING COMPARED

PAUL'S COUNSEL TO THE CORINTHIANS

1. "Let no man deceive himself" (I Cor. 3:18; cf. 6:9,10).
2. Do not associate with a "so-called brother" (5:11, NASB).
3. "You are saved, **IF** you hold fast the word which I preached to you (15:2).
4. "If any man does not love the Lord, let him be accursed" (16:22).
5. "We beg you on behalf of Christ, be reconciled to God" (II Cor. 5:20).
6. "Test yourselves to see if you are in the faith; examine yourselves!" (II Cor. 13:5).

PREVALENT CONTEMPORARY COUNSELING

1. Assurance and security are in no way connected to, or to be examined by, the fruits of sanctification.
2. Regardless of one's present state, he is "eternally secure" if he "asked Jesus to come into his heart" earlier. "We may disgrace our Heavenly Father. . . . We may never call upon His name. We may never seek to walk in close fellowship with Him. We may actually try to deny our (family) name," and yet be saved (P.S. Warren, **Can a Saved Person Ever Be Lost?** p. 35).
3. If you question your salvation, you are calling God a liar.
NOTE: Paul assumed a person to be lost unless the fruit of his life proved otherwise. In many circles today a professing Christian is assumed to be saved regardless of the evidence, or the lack of it, in his life. The Bible does teach that a person may have assurance of salvation, but that assurance must have for its foundation a changed life (cf. I John).

NOTE: Those who would adduce Lot as proof for their "carnal Christian" theory should remember that (1) he had neither the Old or New Testaments; (2) he was married to a wicked, wordly wife; (3) he had no assurance (I Jn. 3:18,19); (4) that he was oppressed by the sensual conduct, and that he "felt his righteous soul tormented day after day with their lawless deeds" (II Pet. 2:7,8).

IX. WHY DR. RYRIE'S VIEW OF THE LORDSHIP OF CHRIST IS DANGEROUS

1. The Bible warns against a faith that will not save (James 2:14-26). A faith that does not surrender, commit, and obey is suspect.
2. It involves an arbitrary and restricted interpretation of the word "Lord." If the apostles had meant no more by this word than "Deity," they would use "**Theos**".
3. It leaves people with the impression that they may enjoy forgiveness while they continue in rebellion, a view most inconsistent with Scripture (Prov. 28:13; Acts 26:20). This view emasculates the biblical doctrine of repentance.

4. It puts people on the toboggan of "Carnal Security." Christ did not come to save **in** sin, but **from** sin (Mt. 1:21).
5. It necessitates an unbiblical view of the "carnal Christian." This is in conflict with the analogy of Scripture. The Bible knows nothing of this **tertium quid**, this monster, a sheep with the disposition of a sow (II Pet. 2:22).
6. It implies that one may be saved without being converted (Mt. 18:3).
7. It implies that sanctification can be separated from justification (Eph. 2:8-10). "Any man who thinks he is a Christian, and that he has accepted Christ for justification, and . . . not for sanctification is miserably deluded. . ." (A. A. Hodge).
8. It does not lay a good foundation for assurance. "Reliance upon a past experience is like trusting in the value of a policy of life insurance upon which several years' premiums have been unpaid. . . . The only conclusive evidence of perseverance is a present experience of Christ's presence and indwelling, corroborated by active service and purity of life" (A. H. Strong, **Systematic Theology**, p. 886).

"Faith must obey her Maker's will
 As well as trust His grace;
 A pardoning God is jealous still
 For His own holiness."

He "gave himself for us, that HE MIGHT REDEEM US FROM EVERY LAWLESS DEED AND PURIFY FOR HIMSELF A PEOPLE FOR HIS OWN POSSESSION, ZEALOUS FOR GOOD DEEDS" (Titus 2:14).

X. EXCERPTS

"During the past thirty years there has been a gradual subtle shift in the emphasis concerning the 'Gospel of the glory of Christ' which amounts to a complete perversion of the blessed evangel. The emphasis in our modern-day evangelism has shifted from that of the Lordship of Christ to an easy-believism. This shifting of the emphasis has led to an adulterated gospel and changed the message and the ministry of the Church. **THIS IS SATAN'S MASTERPIECE.**

“. . . men and movements have so often given the impression that the acceptance of the Lordship of Christ is a second experience of grace, or a sort of optional addendum to the Christian life. SO GREAT HAS BEEN THIS PERVERSION THAT MANY CONGREGATIONS ARE ASTOUNDED WHEN THEY HEAR THE TRUE GOSPEL OF THE LORDSHIP OF CHRIST. THEY BELIEVE WE ARE PREACHING A NEW GOSPEL. Satan has employed every seductive and deceptive force at his command to cause God's servants to by-pass or omit altogether the Lordship of the Redeemer.”

—James A. Stewart, **Defective Evangelism**, p.20

“The hearers of powerful evangelical preachers often come to a miserable end because they are not exhorted to count the cost. They are stirred and excited into professing what they have not really experienced. They begin with a sadly defective notion of what is true Christianity. They fancy that it consists of nothing more than a fancied ‘coming to Christ’ and having strong inward feelings of joy and peace. And so when they find after a time that there is a cross to be carried, and that their hearts are deceitful, and there is a busy devil always near them, they cool down in disgust, and they turn to their old sins.”

—J. C. Ryle

“THE SON OF GOD DOES NOT SAVE REBELS. There must be true submission (repentance) What a parody of the Gospel when many are told to ‘trust Jesus to take them to heaven when they die,’ who nevertheless are living in the practice of sin and rebellion against His laws.”

—James A. Stewart, **The Lordship of Christ**, p.33

“And remember, sins which happened to some of God's people of old, and yet they were God's people, if they happened to you would prove that you were not among the people of God at all, for they were placed, many of them, in circumstances which, though they did not excuse the sin, yet somewhat accounted for it. You are not placed in such circumstances, you have more light given you and a clear revelation of Christ, and therefore more is expected of you, and I tell you in God's sight, if you do not all strive for holiness, it is in vain for you to talk faith in Christ, for there it stands and always must stand, ‘Be ye

holy, for I am holy.' 'Be ye clean that bear the vessels of the Lord.' The Son of Man not only came to seek the lost, but to save them, and what that saving is explained by his very name. 'They shall call his name Jesus, for she shall save his people **from their sins,**' not in their sins, but **from** their sins. Except we, as believers, keep our Lord's commandments and walk according to his will, we shall not be able to comfort ourselves even with the blood of Jesus; for Jesus never died to give us peace while we love sin and live in it. What says the Scriptures, 'If we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin,' see then than only as we are walking in the light as he is in the light, can we have evidence that the blood has cleansed us from sin. God grant us to feel the force of this."

—C. H. Spurgeon, "The Winnowing Fan" (sermon)

"For to this end Christ died and lived again, that He might be Lord both of the dead and the living" (Rom. 14:9, NASB).

"Know for certain that God has made Him both Lord and Christ" (Acts 2:36, NASB).

XI. BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bancroft, Emery H. **Christian Theology**. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1967.
- Bass, Clarence B. "Repentance," **The Zondervan Pictorial Bible Dictionary**, Merrill C. Tenney, General Editor. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1963.
- Bright, William R. "Have You Make the Wonderful Discovery of the Spirit-Filled Life?" San Bernardino, California: Campus Crusade for Christ International.
- Broadus, John A. **Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew**. Valley Forge, Pennsylvania: The American Baptist Publication Society, 1886.
- Chafer, Lewis Sperry. **He That is Spiritual**. Findlay, Ohio: Dunham Publishing Company, 1918.
- Chafer, Lewis Sperry. **Systematic Theology**. Dallas, Texas: Dallas Seminary Press, 1962.
- Colquhoun, John. **Repentance**. London: The Banner of Truth Trust, 1965.
- Grosheide, F. W. **Comentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians**. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdman Publishing Company, 1968.
- Hobbs, Herschel H. **The Epistles to the Corinthians**. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1960.
- Hodge, Charles. **An Exposition of the First Epistle to the Corinthians**. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, n. d.
- Ironside, Harry A. **Except Ye Repent**. New York: American Tract Society, 1937.
- Kent, Homer A., Jr. **The Gospel According to Matthew**, in *The Wycliffe Bible Commentary*, edited by Charles Pfeiffer and Everett F. Harrison. Nashville: The Southwestern Company, 1968.
- Kittel, Gerhard. **Theological Dictionary of the New Testament**, translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1964.

- Lenski, R. C. H. **The Interpretation of St. Paul's First and Second Epistles to the Corinthians.** Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1963.
- Morris, Leon. **The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians.** Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1958.
- Reid, John. "Lord," **Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels**, James Hastings, editor. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1929.
- Robertson, Archibald Thomas. **Word Pictures in the New Testament**, IV. New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1931.
- Robinson, William Childs. "Lord," **Baker's Dictionary of Theology**, Everett F. Harrison, editor. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1960, pp. 328-329.
- Ryrie, Charles Caldwell. **Balancing the Christian Life.** Chicago: Moody Press, 1969.
- Spurgeon, Charles Haddon. **The Soul Winner.** Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1963.
- Stanford, A. Ray. **Handbook of Personal Evangelism.** Hollywood, Florida: Florida Bible College, n. d.
- Strong, Augustus Hopkins. **Systematic Theology.** Valley Forge, Pennsylvania: The Judson Press, 1965.
- Vincent, Marvin R. **Word Studies in the New Testament.** Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1965.
- Vine, W. E. **An Expository Dictionary of New Testament Words.** Old Tappan, New Jersey: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1966.
- Warren, Paul S. **Can A Saved Person Ever Be Lost?** Huntington, West Virginia: Jefferson Avenue Baptist Church Press, 1971.

