



www.PreciousHeart.net/ti

Volume 3 – 2011

**A Non-Legalistic Doctrine of Sanctification:
Refuting Recent Controversy in the Reformed Church**

Dr. Enrique Ramos
President, Evangelical and Education Ministry
Addiction Counselor, VA Hospital, San Juan, Puerto Rico
Theologian in Residence at Reforma Dos Ministry at Center Church
Iglesia del Centro, Arecibo, Puerto Rico ¹

Introduction 2
A. Main Theoretical Argument 3
B. Overview of Reformed Church’s View of Justification and Sanctification..... 5

¹ Ramos currently works as an Addictions Therapist at the V.A. Hospital in San Juan, Puerto Rico. He is a Theologian in Residence with Reforma Dos Ministry of the Iglesia del Centro, Arecibo, Puerto Rico; Chaplain in the Naval Reserve having served at Roosevelt Rhoads in Ceiba, Puerto Rico; and a former theology professor at the Inter-American University in San Germán, Puerto Rico. He has a M.Div. from Westminster Theological Seminary, a M.S.W. from the Universidad de Puerto Rico, an M.Th. from North-West University, South Africa; a Ph.D. from Seminario Campbell Morgan, Argentina; a Ph.D. from Seminario Mayor Escuela de Teologia y Ciencia de la Religion from Colombia; and a Th.D (Hon.) from Faculdade Teologica, Missao, Macedonia, Republica Federativa, Brasil. He is an ordained minister in the General Lutheran Church serving as its International Coordinator and Resident Theologian. He is also Professor at the ReformaDos Escuela de Ministerios (School of Ministry) in Caguas, Puerto Rico, and at the Seminario Reformado students, Latinoamericano of Colombia teaching Systematic Theology and Apologetics, as well as in charge of guiding the doctoral students in their dissertations. He is an ordained minister in the General Lutheran Church serving as Deputy Dean, International Coordinator, Director of Chaplaincy Services, and Resident Theologian.

C. Federal Vision: New Perspective on Paul?.....	6
1. The Gospel	6
2. The Righteousness of God.....	7
3. Final Judgment According to Works	8
D. Justification in the Federal Vision.....	8
1. Works of the Law	10
2. Covenant and Election	10
3. Imputation	11
4. Nature of Union with Christ	11
E. FV Disagrees with the Westminster Shorter Catechism, Confession of Faith, and Larger Catechism.....	12
F. Arguments Against the Federal Vision.....	13
1. Righteousness	13
2. Works of the Law	14
G. Summary Against the Federal Vision.....	15
H. The Lordship Controversy	16
1. The Lordship Doctrine	16
2. Summary of Errors in the Lordship Position	20
Conclusion Against the New Positions on Paul and Sanctification	24
References	25

Introduction

The focus of this article is on recent challenges to the central tenet of the classic Reformed theology of mainstream Protestantism, namely the doctrine of *justification* by faith and its corollary, continuing growth through *sanctification* in the life of the Christian believer. Among the sources of schism in the Reformed Church is the repeated appearance of new disputes regarding this doctrine and the truth of the orthodox Protestant interpretation of justification and sanctification.

Over the last four decades, mainstream Reformed Protestantism has seen a series of what are termed “controversies,” from the Shepherd Controversy (1974–81), leading to the Federal Vision Controversy (ca. 2002–2010), down to the current Lordship Controversy, all of which have adherents claiming to draw inspiration and authority from the early Reformed Church. Among the many subjects of recent debate have been such central doctrines as justification by faith, works of the law, covenant, election, Christ’s human and divine nature, and the nature of the believer’s unity with Christ.

The focus of this study is on the traditional Protestant doctrine of justification by faith, and the imputation that through grace, the Christian believer grows in sanctification over the natural course of life. The author's position is that this traditional understanding of sanctification as the product of God's grace is correct, and that the challenges that have been advanced in recent years—the Federal Vision and Lordship Controversies—are false in their reasoning and problematic in their implications. This study therefore attempts to diagnose the errors of these “controversies” through the use of exegetical analysis and a point-by-point review of the claims of their adherents, in order to show the way back to the classical or “orthodox” Protestant approach to sanctification and justification by faith.

The author's personal theological position is in disagreement with these recent “controversies,” including Lordship Salvation and the Federal Vision, which he believes can be described as a radical theology taking up heretical positions on the teachings of Paul. The core of the author's belief is akin to the doctrine of Sonship as traditionally espoused, although this might better be referred to as Christian grace. From this position, a son or daughter of God receives grace and salvation through Christ's righteousness, a total dependence in the Holy Spirit for his or her sanctification, and the believer constantly “preaching of the Gospel to himself” on the doctrines of repentance and faith.

A. Main Theoretical Argument

The most basic assumption of this article is that Scripture is the sole basis for determining the revealed word of God, and that new doctrines should therefore be evaluated in the light of Scripture's exclusive authority on the Biblical matters to which they relate. The study further assumes the fundamental premise of Reform Protestantism, that of justification by faith rather than works as the true path to sanctification and salvation. The theoretical framework of the study is comprised of the Reformed Doctrine, held in the Three Forms of Unity (Heidelberg Catechism, Belgic Confession, and the Articles of the Synod of Dort), as well as the Westminster Confession of Faith and its catechisms. The author believes that the Reformed Faith has a universal standing in all Reformed churches in the world;

thus, he believes correct interpretation may benefit all who hold to the Reformed Faith, regardless of their national or cultural identities.

The theoretical foundation for this investigation is the extensive body of exegetical analysis and theological speculation available today. This research method calls for scholarly comparative study of theological doctrine and speculation with Scripture and the Reformed tradition, with the use of the tools from linguistic analysis, historiography, and philological criticism of the texts. Literary criticism classifies texts according to style and attempts to establish authorship, date, and audience; legalism argues for a strict literal interpretation of dogma and law as the key to salvation, without regard to faith. Legalism is not therefore a proper critical method for the analysis of doctrine.

The other sound basis for methodology is tradition criticism, which seeks the sources of Biblical materials and traces their development; correct exegetical analysis always takes the Gospels and Scripture as their authority and starting point. This research design includes investigation of primary and secondary literature regarding the specific doctrinal positions. This includes a comparative analysis of the positions of Federal Vision, Lordship, and Shepherd Controversies in the light of the biblical revelation, and an assessment of the points of similarity. At the same time, we attempt to identify any common features among their differences that would benefit from a more scripturally valid interpretation. Although the author's personal religious background is one that finds most sympathy with the Sonship position regarding sanctification, he is aware of the potential for bias that such a background affords. In order to avoid the potential distortions and prejudices resulting from such a bias, therefore, he proposes to give a balanced recognition to sources of information that offer evidence in support of each of the controversial propositions. These sources are primarily periodicals, journal articles, and privately published pamphlets. The validity and reliability of such a literature-based research methodology is supported by the special requirements of theological scholarship in areas of contemporary controversy.

B. Overview of Reformed Church’s View of Justification and Sanctification

Before summarizing the Federal Vision (FV) view, we may here briefly state the Reformed view of the two central issues in question, namely justification and sanctification. In the Reformed view, justification is by definition a one-time act of God, never to be repeated. In contrast, sanctification is the ongoing process that removes the pollution of sin and gradually conforms the sinner to the image of Christ (Eph. 4:20–24). The sinner’s justification definitively sets the believer apart from the world of sin, and God always looks upon the believer as holy because of the imputed righteousness of Christ. If the believer’s standing before God were to hinge upon sanctification, the believer’s status would always be in question because of its imperfect nature (Gal. 5:16–26) (Fesko, 2010).

As the Westminster Divines characterize sanctification: “This sanctification is throughout, in the whole man; yet imperfect in this life, there abiding still some remnants of corruption in every part; whence arises a continual and irreconcilable war, the flesh lusting against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh” (13:2). Calvin writes that justification “is the main hinge on which religion turns” and that apart from it, we do not have a foundation upon which to establish our salvation nor one on which to build piety toward God (Shepherd, n.d.).

Justification is founded only on the work of Christ, and thus sanctification will always be imperfect. Calvin powerfully defends justification as the first blessing and sanctification as the second, for the free pardon of justification provides the indispensable context for the second blessing of our sanctification (Billings, 2007). First, the believer is sanctified by Christ through Spirit and not through himself. That sanctification does not come about in moving away from sin but comes about through union with Christ. Second, sanctification is by faith alone through Christ. Believers are sanctified through the work of Christ through Spirit rather than by their own obedience (Fesko, 2010). The believer is completely dependent on Christ and Spirit for sanctification; there is no perfection until death and resurrection. Therefore, the believer must rely on Christ for his sanctifying power.

C. Federal Vision: New Perspective on Paul?

In the 1970s, the Rev. Norman Shepherd, then a professor of Systematic Theology at Westminster Theological Seminary, proposed that sinners are justified by “faith and works.” This doctrine created considerable opposition and ultimately led to Mr. Shepherd’s dismissal from the seminary. Over the course of the controversy in the 1970s, Shepherd modified his language to teach justification through “covenant faithfulness” but without discernable change to the substance of his theology. Since that time he has openly rejected the Reformed doctrine of the imputation of the active obedience of Christ (i.e., that all of Christ’s obedience was not for himself but for us, and that all that he did—and not just his death on the cross—is imputed to believers). Along with this proposed revision of justification by faith alone came proposed revisions of the doctrines of covenant, election, and baptism.

In the 1990s, after a series of conferences at Auburn Avenue Church, a number of theologians deeply influenced by Shephard and by the insights of other scholars writing extensively on the New Perspective on Paul (NPP) gave themselves the name The Federal Vision (FV). They claimed to be recovering authentic Reformed theology, and that American Reformed theology had been corrupted by revivalism. Thus, the Federal Vision movement is associated with N. T. Wright, Norman Shepherd, James Jordan, and Douglas Wilson, among others, who subscribe to a revisionist impulse that significantly recasts the Reformed tradition (Evans, 2010). These NPP authors interpret Paul’s message to advocate for a redefinition of the doctrines of justification and imputed righteousness. Mr. Wright and others who advocate for the FV view have an alternate understanding of Paul’s message, including the gospel, the righteousness of God, final judgment according to works, justification, and works of the law (*Joint Federal Vision Profession*).²

1. The Gospel

According to Jordan (2007),

² Federal Vision. 2011. *Joint Federal Vision Statement*. Accessed April 18, 2011, www.Federal-Vision.com/joint_statement.html, now moved to <http://federal-vision.com/uncategorized/joint-federal-vision-statement>.

The gospel is the theocratic message that whereas in the old time only one nation was baptized and disciplined under the loving teaching of Yahweh, now all nations are to be baptized and disciplined under the enthroned Incarnate Yahweh. That's clear in Matthew and Acts and everywhere else. Ordo salutis is not the gospel; it's been around since Genesis 3. The gospel is the message that history has changed, that Satan has been defeated, that now all nations, every single one, is destined for transformation. Not just white nations. All nations. That's the new good news. Sometimes the gospel is called postmillennialism. They are synonyms.

Hence in the FV view, Paul is not referring to a system of salvation when he speaks of “the gospel.” Paul's use of the term is not a set of instructions about how to be saved; instead, the gospel is the message “Jesus Christ is Lord.” When Paul preached the gospel that Jesus is Lord and listeners were moved to believe in Jesus, Paul knew that the announcement itself functioned as the vehicle of Spirit, the means of grace. The gospel is a summons to obedience, which takes the form of faith (Wright, 2003).

2. The Righteousness of God

Paul used this phrase to denote the “righteousness of God himself” rather than the status that God's presence bestows on his people. God's righteousness is not an attribute that is imputed to his people. For God's people, righteous status is the result of God's action in Christ and by Spirit. Ignoring the distinction between God's righteousness and the status of righteousness in his people leads one to a misunderstanding of justification (Wright, 2003). Wright uses the metaphor of the law court (legalism) to explain forensic justification. When a judge rules on the part of one party, that party gains the status of “righteous.” This status is not a moral statement about the vindicated party; nor does it have anything to do with the righteousness of the judge. The judge's righteousness is not imputed to the defendant or the plaintiff; only the status of “righteous” (Wright, 2003).

This view of righteous status versus imputed righteousness argues that the “reckoning of righteousness” in Romans 5:14–21 refers to the individual who has heard the gospel and responded with the obedience of faith, thus gains the status of “covenant member” accredited to those in Christ. This righteousness is neither God's nor Christ's own (Wright, 2003). The FV meaning of covenant, as defined by Jordan, is “a personal-structural bond which joins the three

persons of God in a community of life, and in which man was created to participate” (Fesko, 2004).

3. Final Judgment According to Works

Wright (2003) suggests there has been “a massive conspiracy of silence” regarding Paul’s teaching that the believer’s final judgment is according to works. He finds Romans 2:13 positively to teach that “the doer of the law will be justified.” At the end of life a believer is justified, Wright says, drawing from Romans 8:3–4, “because the Spirit is at work to do, within believers, what the Law could not do—ultimately, to give life.” Wright is not saying that works are a necessary consequence of justification, or that justification must necessarily be joined to sanctification, or that saving faith is never alone without works. He is saying that at the end of a believer’s life, the basis of his justification is good works. As he says in his commentary on Romans 2:13, “Justification, at the last, will be on the basis of performance, not possession.” Paul’s message is that God’s final judgment will be in accordance with works of the believer’s entire life; that good works produced over one’s life due to Spirit’s indwelling will lead the Christian to completion on the day of Jesus Christ. This future positive verdict can be denoted with the verb “justify.” Wright says that “justification by faith ... is the anticipation in the present of the justification which will occur in the future, and gains its meaning from that anticipation” (Wright, 2003).

D. Justification in the Federal Vision

According to Wright (2003), justification is:

God’s declaration a) that someone is in the right (their sins having been forgiven through the death of Jesus) and b) that this person is a member of the true covenant family, the family God originally promised to Abraham and has now created through Christ and the Spirit, the single family which consists equally of believing Jews and believing Gentiles.

Wright notes that while traditional Reformed theology understands justification as comprising both forgiveness and the imputed righteousness of Christ (see Westminster Confession of Faith XI.1), the New Perspective categorically denies the latter. In his discussion of “the righteousness of God,” Wright specified that while God “does indeed ‘reckon righteousness’ to those who believe ... this is not, for Paul, the righteousness either of God or of Christ.” As he wrote in

What St. Paul Really Said, “It makes no sense whatever to say that the judge imputes, imparts, bequeaths, conveys or otherwise transfers his righteousness to either the plaintiff or the defendant. Righteousness is not an object, a substance or a gas, which can be passed across the courtroom.” This follows through when he focuses on justification, for while Wright affirms that the believer is reckoned as righteous, this is as a member of God’s covenant people and not by an imputation of Christ’s righteous achievement. He says, “Paul does not say that he sees us clothed with the earned merits of Christ.”

Wright further specifies that justification occurs twice. “It occurs in the future... on the basis of the entire life a person has led in the power of the Spirit—that is, it occurs on the basis of ‘works’ in Paul’s redefined sense. And, near the heart of Paul’s theology, it occurs in the present *as an anticipation of that future verdict.*” In this New Perspective scheme, faith is not an instrument of justification but rather “it is the anticipation in the present of the verdict which will be *reaffirmed in the future.*” The present possession of faith indicates that one will go on to do good works, and it is by virtue of those good works that the believer may be ultimately justified.

From Wright’s statements we may conclude that the FV view is a particular interpretation of *Ordo Salutis*, the chronological order of events beginning with the individual’s position outside of God’s community of people, through the finally saved sinner. Paul referred to the moment of belief and obedience not as “justification” or “conversion,” but calling. The step after calling is justification. God does not grant a new status or privilege based on a person’s faith (Wright, 2003). Norman Shepherd argued, “Since faith, repentance, and good works are intertwined as covenantal response, and since good works are necessary to justification, the ‘ordo salutis’ would better be: regeneration, faith/repentance/new obedience, justification” (Schwertley, n.d.).

Justification, or vindication, in Wright’s law-court imagery, follows the call. The call summons the sinner to reject sin and turn to God, to follow Christ and believe in God and Jesus’ resurrection. Wright maintains that justification is God’s declaration that the individual’s sins have been forgiven, and that the individual has become a member of the covenant family (Wright, 2003). Wright

further states that justification means “membership in God’s true family” (Wright, 2009).

As was seen above, this view holds that justification occurs twice: first in the present as an anticipation of that future verdict, which will be reaffirmed in the future. Wright notes: “Justification is not ‘how someone becomes a Christian’; it is God’s declaration about the person who has just become a Christian.” The present declaration consists of the believer’s anticipation of final resurrection and manifests as baptism. Second, the final declaration will consist of the believer’s resurrection. We are justified by faith by believing in the gospel that Jesus is Lord and resurrected by God, rather than believing in justification by faith (Wright, 2003).

Sanders refers to justification essentially as not how one gets into God’s people, but rather about God’s declaration that someone is in God’s people. Salvation is by grace, but judgment by works. So, one receives the status of “righteous” by God’s election and maintains righteous status by obedience (Sanders, 1977).

1. Works of the Law

The Federal Vision denies the historic Protestant distinction of law and Gospel. It says:

We deny that law and gospel should be considered as hermeneutics, or treated as such. We believe that any passage, whether indicative or imperative, can be heard by the faithful as good news, and that any passage, whether containing gospel promises or not, will be heard by the rebellious as intolerable demand. The fundamental division is not in the text, but rather in the human heart. (Federal Vision, 2011)³

This would seem to be a latent denial of the law/Gospel distinction.

James Dunn holds the view that the Jews did not practice works to earn God’s favor or attain salvation, but instead practiced their boundary markers (circumcision, food laws, sabbath) to keep themselves within the boundary of God’s people (Dunn, 2008).

2. Covenant and Election

Among several key issues for FV proponents are:

³ A Joint Federal Vision Statement. Accessed April 18, 2011, from www.federal-vision.com/joint_statement.html, moved to: <http://federal-vision.com/uncategorized/joint-federal-vision-statement/>.

An unease with the idea that Adam could “merit” eternal life through his perfect and perpetual obedience to God’s command;
Covenant established with Adam was fundamentally gracious, not legal; and
God’s dealings with humankind must be understood by way of covenant, rather than his decrees.

For FV proponents, the elect are identified by their association with the church; in other words, those people who are in covenant with God. Without emphasizing the necessary response of faith to the covenant promise, a faith that savingly unites the believer to Christ and His benefits affirms that all covenant members are individually elect and true beneficiaries of Christ’s saving work with all of its benefits. The FV of the elect is, perhaps, one of the clearest declarations of the fundamentally legal interpretation of those who argue the FV view.

3. Imputation

This term historically refers to believers being made just before God by having Christ’s righteousness imputed (credited) to them by a judicial declaration of a gracious God. FV questions the correctness of this understanding, especially in regard to the imputation of Christ’s active obedience. The consequence is that the believer’s obedience, in addition to faith, becomes responsible for justification, and not simply the evidence that one’s faith is genuine. As Lusk says:

The resurrection is the real centerpiece of the gospel since it is the *new* thing God has done.... It is not Christ’s life-long obedience per se that is credited to us. Rather, it is his right standing before the Father, manifested in his resurrection. His resurrection justified us because it justified him. Again, it is not that his law-keeping or miracle-working are imputed to our account; rather, Christ shares his legal status in God’s court with us as the One who propitiated God’s wrath on the cross and was resurrected into a vindicated, glorified form of life. (Lusk, 2010, p. 142).

The essential point for FV proponents is their agreement that union with Christ’s resurrection life, rather than the imputation of Christ’s earthly obedient works, is how sinners are justified before God.

4. Nature of Union with Christ

According to FV proponents, when individuals are baptized, they are united to the church, which is Christ’s body (hence, they are united to Christ). As a result of this “covenantal union,” individuals receive many of the benefits of Christ’s mediation: election,

justification, adoption, and sanctification. Joseph Minich (who claims not to be an FV advocate) writes,

Baptism is not a ‘work’ performed, after which one can have full assurance. It is not another ‘instrument’ of justification alongside faith. Rather, it is a visible act of God (especially apparent in the case of infants) that is to be seen as the locus of Christian certainty. It is the place where God promises to meet His own. To look to baptism for assurance is not to look for salvation in ‘water,’ but to cling to the place where God promises to meet His people and bless them.

While baptized individuals receive a number of benefits through their “covenantal union,” they do not receive the gift of perseverance. This they receive as they live in “covenantal faithfulness,” obeying God’s law throughout their lives. Wright justifies his view of covenantal faithfulness using Habakkuk 2. However, the emphasis in Habakkuk 2 is on the faithfulness of God’s people (Makidon, n.d.). Some have suggested that the paradigm of covenantal faithfulness ends up resting our justification upon our sanctification; others wonder if this is the best solution to the problem of apostasy (abandoning one’s faith).

E. FV Disagrees with the Westminster Shorter Catechism, Confession of Faith, and Larger Catechism

Before moving to the author’s criticisms of the FV position, a number of short quotations may serve to make the points of disagreement clear as seen in quotes from the Westminster Shorter and Larger Catechism:⁴

1. “Justification is an act of God’s free grace, wherein he pardoneth all our sins, and accepteth us as righteous in his sight, only for the righteousness of Christ imputed to us, and received by faith alone” (WSC, 33).
2. “Those whom God effectually calls, he also freely justifieth; not by infusing righteousness into them, but by pardoning their sins, and by accounting and accepting their persons as righteous; not for anything wrought in them, or done by them, but for Christ’s sake alone; nor by imputing faith itself, the act of believing, or any other evangelical obedience to them, as their righteousness; but by imputing the obedience and satisfaction of Christ unto them, they receiving and resting on him and his righteousness by faith; which faith they have not of themselves, it is the gift of God” (WCF, 11.1).

⁴ See <https://thewestminsterstandards.com/table-of-contents/>.

3. “Faith, thus receiving and resting on Christ and his righteousness, is alone the instrument of justification: yet is it not alone in the person justified, but is ever accompanied with all other saving graces, and is no dead faith, but worketh by love” (WCF, 11.2).
4. “Although sanctification be inseparably joined with justification, yet they differ, in that God in justification imputeth the righteousness of Christ; in sanctification his Spirit infuseth grace, and enableth to the exercise thereof; in the former, sin is pardoned; in the other, it is subdued: the one doeth equally free all believers from the revenging wrath of God, and that perfectly in this life, that they never fall into condemnation; the other is neither equal in all, nor in this life perfect in any, but growing up to perfection” (WLC, 77).

F. Arguments Against the Federal Vision

1. Righteousness

The term righteousness cannot mean “covenant membership,” as various theologians associated with the NPP maintain. Such a definition is untenable in the face of texts such as Genesis 18:24–25, where Abraham negotiates the deliverance of Sodom and Gomorrah on the premise that there might be fifty righteous men within its confines. Given that God was only in covenant with Abraham, it is impossible here to define righteousness as covenant membership. Clearly, righteousness is moral equity. When one considers the term righteousness as it is applied to God, it cannot universally mean his covenant faithfulness. What, for example, of God’s righteousness towards those who are outside the covenant? Is God righteous in his dealings with unbelievers? The Scriptures affirm that God is righteous with both those inside and outside the covenant. To understand righteousness as covenant membership and God’s covenant faithfulness is exegetically indefensible.

Furthermore, there are two aspects to the work of Christ: namely, his *passive* and his *active* obedience. Christ’s passive obedience is his suffering obedience, his bearing of the penalty of the curse of the law throughout his life and especially in his crucifixion. By this work, our sins are forgiven. Christ’s active obedience is his keeping of the commands of the law throughout his life. By this work, we are reckoned to have kept the law perfectly, as originally demanded of Adam in the covenant of works. Thus, the demands of God’s justice are satisfied, and the glorious riches of his grace are displayed. This righteousness of Christ must be applied to believers if it is to be of

benefit to them. This application of Christ's benefits comes by means of imputation. That is, Christ's righteousness is judicially reckoned or credited to sinners so that their sins may be forgiven and the perfect obedience of Christ may be accounted as their own.

FV proponents reject the idea of Paul's teaching that Christ's righteousness is credited to us. In other words, they deny the clear Gospel message that Christ's perfect obedience is credited to believers so that they stand before God as perfect law keepers themselves.

2. Works of the Law

It has proven exegetically unsustainable to define the "works of the law" as only referring to circumcision, food laws, and the Sabbath. This definition has now been modified by James D. G. Dunn, for example, to include the entire law functioning as a boundary marker, though Dunn has left his overall understanding of justification unchanged. When Paul quotes Deuteronomy 27:26 in Galatians 3:10, the reference cannot be only to boundary markers; but it is to the entire law, which is evident from the broader context of Deuteronomy 27–30. Moreover, to argue that there was an absence of legalism in first century Judaism ignores indisputable primary source evidence to the contrary.

Focusing on Wright's understanding of justification by works, his view has been particularly influential within Reformed circles; he argues that justification is covenantal, forensic, and eschatological. Wright also maintains that there is a present and future justification. Let us briefly examine Wright's argument.

a. Covenantal

Wright is correct to say that justification is covenantal, though he understands "covenant" in terms of first century Judaism. Paul's understanding of covenant, however, is much broader than the first century, evidenced by the absence of any citation of first century literature in his writings. Rather, justification is covenantal in terms of the broken covenant of works and the covenant of grace, or as Paul explains it—the first and second Adams.

b. The Law Court

First, Wright is correct to argue that justification is forensic, though his understanding hinges upon a declaration before the world

of who is in the covenant and therefore “in the right.” In other words, justification is a forensic declaration of vindication before the world. Paul, however, does not place the law court before the world but before the presence of God.

Second, Wright rejects the doctrine of imputation on the basis of his understanding of the Jewish law court. The judge does not transfer anything to the one who stands accused. Wright, however, imposes his understanding of the Jewish law court upon the Scriptures. Wright misunderstands the heart of the gospel by imposing an earthly human court and its proceedings upon the heavenly court. What judge, for example, sends his own son to die in the place of the accused?

c. Present and Future Justification

Wright clearly affirms that there is a present justification, which one receives by looking to Christ in faith, understood as faithful submission to his lordship, and a future justification, based upon one’s Spirit-produced works. The Reformed church has historically rejected such a construction because of its similarity to the Roman Catholic understanding of justification, where one is declared righteous on the basis of his sanctification. Historically, when Reformed theologians have spoken, they have done so not in terms of a future justification, but in terms of an open acknowledgement and acquittal on the Day of Judgment (cf. LC, 90; SC, 38). In other words, our justification occurs in secret now, but that same justification will be open or public on the Day of Judgment.

G. Summary Against the Federal Vision

The general conclusions of this critique mean that the following points of the Federal Vision are out of accord with Scripture and our standards:

1. “Righteousness” defined as covenant membership rather than moral equity, or adherence to a moral standard.
2. “Works of the law” for justification understood as boundary markers identifying Israel as God’s covenant people.
3. Justification only as vindication.
4. A second or future justification that has a different ground from one’s justification by faith.
5. Shifting the ground of justification from the finished work of Christ to the Spirit-produced works of the believer.

6. Denial of the imputation of the active and/or passive obedience of Christ.
7. Compromising the self-authenticating and self-interpreting nature of the Scriptures by giving the literature of Second Temple Judaism undue interpretive weight.

H. The Lordship Controversy

1. The Lordship Doctrine

The Lordship Theology is probably the most widely accepted of the dissident views among Reformed thinkers. Those who hold to Lordship Theology believe that if a person is truly a Christian, they *must* live a righteous, obedient life. Without this practical righteousness, there is no reason for a person to think that they are a Christian. In the long run, however, the Lordship position compromises the Biblical and Reformed position of Salvation *sola fide, sola gratia*—justification by grace through faith in Christ *alone*.

In his commentary on the Sermon on the Mount, Martyn Lloyd-Jones says, “Nothing is more dangerous than to rely only upon a correct belief and a fervent spirit, and to assume that, as long as you believe the right things and are zealous and keen and active concerning them, you are therefore of necessity a Christian” (Lloyd-Jones, 1976).

According to Lordship Salvation, saving faith includes submission and obedience. Richard Belcher (1990) says, “True saving faith includes in it a submission to the Lordship of Christ.” Another Lordship proponent says, “Saving faith is trust in Christ Himself. It is a commitment of self in submission to all of Christ that is revealed.” John MacArthur (2006) says, “Saving faith, then, is the whole of my being embracing all of Christ. Faith cannot be divorced from commitment.” He also says, “The true test of faith is this, does it produce obedience? If not, it is not saving faith.” In the same vein, Bailey Smith (1991) asserts, “Saving faith is not mere intellectual assent, but it involves an act of submission on our part.”

Those who hold to the Lordship view would say that true Christians live a life characterized by obedience to all that the Father has commanded. John MacArthur wrote,

Hell is undoubtedly full of people who did not actively oppose Jesus Christ, but simply drifted into damnation by neglecting to respond to the gospel. Such

people are in view in Hebrews 2:1–4. They are aware of the good news of salvation provided by Jesus Christ but aren't willing to commit their lives to Him." (MacArthur, 1986, p. 80)

Why does he say these people are not believers? What do they lack? The answer is clear: Commitment! MacArthur gives this story to illustrate his point:

I will never forget a particular lady who came into my office and informed me that she was a prostitute. She said, "I need help; I'm desperate." So I presented the claims of Christ to her. Then I said, "Would you like to invite Jesus Christ into your life?" She said, "Yes, and she prayed." I said, "Now, I want you to do something. Do you have your book with all your contacts?" She said she did. I said, "Let's light a match to it and burn it." She looked at me and said, "What do you mean?" I said, "If you want to live for Jesus Christ, and you've truly accepted His forgiveness and met Him as your Savior, then you need to prove it." She said to me, "That book is worth a lot of money. I don't want to burn it." She put it back in her purse and looked me right in the eye and said, "I guess I don't really want Jesus, do I?" Then she left. When it came down to counting the cost, she wasn't ready. I don't know what the outcome of that poor woman has been. I do know that she knew the facts and believed them, but she was not willing to make the sacrifice. (MacArthur, 1986, p. 84)

MacArthur (1988) further discusses questions he received in response to his book, *The Gospel According to Jesus*. He quotes Zane C. Hodges from Hodges' *Absolutely Free!*

What faith really is, in biblical language, is receiving the testimony of God. It is the *inward conviction* that what God says to us in the gospel is true. That—and that alone—is saving faith. (Hodges, 1989)

MacArthur then rebuts Hodges' argument: "By emphasizing the words inward conviction and underscoring them with the phrase 'that—and that alone,' Hodges is explicitly rejecting the concept that faith inevitably produces righteous behavior" (1988).

The question MacArthur raises in response to Hodges are:

- Is Hodges adequately characterizing what it means to believe?
- Do people know on an intuitive level whether their faith is real?
- Can someone believe in his belief, yet not truly believe?
- Is there no such thing as spurious faith?

MacArthur maintains that the NT writers answered these questions repeatedly, and that they saw imitation faith as a very real danger. The debate over Lordship Salvation must ultimately answer the question

of whether assenting to the facts of the gospel, and holding an inward conviction that the truths apply, is enough to guarantee eternal life if the individual never shuns sin or submits to Christ? What MacArthur terms “mental assent” is dead faith (n.d.).

Sam Storms (2006) takes up the question of what is at stake in the Lordship Theology debate. He characterizes those who affirm “Lordship” salvation as those opposing the idea that we can possess saving faith in the absence of submission to the Lord Jesus in daily obedience. He maintains, “We are saved by faith alone, but not by the faith which is alone (*sola fides iustificat, sed non fides quae est sola*).” Faith is not saving in the absence of submission to the lordship of Jesus. He argues that Lordship Salvation does not teach that Christians cannot sin; rather that they cannot be complacent in sin. Lordship Salvation insists that Christians will sin less. If they sin, they will suffer for it. Complacency and contentment in sin, Storms maintains, are the hallmarks of an unregenerate soul (Storms, 2006).

Lordship Salvation distinguishes between acknowledgement of the principle of Christ’s authority over the convert’s life and the practice of progressive submission to Christ. Lordship advocates recognize:

First, that Christ died for sinners and that eternal life waits for those who believe in Christ’s death;

Second, that we know we are God’s children because the Holy Spirit awakens our hearts to this confirmation; and

Third, one’s profession is borne out by loyalty, love, and obedience (Storms, 2006).

Another Lordship proponent, Ernest Reisinger (1993), says that one of the major points of disagreement in the Lordship controversy concerns the role of repentance in salvation. Teachers of both viewpoints believe in repentance, but the Lordship teaching is that “faith alone is not the kind of faith that justifies.” Repentance and saving faith cannot be separated in the application of God’s salvation. Temporary or delusive faith, implicit faith and historic faith are all spurious. Lordship gospel is different from non-Lordship gospel, and only one is biblical gospel.

Repentance is important because Jesus said if we do not repent, we will perish. Reisinger finds the following errors in the non-Lordship position:

1. Repentance is not an essential part of salvation.
2. The forgiveness of sin offered by non-Lordship teaching is not necessarily connected to repentance.
3. Repentance is a call to God’s fellowship and is not connected with eternal life.
4. Repentance and rejecting sin in coming to Christ have nothing to do with each other.
5. Repentance has been redefined in a way that removes its association from the idea of turning away from sin.

The non-Lordship position does not recognize the inseparable connection between repentance and faith. However, in Reisinger’s view, evangelical repentance and true saving faith are “Siamese twins—inseparable in their application.” Reisinger writes that repentance is spurious when it dwells not on sin itself, but on the consequences of sin. Repentance and faith are sacred duties and inseparable graces (1993).

Tom Nettles (1991) discusses the term “easy-believism” and “cheap grace” as terms with pejorative overtones that non-Lordship followers resist. Nettles, however, believes that certain aspects of these terms have some truth attached. Saving faith involves both assent and intellect. True faith is hard work because of all the evil we must conquer as a demonstration of genuineness.

In his critique of the non-Lordship position, Tom Ascol (1991) begins with a quote from J. I. Packer:

If, ten years ago, you had told me that I would live to see literate evangelicals, some with doctorates and a seminary teaching record, arguing for the reality of an eternal salvation, divinely guaranteed, that may have in it no repentance, no discipleship, no behavioral change, no practical acknowledgment of Christ as Lord of one’s life, and no perseverance in faith, then I would have told you that you were out of your mind. Stark, staring, bonkers, is the British phrase I would probably have used. (Packer, 1991, cited in Ascol, 1991).

The fundamental questions are whether it is possible to believe in Christ without submission to his Lordship. Like to that is whether the reception of Christ as Lord and Christ as Savior are two distinct and separate experiences in a believer’s life. The answers to these

questions reveal one's position, and the gospel itself is at stake. Faith is a duty and must involve will. Nor can faith be restricted to the intellect. Saving faith involves the whole man (Ascol, 1991).

In his discussion of the Carnal Christian theory, Earnest Reisinger (1994) holds that the "carnal Christian" teaching is in error when it separates justification and sanctification, thereby making optional the act of submission to Christ. Reisinger preaches that non-Lordship teachers have invented a category of "carnal Christian" to explain the lives that have not been changed by the power of the Holy Spirit. The separation of conversion, in which the decision is made to accept Christ as a personal Savior, from the decision to make Christ Lord, is in error because no human can make Christ Lord. Christ's status as Lord is independent of sinners' thoughts and actions. Only God can make Christ Lord.

Reisinger goes on to say that in between conversion and the decision to make Christ Lord, the believer may continue to live as if he were an unbeliever. This second blessing teaching is in error, because it sends Christians to search for holiness that is received by a single religious crisis experience as opposed to the daily submission to God's will; carnal Christians will comfortably go to hell; lordship teachers believe and instruct that Christians are sometimes carnal in some parts of their lives at some times, and spiritual in others; otherwise they are not Christians at all (Reisinger, 1994).

John MacArthur defines the carnal person as one who places himself on the throne, rather than putting Christ in charge. Thus, the carnal person still lives a life of chaos, because his life has not changed. Carnal Christians believe in Jesus for the purpose of salvation, but do not want to submit their lives to Christ (MacArthur, n.d. Bible Bulletin Board).

2. Summary of Errors in the Lordship Position

Christian Temple (1999) presents the case for faith alone as a condition for eternal life, which is in opposition to the Lordship position of faith based on knowledge of the facts, assent to this knowledge, repentance, and submission to Christ as conditions of eternal life. He asks if simple faith is "dead faith," and answers with a quote from the *Wycliff Bible Dictionary* (1998):

A proper definition of faith must take into consideration its complexity, for while the exercise of it may be said to be simplicity itself, it involves the whole

personality.... Saving faith, therefore, involves active personal trust, a commitment of oneself to the Lord Jesus Christ. But it is not the amount of faith that saves, it is the object of faith that saves. Great faith in the wrong object does not alter man's lost estate one iota. Little faith (so long as it is faith) in the right object [Christ] must result in salvation.

Temple notes that speaking of a free gift that costs more in terms of giving us something to do in order to achieve salvation is not consistent; gifts only need to be accepted and are not earned. Nor do gifts require repayment. Temple goes on to discuss other potential errors in the Lordship position. These errors seem to arise from the desire to have Christians engage in behavior that is Christian-like. The greatest error, as he sees it, is that the Lordship position puts individuals in a Catch-22. "You must make Christ Lord in order to be saved, but you must first be saved in order to make Christ Lord."

Additionally, the Lordship position holds that the meaning of the New Testament use of the word "lord" (*kurios*) denotes "sovereign master," to whom submission is required. However, the Greek *kurios* is almost always used to denote "deity." Christ, as a deity, carries the authority to administer salvation to believers (Temple, 1999). Submission thus implies a cost to the believer. Packer's supposition that "free forgiveness in one sense will cost [the forgiven] everything" brings up the question of how a free gift can cost anything (Packer 1991).

Temple's next issue with Lordship is that the believer must have some knowledge of biblical principles to submit to Christ's Lordship. He asks,

How is a new believer to have had prior knowledge of biblical knowledge at the moment when salvation is at hand? How much does a believer have to know in order to be saved? Along the same lines, how much submission is enough submission? How much willingness to submit to Christ is enough? (Temple, 1999).

The Lordship position also leaves Christians in the unfortunate position of having to judge others' commitment to submission (Temple, 1999).

Temple ends his analysis with his position that the Lordship Salvation view "presents an inadequate (rigid) view of the salvation process." What of the non-believer who is not witnessed to, or has no church or bible study to help? What of those who know *only* that they are seeking mercy and the *gift* of forgiveness and salvation? How is

this non-believer supposed to obtain the knowledge of Christ's requirements? The *free gift* carries too many qualifications if one must submit to Christ's lordship in order to obtain it (1999).

Zane Hodges weighs in on the matter by observing that "Salvation, of course, is not earned." Therefore, it can be said to be "by grace ... through faith" and "not of works" (Eph. 2:8–9). Our works have nothing to do with whether we go to heaven or hell. Salvation is a gift, and it is absolutely free. Faith in Christ is the means by which this gift is received (Hodges, 1991).

John's Gospel often says that believers in Jesus have eternal life; conversely, John does not suggest that lack of good works in a believer's life disqualifies him from the guarantee of eternal life. The notion that a believer in Christ can go for years and not be affected by its miraculous nature is bizarre (Hodges, 1990). Hodges further maintains that the issue is assurance, and that this belief that assurance depends on good works reinforces and breathes new life into man's boastful inclinations (Hodges, 2009).

The Lordship view teaches that assurance comes from obedience, from holy living, from your works. Martin Luther said, "For certainty does not come to me from any kind of reflection on myself and on my state. On the contrary it comes solely through hearing the word, solely because I cling to the word and its promises."

John Calvin wrote, "From one's work conscience feels more fear and consternation than assurance." John Calvin taught that assurance was of the essence of faith (Calvin, 1536). If good works are the basis of assurance, then the believer's eyes are distracted from the sufficiency of Christ and His work to meet his eternal need. His eyes are focused on himself. If I seek assurance through examining my good works, one of two things must necessarily result: (1) I will minimize the depth of my sinfulness; (2) I will see my deep sinfulness as hopelessly contrary to any conviction that I am saved. Our assurance is to be based upon God's Word; His promise that He would give eternal life to all who believe on His Son. Assurance does not come from our works.

Saving faith is accepting the testimony of God. Do you believe that Jesus is the Christ? If you do, then on the testimony of scripture, you are saved, you possess everlasting life. Benjamin Warfield, the Presbyterian who probably would not have put himself in the

Lordship camp, said, “The saving power resides exclusively, not in the act of faith, or the attitude of faith, or the nature of faith, but in the object of faith.” The truth is, technically, that we are not saved *by* faith but *through* faith. Faith is the instrumental means; grace is the efficient means of our salvation. We are saved by Jesus Christ. We are saved by His grace. We are saved through faith. You would understand what I meant if I said to you, “I put the fire out with the hose.” Now hoses do not put out fires. But hoses are the channels for water that puts the fire out. The hose is the instrumental means; the water is the efficient means. Faith is the instrumental means by which we are able to access our salvation through Jesus Christ.

The Lordship view teaches that in order to be a Christian, you must do more than believe the gospel. I see this as adding to the gospel; indeed, it is totally unbiblical! The Grace view teaches that a person becomes a Christian when they understand and believe the gospel of Jesus Christ. At that moment they are placed into the body of Christ, given Christ’s righteousness, indwelt by God, and are as sure of heaven as if they were already there. They are “in Christ.”

Because God permanently indwells, His power is constantly available to the believer. That power will not operate in the Christian’s life, however, unless he personally appropriates it by faith. Moment by moment the believer must trust God rather than himself to give him power for victory in daily life.

What if the Free Grace view is not correct? If it is wrong, what damage could this view possibly cause? If the Free Grace view is wrong, it could cause people to think that they are saved when they are really not; it would be giving false hope to unbelievers. What are the consequences of false hope? Do you believe in election? Will the elect of God ever be lost? No. Will the reprobate ever be saved? No. So, in the author’s opinion, the worst that the Free Grace view will do is give false hope to the reprobate.

If the Lordship teaching is wrong, what harm can it do? It can cause a believer to think that they are not redeemed because of sin in their life. This view can bring the elect to despair under guilt and condemnation. It can cause a believer to give up on Christianity by making them doubt that they really are saved.

Conclusion Against the New Positions on Paul and Sanctification

The new positions on Paul, the Federal Vision, and the Lordship views of justification and sanctification have been briefly described above in a fair and adequate manner. These views, the author contends, share a common fallacy: they make Christianity something to be achieved by following doctrines from men who do not properly understand the plan of salvation. Those views believe that salvation comes by obedience, keeping commandments, and by following rules or rituals of practice. We refer to such views as “legalism,” and these Christian legalists take certain passages of scripture to imply that the Bible says something that really cannot be supported in inside the full light of the Gospel of the Bible.

With regard to the Federal Vision, it has been argued that their definition of righteousness as covenant membership, rather than moral equity or adherence to a moral standard, is a legalistic interpretation that offends a proper reading of the scriptures. The law was given to show that we are imperfect and condemned to be separated from God unless God Himself did something to bridge that gap. The Law of Faith is belief that only God is righteous and merciful, and only He can provide the way of salvation for mankind. This plan of salvation from God was carried out when God the Son, Jesus Christ, paid the requirements of the law for all on the cross. Those who, by faith, believe God and accept the sacrifice He provided for mankind’s sins will be saved. As Don Koenig (2005) says:

God is interested in saving people who truly trust in Him... He is not interested in having people in His presence who think they got there by their own righteousness through following the letter of the law or by rituals of obedience.

Furthermore, the FV view that “works of the law” are to be understood, in terms of justification, as boundary markers identifying Israel as God’s covenant people. That is legalistic and offends the accepted Reform view where justification is by definition a one-time act of God, not dependent on works, indeed and truly, not dependent upon any legalistic boundaries.

In closing, we may reaffirm that since the Reformation, the core Protestant Reformed doctrine holds that salvation is “by Christ alone, by grace alone, and by faith alone” (Williams, 2002, p. 1). The logical consequence of which is that sanctification, too, comes by and through faith in Christ. As we are justified by faith, so are we

sanctified by faith, which can only be achieved and demonstrated by spiritual union with Christ. By splitting the law of obedience from the life of faith, these new legalists indulge in a Pharisaic observance of outward forms and rituals. However, true sanctification can only come through God's grace and the faith that receives it through the intercession of Christ. This constitutes Paul's "gospel of grace" and the correct understanding of the role of sanctification in the life of the Christian believer.

References

- Ascol T. 1991. Old Error Rediscovered. *The Founders Journal*, Issue 6, Fall 1991.
- Belcher R.P. 1990. *A Layman's Guide to the Lordship Controversy*. Southbridge MA: Crowne Publications.
- Billings J.T. 2007. *Calvin, Participation, and the Gift: The Activity of Believers in Union with Christ*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Calvin J. 1536. *Institutes of the Christian Religion* Book 3.
- Copeland, M. 1999. *Executable outlines*. Access online July 2, 2010 at URL www.executableoutlines.com/textserm.htm.
- Dunn, J.D.G. 2008. *The New Perspective on Paul: Revised Edition*. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.
- Evans, W.B. 2010. Déjà vu All over Again? *The Contemporary Reformed Soteriological Controversy in Historical Perspective*. WTJ 72:135-51.
- Farstad, A.L. 1992. We believe in Sanctification. Introduction. *Journal of the Grace Evangelical Society*, 5 (2) Autumn.
- Farstad, A.L. 1995. We believe in Sanctification. Part 5: Future Sanctification Future Sanctification: Perfect, or Ultimate, Sanctification. *Journal of the Grace Evangelical Society*, 8 (14) Spring.
- Federal Vision. 2011. A Joint Federal Vision Statement. Retrieved from http://www.federal-vision.com/joint_statement.html April 18, 2011.
- Fesko, JV. 2010. Sanctification and Union with Christ: A Reformed perspective. *Evangelical Review of Theology* 34:3 (July):197-214.
- Fesko, JV. 2004. *The Federal Vision and the Covenant of Works*. Retrieved Jan. 14 from http://www.genevaopc.org/media/pubs/res_pdf_44.pdf
- Hodges Z. 1989. *Absolutely Free!* (Grand Rapids MI: Zondervan).
- Hodges, Zane C. 1990. We believe in assurance of salvation. *Journal of the Grace Evangelical Society*, 3, (2) Autumn.
- Hodges, Zane C. 1991. We believe in Rewards. *Journal of the Grace Evangelical Society*, 4 (2) Autumn.
- Hodges Z. 2009. Assurance And Works: An Evangelical Train Wreck. *Journal of the Grace Evangelical Society* 22:42 Spring 2009.
- Jordan, J. 2007. Latitude in the Right Place. Retrieved from <http://deregnochristi.org/2007/09/30/latitude-in-the-right-place/#comment-2153> April 18, 2011.

- Koenig, Don. "Christian Legalism—the Dark Side of Christianity," (2005), from www.ThePropheticYears.com/comments/The%20dark%20side%20of%20Christianity.htm.
- Lloyd-Jones, D.M. 1960. *Studies in Sermon on the Mount*. Grand Rapids MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing.
- Lloyd-Jones, D.M. 2003. *Great Doctrines of the Bible: God the Father, God the Son; God the Holy Spirit; The Church and the Last Things*. Crossway Books.
- Lusk, R. 2010. The Biblical Plan of Salvation. In Schwertly 2010, *The Auburn Avenue Theology*, p. 142.
- MacArthur J. 1986. *The Superiority of Christ*. Chicago:Moody Press.
- MacArthur J. 1988. *The Gospel According to Jesus*. Grand Rapids MI:Zondervan.
- MacArthur, J. 2006. *Saving Faith*. Bible Bulletin Board. Retrieved 15 Jan 2011 from <http://www.biblebb.com/files/MAC/80-169.htm>
- MacArthur J. n.d. *Faith According to the Apostle James*. Retrieved 14 Jan 2011 from <http://www.biblebb.com/files/MAC/faithaccordjames.htm>
- MacArthur J. n.d. *MacArthur's Questions and Answers*. Bible Bulletin Board. Retrieved 10 Jan 2011 from <http://www.biblebb.com/files/macqa/70-9-8.htm>.
- Makidon, M. n.d. *Justification: God's Plan and Paul's Vision*, Book review. Retrieved Jan.06, 2011 from http://makidon.org/papers/wright_justification.pdf.
- Minchen, J. 2011 Within the Bounds of Orthodoxy. Retrieved from http://www.federal-vision.com/minich_bounds_of_orthodoxy.html April 18, 2011.
- Morgan, M. 2007. Federal Vision: The Issue For This Generation. *By Faith, 17*, (October), 1-14.
- Nettles T. 1991. Early Baptists and Easy-Believism. *The Founders Journal* Issue 6 Fall 1991. <http://wwwFOUNDERS.org/journal/fj06/article3.html>
- Packer, J.I. 1991. *Evangelism and the Sovereignty of God* Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.
- Packer, J.I. 1991. Understanding the Lordship Controversy. *TableTalk* Ligonier Ministries.
- Reisinger E. 1994. The Lordship Controversy and the Carnal Christian Teaching (Part 1). *The Founders Journal* Issue 16 Spring 1994. <http://wwwFOUNDERS.org/journal/fj16/article2.html>
- Reisinger E. 1994. The Lordship Controversy and the Carnal Christian Teaching (Part 2). *The Founders Journal* Issue 17 Spring 1994.
- Reisinger E. 1993. The Lordship Controversy and Repentance. *The Founders Journal* Issue 14 Fall 1993.
- Rushdoony, R.J. 2008. *Sovereignty*. New York: Ross House Books
- Sanders, E.P. 1977. *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*. Philadelphia, PA: SCM Press Ltd.
- Schwertly, B. 2005. *Christ's Warning Concerning False Teachers*. Online at <http://www.reformedonline.com/view/reformedonline/False%20Teachers.htm>
- Schwertly, B. 2010. *Auburn Avenue Theology: A Biblical Analysis*. In Press. <http://www.reformedonline.com/view/reformedonline/A%20Refutation%20of%20the%20Auburn%20Avenue%20Theology.html>

- Schwertly, B. n.d. *A Refutation of the Auburn Avenue Theology's Rejection of Justification by Faith Alone*. Retrieved Jan. 2, 2011 from http://www.reformedonline.com/view/reformedonline/A%20Refutation%20of%20the%20Auburn%20Avenue%20Theology.htm#_ftnref12
- Shepherd, V. n.d. *Calvin on Justification*. Retrieved Jan 14, 2011 from <http://www.victorshepherd.on.ca/Course/Reformation/justification.htm>.
- Smith, B. 1991. *The Grace Escape: Jesus as Savior and Lord*. Nashville: Broadman Press.
- Storms, S. 2006. *The Lordship Salvation Debate*. Enjoying God Ministries. <http://www.enjoyinggodministries.com/article/the-lordship-salvation-debate/>
- Temple, C.N. *Lordship Salvation: Is it Biblical? A Study of the Lordship Salvation Controversy Part One*. Retrieved 20 Jan 2011 from <http://www.dtl.org/salvation/article/guest/lordship-1.htm>
- Temple, C.N. *Lordship Salvation: Is it Biblical? A Study of the Lordship Salvation Controversy Part Two*. Retrieved 20 Jan 2011 from <http://www.dtl.org/salvation/article/guest/lordship-2.htm>
- Waters, Guy Prentiss. 2006. *The Federal Vision and Covenant Theology: A Comparative Analysis*. New York P & R Publishing; annotated edition.
- The Westminster Shorter Catechism. 1648. Retrieved Jan. 5, 2011 from http://www.puritanseminary.org/media/Shorter_Catechism.pdf
- The Westminster Confession of Faith. 1646. Retrieved Jan. 5 2011 from http://www.gracefallbrook.com/westminster_standards/The_Westminster_Confession_of_Faith.pdf
- Wilkin, R.N. 1993. We believe in Sanctification. Part 2: Past Sanctification, *Journal of the Grace Evangelical Society*, 6 (10) Spring.
- Wilkin, R.N. 1994. We believe in Sanctification. Part 3: Man's role in present Sanctification. *Journal of the Grace Evangelical Society*, 7 (13) Autumn.
- Williams, N. H. (2002) *The theology of Sanctification* . Jenkintown, PA:World Harvest Mission.
- Wilson, D. 2002. *Reformed is Not Enough: Recovering the Objectivity of the Covenant*. Moscow, ID. Canon Press.
- Wright, N.T. 2003. *New Perspectives on Paul*. Rutherford House, Edinburgh: 10th Edinburgh Dogmatics Conference: 25-28 August 2003. Retrieved Jan. 15, 2011 from (http://www.ntwrightpage.com/Wright_New_Perspectives.htm)
- Wright, N.T. 2009. *Justification: God's Plan and Paul's Vision*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.
- Wycliffe Bible Dictionary. Hendrickson Pub., 1998.



www.PreciousHeart.net/ti