

Ifs, Ands, and Buts: The Two Inheritance Controversy of Romans 8:17

By: Bryan C. Ross

March, 2014

These are not the same:

Joint-Heir (Rom. 8:17)—“A heir having a joint interest with another.”
(*Webster’s 1828 Dictionary*)

Reign (II Tim. 2:12)—“1) To possess or exercise sovereign power or authority; to rule; to exercise government, as a king or emperor; or to hold the supreme power.
2) To be predominant; to prevail. 3) To rule; to have superior or uncontrolled dominion (Rom. 6).” (*Webster’s 1828 Dictionary*)

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
The Main Argument	4
Appendix A: Advancement in Pauline Truth Argument	18
Appendix B: The Greek Participle Argument	30
Appendix C: The History of Translation	36
Endnote: From Page 13	39

Introduction

We first became aware of a growing controversy over how one should understand joint-heirship in Romans 8:17 at the Grace Impact Summer Family Bible Conference in Chicago during July of 2013. Shortly after coming home from the conference we received an email containing a link to a paper circulating on the internet and Facebook titled, [*Heirs of God or joint-heirs With Christ? Sanctified Works in the Dispensation of Grace*](#). At about the same time, (early August) we were added by someone (not sure who) to the Joint-Heirs with Christ Facebook group page where the aforementioned paper was being promoted and discussed.

Over time, after reading the paper through multiple times and following the discussion on Facebook for a while, we became convinced that the fundamental premise promoted by the paper that not all believers are “joint-heirs with Christ” was erroneous. As a pastor and Bible student we had read, studied, and taught on Romans 8:17 many times in the past and have never come to the conclusion that there was a difference between being an “heir of God” and a “joint-heir with Christ” as the paper maintains. After some early study and participation in discussions on Facebook, we pulled back in order to conduct our own inductive study of the passage. The contents of this paper are the fruit of our own study of the matter.

While conducting our research it became apparent that the brothers associated with *Heirs of God or joint-heirs With Christ?* paper were not the only ones teaching that there are two different inheritances in Romans 8:17. This “two inheritance” view is also being propagated by the supporters of a doctrinal system known as Sonship Edification (SE). SE also teaches that all justified believers are “heirs of God” but being a “joint-heir with Christ” is predicated upon the meeting of certain conditions. Consider the words of Mark Newbold one of the foremost teachers of SE:

“A lot more could be said about being a *joint-heir with Christ*, but really the important benefit right now is to understand and appreciate that there is an inheritance that all believers get as *heirs of God*, **but** that heir-ship does **not** include anything about the Father’s business or the running of it, or the rewards and glory of it — all that is contained in another inheritance—a *joint-heir-ship with Christ*; **reserved only for the sons of God who have realized the value of their adoption as sons; understand and appreciate the worth of the Father’s business and the curriculum He’s written to properly edify you and educate you (which is the only place real spiritual growth and godly edification [the edification process] takes place); and then whole-heartedly commit to it!**”¹ (Emphasis is ours)

Careful readers should note that only those believers who meet the following conditions are made “joint-heirs with Christ,” according to Newbold: 1) realize their value as adopted sons, 2) understand and appreciate the Father’s business, 3) understand and appreciate the Father’s SE curriculum for proper edification, and 4) whole-heartedly commit to the [SE curriculum](#). According to this construct, joint-heirship with Christ is something the believers EARN or ATTAIN through proper edification which is only achieved by following and whole-heartily

¹ Mark Newbold, *Romans 8:13-39*. Page 705.

committing to the SE curriculum. This of course means that only believers who are privileged enough to know SE doctrine are capable of even becoming “joint-heirs with Christ.” Practically, SE divides the body of Christ into various groups of believers depending on the level of one’s progress through and commitment to the Sonship Curriculum. Some have even suggested that one is not complete in Christ (Col. 2:10) until they have ATTAINED a “Colossians level” of edification. This type of thinking leads to what Paul warned about in II Corinthians 10:12, “For we dare not make ourselves of the number, or compare ourselves with some that commend themselves: **but they measuring themselves by themselves, and comparing themselves among themselves, are not wise.**”²

The position set forth regarding Romans 8:17 in the *Heirs of God or joint-heirs With Christ?* paper is a permutation of the SE position summarized above. Both maintain a difference between “heirs” and “joint-heirs” in Romans 8:17. Both hold that the “if so be” portion of the verse places a condition upon being a “joint-heir with Christ” in the previous clause. Both connect Romans 8:17 with II Timothy 2:12 to support their conditional reading of what it means to be a joint-heir. Both link the degree of a believer’s sanctification in this life with the attainment of reigning with Christ as “joint-heirs” in eternity. However, they disagree regarding what conditions must be met in order for one to qualify for joint-heir status. Rather than understanding, appreciating, and whole-heartily committing to the SE curriculum, the paper’s author asserts that suffering with Christ for the rightly divided paradigm of scripture is what qualifies one to be a “joint-heir with Christ.” Suffering with Christ in Romans 8:17 is taken to mean individual voluntary suffering for the mystery, by the paper’s author and his chief supporters.³ The *Heirs of God or joint-heirs With Christ?* paper presents a nuanced version of the basic SE position with respect to Romans 8:17 that is devoid of the distinct verbiage that is part and parcel of Sonship Edification. Consequently, the paper is best viewed as permutation or cousin to the basic suppositions of Sonship Edification.

It is important to note that both of these variations of the “two inheritance” view have their origin within mid-Acts Pauline Dispensationalism. Both stripes of this teaching maintain that the King James Bible is God’s Word for English speaking people and that it must be rightly divided if God’s Word is to be properly understood. Consequently, discussions among Grace Believers regarding these issues have proven to be particularly hostile and divisive. This author and many others with whom he has spoken regarding this controversy are worried that this issue is wreaking havoc on the body of Christ. It is not our intent to pour salt on an already gaping wound and thus only further inflame an already painful situation through the publication of this paper. Rather, our goal is to respectfully set forth what we believe to be the correct understanding of Romans 8:17 in a plain, clear, and forthright manner. All believers who are

² The purpose of this paper is not to provide a detailed discussion of Sonship Edification (SE). That could easily be the subject of another paper or book length work. Our purpose in bringing it up here is to alert the reader to the fact that there are many currently within the Grace Movement arguing that being a “joint-heir with Christ” is conditioned upon something even if they do not agree as to exactly what that condition is. SE adopts a framework for edification from the book of Proverbs that is then read back into [Paul’s Epistles](#). Passages such as [Romans 8](#) are not expounded based upon the text of Scripture alone but on the text of Scripture filtered through the SE framework. For example, much is made by Mark Newbold and Michael McDaniel about “the Father’s Business” when expounding Romans 8:17 but that language is not found in the text of Romans 8. Interested parties are encouraged to see *Sonship Establishment Lessons 1-20 and 21-40* by Michael McDaniel and Mark Newbold’s notes on Romans pages [601](#) through [800](#) to substantiate the veracity of these statements.

³ We have read many pages in Michael McDaniel’s *Sonship Establishment* notes and cannot find where he ever comes to the point and clearly states what suffering with Christ in Romans 8:17 actually is.

“heirs of God” are also “joint-heirs with Christ” automatically because they have been joined to Christ and made members of Christ’s body the moment they trusted in the finished work of Jesus Christ. Conflating Romans 8 and II Timothy 2 leads to confusion between inheritance and rewards, a distinction we believe lies at the core of the present controversy. These two passages are not talking about the same type of suffering and it is a mistake to connect them and teach that they are.

We would like to thank the many pastors who have taken time out of their busy schedules to discuss this important matter as well as review and offer feedback on the manuscript. We are under no illusions that this paper will persuade everyone to our manner of thinking, especially those who are already entrenched in their positions; however, we do pray that readers honestly and prayerfully consider the arguments set forth herein. Furthermore, we hope that the present volume will dispel the notion put forward by some supporters of the “two inheritance” view that those who oppose them have not “studied” the issue. Lastly, this paper should be viewed as a snapshot of our thinking at the present time. Further study may lead to refinements in the thinking expressed in this paper which may necessitate future revisions, updates, and editions.

Bryan C. Ross
Grace Life Bible Church
Grand Rapids, MI
gracelifebiblechurch.com
Spring, 2014

The Main Argument

All Who Trust the Gospel of the Grace of God Are Joint-Heirs with Christ

Romans 8:16-17—“The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God: And if children, then heirs; heirs of God, and joint-heirs with Christ; if so be that we suffer with *him*, that we may be also glorified together.”

The Grace Movement has been no stranger to controversy over the years. Unfortunately, a new dispute has emerged within Grace Circles regarding the nature of the believer’s inheritance. Some are arguing that being an “heir of God” and a “joint-heir with Christ” in Romans 8:17 are not the same thing. Supporters of this “two inheritance” view maintain that all believers are made “heirs of God” the moment they trust in the finished work of Christ but that only those who suffer for the truth of the mystery revealed to Paul will be made “joint-heirs with Christ.” It is often stated by those arguing for this position that being an “heir of God” relates to one’s justification whereas being a “joint-heir with Christ” pertains to one’s sanctification.

One representation of this “two inheritance” view is a paper titled, *Heirs of God or Joint-Heirs with Christ? Sanctified Works in the Dispensation of Grace* that is circulating on the internet, particularly on Facebook. The key to understanding this paper is found on pages six and seven where the author makes the “if so be” of Romans 8:17 conditional, thereby placing a condition upon being a “joint-heir with Christ” in the previous clause. After quoting Romans 8:16-17 the author states the following,

“If you read this verse carefully, you will note that there are actually two separate types of eternal inheritance that are being identified: heirs of God and joint-heirs with Christ. In other words, one is an inheritance given to all that are justified, and the other is an inheritance which is given *only* to those who are sanctified.

Everyone in the Church the Body of Christ is an heir of God. This is to say that all in the Church the Body of Christ are recipient heirs of eternal life in heaven: (quotes Galatians 3:29)

However, not everyone in the Church the Body of Christ will be declared a joint-heir with Christ. The reason being that joint-heirship is very much conditional, as the words “*If so be*” would attest.

What does it mean to suffer with Christ (*If so be that we suffer with him*)? How can we define the suffering which is spoken of here? There is a tendency that exists among the church today to view Christian suffering in vague and generalized terms. The common view is that *anyone* who believes in Christ is also, by default, suffering *for Christ*. While there is a very real suffering that comes from professing faith in Christ, this is not the type of suffering that Romans 8:17 refers to.

To this point, I submit for your consideration that the *suffering* with Christ referred to here, speaks **of a special kind of suffering that is inherent to the Pauline doctrine itself**. This is to say, **that this suffering is unique and exclusively appointed to saints**

who stand steadfast in a rightly divided paradigm of scripture. This is because, it is only in rightly dividing the word that the saint is illuminated to the distinctiveness of Paul's mystery and it is ONLY through the doctrinal comprehension of that mystery that true and effectual sanctification of the believer is produced!"⁴

With this conditional understanding in mind, the above author then cross-references Romans 8:17 with II Timothy 2:12 to close the argument that "joint-heirs" are those who suffer with Christ for the truth of the mystery and are therefore granted a "reign" with Christ (i.e., joint-heir) while those who do not remain only "heirs of God." Regarding this piece of the "two inheritance" puzzle the author states,

"As 2nd Timothy 2:12 suggests, there will be those in the Church the Body of Christ who deny Christ, and likewise, will also be denied *by* Christ. Of course, the context here speaks not of losing one's salvation (as verse 13 attests) but rather of one's inheritance being denied. Paul is warning us here that the inheritance and honor of reigning in eternity as joint-heirs with Christ, will not be granted to everyone in the Church the Body of Christ."⁵

The entire "two inheritance" position hinges upon this conditional reading of Romans 8:17. In short, if it could be demonstrated that the "if so be" of Romans 8:17 is NOT conditional then the entire argument falls apart. Simply stated, the debate rests upon how one interprets three English words "if so be" and their corresponding Greek word.

Use of the Word "If" in the New Testament

In the Bible, the word "if" is not always used to convey condition; sometimes it's used to express the challenge of logic. For example, when Paul states in Colossians 3:1 "**If ye then be risen with Christ**, seek those things which are above, where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God," Paul is not placing a condition upon or questioning whether or not believers are risen with Christ. Rather, he is arguing that because believers are already risen and seated with Christ in the heavenly places we should seek those things which are above. In short, the use of the word "if" in this case does not convey the "if/then" principle of the law (condition) but the "if this is true/then this naturally follows" progression of logic. Believers should seek those things which are above because they have already been raised with Christ and seated in the heavenly places with Christ. The context and sentence structure of each passage determines whether or not the word "if" should be understood conditionally or logically.⁶

According to Romans 8:16, the Holy Spirit bears witness with our spirit that "we ARE the children of God." Consequently, believers are already in the state of being the children of God at the end of verse 16. With this in mind, verse 17 begins, "**And if** children, then heirs; heirs

⁴ Matt Stutzman. *Heirs of God or joint-heirs with Christ? Sanctified Works in the Dispensation of Grace*. 6-7.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 7.

⁶ The Greek word translated "if" at the beginning of Colossians 3:1 is derived from the Greek word *ei*. Generally speaking *ei* implies simple condition; however, its exact meaning is affected by the Greek mood following its occurrence. When the condition "*ei*" is followed by the indicative mood "the hypothesis is assumed as an actual fact, the condition being unfulfilled, but no doubt being thrown upon the supposition" (Companion Bible, [Appendix 118](#)). Consequently, in the case of Colossians 3:1, Paul is stating that believers are risen with Christ as an actual fact and therefore the supposition that believers should seek those things which are above is not in doubt. Rather it follows logically from the fact that believers are "risen with Christ" (present tense) that believers should now in the present "seek those things which are above."

of God.” This is the “if” of logical argumentation not condition; Paul is saying “if” one is a child of God (v.16 affirms that believers are) then one is also an heir of God in verse 17.⁷ In Romans 8, Paul is addressing those who have already believed the truths of Romans 1-5 and are in the state of being the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus. Therefore, it follows logically from their standing as children of God that the Romans were also heirs of God and that their position as heirs found its origin in God the Father. In other words, logically one who is the child of God would also be an heir of God.

Verse 17 goes on to say “**and** joint-heirs with Christ.” Consequently, the one who is already a child of God in (v. 16) and an “heir of God” (v. 17) by logical extension is also a “joint-heir with Christ.” If one were to make any of these statements conditional, for consistency sake, they would all have to be viewed as conditional because each statement is built upon the previous. This is the function of the English conjunction “and.” Put another way, the person that is already a “child of God” (v. 16) and an “heir of God” (v. 17) is also a “joint-heir with Christ” because they are in the state of being a child of God. In this context Paul is only addressing those who ARE “children of God” not those who are not. Therefore, his statements intend to set forth what is only true for those who have been made members of the family of God by the “spirit of adoption” (v. 15) through believing Paul’s gospel.

The expression “heir of God” deals with the origin of our inheritance (God the Father) whereas the phrase “joint-heir with Christ” deals with the extent of our inheritance. That being said, there is still fundamentally only one inheritance that each believer receives. As children of God, we receive and participate jointly in what the father has chosen to give his Son.

What Does it Mean to be a “Joint-Heir With Christ”?

The notion of multiple inheritances is completely foreign to Pauline theology. Paul always speaks of the believer’s “inheritance” singular not of “inheritances” plural. Canonically, the first time Paul uses the word “inheritance” is in Acts 20:32 while addressing the Ephesian elders, “And now, brethren, I commend you to God, and to the word of his grace, which is able to build you up, and to give you **an inheritance** among all them that which are sanctified.” Other Pauline passages related to the subject of inheritance include:

- Acts 26:18—To open their eyes, *and* to turn *them* from darkness to light, and *from* the power of Satan unto God, that they may receive forgiveness of sins, and **inheritance** among them which are sanctified by faith that is in me.
- Galatians 3:18—For if **the inheritance** *be* of the law, *it is* no more of promise: but God gave it to Abraham by promise.
- Ephesians 1:11—In whom also we have obtained **an inheritance**, being predestinated according to the purpose of him who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will:

⁷ Sonship Edification (SE) teachers Mark Newbold and Michael McDaniel agree that this first “if” in Romans 8:17 serves the logical function. Newbold states in his notes on Romans 8 that, “The “*if*” is a 1st class condition = if, and we are the *children of God* by virtue of regeneration.” (699) Likewise McDaniel writes, “Following the colon that ends verse 16, we get “And if. . .” This is what is known as the first class conditional “if.” It is not saying “if” in the sense of maybe it is or maybe it isn’t. It is saying “if” in the sense of taking truth and certainty of the aforementioned truth and applying it to what is about to be said. In other words, “if this first thing (which we both know and agree about) is true, then this second thing is just as true.” (*Sonship Establishment: Sessions 1-20*, 36)

- Ephesians 1:14—Which is the earnest of our **inheritance** until the redemption of the purchased possession, unto the praise of his glory.
- Ephesians 1:18—The eyes of your understanding being enlightened; that ye may know what is the hope of his calling, and what the riches of the glory of **his inheritance** in the saints,
- Ephesians 5:5—For this ye know, that no whoremonger, nor unclean person, nor covetous man, who is an idolater, hath any **inheritance** in the kingdom of Christ and of God.
- Colossians 1:12—Giving thanks unto the Father, which hath made us meet to be partakers of **the inheritance** of the saints in light:
- Colossians 3:24—Knowing that of the Lord ye shall receive the reward of **the inheritance**: for ye serve the Lord Christ.

The notion that being an “heir of God” and a “joint-heir with Christ” in Romans 8:17 constitutes two separate inheritances stands in opposition to the verses quoted above. None of these verses supports the concept that there is more than one inheritance for believers. Ephesians 1:18 is especially important to consider in this context. Please note that this verse is speaking about “his inheritance in the saints” or what God the Father is set to inherit through his saints i.e., all the members of Christ’s body. The Father does not have multiple inheritances “in the saints” as the “two inheritance” view demands but one singular inheritance.

Being a “joint-heir with Christ” simply means that believers are joint participants with Christ in all that the Father has chosen to give his Son.⁸ The Greek word translated “joint-heir” in Romans 8:17 is the word *sygklēronomos* and carries the following meanings: 1) a fellow heir, a joint heir 2) one who obtains something assigned to himself with others, a joint participant, according to *Strong’s Concordance*. Besides Romans 8:17 the underlying Greek word *sygklēronomos* is only found three other times in the New Testament.

⁸ Rather than allowing the verse, its context, and clear cross references define what it means to be a joint-heir, Sonship Edification teachers Newbold and McDaniel connect it to one’s knowledge of and commitment to what they call the Sonship Curriculum. In multiple places, Newbold ties the attainment of joint-heirship to the SE Curriculum: “. . . *joint-heir-ship with Christ*; reserved **only** for the sons of God who have realized the value of their adoption as sons; understand and appreciate the worth of the Father’s business and the curriculum He’s written to properly edify you and educate you (which is the **only** place real spiritual growth and godly edification [the edification process] takes place); and then whole-heartedly commit to it! The realization of the reality that there are 2 distinct inheritances, and that the only one that comes directly out of the Father’s business is our *joint-heir-ship with Christ*. . .” (705) Meanwhile, McDaniel ties the attainment of joint-heirship to the level of one’s sanctification in this life, “The “joint-heir” inheritance, which is connected to your sanctification (specifically the component of being an adopted son) is directly related to the Father’s business. This is how the Father begins to tell you some things about His business and your role in it, which is exactly what you should expect after coming out of the pronouncements of vv. 14-15.” (*Sonship Establishment—Sessions 1-20*, 39) According to either construct, joint-heirship is an earned inheritance based upon the level of one’s sanctification which is only achieved via knowledge of and commitment to the SE curriculum. The notion that joint-heirship is contingent upon one’s sanctification is shared by the supporters of the *Heirs of God or joint-heirs With Christ?* paper. This is evident when one considers the paper’s subtitle, *Sanctified Works in the Dispensation of Grace*.

- Ephesians 3:6—That the Gentiles should be **fellowheirs**, and of the same body, and partakers of his promise in Christ by the gospel:
- Hebrews 11:9—By faith he sojourned in the land of promise, as *in* a strange country, dwelling in tabernacles with Isaac and Jacob, the **heirs with him** of the same promise:
- I Peter 3:7—Likewise, ye husbands, dwell with *them* according to knowledge, giving honour unto the wife, as unto the weaker vessel, and as **being heirs together** of the grace of life; that your prayers be not hindered.”

The writer of Hebrews reports that Jesus Christ is an heir of God, having been made “heir of all things.”

Hebrews 1:1-2—God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, Hath in these last days spoken unto us by *his* Son, whom **he hath appointed heir of all things**, by whom also he made the worlds;

Colossians 1:16-20 teaches that Christ has been given the “preeminence” in “all things” so that in him “should all fullness dwell.” In short, Jesus Christ is an heir of God.

Therefore, to be a “joint-heir” simply means to be a co-participant with another in the reception of an inheritance. The meaning of the English word “joint-heir” confirms this reality. *Webster’s 1828 Dictionary* defines a “joint-heir” as an “heir having a joint interest with another.” To be a “joint-heir” with Christ simply means that we have a joint inheritance with Christ in all that the Father will inherit through the work of his Son. Stemming from the straightforward definition of the English word as well as the relevant verses we present the following simple logical and Scriptural argument that all believers are “joint-heirs with Christ”:

- All believers are heirs of God (Rom 8:16, Gal 4:7) who inherit all things (Rom 8:32).
- Christ is an heir of God who inherits all things (Heb 1:1-2).
- Therefore, all believers must be "joint-heirs with Christ" because both are heirs of God who inherit all things (Rom 8:17).

This conclusion follows logically from the premises as well as from the definition of what it means to be a “joint-heir.” Put another way, if (a) God is your father and (b) God is my father then (c) we must be brothers.

The Meaning of the Phrase “If So Be”

At this point, supporters of the “two inheritance” mindset will point out that the statement “and joint-heirs with Christ” is followed by the expression “if so be that we suffer with him.” It is here that they find justification for their argument that being a “joint-heir with Christ” is conditioned upon suffering with Christ. The “if so be” is viewed as placing a condition on the previous clause about being a “joint-heir with Christ.”

This writer maintains that the correct understanding of the Greek word translated “if so be” in Romans 8:17 is LOGICAL not CONDITIONAL. The Greek word rendered “if so be” in this case is found six times in the New Testament. According to *Strong’s Concordance*, the Greek word *ei per* carries the following meanings: “if indeed, since, if after all.” In order to ascertain

the meaning and usage of the Greek word *ei per* we need to consider each time it occurs within the text of the New Testament:⁹

- Romans 8:9—But ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, **if so be** that the Spirit of God dwell in you. Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his.
- I Corinthians 5:8—For **though** there be that are called gods, whether in heaven or in earth, (as there be gods many, and lords many,)
- I Corinthians 15:15—Yea, and we are found false witnesses of God; because we have testified of God the he raised up Christ: whom he raised not up, **if so be** that the dead rise not.
- II Thessalonians 1:6—**Seeing it is** a righteous thing with God to recompense tribulation to them that trouble you;
- I Peter 2:3—**If so be** ye have tasted that the Lord *is* glorious.

Considering the definitions of the English words “indeed” and “since” will help establish the intended meaning behind the Greek word. According to *Webster’s 1828 Dictionary* the English words “indeed” and “since” carry the following relevant meanings:

- Indeed—is usually emphatical, but in some cases more so than in others; **as, this is true; it is indeed.** Indeed is used as an expression of surprise, **or for the purpose of obtaining confirmation of a fact stated. Indeed! Is it possible? Is it so in fact?**
- Since—because that; this being the fact that.

By meaning and usage in the New Testament, the Greek word *ei per* is not one of condition but of logic. It denotes progression in thought as in logical argumentation i.e., if A is true, then B follows from it (or the like). For example, consider the “if so be” as it appears in I Corinthians 15:15. In this context, beginning with verse 12, Paul is in the middle of making an argument regarding the reality of resurrection in general and the resurrection of Christ specifically. Paul is not questioning the reality of resurrection because he emphatically states in verse 20 “But now is Christ risen from the dead. . .” Therefore, “if so be” in verse 15 serves the purpose of logical challenge and is in line with the rhetorical question asked in verse 12. The phrase is not designed to question or cast doubt upon whether or not Christ actually rose from the dead nor does it touch off an entirely new sequence. William R. Newell in his *Romans: Verse by Verse* states the following regarding the use of the Greek word *ei per* in the New Testament:

⁹ The same grammatical principle that we observed in footnote number 4 is in play here in Romans 8:17 as well. The Greek word *ei per* (“if so be”) is once again followed by the indicative mood. This of course means the hypothesis, that believers are joint-heirs with Christ is assumed as an actual fact. Therefore the expression “if so be that we suffer with him” does not throw doubt upon the supposition that those who are the “heirs of God” are also “joint-heirs with Christ.” Rather than introducing a condition, “if so be” is fact-stating, it communicates that believers will “suffer with” Christ on account of having been made “joint-heirs with Christ” in the previous clause. In short, believers suffer with Christ because they have been joined to Christ and made members of his body. This is in line with the common sense reading of the verse in English.

“*Eiper*—“if so be that,” Is used six times in the New Testament; Romans 8:9 and 17; I Cor. 8:5; 15:15; II Thess. 1:6; I Pet. 2:3. An examination of these references shows that this word *eiper* can only be interpreted in one passage, I Cor. 15:15, as introducing a non-existent state of things; and here it is only most evidently for the sake of argument only: “if so be that the dead rise not.” This use in Rom. 8:9, the text proves to be in connection with a positive asserted fact. “if so be the Spirit of God dwelleth in you.” This word *eiper* can be rendered in all six passages by “if, as is supposed.” I would suggest the rendering, “inasmuch as,” for Rom. 8:17.”¹⁰

While we see no reason to alter the text of the King James Bible as Brother Newell has suggested, his overall explanation of how *ei per* is used in the New Testament is in line with the findings of our own independent study. This is further evidenced by how the translators of the 1560 *Geneva Bible* chose to render Roman 8:9 in English:

“Now ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, **because** the Spirit of God dwelleth in you: but if a man hath not the Spirit of Christ, the same is not his.” (Please note that we took the liberty to update the spelling of words for ease of readability.)

The logical usage of the Greek word *ei per* is made plain when one considers how the King James translators rendered the word in English in II Thessalonians.

II Thessalonians 1:5-6—*Which is* a manifest token of the righteous judgment of God, that ye may be counted worthy of the kingdom of God, for which ye also suffer: **Seeing** *it is* a righteous thing with God to recompense tribulation to them that trouble you;

In this context, the English word “seeing” is not talking about seeing a mountain, a ball game, or a movie. Nor is it calling anything into question or contrasting two different things. Rather it is denoting the exact same meaning as the Greek word *ei per* i.e., “if indeed, since, if after all.” *Webster’s 1828 Dictionary* states the following regarding the meaning of the English word seeing: “This participle appears to be used indefinitely, or without direct reference to a person or persons. “Wherefore come ye to me, *seeing* ye hate me.?” Gen. 26. **That is, since, or the fact being that or thus; because that.**”

The evidence presented thus far is both overwhelming and clear. When one considers the meaning and usage of the Greek word *ei per* throughout the New Testament there is no textual or contextual reason for thinking that it places a condition upon being a “joint-heir with Christ” in Romans 8:17. A common sense reading of Romans 8:16-17, in English, reveals that there is no reason to think that the child of God (v. 16) who is an “heir of God” (v. 17) is not also by logical implication and extension a “joint-heir with Christ.” All Greek arguments aside, this is the natural reading of the passage in English.¹¹

¹⁰ William R. Newell. *Romans: Verse by Verse*. Chicago, IL: Moody Press, 1938, 316.

¹¹ After correctly noting that the first “if” in Rom. 8:17 serves the logical function, SE teachers Mark Newbold and Michael McDaniel inexplicably teach that the “if” in the “if so be” portion of the verse introduces a condition upon being a “joint-heir with Christ” in the previous clause (see footnote 7 for an explanation of why this is false). Newbold writes, “... **if so be** ...” = that’s not a 1st class condition “if and it’s true” - that’s an *if* of contingency or condition—in other words, you are a *joint-heir with Christ* **only IF certain conditions are met!** A dreaded “*if*” in the eyes of most Christians!” (705) Newbold, offers no explanation for why one should view the first “if” as logical

What Does it Mean to “Suffer with Him”?

Moving on with our exposition of Romans 8:17, we encounter the next bone of contention in this discussion with the phrase “we suffer with him.” Much is made by the supporters of the “two inheritance” position about what it means to suffer with Christ. Piggy backing on a conditional reading of the “if so be,” Romans 8:17 is connected with II Timothy 2:12 thereby making suffering with Christ to be suffering for the Pauline revelation. In other words, suffering with Christ in Romans 8:17 is taken to be unique individual suffering for the truth of the mystery by individual believers. Suffering for the mystery is what makes one a “joint-heir with Christ” according to the “two inheritance” view. Please recall the quotation from the paper at the beginning of this essay:

“. . . I submit for your consideration that the *suffering* with Christ referred to here, speaks **of a special kind of suffering that is inherent to the Pauline doctrine itself.** This is to say, **that this *suffering* is unique and exclusively appointed to saints who stand steadfast in a rightly divided paradigm of scripture.**”

Once again an investigation into the underlying Greek words does not confirm the “two inheritance” reading of the passage. The Greek words translated “that we suffer with” (*sympaschō*) in Romans 8:17 and “we suffer” (*hypomenō*) in 2Timothy 2:12 are not the same word and carry different meanings. According to *Strong’s Concordance* the Greek word *sympaschō* means 1) to suffer or feel pain together, 2) to suffer evils (troubles, persecutions) in the like manner with another. In other words, the meaning of the underlying Greek word in Romans 8:17 is dealing with suffering that is common to all the children of God (v. 16) not unique individual suffering for Pauline truth as the “two inheritance” mindset demands. This meaning is made plain when one considers the only other time the Greek word *sympaschō* occurs within the text of the New Testament in 1Corinthians 12:26

“And whether one member suffer (*paschō*), all the members **suffer with it** (*sympaschō*); or one member be honoured, all the members rejoice with it.”

The meaning is clear; when one member of the body of Christ suffers (third Greek word for “suffer” *paschō*) all the members suffer in common or together with that member. The meaning of the Greek word is confirmed by the English as it stands in the King James Bible. Romans 8:17 and 1Corinthians 12:26 are not speaking about specific or unique individual suffering for Pauline truth but suffering that is

and the second “if” as conditional. No attempt is made to explain what is going on grammatically in the verse to justify this reading, students are just supposed to take his word for it. Once again, McDaniel follows suit by arguing that the second “if” is conditional after noting that the first “if” was logical, a conclusion for which McDaniel offers no explanation in the following quotation: “The first “if” of verse 17 was that first-class conditional if that acknowledges the truth of a thing being carried forward to another thing. This is an “if” of condition. You can tell by the construction of the sentence which kind of “if” is used. Therefore, a saint can only be a joint-heir if certain conditions are met; in this case, that we ‘suffer with Christ.’”(*Sonship Establishment—Sessions 1-20*, 49) This is poor Bible study and indicative of an attempt to make the text match one’s preconceived “curriculum” rather than adjusting one’s curriculum to match the text. Likewise, the author of the *Heirs of God or joint-heirs with Christ?* paper just pronounces to his readers that the “if so be” is conditional and offers no exegesis or exposition for why. No attempt is made to explain the underlying Greek word; his readers are just supposed to take his word for it that the statement is conditional. We have proved above and beyond doubt in both Greek (*ei per*) and English (if so be) that this portion of the verse is logical and not conditional.

felt and experienced by all “children of God” (Rom. 8:16) or individual “members” of the body of Christ (1Cor. 12:26). This would be the suffering that Paul says all believers “must” endure according to Acts 14:22, “Confirming the souls of the disciples, *and* exhorting them to continue in the faith, and that **we must through much tribulation** enter into the kingdom of God.”

That this is the proper understanding is self-evident when one closely considers the context of Romans 8. Note in Romans 8:16 that the Spirit bears witness with our spirit, “that **we** are the children of God.” Who then is the “**we**” that suffer with Christ in verse 17? It is the same “**we**” who are declared to be the “children of God” at the end of verse 16; i.e., all members of the body of Christ. There is no reason within the context of Romans 8 to think that Paul has suddenly begun talking about or addressing a different classification of believers in the middle of making his point. Those who are the “children of God” are also “heirs of God and joint-heirs with Christ” and therefore suffer together “with Christ.”

Moreover, it should not be overlooked that the Greek word translated “that we suffer with” in Romans 8:17 is in the Present Active Indicative tense which means that the people Paul is addressing are already experiencing the suffering while he is speaking. Once again, these insights gained from the Greek are readily apparent when considering the English text of the King James Bible. Please note verse 18,

“For I reckon that the **sufferings of this present time** (while Paul is still writing the letter) *are* not worthy *to be compared* with the glory that **shall be revealed in us.**”

That the Roman believers were already experiencing suffering while Paul is in the process of addressing them is stated as a point of fact in verse 18. Paul includes himself with the Romans as a child of God, when he wrote that the suffering they were collectively already enduring was “not worthy to be compared with the glory that shall be revealed in **us.**” Who is the “us” at the end of verse 18? It is the same group of people that comprises the “we” of verse 17 i.e., Paul and the Romans. Paul viewed himself as suffering with the Romans even though he had never seen their face in the flesh. Those who are suffering in verse 18 are the same people who are declared to be the “children of God” in verse 16. These facts confirm that the Greek word translated “that we suffer with” is referring to the common suffering that all believers endure together as “children of God.” This reality is further demonstrated by 1Corinthians 12:26 which explains how Paul could have suffered with the Romans even though he did not know them personally, “And whether one member suffer (Paul), **all the members suffer with it** (the Corinthians); or one member be honored, all the members rejoice with it.”

Furthermore the end of verse 18 makes it clear that all those who are “children of God” and “joint-heirs with Christ” definitely will (“shall”) all have Christ’s glory revealed in them. By maintaining that the phrase “if so be” is conditional in verse 17 a condition is placed upon believers being “glorified together” with Christ at the end of verse 17 by the supporters of the “two inheritance” view. That this cannot be the correct interpretation of verse 17 is evident because verse 18 states that the current sufferings of Paul and the Romans are not comparable to the “glory that shall be revealed in us.” Since Paul has not changed who he is addressing, it is clear that all God’s children are 1) heirs of God, 2) joint-heirs with Christ, and 3) will have Christ’s glory revealed in them in the future i.e., be “glorified together” with Christ.

There is no textual or exegetical justification in Romans 8 for teaching that the suffering mentioned in verse 17 is unique individual suffering for the truth of the mystery. The suffering in Romans 8 is exactly what the text states that it is in verses 18-25, the groaning of a creation that has been cursed by sin. Physical pain and ultimately death do not just affect individual believers they impact the entire body of Christ. Even though we have been made “heirs of God and joint-heirs with Christ” believers still

endure the realities of living in a sin-cursed world as we wait in hope for the redemption of our bodies (v. 18-25). Once again, the fact that Paul is still addressing the same group of people, i.e., the “children of God” is evident when we trace the use of the pronouns through the passage.

“The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that **we are the children of God**: And if children, then heirs; heirs of God, and joint-heirs with Christ; if so be that **we** suffer with *him*, that **we** may be also glorified together. For I reckon that the sufferings of this present time *are* not worthy *to be compared* with the glory which shall be revealed in **us**. For the earnest expectation of the creature waiteth for the manifestation of the sons of God. For the creature was made subject to vanity, not willingly, but by reason of him who hath subjected *the same* in hope, Because the creature itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God. For **we** know that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now. And not only *they*, but **ourselves also**, which have the firstfruits of the Spirit, even **we ourselves** groan within **ourselves**, waiting for the adoption, *to wit*, the redemption of **our** body. For **we** are saved by hope: but hope that is seen is not hope: for what a man seeth, why doth he yet hope for? But if **we** hope for that we see not, *then* do **we** with patience wait for *it*.” (Rom. 8:16-25)

One has to read into the passage to conclude that the “we suffer with *him*” in Romans 8:17 is referring to individual suffering for the truth of the mystery. Not only does the word mystery appear nowhere within the context of Romans 8 but individual unique suffering is not even what the passage is speaking about in general.

At this point, proponents of the “two inheritance” view will attempt to cry foul with respect to this explanation on the grounds that the writer has not adequately or accurately explained what it means to suffer WITH Christ. Suffering with Christ, according to the “two inheritance” paradigm means to suffer on account one’s stance for Pauline truth. In the past, this writer was asked by a supporter of the “two inheritance” position what it means to “suffer WITH him” in Romans 8:17?¹ (*See endnote i on pages 39 and 40 for a detailed summary of the SE position on what it means to suffer with Christ in Romans 8:17.*)

We would like to respond with a question of our own. If Christ is seated at the right hand of the Father far above all principality, power, might, dominion, and every name that is named (Eph. 1:20-21) how does he suffer anything during the dispensation of Grace? Christ cannot be tortured, tormented, or suffer aches and pains today during the dispensation of Grace by virtue of his present resurrected and exalted position. So then how does Christ suffer anything? It is only through his position as the head of the body of Christ that He is capable of suffering anything during the dispensation of Grace. Upon belief in the gospel of the Grace of God, the Holy Spirit baptizes the new believer into the body of Christ (1 Cor. 12:12-13) of which Christ is the head (Eph. 1:22, 4:14, 5:23; Col. 1:18, 2:10, 2:19). Consequently, it is only on the basis of positional truth, with respect to the body, that Christ suffers anything. As the head of the body, when a member of the body suffers, all members of the body, including Christ as the head suffers with it, according to 1Corinthians 12:26. As we demonstrated above, 1Corinthians 12:26 is speaking about the suffering that all members of the body of Christ experience in common by virtue of being a member in particular of Christ’s body.

The Apostle Paul teaches that believers are “in Christ” and that Christ is “in us.” So how do we suffer with him in Romans 8:17? First, according to Romans 6 we have been identified, by spiritual baptism, with Jesus Christ in his death, burial, and resurrection. The mechanics of positional truth place us upon the cross with Christ as he shed his blood in payment for our sins. Paul states in II Corinthians 4:10 that as believers we are “always bearing about in the body the dying of the Lord Jesus, that the life

also of Jesus might be made manifest in our body.” As believers we bear the marks of the Lord’s suffering as we progress through this life. Is this not what Galatians 2:20 is about? “I am crucified with Christ: nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me: and the life which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me.”

Advocates for the “two inheritance” view maintain that a truly saved Acts 2 denominational believer in a foreign land that is tortured or executed for his faith in Christ is not a “joint-heir” because he was not suffering for the truth of the mystery. This person does not “suffer with Christ” because they were not enduring hardship for the sake of Pauline truth, according to the “two inheritance” position. Aside from being highly presumptuous, it is also completely false. How are people saved and made members of Christ’s body today during the dispensation of Grace? According to Paul’s gospel, i.e., the unique message delivered to the Apostle Paul by the revelation of Jesus Christ (Gal. 1). Therefore, any truly saved person that suffers anything during this dispensation is suffering on account of Pauline truth whether they realize it or not. To maintain that the truly saved martyrs of church history, men such as John Wycliffe, Jan Huss, or William Tyndale were not “joint-heirs with Christ” because they did not suffer with a working knowledge of mystery truth is ridiculous. For the sake of argument, just how much are the advocates of the “two inheritance” view suffering for Pauline truth when compared with believers in other lands that live in constant fear of being tortured or executed for their faith? The bottom line is any believer who suffers anything whether it be the aches and pains of life, ridicule for their belief in the mystery, incarceration, torture, or even death does so on account of and for Pauline truth. This is because it is through the gospel committed to Paul that anyone is saved and made a member of the body of Christ during the dispensation of grace. All believers are “heirs of God” and “joint-heirs” with Christ because we are members of Christ’s body. Consequently, it is based upon the mechanics of positional truth that we suffer with Christ. Where one member suffers all the members suffer with it period. I suffer with Christ and Christ with me because I am in Christ and Christ is in me.

In summation of this point, is it not ironic that Paul explicitly states that the sufferings he was enduring “as an evil doer” in II Timothy were specifically on account of what he calls “my gospel” in II Timothy 2:8-9? Consequently, the context of II Timothy 2 has Paul suffering on account of the basic truths of his gospel; whereby upon belief one is made a child of God by the Spirit of adoption. According to Romans 16:25-26, the primary function of the book of Romans is to set forth the foundational truths of what Paul calls “my gospel” as well as explain its implications upon all those who trust its message. This is evident by the fact that the mystery is not fully expounded in the book of Romans. Setting forth the advanced doctrines of the mystery program is the job of Ephesians, Philippians, and Colossians. Thus the main purpose of Romans is not to establish the advanced truth of the mystery program that one must suffer for in order to be made a “joint-heir with Christ” as the “two inheritance” position has asserted. Rather Paul is establishing in Romans basic spiritual principles that later demonstrate themselves in the life circumstances of the Apostle Paul (II Timothy 2). Even though believers are “children of God,” “heirs of God,” and “joint-heirs with Christ” we will still suffer trouble as evil doers for our belief in Paul’s gospel. According to our beloved Brother John Verstegen, “the *purpose* of Paul mentioning suffering in Romans 8 is not to emphasize reward, but the glorification which all members of the body will share. In other words, Paul mentions suffering in this context, not to suggest some additional inheritance that they had to attain to, but rather to encourage and comfort the Romans in the midst of their suffering. They needed to realize that despite the fact that they were “In Christ:” 1) they were not immune from experiencing the sufferings of the present time, 2) the suffering was indeed only temporary; “this present time”, 3) they would indeed share in the glorification of Christ, 4) that glorification would

far exceed the suffering, and 5) by understanding and believing this truth, they would be "saved" from the despair that can often accompany suffering."¹²

Difference Between Inheritance and Rewards

Not only does the "two inheritance" confusion stem from a conditional reading of the "if so be" in Romans 8:17 but also from failing to distinguish between inheritance and rewards. We have already demonstrated above that Paul only speaks of one inheritance when addressing members of the body of Christ. He also speaks of "the reward of the inheritance" in Colossians 3:24. We submit that failing to clearly acknowledge this difference is partly to blame for the confusion exhibited by the "two inheritance" mindset. According to *Webster's 1828 Dictionary* one does not need to do anything to receive an inheritance except be a member of the family.

Inheritance—An estate derived from an ancestor to an heir by succession or in course of law; or an estate which the law casts on a child or other person, as the representative of the deceased ancestor. 1) The reception of an estate by hereditary right, or the descent by which an estate or title is cast on the heir; as, the heir received the estate by inheritance. 2) The estate or possession which may descend to an heir, though it has not descended. 3) An estate given or possessed by donation or divine appropriation.

¹² SE teachers Newbold and McDaniel have much to say about the "Father's Business" when defining what it means to be a "joint-heir with Christ." McDaniel ties joint-heirship to participation in the "Father's Business." "Before we get into the final details of vs. 17, let me make sure we see the connection between the inheritance of being a "joint-heir" and the Father's business. First of all, the (your!) inheritance comes out of the business. You can't talk about the "joint-heir" inheritance unless you talk about the business, because the inheritance is integrally joined to the business. It's part of the business; it's where the inheritance comes from. If there was no business, there'd be no inheritance, even an "heir of God" inheritance. So, you need to think about your inheritance in eternity is going to come out of the business and specifically, your involvement in the business. So, how involved do you want to be?" (*Sonship Establishment, Sessions 1-20*, 39) Nine pages later, McDaniel attempts to explain how being a "joint-heir with Christ" works by comparing it to the running of the Father's business, "There is one last thing I want to cover with regard to these two inheritances and that has to do with how they are related to the Father's business. It is true that both inheritances come "out" of the Father's business. But the "heir of God" inheritance does not include anything to do with the running of that business, the rewards of that business or the glory of that business. Those are the things related to only the "joint-heir" inheritance. Think of it this way. Let's say you own a very successful business. Through the years, that business has produced a personal wealth for you. Applying this illustration to the adoption of sons, you would divide up your personal wealth between all your children. That personal wealth came "out of the business." It did not represent all that the business created, for much of the wealth was put back into the business. But whatever personal wealth there was, was produced by the business. The adopted son would get another inheritance; that which pertained to the business itself. As the business continued to produce greater and greater wealth, as the business itself became more and more valuable, only the adopted son would be the beneficiary of that. Not only would he have "personal wealth," but additionally, he would have "business wealth." That is the same difference between an "heir of God" and a "joint-heir with Christ." Both are produced by the Father's business, but only one of them will possess the ongoing wealth of the business." (*Sonship Establishment, Sessions 1-20*, 48-49) As good as all this sounds, what in the world does it have to do with the TEXT of Romans 8? Where does the TEXT of Romans 8 say anything about "the Father's Business?" This is great human viewpoint but it is not good Bible study. These quotes from the pen of McDaniel demonstrate yet again that SE is imposing its "curriculum" upon the text of Romans 8 instead expounding the text as it lies on the page. In our estimation SE is dangerous in this respect and should be rejected outright. Rather than going to the obvious cross references where the same Greek word translated "joint-heirs" occurs to help explain the concept they read the text through the lenses of their preconceived "curriculum."

All believers are adopted into the family of God and made children of God by faith in the finished work of Christ. As members of God's family by default we receive an inheritance. Romans 8:16-17 makes this clear; the child of God (v. 16) is an "heir of God" (v. 17) and "joint-heir with Christ" (v. 17) automatically by the grace of God upon adoption into God's family (v. 14-15).

The issue of reward is a different matter. A reward, according to the dictionary deals with just compensation or payment for services rendered. *Webster's 1828 Dictionary* defines a reward as "To give in return, either good or evil. Hence, when good is returned for good, reward signifies to repay, to recompense, to compensate. When evil or suffering is returned for injury or wickedness, reward signifies to punish with just retribution, to take vengeance on, according to the nature of the case." When a man collects a paycheck every two weeks he is rewarded for the services he performed. Likewise if a man fails to work he collects nothing because no service was rendered. If a man wishes to continue to receive rewards in the form of payments he must endure and continue working.

So it is with II Timothy 2:12. In this context Paul is addressing Timothy as an individual member of the body of Christ (II Tim. 2:1) and encouraging him to "endure" the "hardness" of the ministry (II Tim. 2:1-4), despite the mass apostasy that was already occurring in Asia (II Tim. 1:15). This is a much different context from when Paul was addressing the believers at Rome in Romans 8. In II Timothy 2:12 when Paul uses the word "suffer" it has a totally different meaning than in Romans 8:17. First, as noted above the underlying Greek words are not the same and have different meanings. Rather than referring to automatic common suffering as in Romans 8:17 ("suffer with") in this context Paul is speaking about individual voluntary suffering. The Greek word translated "suffer" in II Timothy 2:12 is the word *hypomenō* which means "to preserve under misfortunes and trials to hold fast to one's faith in Christ; to endure to bear bravely and calmly ill treatments," according to *Strong's Concordance*. Once again, these insights gained from examining the underlying Greek text bear themselves out in the English of the King James Bible. In the immediate context in II Timothy 2:10 we find the same Greek word (*hypomenō*) rendered "endure" in English. In fact, the Greek word *hypomenō* occurs 17 times in the *Textus Receptus* and is translated in English by the King James translators as: endure (11x), take patiently (2x), tarry behind (1x), abide (1x), patient (1x), and suffer (1x). Some more prominent occurrences of the word *hypomenō* include:

- Matthew 10:22—And ye shall be hated of all *men* for my name's sake: but he that **endureth** to the end shall be saved.
- Matthew 24:13—But he that shall **endure** unto the end, the same shall be saved.
- Luke 2:43—And when they had fulfilled the days, as they returned, the child Jesus **tarried behind** (i.e., he remained where he was) in Jerusalem; and Joseph and his mother knew not *of it*.
- Romans 12:12—Rejoicing in hope; **patient** in tribulation; continuing instant in prayer;
- I Corinthians 13:7—Beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, **endureth** all things.
- I Peter 2:20—For what glory *is it*, if, when ye be buffeted for your faults, ye shall **take it patiently**? but if, when ye do well, and suffer *for it*, ye **take it patiently**, this *is* acceptable with God.

The meaning of II Timothy 2:12 comes into focus when one considers the definitions of the English words “endure” and “suffer.”

- Endure—1) To last; to continue in the same state without perishing; to remain; to abide. 2) To bear; to brook; **to suffer** without resistance, or without yielding. To bear with patience; to bear without opposition or sinking under the pressure. Therefore, I endure all things for the elect's sake. 2 Tim 2.
- Suffer—1) To feel or bear what is painful, disagreeable or distressing, either to the body or mind; to undergo. 2. **To endure**; to support; to sustain; not to sink under.

In II Timothy 2, Paul is exhorting Timothy to endure and remain in the truth at all costs and not to be “turned away” as Phygellus and Hermogenes (II Tim. 1:15), Hymenaeus and Philetus (II Tim. 2:17), or Demas (II Tim. 4:10) where. The problem with all these men is that they did not suffer, endure, or abide in the truth. In II Timothy 2:12, Paul is reminding Timothy that he will be rewarded for his faithful service by being granted a position of reigning with Christ whereas these men who did not endure will not. Yet if they were ever truly saved they cannot be denied their position in the family of God i.e., their inheritance.

We agree with our “two inheritance” brethren that those who choose to endure, suffer, abide and remain faithful to Pauline truth will be granted a position of reigning with Christ. However, we disagree that Romans 8:17 and II Timothy 2:12 are talking about the same type of suffering. To read II Timothy 2:12 into Romans 8:17 is the equivalent of confusing inheritance with rewards. Rewards are given for work or service rendered. Is this not what the Judgment Seat of Christ is about? Trying every man’s “work” by fire to determine what “sort” it is (I Cor. 3:10-15). Those whose work abides the fire will be rewarded by reigning with Christ. Those whose work is consumed will suffer loss. Not loss of salvation but loss of reward. Those who suffer in II Timothy 2:12 are granted a position of reigning with Christ while those who do not endure in the truth will not. The suffering in Romans 8 is automatic and common to all believers whereas the suffering in II Timothy 2 is individual, voluntary, and dependent on one’s choosing to endure and remain in the truth. To conflate these two passages together not only creates confusion but it robs the believer of the richness of understanding these two aspects of Pauline truth: the difference between inheritance and rewards. II Timothy 2:12 is dealing with the “reward of the inheritance,” mentioned in Colossians 3:24.

Appendix A

Advancement in Pauline Truth Argument: Is the “Two Inheritance” View the Next Great Advancement in the Resurgence of Pauline Truth?

It is often asserted by some teachers of the “two inheritance” view that their position with respect to Romans 8:17 constitutes a “new” or further “advancement in the resurgence of Pauline truth.” Some have gone so far as to accuse their Grace Brethren with whom they disagree of functioning like “Denominational Brethren.” Self-comparisons have been made by some purveyors of the “two inheritance” position to Martin Luther, John Nelson Darby, and J.C. O’Hair in terms of furthering the resurgence of Pauline truth via the propagation of their position. In short, those who disagree with the “two inheritance” understanding of Romans 8:17 are routinely accused by its supporters of functioning with either: 1) denominational leaven, 2) a clergy/laity superiority complex, or 3) flat out opposing the advancement of Pauline truth.

In this appendix we want to consider the veracity of the fundamental claim that the “two inheritance” understanding constitutes a “new advancement” in the resurgence of Pauline truth. The results of our investigation into the matter have revealed that nothing could be further from the truth. The notion that there are two different inheritances in Romans 8:17 has been the historic position of the Acts 28 view for almost one hundred years. In other words, the idea is far from “new” as has been commonly asserted. Furthermore, it could be argued from the vantage point of church history and/or historical theology that J.C. O’Hair and the other founders of the American mid-Acts Grace Movement were aware of the “two inheritance” position and discarded it when they rejected Acts 28 dispensationalism as false. We maintain that rather than being a step forward in the “resurgence of Pauline truth” the “two inheritance” mindset manifests a **retreat** from truths previously uncovered. In an attempt to prove this assertion we will consider three general categories: 1) the historic Acts 28 position, 2) the rejection of Acts 28ism by J.C. O’Hair, and 3) the testimony of mainline fundamentalism.

Historic Acts 28 Position

Students of the history of Dispensational Bible Study will no doubt recognize the names Charles H. Welch and Stuart Allen. Generally, Welch is viewed as the great champion for the Acts 28 position in the 20th century. Welch was the editor of the monthly Bible study periodical *The Berean Expositor* as well as the author of numerous books on a host of theological subjects. In addition, Welch was the Principal of the Chapel of the Open Book in London, England until his death in 1967. Upon his death he was succeeded by his understudy Stuart Allen. For more information about the life and ministry of Welch interested parties are encouraged to consult Lessons 80 and 81 of the [Grace History Project](#).

In 1948, Welch published his commentary on Romans titled *Just, and the Justifier* in which he teaches that there is a difference between being an “heir of God” and “joint-heir with Christ” in Romans 8:17. While we hesitate to quote lengthy sections from Welch’s writings due to the fact that they are complicated and hard to follow for the sake of historical accuracy we feel that we must. Welch begins his exposition of Romans 8:17 as follows:

(2) Heirs and Joint-Heirs (viii. 17-21).

The epistle to the Ephesians reveals the “hope of our calling,” while the epistle to the Philippians reveals the “prize of the high calling.” Hope is associated with grace; the Prize with reward. Hope is ours because we are in Christ; the Prize will be ours, “if so be we suffer with Him.” **From this it follows that an heir of God is not, necessarily also a joint-heir with Christ.** It was “to him that overcometh” that the promise was made that he should sit with Me upon the throne (Rev. 3:21). “If we suffer,” said apostle Paul, “we shall also reign with Him” (2Tim. ii:12). The doctrine has changed from “in Christ Jesus” to “with Christ.” We do not meet the preposition *sun*, “with,” in Romans viii until verse 16, where it occurs in the word *summartureo*, “bear witness together.” After that we have *sugkleronomos*, “joint-heirs;” *sumpashco*, “jointly suffer;” *sundoxazomai*, “jointly glorified.” The next occurrences are in verse 22, *sustenazo* “groan together” and *sunodini*, “travail together,” and in the latter half of the chapter, there are two or three more compounds of *sun*.

This use of the words “heir,” and “joint-heir,” the one standing in pure grace, the other associated with faithfulness and possible suffering is found in the epistle to the Colossians:

“Giving thanks unto the Father, which has made us meet to be partakers of the inheritance (*kleros*, the allotment) of the saints in the light” (Col i:12).

“Knowing that of the Lord ye shall receive the reward of the inheritance (*kleronomia*, the allotted portion): for ye serve the Lord Christ” (Col. iii:24).

In the first instance the child of God has been “made meet,” in the second there is introduced “reward,” “service,” and even “receiving wrong,” showing that the two subjects are on different grounds, the one being followed by reference to the forgiveness of sins, the other by a reference to what the servant has done. So in Romans viii “If children, then heirs, heirs of God” is parallel with Colossians i:12, “Joint-heirs with Christ, if so be we suffer with him,” is parallel with Colossians iii:24, or as the Apostle wrote to Timothy: “If we died with Him, we shall also live with Him, If we endure, we shall also reign with Him” (2 Tim. ii.11-12).¹³

That Welch taught a distinction between an “heir of God” and a “joint-heir with Christ” in *Just, and the Justifier* is beyond doubt. Like the modern purveyors of this notion, Welch also connected Romans 8:17 with II Timothy 2:12. However, a careful reading reveals that Welch connects those who are “joint-heirs with Christ” via suffering with Christ to the “overcomers” of Revelation 3:21. This connection between the saints at Rome with the overcoming saints of

¹³ Charles H. Welch. *Just, and the Justifier*. Surrey, England: Leonard A. Canning, 1948, 213-214.

Israel's prophetic program is mandated by Welch's dispensational position that the church did not begin until Acts 28. Since Romans was written during the Acts period, and the body of Christ had not yet been formed according to Welch, joint-heirship with Christ through suffering **must be** associated with Israel in order for Welch to remain consistent.

Next, Welch proceeds to list the other occurrences of the Greek word *sugkleronomos* (joint-heirs) in the New Testament. Immediately after noting that the next occurrence of *sugkleronomos* is found in Ephesians 3:6 (fellowheirs) Welch anticipates the difficulty this reality causes for this exposition of Romans 8:17 and states the following:

“We can image the criticism that this reference nullifies the idea expressed above on Romans viii.17. To this we reply that the truth revealed in Eph. iii.6 was unknown at the time the Apostle wrote to the Romans; that it reveals the constitution of the mystery, making known the glorious equality that exists between all members of the One Body, whereas, Romans viii.17 is a revelation concerning “fellow-heirs” of Christ in connection with suffering. No such qualification is to be found in Ephesians iii. The next reference (to *sugkleronomos*), Hebrews xi.9-10, is more in line with Romans viii.17.”¹⁴

Careful readers will note the real reason why Welch teaches a distinction between “heirs” and “joint-heirs” in Romans 8:17, is because his dispensational system demands it. Welch does not believe that Romans is written to the church since it was written during the Acts Period and that the mystery had not yet been revealed in his view. Consequently, knowing that the exact same Greek word (*sugkleronomos*) is used in connection with the revelation of the mystery and formation of the body of Christ in Ephesians 3, Welch must teach a difference between “heirs” and “joint-heirs” otherwise he would be left with the awkward and inconsistent notion that believers are “joint-heirs with Christ” before the “fellowheirs” status that Jews and Gentiles enjoy in the body of Christ had been inaugurated and revealed in Ephesians. This is made plain by Welch's statement that one “can image the criticism that this reference (Eph. 3:6) nullifies the ideas expressed above on Romans viii.17.”

This reality is proven by Welch's attempts to “balance” Romans 8:17 by connecting it with Hebrews 11:9-10 and I Peter 3:7 rather than with Ephesians 3:6. After using the example of how Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob “lived as pilgrims in the land of promise, and looked for something beyond and above, even the New Jerusalem, the heavenly city,” Welch states that Hebrews 11 is dealing with overcoming faith or faith that endures. According to Welch it is this faith which “avoids Esau's bartering of the birthright for the present mess of pottage” that causes the teaching of Romans 8:17 to “fall into line.” That Welch viewed the hope of the saints in Rome as “millennial” is beyond dispute.

¹⁴ Ibid., 215-215.

“The hope of the church as expressed in the epistle to the Romans was millennial (Rom. xv. 12-13); consequently the joint-heirs with Christ who are in any sense overcomers will find much that illuminated their position in Revelations ii., iii. There, addressing Himself to the seven churches of Asia, the Lord makes certain promises “to him that overcomes”: “the tree of life” (Rev., ii.7), “The crown of life,” and “The second death” (Rev., ii.10-11): “The hidden manna,” “white stone,” and “new name” (Rev. ii.17): “Power over the nations . . . even as I received of my Father” (Rev., ii.26-28): “White raiment,” “book of life,” and “name confessed” (Rev., iii.5): “A Pillar.” “A new name,” the name of the “New Jerusalem” (Rev. iii. 12): and finally, “a grant to set with Christ in His throne, even as he overcame, and sat with His Father in His throne” (Rev. iii.21). To sit down with Christ in his throne as an overcomer, to reign with Him, because one has endured to be a joint-heir of Christ, if so be that we suffer with him, are all expositions of the same truth, though it operates in different spheres, whether the dispensation of the mystery, or the Acts period.”¹⁵

Maintaining a difference between “heirs of God” and “joint-heirs with Christ” in Romans 8:17 has been a hallmark of the Acts 28 position for decades. After the death of C.H. Welch in 1967, his understudy and successor Stuart Allen advanced the same understanding of Romans 8:17 in his book *The Galatian & Roman Epistles of Paul* in 1987 (see pages 122-123).¹⁶

O’Hair’s Rejection of Acts 28ism

John Cowen O’Hair the longtime pastor of the North Shore Church in Chicago, IL is widely regarded as the fountainhead of the mid-Acts Grace Movement in the United States. While in 1920 O’Hair came to understand that sign gifts and water baptism were not for the church of this dispensation, he maintained into the 1930s that the church began in Acts 2 and did

¹⁵ Ibid., 216.

¹⁶ Harry Bultema’s *Romans: Truth in Paradox* is an example of a written work associated with the mid-Acts Grace Movement that advocated for a difference between “heirs” and “joint-heirs” in Romans 8:17. Appearing in print as a single volume in 1989, the contents of *Romans* is comprised of articles that Dr. Bultema originally published in his monthly Bible study magazine, *The Morning Star* between June, 1951 and November, 1954 (some of these articles were published after his death in 1952). Bultema clearly viewed the expression “if so be” in Romans 8:17 as being one of condition rather than logic and connected Romans 8:17 with II Timothy 2:12. However, Bultema placed the body of Christ upon the earth reigning with Christ as kings during the Millennium. In this context it bears noting that Dr. Bultema never believed that the body of Christ started in either Acts 9 or Acts 13 like most of the members of the Grace Movement both past and present. Rather, Bultema maintained that “the Church which is His Body began at the cross” but was not revealed to Paul until Acts 28 after Israel was granted a thirty year extension of mercy, according to his son Dan Bultema in the July-August, 1964 issue of *Truth Magazine* (Those interested in reading more about Bultema’s position on the origin of the church are encouraged to consult the Dec. 1945, June-July, 1946, and Dec. 1948 is of *Morning Star*). (57-58) Consequently, according to the rigid standards set forth by the modern supporters of the “two inheritance” view Dr. Bultema is not a “joint-heir with Christ” because he was not suffering with Christ in the correct doctrinal understanding even though he taught a connection between Romans 8 and II Timothy 2 and two different inheritances in Romans 8:17. See pages 69-70 of *Romans: Truth in Paradox* to read Bultema’s commentary on Romans 8:17.

not arrive at a clear mid-Acts position until the latter half of the decade.¹⁷ As O’Hair worked at developing a consistent dispensational answer to the Pentecostal confusion descending upon Fundamentalism in the 1930s, he repeatedly faced the charges of Bullingerism, Hyperdispensionalism, and Ultradispensionalism on account of his position regarding the sign gifts and water baptism.

These charges reached a climax in 1935 with the publication of *Wrongly Dividing the Word of Truth* by H.A. Ironside. O’Hair responded to Ironside by drafting three personal letters that he later published in booklet form: 1) *Art Thou He That Troubleth Israel?* (March 15, 1935); 2) *Wrongly Deriding Christian Brethren* (May 20, 1935); 3) *Puerile and Childish Diatribes* (May 20, 1935). In these letters, particularly *Wrongly Deriding*, O’Hair makes many Acts 28 sounding statements. In August of 1935, O’Hair launched his monthly Bible Study periodical *Bible Study for Bereans (BSfB)* which ran through July, 1937. The first five issues of *BSfB* manifest a distinct Acts 28 flavor in terms of the dispensational position being advanced in the magazine. The October, 1935 issue contained a reprint of large sections of Otis Q. Sellers’s *Do We Wrongly Divide the Word of Truth?* which is without question an Acts 28 document.

As the calendar turned from 1935 to 1936 O’Hair had a major change of mind dispensationally away from the Acts 28 position. Signs of a coming change are observable in the last article O’Hair wrote for *BSfB* in December, 1935 on the subject of the Lord’s Supper. Readers of the January, 1936 issue of *BSfB* are met with the following statements in the first article titled “Is the One Body of Romans the One Body of Ephesians:”

“I have tried to see a new Body beginning after that important climax in Acts 28:25 to 28; but I have seen too much spiritual disaster result from unsound exegesis and fanciful speculation of well meaning brethren, who have not only distinguished between things that differ, but between imaginary differences. Many of them begin by eliminating all that pertains to the New Covenant and they proceed to eliminate some things that they imagine are exclusively associated with the New Covenant, dropping the Lord’s Supper, the rapture of I Thessalonians 4:13 to 18, the judgment seat of II Corinthians 5:10 and Romans 14:10, the believer’s need of a high Priest, Intercessor, or Advocate. These eliminations are only stepping stones toward other eliminations.”

O’Hair plainly admits in January, 1936 what is evident from a consideration of his writings in 1935 that he had been toying seriously with the notion of embracing the Acts 28 position for a time. Judging from our evaluation of the documents, O’Hair ran headlong into the issue of the Lord’s Supper in December, 1935 which prompted the abrupt shift in his thinking exhibited in January, 1936, his comments cited above testify to this fact. From January, 1936 on O’Hair begins a process of determining exactly when he thinks the church of this dispensation began, having ruled out both Acts 2 and Acts 28 as viable options. One will search in vain through the rest of the issues of *BSfB* to find a clear articulation of the mid-Acts position. It was after the

¹⁷ Those interested in learning more about O’Hair’s early period in the 1920s are encouraged to consult [The Origin of the Grace Movement: The Early Theology of John Cowen O’Hair](#) by Dale S. DeWitt with research assistance being provided by Bryan C. Ross. In addition, interested parties should also view [Grace History Project](#) Lessons 85-86, and 90.

final issue of *BSfB* in July, 1937 but before the publication of *The Dispensational Razzle-Dazzle* in April, 1938 that O’Hair wrote *God’s Reign of Grace For the Human Race* in which he maintains that the church of this dispensation began before Paul wrote the book of Romans in Acts 20.¹⁸ This was the first clear articulation of a mid-Acts dispensational position and became a cornerstone in the founding of the Worldwide Grace Testimony in January, 1939.¹⁹

Interestingly enough, the section of Charles H. Welch’s *Just, and the Justifier* that contains his comments on Romans 8:17 originally appeared in [Volume XXV](#) of *The Berean Expositor* which was published in 1935, the very same year that O’Hair strongly entertained Acts 28ism for a time. Consequently, one could make the historical argument that when O’Hair turned away from the Acts 28 position in January, 1936 he was by default also rejecting the notion of two separate inheritances in Romans 8:17. This of course paints a very different picture of things than the one presented by the modern supporters of the “two inheritance” view. Rather than being a “recent development” or “further advancement in the resurgence of Pauline truth” within Grace Circles it was known to the founders of the Grace Movement and rejected as part and parcel of the Acts 28 position. That it has remained the historical position of the Acts 28 movement is beyond question as we have documented above.

In fact even during the timeframe that O’Hair was weighing the validity of the Acts 28 position he always maintained a connection between those who are “joint-heirs with Christ” in Romans 8:17 and those who are “fellowheirs” in the body of Christ in Ephesians 3:6. Consider the following evidence:

- *Wrongly Deriding Christian Brethren* (May 20, 1935)—“ But that Gentiles should be joint-heirs in a joint-Body was not made known to Amos and other sons of men in other ages. Ephesians 3:5.”
- *Bible Study for Bereans* (August, 1935)—“We are God’s children and joint-heirs with Christ. The Holy Spirit is indwelling us as the evidence of this relationship. Romans 8:16 and 17.”

After his rejection of the Acts 28 view in January, 1936 statements connecting Romans 8:17 and Ephesians 3:6 increased in the writings of J.C. O’Hair.

- *Bible Study for Bereans* (January, 1936)—“Perhaps you are aware of the no small stir that is abroad concerning this One Body. In some sections of the land there is a controversy, even unpleasant in spots, and Fundamentalists are much exercised about definitely fixing the time of the beginning of this Body historically. They all know that this church was purposed by God in

¹⁸ “When we acknowledge that there is a great difference between Christ exalted to be a Prince and a Saviour to give repentance to Israel and Christ above all principalities in the heavens, Head of the Church which is His Body, this question must follow: “did a dispensational change take place between Acts 5:30 and Ephesians 1:19 to 22?” The answer must be an emphatic “Yes”. It is absurd to say that Israel had been set aside when Peter proclaimed the message of Acts 5:30 and 31. It is also equally absurd to say that Israel had not been set aside when Paul wrote Ephesians. Therefore, Israel was set aside some time between the time these two messages were given. The casting away of Israel brought the reconciling of the Gentiles. Romans 11:15. This reconciliation ministry is proclaimed in II Corinthians 5:16 to 21. Therefore Israel had been cast away before that Epistle was written. Although the final doom was not pronounced until Acts 28:25 to 28. . . This awful Divine judgment fell upon Israel sometime between the day of Pentecost and the year Romans was written.”

¹⁹ For a more detailed treatment of O’Hair’s theological development interested parties are encouraged to consult [Grace History Project](#) Lessons 93-106, 109, 114.

Christ Jesus before the foundation of the world; that members of that Body were predestined to be conformed to the image of God's Son, **to be children of God and joint-heirs with the Lord Jesus Christ; that members of His Body were chosen to be seated with Him where He now is, in the heavenlies, and there blessed with Him with all spiritual blessings.** Ephesians 1:1 to 22. The Divine Record is, that that Body is One New Man. Ephesians 2:15.”

- *Bible Study for Bereans* (January, 1936)—“In the Body of Romans members were predestinated to be conformed to the image of God's Son, to be God's children, to be joint-heirs with Christ, all witnessed by the indwelling Holy Spirit. Romans 8:14 to 28. Compare with Ephesians 1:2 to 18.”
- *Bible Study for Bereans* (April, 1936)—“Six or seven different Greek words are translated “partaker” in the Scriptures. These words are used by the Holy Spirit to tell us what it means to be a partaker of Christ. **Believers are joint-heirs with Christ and are joined to Christ in an inseparable and eternal union; members of His Body, seated with Him and blessed in Him with all spiritual blessings in the heavenlies.** It is very interesting to trace the meanings of the different words translated “partaker” and learn of our intimate relationship, partnership and fellowship with Christ; “joint-heirs”, “sharers”, “partners”, “Co-partners”. “In Christ” and “Christ in us”. Christ partook of our nature that we might partake of His nature. We partake of His sufferings that we might partake of His glory. As the Captain of our salvation, He was made perfect through suffering.
- *Bible Study for Bereans* (December, 1936)—“All of these facts were revealed in the Epistles that Paul wrote before he declared himself a prisoner of the Lord for the hope of Israel. All of these heavenly blessings for uncircumcised Gentiles were included in the grace message which Paul received by revelation from Christ in glory. The whole program was too much for the Jews that believed. To them it was a mystery. **Indeed it was a mystery, that there was neither Jew nor Gentile in Christ, but that they were both in one Body, temples of the Holy Spirit, and joint-heirs with God's Son.**”
- *Bible Study for Bereans* (February/March, 1937)—“The believer is a temple of the Holy Spirit and is a child and heir of God and a joint-heir with Christ. It is his privilege to rejoice daily in the hope of the glory of God and to be conscious of the peace of God that passeth understanding. It would require many hours to list all of the blessings and benefits included in the word “Gospel.” Read Colossians 1:12 to 16.”
- *God's Reign of Grace for the Human Race* (Spring, 1938)—“That the Gentiles should be **fellowheirs (joint-heirs)**, and of the same **Body (joint-Body)**, and **partakers (joint-sharers)** of His promise in Christ by the gospel.” Ephesians 3:6.”
 - 6. “And if children, then heirs; heirs of God, **and joint-heirs with Christ**; if so be that we suffer with Him, that we may be also glorified together.” Romans 8:17.
 - 6A. “That the Gentiles should be **fellowheirs (joint-heirs)**, and of the same Body, and partakers of His promise in Christ by the gospel.” Ephesians 3:6.”

Is it not ironic that in the same work (*God's Reign of Grace for the Human Race*) that O'Hair first articulates a clear mid-Acts position (the church began before Paul wrote Romans in Acts 20) we find him doing exactly what Welch refused to do, i.e., connect Romans 8:17 with its obvious Pauline cross

reference in Ephesians 3:6. O’Hair knew what Welch could not admit on account of this dispensational framework, and the modern supporters of the “two inheritance” view refuse to concede, namely that anyone who is a “fellowheir” in the **body of Christ** is also a “joint-heir with Christ” simply by being a member Christ’s body. In fact, it was understanding that the body of Romans was the same as the body in Ephesians that led O’Hair out of Acts 28ism. Simply stated, it was observing the connection between “joint-heirs” in Romans 8:17 and “fellowheirs” in Ephesians 3:6 that aided O’Hair in establishing a mid-Acts dispensational position to begin with, as the above quotations demonstrate. Consequently, when O’Hair rejected the Acts 28 dispensationalism it could be argued that he also was rejecting the notion of two different inheritances in Romans 8:17 as part and parcel of Acts 28ism. From the spring of 1938 forward, O’Hair connects Romans 8:17 with Ephesians 3:6 as a hallmark of Pauline theology in much of his printed literature.

This reality is clearly observable in O’Hair’s longest and most enduring work *The Unsearchable Riches of Christ* written in 1941. Multiple times in *Unsearchable Riches* O’Hair uses the concepts of “joint-heirs” and “fellowheirs” interchangeably when expounding upon the nature of the church’s composition and relation to its Head. Consider the following examples:

- “Then believing Jews and Gentiles were baptized by the One Spirit into the One Body. I Corinthians 12:13. That One Body is called in Ephesians 3:6, “the Joint-Body.” Divine Truth concerning this “Joint-Body,” its hope and calling, is called “**the unsearchable riches of Christ.**” Ephesians 3:8.”
- “Christ’s Body is called in Ephesians 3:6, “the Joint-Body.””
- “That the Gentiles should be joint-heirs and of the Joint-Body, and joint-sharers of His promise in Christ by the gospel. . . When did God begin to join those who were nigh (non-covenant Gentiles) and those who were afar off (covenant Israelites) in one Body, and make them a Joint-Body?”
- “Not one of these prophets said one thing, or knew one thing, about the Joint-Body of Ephesians 3:6, the Church of the Mystery.”
- “This is what I believe and teach concerning the Church of the Mystery, the Body of Christ. But the Church to which Peter belonged on the day of Pentecost was not the Church of the Mystery, for the Divine movement which Peter presented in connection with the gospel of the circumcision, unlike the Joint-Body of Ephesians 3:6, was prophesied.”
- “**That the Gentiles should be jointheirs, and of the JOINT-BODY, and jointsharers of His promise in Christ by the gospel.**”
- “In the meantime all saved Gentiles have been translated into the kingdom of the Son of God’s love. Colossians 1:13. They have been adopted into the household of God, and are the children of God and joint-heirs with the Lord Jesus Christ. Ephesians 1:5. Romans 11:13 to 17”
- “**That the Gentiles should be jointheirs, and of the same (joint-) Body, and jointpartakers, of His promise in Christ by the gospel.**” Ephesians 3:6.”
- “**Which IN OTHER AGES was not made known unto the sons of men as it is now revealed unto His holy apostles and prophets by the Spirit; That the Gentiles should be fellowheirs**

(joint-heirs) and of the same Body (Joint-Body), and partakers (joint-sharers) of His promise in Christ by the gospel.” Ephesians 3:5 and 6.”²⁰

Writing some forty years later in 1981, Pastor C.R. Stam asserted in his *Commentary on the Epistle of Paul to the Romans* that all members of the body of Christ are “joint-heirs with Christ” because believers are *in Him* and seated *with Him* in the heavenly places.

“As “joint-heirs with Christ” we share in all of Christ’s riches; not part belonging to each, but all to both. All He has is ours (I Cor. 3:21-23; II Cor. 4:15). In Him and with Him we are blessed with “all spiritual blessings in heavenly places” (Eph. 1:3). Some have erroneously equated this “joint-tenancy” with “tenancy in common,” but in any case it is a “tenancy of coparceny,” in which the coparceners, whatever their number, constitute but one heir. Thus we may also be assured that “if so be we suffer with Him,” we shall also be “glorified together.” With this thought the Apostle introduces the subject of our present sufferings and the glory to come (Rom. 8:18-27).²¹

In Pastor’s Stam’s comments as with Pastor O’Hair’s, we can observe a rejection of the fundamental notion that there is a difference between an “heir of God” and “joint-heir with Christ” in Romans 8:17. Stam, like O’Hair before him, viewed the believer’s joint-heir status with Christ as stemming from our membership in the body of Christ and our unity with its Head the Lord Jesus Christ.

Testimony of Mainstream Fundamentalism

William R. Newell, author of *Romans: Verse by Verse* acknowledged in 1938 that two schools of thought regarding Romans 8:17 parted company with each other over how one should interpret the “if so be” portion of the verse. In his comments, Newell demonstrates an awareness of both the traditional teaching found in John Nelson Darby’s *Synopsis of the Books of the Bible, Volume IV* (see page 189) and H.A. Ironside’s *Lectures on the Epistle to the Romans* from 1928 (see page 104) that “heirs of God” are also “joint-heirs with Christ” as well as those who maintained as Charles H. Welch did (1935) that the “if so be” portion places a condition upon being a “joint-heir with Christ” in the previous clause. According to Newell the correct answers can only be determined by paying close attention to the details of the passage.

“If so be that we suffer with Him, that we may be also glorified with Him.—Here two schools of interpretation part company, one saying boldly that all the saints are designated, and that all shall reign with Christ; the other, that reigning with Christ depends upon voluntary choosing of a path of suffering with Him. Well, the Greek word *eiper* translated “if so be,” will support either of these interpretations.

“That we may also be *glorified together.*” This is the key to our question: WHO are to be glorified with Christ when He comes? In Chapter Five Paul says (and that of, and to, all the saints), “We rejoice in hope of the *glory of God.*” And in II Thessalonians 1:10 we read, “When He shall come to be glorified *in His saints*, and to be marveled at *in all them that believed.*” And in I Corinthians 15:23: “Christ the firstfruits; then *they that are*

²⁰ All quotes in this section are taken from *The Unsearchable Riches of Christ* by J.C. O’Hair originally published in 1941.

²¹ C. R. Stam. *Commentary on the Epistle of Paul to the Romans*. Chicago, IL: Berean Bible Society, 1981, 195.

Christ's, at His coming.” And again (Col. 3:4): “When Christ our life shall be manifested, then shall ye also [evidently all the saints!] with Him be manifested in glory.” Again (I John 3:2): “Now are *we* [all the saints] children of God . . . We know that, if He shall be manifested, *we* [all the saints] shall be like Him; for we shall see Him even as He is!”

Such passages leave *no room at all* for a “partial rapture!” *All* the saints will share Christ's glory.”²²

Newell argues that the key to answering the conundrum regarding Romans 8:17 is not found in the “if so be” portion of the verse but the final clause about being “glorified” with Christ. Since all believers will have Christ gloried in them, i.e., “share in Christ's glory” at His coming (Rapture) it follows logically that all believers are “joint-heirs with Christ,” according to Newell.

Moreover, it is important to note that there is tension between Newell's statement above that “if so be” will support either reading of Romans 8:17 in the main text of his commentary when compared with the footnote at the bottom of the page regarding the use of the Greek word *eiper*. In the footnote, Newell makes it plain that *eiper* serves the function of logical argumentation as opposed to simple condition as has been asserted.

“*Eiper*—“if so be that,” Is used six times in the New Testament; Romans 8:9 and 17; I Cor. 8:5; 15:15; II Thess. 1:6; I Pet. 2:3. An examination of these references shows that this word *eiper* can only be interpreted in one passage, I Cor. 15:15, as introducing a non-existent state of things; and here it is only most evidently for the sake of argument only: “if so be that the dead rise not.” This use in Rom. 8:9, the text proves to be in connection with a positive asserted fact. “if so be the Spirit of God dwelleth in you. This word *eiper* can be rendered in all six passages by “if, as is supposed.” I would suggest the rendering, “inasmuch as,” for Rom. 8:17.”²³

The next portion of Newell's exposition tackles the controversial subject of what it means to “suffer with him” in Romans 8:17. Newell points out that the Greek words translated “suffer with” in Romans 8:17 and “suffer” in II Timothy 2:12 are not the same and carry different meanings. In turn, Newell states that suffering with Christ in Romans 8:17 “is not a voluntary matter, but one necessitated by the relationship.” In contrast, Newell notes that the suffering mentioned in II Timothy relates to a voluntary decision to “endure” and is “an additional thing, fitting one for reigning with Christ.” In the end, Newell is clear that all members of the body of Christ are “joint-heirs with Christ.” Readers are encouraged to consider the remainder of Newell's commentary for themselves:

“Now, as to places in the Kingdom, what reward we shall have, what responsibilities of kingdom government (in the 1000 years), we shall each be able to bear, or be entitled to, our “suffering with” Christ Jesus, seems to determine. “If we died with Him [as did all believers] we shall [all] also *live* with Him [in glory]; if we endure, we shall also reign with Him” (II Tim. 2:12, R. V.)

Now the Greek word used in Romans 8:17 for “suffer with” (*sumpascho*) is used just once more in the New Testament: in I Corinthians 12:26: “If one member suffer, all the members *suffer with it*.” Here Paul is speaking of the Body of Christ into which all believers have been baptized by the Spirit (I Cor. 12:12, 13): “As the [human] body is

²² William R. Newell. *Romans: Verse by Verse*. Chicago, IL: Moody Press, 1938, 316.

²³ *Ibid.*, 316.

one, and hath many members, and all the members of the body, being many, are one body; so also is Christ; For in one Spirit were we all baptized into one Body.” Here note all believers are in this Body. And then, verse 26: “Whether one member suffereth, all the members suffer with it.” Here (and mark again this is the only occurrence of the word besides Rom. 8:17) “suffering with” is not a voluntary matter, but one necessitated by the relationship. If someone should tread upon your foot, your whole body would be exercised. So it is with Christ and His members.

Now as to the other word, of II Timothy 2:12: “If we endure, we shall also reign with Him”; this word is entirely different: but (and note this), the subject of which it treats is different. Being a joint-heir with Christ, and being a member of His Body, and therefore, sharing necessarily those sufferings that every member of a living Christ will suffer in a world where Satan is prince, is one thing; gaining the ability to have victory over Satan and the world, entering gladly into the conflict those sufferings involve, and *enduring*, is perhaps an additional thing, fitting one for reigning with Christ, though all His members are joint-heirs with Him.”²⁴

William R. Newell was aware of the divergent opinions regarding joint-heirship in Romans 8:17 when he penned his commentary in 1938. Newell’s common sense exposition notes the differences in context between Romans 8 and II Timothy 2 and seeks to understand the text as it lies on the page. Any similarities between our expositions of Romans 8:17 contained in this paper and Newell’s are coincidental since our explanation was based upon our own study of the passage before we read Newell. That being said, we find Newell’s comments on Romans 8:17 to be sound and in-line with the findings of our own inductive study of the text.

Conclusion

When viewed through the prism of historical theology the claims of “two inheritance” supporters that their position is “new” are found to be completely without foundation. The crux of the “two inheritance” position was outlined by Charles H. Welch in *The Berean Expositor* in 1935 and has been the historic position of Acts 28 dispensationalism for the majority of the last century. Mainline Fundamentalism as well as mid-Acts Pauline dispensationalism have been aware of the central arguments of the “two inheritance” position since the late 1930s. Given the history presented in this Appendix we maintain that the modern “two inheritance” mindset should not be viewed as “a further advancement in the resurgence of Pauline truth” but **as a retreat** from truths previously recovered.

The only piece of the “two inheritance” puzzle that can truly be viewed as “new” is their demand that suffering with Christ in Romans 8:17 is voluntary on account of the advanced truths of the mystery or a working knowledge of “rightly divided paradigm of Scripture.” Supporters of the “two inheritance” position have not proved from the text of Romans 8 that suffering with Christ is anything other than what the text of Romans 8 plainly teaches i.e., the automatic suffering that is true of and experienced by all members of the body Christ by virtue of their spiritual union with Christ.

Let the record show that we have included this information as an Appendix separate from the Main Argument section of this paper. We have done this so that there is no confusion as to our position. Our reasons for rejecting the “two inheritance” viewpoint are not based upon

²⁴ Ibid., 316-318.

church history and historical theology but the exposition of the text of Romans 8 presented in the Main Argument section. The Bible is our final authority not church history. It was deemed necessary that this Appendix be included to address the common claim made by supporters of this doctrine that it is “new” and constitutes a further “resurgence in Pauline truth.” This claim is false and should be rejected outright.

Appendix B

The Greek Participle Argument: Should We Read an “And” as though it Were a “But”?

Unfortunately, supporters of the “two inheritance” view have attempted to manufacture a context with respect to Romans 8 that supports their paradigm. On the Joint-Heirs with Christ group page on Facebook the author of *Heirs of God or Joint-Heirs With Christ? Sanctified Works in the Dispensation of Grace* presented the following “Greek Participle Argument” regarding the context of Romans 8:17. For the record, and in fairness to the author, this argument cannot be found within the text of the original paper. Rather it surfaced as a secondary argument as the “two inheritance” view was being discussed on Facebook after the fact.

“Bryan Ross . . . I brought up the Greek participles “men” and “de” that are used in Romans 8:17 back when you were challenging this issue on the basis of the now debunked punctuation argument. I’m not sure if you didn’t understand what I had said in that message, or if you don’t agree with it, or if you are simply ignoring it.

In any case, I’ll restate what I had said there and ask you to give it some thought:

Those two participles “men” and “de” (G3303, and G1161) are combined together in verse in 13 total verses in the book of Romans. In every case (without exception) the use of these words together in Romans are ALWAYS used to contrast two different things. They are never conjunctive.

Again here are a few examples of this which I believe deserve your honest consideration so long as this discussion is being contested from a basis of Greek:

For circumcision verily (G3303) profiteth, if thou keep the law: but (G1161) if thou be a breaker of the law, thy circumcision is made uncircumcision.- Romans 2:25

And not as it was by one that sinned, so is the free gift: for (G3303) the judgment was by one to condemnation, but (G1161) the free gift is of many offenses unto justification. – Romans 5:16

Likewise reckon ye also yourselves to be dead indeed (G3303) unto sin, but (G1161) alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord. – Romans 6:11

I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord. So then with the mind I myself serve (G3303) the law of God; but (G1161) with the flesh the law of sin. – Romans 7:25

And (G1161) if Christ be in you, the body (G3303) is dead because of sin; but (G1161) the Spirit is life because of righteousness. – Romans 8:10

And (G1161) if children, then heirs; heirs of God, (G3303) and (G1161) joint-heirs with Christ; if so be that we suffer with him, that we may also be glorified together. – Romans 8:17

I have only provided six of the total 13 citations in Romans here in which G3303 and G1161 are used together. . . I'd encourage you to look up the rest as part of your due diligence.

Given that ALL 13 examples in Romans clearly use these participles together to contrast two different things, it would certainly be illogical for a person to argue that Romans 8:17 is somehow the lone exception that deviates from the established pattern and precedent. Wouldn't you agree?"²⁵

A complete induction of every verse in the New Testament that contains the Greek words *Men* and *De* in the same verse does not support the author's alleged "established pattern and precedent" in Romans or any other New Testament book. What follows are the results of our investigation into the matter. What these findings demonstrate are the great lengths that the supporters of the "two inheritance" are willing to go to maintain their conditional reading of Romans 8:17. Please recall from the Main Argument section to this essay that their entire position hangs upon this conditional reading of Romans 8:17.

- *Men* (3303)—is a primary particle in terms of the part of speech. It is found 193 times in the *Textus Receptus* the Greek text supporting the King James Bible. The word has been variously translated into English as follows:
 - Indeed—22x
 - Verily—14x
 - Truly—12X
 - Misc.—3x
 - Not Translated—142x

- *De* (1161)—is a CONJUNCTION (primary participle) in terms of the part of speech. The Greek word is found 2,870 times in the Greek text supporting the King James Bible. As a CONJUNCTION it can be either ADVERSATIVE (that is expressing contrariety, opposition, or antithesis: for example "*But*" is an adversative conjunction) or CONTINUATIVE. This is evidenced by the multiple ways it has been translated into English.
 - But—1,237 x
 - And—934 x
 - Now—166 x

²⁵ September 10, 2013—Joint-Heirs Group Facebook Page.

- Then—132 x
- Also—18 x
- Yet—16 x
- Yea—13 x
- Moreover—13 x
- Nevertheless—11 x
- For—4x
- Even—4x

There are 112 verses in the New Testament that contain the Greek words *Men* (3303) and *De* (1161) in the same verse. How the word *De* (1161) is rendered in English is determined by each individual occurrence, not by an arbitrary rule. In other words, the determinative factor in whether *De* (1161) is ADVERSATIVE (“but” in English) or CONTINUATIVE (“and” in English) is the sentence structure of each verse. This is clear when one considers how *De* (1161) is rendered in English in these 112 verses.

- But—69x
- And—47x
- Other—19x

It is important to note that when *De* (1161) is rendered “and” in English it is representative of the CONTINUATIVE use of the Greek word. This is evident by noting the definition of the English CONJUNCTION “and:” And (conj.)—“And is a conjunction, connective or conjoining word. It signifies that a word or part of a sentence is to be added to what precedes.” (*Webster’s 1828 Dictionary*)

Verses Containing The Greek Words <i>Men</i> (3303) and <i>De</i> (1161) in the Same Verse	Listing of How <i>De</i> (1161) in Translated Into English in Each Verse Listed in the Opposing Column
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Matt. 3:11 ● Matt. 9:37 ● Matt. 10:13 ● Matt. 13:8 ● Matt. 13:23 ● Matt. 13:32 ● Matt. 16:3 ● Matt. 16:14 ● Matt. 17:11 ● Matt. 20:23 ● Matt. 21:35 ● Matt. 22:5 ● Matt. 22:8 ● Matt. 23:27 ● Matt. 23:28 ● Matt. 25:15 ● Matt. 25:33 ● Matt. 26:24 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● But ● But ● But ● But ● But ● But ● But ● But ● And (2x) ● And ● But ● And ● But, Another ● But ● But ● But ● But ● And ● But ● But

- Matt. 26:41
- Mark 1:8
- Mark 9:12
- Mark 10:39
- Mark 12:5
- Mark 14:21
- Mark 14:38
- Luke 3:16
- Luke 10:2
- Luke 11:48
- Luke 23:38
- Luke 23:41
- Luke 23:56
- John 7:12
- John 10:41
- John 16:22
- Acts 1:5
- Acts 5:23
- Acts 9:7
- Acts 11:16
- Acts 12:5
- Acts 14:4
- Acts 14:12
- Acts 17:32
- Acts 18:14
- Acts 19:4
- Acts 21:9
- Acts 22:3
- Acts 22:9
- Acts 23:8
- Acts 25:4
- Acts 25:11
- Acts 26:9
- Acts 27:1
- Acts 27:41
- Acts 27:44
- Acts 28:22
- Rom. 2:8
- Rom. 2:25
- Rom. 5:16
- Rom. 6:11
- Rom. 7:25
- Rom. 8:10
- Rom. 8:17
- Rom. 9:21
- Rom. 11:22
- Rom. 11:28

- But
- But
- And
- And (2x)
- And
- But
- But
- But
- But
- And
- And
- And
- And
- Others
- But
- But
- But
- But
- But
- Then, But
- But
- But, And
- And
- And (2x)
- And
- Then
- And
- Yet
- And, But
- But
- And
- But
- Ought
- But
- And, But
- And
- But
- But (2x)
- But
- But
- But
- But
- And, But
- And (2x)
- And
- But
- But

- Rom. 14:2
- Rom. 14:5
- Rom. 16:9
- I Cor. 1:18
- I Cor. 1:23
- I Cor. 2:15
- I Cor. 3:4
- I Cor. 5:3
- I Cor. 7:7
- I Cor. 9:24
- I Cor. 9:25
- I Cor. 11:7
- I Cor. 11:21
- I Cor. 12:8
- I Cor. 12:20
- I Cor. 15:39
- I Cor. 15:40
- II Cor. 2:16
- II Cor. 4:12
- II Cor. 8:17
- II Cor. 10:1
- II Cor. 10:10
- Gal. 4:23
- Eph. 4:11
- Phil. 1:15
- Phil. 1:28
- Phil. 3:1
- Phil. 3:13
- II Tim. 1:10
- II Tim. 2:20
- II Tim. 4:4
- Titus 1:15
- Heb. 7:2
- Heb. 7:8
- Heb. 9:6
- Heb. 9:23
- Heb. 10:33
- Heb. 12:10
- Heb. 12:11
- James 3:17
- I Peter 1:20
- I Peter 2:4
- I Peter 2:14
- I Peter 3:18
- I Peter 4:14
- Jude 8
- Jude 10

- Another
- Another
- And
- But
- And
- Yet
- And
- But
- And
- But
- And, But
- But
- And
- To Another
- But (2x)
- And
- And
- And
- But
- But
- Now, But
- But
- But
- And (3x)
- And
- But
- But
- And
- But, And
- But, And
- And
- But
- And
- But
- Now
- But
- And
- But
- Now, Nevertheless
- But
- But
- But
- And
- But
- But
- And
- But (2x)

The preceding lists establish that there is no hard and fast rule regarding how the Greek word *De* is rendered in English when it occurs within the same verse as the Greek word *Men*. In fact, there are 8 examples where the conjunction *De* is translated in both the adversative (but) and continuative sense (and) within the same verse. Consequently, the following secondary statements made by the author of *Heirs of God or joint-heirs with Christ?* and quoted above are completely false and should be rejected outright: “In every case (without exception) the use of these words together in Romans are ALWAYS used to contrast two different things. They are never conjunctive.” That this is false is evident from an examination of the verses used to posit the question in the first place. Consider that the author included Romans 8:10 in his sampling of the 13 verses from Romans in which the Greek words *De* and *Men* occur together in the same verse. Next, note that in Romans 8:10 the Greek word *De* is translated in both the ADVERSATIVE (“but”) and CONTINUATIVE (“and”) form within the same verse. The translators of the King James Bible knew the difference between the two uses of the Greek word and thus rendered it accordingly in English given the sentence and thought structure of each verse. Any attempt to establish hard and fast rules beyond the natural syntax and structure of each individual verse is completely without foundation and should be rejected.

In reality, advocates for the “two inheritance” view are asking their audience to accept a view that impedes the integrity of the King James translators by suggesting that they did not know the difference between the English words “but” and “and.” In their zeal to support their paradigm they have presented a position that demands their audience suspend all common sense in reading English and read an “and” as though it were a “but.” Consider the verses in question once again:

Romans 8:16-17—The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God: **And** if children, then heirs; heirs of God, **and** joint-heirs with Christ; if so be that we suffer with *him*, that we may be also glorified together.

Appendix C

The History of Translation: “Heirs Annexed With Christ”

Many opponents of the “two inheritance” position have sought to defend their belief that all believers who are “heirs of God” are also “joint-heirs with Christ” based upon how Romans 8:17 is punctuated in the King James Bible. Advocates of this line of thought point to the fact that a semicolon separates the “joint-heirs with Christ” section of the verse from the “if so be that we suffer with *him*” portion. According to this line of thinking, the semicolon is significant because it indicates that the “if so be” section should be viewed as providing further elaboration to the previous clause. In other words, how the sentence is punctuated indicates that the “if so be” portion is not intending to introduce a condition or cast doubt upon the reality of the previous clause.

As these things were being discussed on Facebook someone pointed out that the 1611 edition of the King James Bible contains a colon between the two clauses in question rather than a semicolon. On the basis of this punctuation difference between the 1611 and 1769 editions of the King James Bible the Punctuation or Semicolon Argument was declared to be a “red herring” by supporters of the “two inheritance” view. It is a well-known fact among King James Bible advocates that there are punctuation differences between the various editions of the King James Bible. This reality is not surprising especially when one considers the fact that the Greek text did not originally contain any punctuation marks. Any punctuation marks observable in modern editions of the *Textus Receptus* (TR) were added later by editors.

Given the punctuation differences between the 1611 and 1769 editions of the King James Bible we thought it might be good to look at how earlier translations of the TR into English treated Romans 8:17. In order to accomplish this we consulted scanned facsimiles of the 1st editions of these English translations available on the internet. The biggest insight we gained from this process was unrelated to how the verse should be punctuated in English, for there was not uniformity among the various translations on this point.²⁶ Rather the most enlightening understanding was related to how the first five English translations of the TR rendered the wording of the verse in the vernacular language.

²⁶Even a cursory reading of the following list indicates that there was no standard manner of punctuating any part of Romans 8:17 in the various English translations of the TR. For example, the Tyndale Bible contains only one punctuation mark a colon between “heirs annexed with Christ” and “if so be.” In contrast, the Matthews Bible contains slashes between the various clauses but nothing separating “heirs annexed of Christ” and “if so be.” Likewise, the Great Bible contains no punctuation mark between the clauses in question but commas rather than slashes between the other parts of the verse. Given the lack of uniformity in terms of how the verse has been punctuated in the English Bible, it would unwise to rest one's **entire argument** on the presence of a semicolon in the 1769 edition of the KJV. The differences in punctuation between editions of the KJV makes an argument based upon punctuation **less clear** than an argument based on the clear cross references. Regarding how the portions of the sentence in question were punctuated we present following findings:

- 3 Colon: Tyndale, Bishops, and KJV (1611)
- 2 Comma: Coverdale and Geneva
- 2 None: Matthews and Great
- 1 Semicolon: KJV (1769)

Below we have listed how each translation of the TR stated Romans 8:17 in English. Please note: for ease of readability we have updated only the spelling of words. No changes were made to how the verse is punctuated in each translation.

William Tyndale (1525)—If we be sons we are also heirs the heirs I mean of God and heirs annexed with Christ: if so be that we suffer together that we may be glorified together.

Miles Coverdale (1535)—If we be children, then are we heirs also, namely the heirs of God, and heirs annexed with Christ, if so be that we suffer together, that we may be also glorified together.

Matthews Bible (1537)—If we be sons/ we are also heirs/ heirs I mean of God/ and heirs annexed of Christ if so be that we suffer together/ we may be glorified together.

Great Bible (1539)—If we be sons, then are we also heirs, heirs I mean of God, heirs annexed with Christ if so be that we suffer with him, that we maybe also gloried together with him.

Geneva Bible (1560)—If we be children, we are also heirs, even the heirs of God, & heirs annexed with Christ, if so be that we suffer with him, that we may also be glorified with him.

Bishops Bible (1568)—If we be sons, then are we also heirs, the heirs of God, and joint-heirs with Christ: so that we suffer together, that we may be also glorified together.

Authorized Version (1611)—And if children, then heirs, heirs of God, and joint-heirs with Christ: if so be that we suffer with him, that we may be also glorified together.

Authorized Version (1769)—And if children, then heirs; heirs of God, and joint-heirs with Christ; if so be that we suffer with *him*, that we may be also glorified together.

Translation Considerations

There would have been no discussion between 1525 (Tyndale) and 1568 (Bishops) over whether or not someone was a “joint-heir with Christ” because the expression could not be found in Romans 8:17 in these early English Bibles. The first five translations of the TR into English described “heirs of God” as being “heirs annexed with Christ” or “of Christ” in Romans 8:17. This is a fascinating reality that we have found quite instructive regarding the meaning of the verse. *Webster’s 1828 Dictionary* provides the following definition for the English word annex: 1) To unite at the end; as to annex a codicil to a will. To subjoin, to affix. 2) To unite, as a smaller thing to a greater; as to annex a province to a kingdom.

Next note that all of these early TR translations speak of believers as already having been “annexed” (past tense) “with” or “of Christ.” In other words, it is already a done deal seeing as how “annexed” means “joined at the end; connected with; affixed,” according to *Webster’s 1828 Dictionary*. According to these early English translations, believers have been united, joined, and affixed to Christ. Believers are made participants in the inheritance God the Father has chosen to give his Son the Lord Jesus Christ because they have been annexed and affixed to Christ. In short, whatever Christ inherits from the Father believers inherit as well on account of having been “delivered us from the power of darkness” and translated “into the kingdom of his dear son (Col. 1:13).” This reality follows logically for the second definition of “annex” presented above.

Prior to belief in the gospel of the grace of God believers were the enemies of God (“under the power of darkness”). Upon belief in the finished work of Christ, we are annexed and joined under the domain of Christ and are granted a full inheritance with the one to whom we are joined. In short, all “heirs of God” are “joint-heirs with Christ” because it is only on account of the fact that we have been “annexed with Christ” that we stand to inherit anything from God the Father other than his wrath. How could this be more clear? Those who are the sons of God, are also the heirs of God because they have been made heirs on account of their annexation with Christ. These early English translations of the TR are very illuminating in terms of helping one understand the concept of joint-heirship.

A second observation bears noting. Consider how the Bishops Bible rendered Romans 8:17, “If we be sons, then are we also heirs, the heirs of God, and joint-heirs with Christ: so that we suffer together, that we may be also glorified together.” Not only is the Bishops Bible of 1568 the first English translation to use the expression “joint-heir” it also states plainly as a matter of fact that suffering together with Christ is the result of being a “joint-heir with Christ.” There is no “if” between the “joint-heirs with Christ” portion and the “so that we suffer together” section of the verse. Rendering the verse in this fashion makes it plain that the clause following the colon is in no way meant to place a condition upon the preceding portion. The only reason one suffers with Christ is because they have been joined or annexed to Christ. One cannot “suffer together” with Christ until he is jointed to Christ. All of this is plainly observable and understood from the text of 1769 King James Bible for anyone seeking to exposit the text of Romans 8 as it lies on the page.

ⁱ (Endnote from page 13) Regarding what it means to “suffer with *him*” in Romans 8:17, Mike McDaniel waxes on endlessly without ever saying what actually it means to suffer with Christ. In the end, McDaniel makes nebulous statements about how it is not the job of the SE curriculum in Romans 8 to say what it actually means to suffer with Christ because the student is not yet edified enough to receive that information according to the construct of the curriculum. Please consider McDaniel’s teaching in his own words, “So what is it that we are being told in vs. 17? You are being told: 1. There is a qualification for being a joint-heir with Christ 2. That qualification is that you “suffer with Him” 3. That suffering will result in being glorified together with Christ. And that’s it for now. No, you have not yet been told what that suffering is. You haven’t been told what He is suffering today in this dispensation of grace, but only that there is something that He is suffering that we are supposed to suffer “with Him.” Vs. 17 is not meant to begin taking you through a systematic study of suffering. I realize that by raising the issue, you want to know the details about the suffering, but that is not what you are given to know.” (*Sonship Establishment, Sessions. 1-20, 50*) So according to McDaniel, one’s ability to become a “joint-heir with Christ” is contingent upon suffering with Christ but it is not the job of the SE curriculum to teach one what that means in the only verse in the Bible that uses the expression “joint-heir,” according to McDaniel. After droning on and running all over the Bible for examples of suffering, eight pages later McDaniel writes, “When you read vv. 16-17, you do not yet know what those things are. You will know because before you get out of chapter 8, you are going to be informed about some of the things included in this suffering. You won’t be told about all of it in Romans 8 because you don’t need to know about all of it yet. What you do need to know is that through this suffering you will get a joint-heir inheritance that is greater than any suffering you will go through. You only need to know the first ones that you will encounter. What is being given to you is a foundation that will be built upon later on. What I will tell you now is this: 1. Everything in our Sonship Education/Edification (being conformed to the image of Christ) is tied to our “suffering with Him” in various manners that are equivalent to how Christ suffers today in this dispensation of grace. 2. The degree and extent of our heir-ship with Him (our joint-heir inheritance) will be determined at the judgment seat of Christ. 3. The basis for determining that inheritance will be by the amount of equivalency in our sonship lives to that which Christ is presently suffering. 4. The degree to which we “suffer with Him,” is the degree of the reward of our inheritance. Just to put this into an application, if your response to the things which come your way are not to “suffer with Him,” then there will be no joint-heir inheritance reward. If that improper response is your response every time, then you will get “zero” joint-heir inheritance. If you respond properly 50% of the time, then you will get half of the inheritance you could have had. I am saying it to you this way so you will see how critical the “if so be” of verse 17 is. Your entire joint-heir inheritance is based on this one thing. Therefore, this has to be a huge issue for a son. This is why you cannot decide to put off this sonship education because you think you will get it when you get to heaven. . . If a son waits until he has gone to the heavenly places to be educated in the Father’s business or to be educated in godliness, then: 1. He will never obtain a joint-heir inheritance 2. He will never occupy a seat of authority in God’s government in the heavenly places 3. He will not be glorified together with Christ 4. He will never be allowed to function in certain areas of the Father’s business All of the above benefits are bestowed upon a son based upon something he does while he is on this earth. During your earthly life is when you will either qualify for the things listed above, or you won’t. But nothing you do in eternity is going to change any of those 4 things – ever. That is a big reason why you can’t say, “I’ll worry about this sonship stuff when I get to heaven.” It is the Sonship Education and Edification during your lifetime on earth that qualifies you for the benefits of eternity.” (*Sonship Establishment, Sessions. 1-20, 58-60*) Need we say any more? According to SE not all believers will be glorified with Christ in Romans 8:17 unless they “qualify for the benefits of eternity” by following and committing to the SE curriculum. Not only is this teaching failing to expound upon the text of Romans 8 it is establishing two or more classes of believers based upon a supposed curriculum from Proverbs that has been imposed upon the Pauline Epistles.

It is not our motive to tax the reader’s patience by including these lengthy footnotes on SE, however, it is essential that the body of Christ understands the nature of this teaching that has penetrated so deeply within the great Grace Community. In his notes on Romans 8, Mark Newbold offers essentially the exact same argument as McDaniel that we observed above. He writes, “The primary determining factor that qualifies us to be *joint-heirs with Christ* comes down, really, to the issue of what that expression involves when it talks about suffering *with him*. Everything that we are more or less involved with in our sonship edification/education that conforms us to His image, is going to be tied to *suffering with Him* in various manners and forms equivalent to how He does (*suffer*)—and the way in which He does in this dispensation of God’s grace. And our heir-ship with Him—or the degree of it—or the extent of it that will be determined at the judgment seat of Christ—will be determined by the amount of

equivalency that there is in our sonship lives and through the effectual working of our sonship education, that has us *suffering with Him*. In other words, the degree to which we *suffer with Him*, is the degree of the reward of our inheritance! And if it's zero (nothing)—then we'll get nothing! And I say all this just to underscore for you the reality of, and the gravity of this element of contingency—this “*if so be*” — this issue that qualifies you for the reward of your inheritance with Christ as a *joint-heir with Him*! It's a **huge** thing to you as a son! This is one reason why you can't just say, “Well, we're all going to go to the same place when we die, so I'll worry about all that future stuff when I get there—I'll just get educated then.” (dead wrong!) You'll get educated—but you won't get this inheritance, and you won't be allowed to function in God's business, and you won't be “*glorified together*” with Christ in the Father's business! Now I know that you want some satisfaction and contentment as to what these sufferings are—(but the truth of the matter is, and the reason I'm hesitant to go into this is, that by the time you get to the end of (:17), you're supposed to have a natural wondering what *suffering with Him* is—or just how is it that I do that—and then (:18) and ff begins to tell you that—and you get the first kind of the *suffering with Him* that you're expected to be involved in.) (There are other kinds that you're expected to be involved in, but you're not going to get them until you've got enough education to deal with them.) — beginning in (:18) is the first kind. So that alone should give you an understanding of the kind of suffering we're talking about. But for now—as a matter of our sonship establishment into this first virtuous attitude we're supposed to have in viewing our education as sons—we are to perceive by what's said to us here—we're supposed to have the beginning of the generation of some thinking that matches our Father's own thinking— about the thoroughness, and the perfection, and the capability of what the Father's going to teach us, so that we can have complete and total confidence in the Father and in His curriculum He's giving us—so that we can have complete conviction that it's going to do exactly what it's supposed to do— fully educate you; fully train you; fully qualify you for your **sonship inheritance**! (All the details are going to be given to you as the curriculum unfolds and progresses on.) In fact, you're not supposed to be able to understand all the details of either your *joint-inheritance with Christ* and all that is involved in that; or with what specific things we are going to *suffer* and endure as we *suffer with Christ*; or what are the details of the kind of *glory* we are going to be sharing with Christ as we *glorified together*. The truth is, you can't possibly know all that right now—there's just no frame of reference for it yet—and all that's going on here is to get you **established** as a son—and this is just the first component that, - at the end of it all (at the end of sonship establishment), sonship establishment is designed to have it so that you understand and appreciate that you are not only in possession of a curriculum that accomplishes all this—but that you understand that the curriculum you possess is designed and composed and constructed so as to fully meet all of the objectives, and provides fully for obtaining of all of the goals and aims and attainments that are necessary, from beginning to end, so that you *suffer with the Lord Jesus Christ* (or at least have the full opportunity to, if you so choose to) *suffer with the Lord Jesus Christ* in all the fullness that the Father has designed and provided for us to so do—and so, attain, therefore, the fullness of the inheritance of being a *joint-heir with Christ*.” (707-708)

Careful readers of the *Heirs of God or joint-heirs with Christ?* paper will note that it is devoid of the explanatory language that is characteristic of SE such as, “Sonship Establishment, “Sonship Edification,” or “the Father's Business.” The decision to leave out the more objectionable aspects of SE teaching regarding Romans 8:17 from the paper appears to have been a willful decision on the part of the author. We can only surmise that this was done to distance the paper from the clearly objectionable portions of the SE version of the “two inheritance” view. That is why this author views the paper as a permutation or cousin to the SE position on Romans 8.