

## THE TULIP SHOTGUN: PLUCKING PROOFTEXTS AWAY FROM TULIP

Note: This post is publicly viewable and therefore one-click shareable, so feel free to use it as a response to the usual culprits! We at MemeVangelists are here to serve the body of Christ! Edits, additions and upgrades may also be made, so check back regularly and feel free to make suggestions for improvements.

Yes, others have covered these texts before. But now I myself have gone through each text for myself, personally, and there is a difference in doing that as opposed to if I just 'surrender my sensemaking' to someone else to work through the passages. In fact, I encourage YOU to check each passage for yourself rather than take my word for it.

#MV

xoxoxoxoxoxoxoxoxoxox

### INTRODUCTION

The attached 'shotgunning' list of alleged prooftexts for the tenets of Calvinism has made the rounds often. Attempts like these are common in any systematic, as with just one easy press of the trigger they aim to overwhelm the recipient with what seems to be a great weight of evidence for their beliefs.

Conversely, to debunk the citation of each passage takes times & effort - or else the poster can condescendingly claim "Just just don't believe the Bible".

Well, here I am taking the time & effort to show how the context and actual text of each citation do not actually teach Calvinism. In some cases, it actually refutes or contradicts the system!

Often what happens is that the Calvinist will interpret a passage a certain way (e.g. Eph 2:1 'you were dead in sins' = literal corpseslike inability to respond), derive a philosophical lens from it (this includes being unable to positively respond to the Gospel, ergo Total Depravity) and then view other passages through this doctrinal lens (slaves to sin are dead corpses, they don't even want to be free). You will see many times in the list of prooftexts that the same passages are reused for different petals of TULIP, showing how all the petals are intertwined.

From there, they will JUMP TO CONCLUSIONS in taking a passage and making it into a prooftext. Very often they will (wittingly or unwittingly) engage in a shell game whereby a passage that is tangentially related to their doctrines gets highly extrapolated - without justification in the text itself, but simply as a result of magnification via their doctrinal lens - into a prooftext for the specific doctrine.

For example, passages that speak of the sinfulness of people are extended to mean people will never accept God's offer of salvation (Total Depravity); passages about God choosing for service are taken to be unconditional and to salvific status, even if there are specific conditions listed there! (Unconditional Election); passages about God saving people are assumed to be irrespective of their own wills (Irresistible Grace); passages about Christ saving certain groups are used to

exclude other groups via Negative Inference Fallacy (Limited Atonement). The passages don't actually say what the Calvinist assumes or argues they say.

Since this is the fastest way to remove an alleged prooftext from candidacy, I will put this clarification at the start of every explainer where it applies (which is almost every prooftext!). If this is highly redundant, that is intentional because it will remind and train you to resort to this as the first line of inquiry: "Does the passage actually state what you say it does?"

As you will see, suddenly that shotgun blast of dozens of prooftexts dwindles down to a handful of passages, a peashooter. It's actually quite pitiful, sad and pathetic.

And when there is a dearth of unclear verses that can be disputed, our understanding should rather be informed by the majority of verses that are clear - and that is when the whole counsel of the Bible crushes Calvinism under its holy weight.

xoxoxoxoxoxoxoxoxoxox

#### TOTAL DEPRAVITY

This has been called the most important petal of TULIP, as both Calvinists and nonCalvinists recognize that the system stands or falls with it - its assumptions logically entail in the following petals, as you will see. Lose the T, and the ULIP are unnecessary.

The key point of the doctrine is not merely that that people are prone to sin (something every proper Christian affirms, e.g. Ancestral Sin), Total Depravity also says that sinners cannot or will not ever accept God's free offer of salvation in the Gospel (as Living Christian puts it, it is basically a Singular Inability - they can do anything else but accept the Gospel!). Many of the prooftexts conflate the two by arguing that do accept the Gospel is itself a good work - but as Leighton Flowers often compares, try calling up your boss and telling him that you won't come into the office because 'acceptance = work' and see how far that gets you!

Conversely, a slew of passages indicate that God is making a genuine offer to people to repent and be saved, which they really can accept. Since nothing is said about them not really being unable to respond positively, the Calvinist must hence infer and import into these cases that Total Depravity actually applies and the people actually cannot accept God's offer unless first regenerated - the very definition of eisegesis. RC Sproul egregiously does this with the Prodigal Son, inserting that the son came to his senses 'not by himself' because Sproul's doctrine insists that God must first make sinners come to their senses.

Conversely, a key dilemma for the doctrine is whenever something (other than their alleged own Depraved state) prevents people from believing and being saved. On the surface these may seem to support that God does not want certain people to be saved per Unconditional Election and Limited Atonement - but these examples actually disprove Total Depravity! For why need to redundantly blind those born already

unable to see the light, or deceive those who already will never believe the truth? This redundancy helped lead people like Leighton Flowers, Alana L, Bobby Conway and Michael L Brown out of Calvinism. It helped prevent Mike Winger from adopting Calvinism during his deep dive into it. To this day, no satisfactory response has been given from Calvinists. And to cap it off, Luke 8:12 indicates that the people COULD have believed and be saved absent an additional outside interference.

Gen 2:17 - Does not state that sinners cannot accept God's offer. Death does not necessarily equate to corpselike inability to respond or eternal damnation. In fact, Adam & Eve later don't drop physically lifeless immediately, but rather are cast out of the Garden, which supports the view that metaphorical death is about separation.

John 3:6 - Does not state that sinners cannot accept God's offer.

John 8:34 - Does not state that sinners cannot accept God's offer. In response to the common argument that slaves to sin means they cannot yearn for freedom, this honestly doesn't seem to have any conception of how slaves in the real world feel; see the American Civil War or Exo 3:7-9. Being unable to free themselves does not mean they cannot accept a Saviour's offer to emancipate them. Keeping consistent with the slave metaphor means that Christians should be unable to sin at all vis-a-vis Rom 6:2,11!

Gen 6:5 - Does not state that sinners cannot accept God's offer. Hyperbole, three verses later in v9 Noah is called righteous.

Rom 1:18-32 - Does not state that sinners cannot accept God's offer. These are people whose thinking became futile and hearts became darkened when they denied God (v21,28,32), not that they were born with deluded minds and stony-dead hearts. This is an example of judicial hardening, God punishing their freely chosen rebellion by giving them exactly what they want, self-rule unto decadent self-destruction.

Jer 17:9 - Does not state that sinners cannot accept God's offer.

Isa 64:6-7 - Does not state that sinners cannot accept God's offer. Poetic hyperbole, saying that no one calls on God's name yet immediately after invokes YHWH for mercy which directly contradicts the claims of Total Depravity.

Rom 3:23 - Does not state that sinners cannot accept God's offer. Poetic hyperbole (read the next verses where throats are graves and there's snake venom under their lips), speaks of everyone having sinned which is not the point of contention. Note Psalm 14 is the citation, they have become corrupt (not were born that way) and contrasts them with THE RIGHTEOUS people of God. The following verses in Rom 3 hence likewise do not teach Total Depravity. And immediately after saying 'no one' is righteous, Paul say Abraham was credited as righteous in Rom 4:3.

Rom 8:7-8 - Does not state that sinners cannot accept God's offer. Enemies who are hostile does not mean they cannot accept reconciliation; submitting to the Law (a whole slew of rules and righteous living) is not the same as accepting that one cannot do so and therefore needs Christ's free offer to fulfill it on our behalf.

Pleasing God in this context is fulfilling the whole Law, not about making God happy in a few instances such as accepting Christ (many unbelievers did things which God approved of).

Isa 65:12 - Does not state that sinners cannot accept God's offer. The passage is about those who reject God and thus invite judgment.

Tit 1:15 - Does not state that sinners cannot accept God's offer.

Jer 13:23 - Does not state that sinners cannot accept God's offer. Note that the people mentioned are ACCUSTOMED to doing evil, not from birth.

Rom 5:12 - Does not state that sinners cannot accept God's offer. At best teaches Ancestral Sin. In fact the verse states does not state that SIN spread to all men which is what the Calvinist doctrine of Adam's Imputed Guilt teaches (doomed from the womb, born already damned because of what Adam did), but that DEATH spread to all men which is a self-evident fact since every human is physically mortal.

Rom 5:14-19 - Does not state that sinners cannot accept God's offer. At best teaches Ancestral Sin. In fact, vv18-19 states that while ALL are condemned (to physical death) but only MANY are made sinners, which contradicts Adam's Imputed Guilt spreading to all humanity and instead supports Age of Accountability. Furthermore, parallel justification and life for all men (refuting Limited Atonement) but only many are made righteous (those who accept Christ's offer).

Eph 2:1-5 - Does not state that sinners cannot accept God's offer. Metaphorical usage of 'dead' does not indicate literal corpse-like inability to respond, but separation. See how the metaphorically dead can awake, arise, return to the Father, and do other things in Eph 5:4, Rev 3:1-2, Luke 15's Prodigal Son, Luke 9:60, John 5:25.

Mark 7:21-23 - Does not state that sinners cannot accept God's offer.

Psa 14:2-3 - Does not state that sinners cannot accept God's offer. As the entry on Rom 3:23 noted, they have become (not were born) corrupt and read on further to where the Psalm mentions the RIGHTEOUS people of God. Honestly, it is a true stereotype that Calvinists have a serious problem with context and reading even a little bit before and after a proof-text!

Mat 7:17-18 - Does not state that sinners cannot accept God's offer. That people are likened to trees is not meant to teach that we are unchangeably bound to our fates like the genetics of plants, it is speaking about how outside observers can tell what the insides contain.

Psa 58:3 - Does not state that sinners cannot accept God's offer. Poetic hyperbole, not didactic. Contradicts other passages on the alleged timing Total Depravity takes effect, even in this single verse two different timings separated by 9 months are mentioned.

John 3:19 - At last, a passage that could legitimately be interpreted as teaching that people reject God's offer due to their preferring evil! But do people start

out that way (as per Total Depravity), or do they gradually grow accustomed to evil and hardened as many passages indicate? This verse does not say, it only gives the current state of those who are rejecting God. It takes roping in other alleged prooftexts to complete the doctrine of Total Depravity.

1 Cor 2:14 - Does not state that sinners cannot accept God's offer. This is about problematic believers (see the issues they have in chapter 1) not seeking to further their understanding about the deeper things of God (read on to 3:1-3), not unbelievers being Totally Unable to grasp the bare basic Gospel offer. Parallel 2:14's natural person with 3:1-3's people of flesh.

Prov 14:12 - Does not state that sinners cannot accept God's offer. Poetic hyperbole, not didactic. Death does not necessarily equate to corpse-like inability to respond or eternal damnation.

1 Cor 1:18 - The only other passage that could legitimately be interpreted as teaching that people reject God's offer due to their preferring evil! Again this verse does not state what Total Depravity claims, i.e. that people start out already evil.

Col 2:13 - Does not state that sinners cannot accept God's offer. In fact, read one verse prior where it says that THROUGH FAITH we are raised, the reverse order of Regeneration Precedes Faith.

Job 15:14-16 - Does not state that sinners cannot accept God's offer. Note also that the speaker Eliphaz is rebuked by God for not speaking rightly of God (42:7).

Psa 51:5 - Not listed in the image, but is commonly used so I'll just address it too. Does not state that sinners cannot accept God's offer. It is poetic hyperbole not didactic, some interpret it as describing David's mother (look carefully at how it is worded), avoid Faulty Generalization, and the timing of the alleged Total Depravity taking effect contradicts other timings as mentioned above.

xoxoxoxoxoxoxoxoxoxox

#### UNCONDITIONAL ELECTION

If Total Depravity is true, then nobody would ever accept God's offer of salvation. Hence God must unilaterally make people accept salvation, and if He doesn't do it for everyone then whom God chooses must be unconditional (because everyone is exactly the same when it comes to the possibility of repenting, namely 0% chance).

Whereas, a proper contextual reading of alleged Unconditional Election 'predestined, chosen' prooftexts will show that HOW a person comes to believe is not stated. We agree that God has the prerogative to choose; the question is, HOW does he sovereignly decide to choose, and for WHAT purpose? And as you shall see, NONE of the alleged prooftexts unequivocally mention anything about being unconditional - many of them actually include clear conditions! Once again it takes assumptions, presuppositions and eisegesis about Total Depravity to make the texts mean what the Calvinist wants them to mean.

Election/choosing is actually about service more than salvation, it is conditional and corporate and can be changed. The term 'elect' is actually synonymous with the Jewish people and this makes much more contextual sense such as in passages such as Matt 24:24 (the elect being deceived by false messiahs, exactly what current Rabbinic Jews are looking for to rebuild the Temple) and 2 Tim 2:10 (the elect MAY be saved, not a certainty) than the definition of 'those unchangeably saved from eternity past'.

Rom 9:15-16 - Does not actually state unconditional; even if human desire and effort are mentioned, this is not an exhaustive list of all conditions. Agreed that the plan of salvation is according to what God wants, but the real question is WHAT does God want? We contend that God wants all to be saved via freely accepting His offer of salvation. Note also v15 is quoting from Exo 33:19, where Moses is interceding for the rebellious Israelites - not one adult of whom entered the Promised Land (except Joshua & Caleb), and who are used as warning NOT to be rebellious in Heb 3:7-11.

Eph 1:9-12 - Does not actually state unconditional or strictly salvation. This entire chapter speaks of believers in Christ being predestined to undergo a process and reach an end destination that has already been decided, it has been pre-destined. It says nothing about HOW a person becomes a believer and joins this process. Note also how the citation cuts off before v13, which clarifies 'You also' believed later on (Christians in general) as opposed to 'us in him' of v4 (the Apostles specially called to service).

Rom 9:11 - Does not strictly state unconditional or salvation, as God's choosing was before (not regardless) of Jacob & Esau's actions which can fit a foreknowledge view. Does not state that this election is to individual salvation/damnation, v12 clarifies that this is about serving. v13 quotes Malachi 1:2-3 which is about the nations of Israel & Edom, and Esau the individual never served Jacob the individual, however Edom did serve Israel the nation as per v12.

John 1:12-13 - Does not actually state unconditional, what is listed is not an exhaustive list of all conditions. Agreed that the plan of salvation is according to God's plan & criteria, not genetic lineage (blood, will of the flesh) or legal adoption (will of man). This is not about free will vs God's will, otherwise blood being mentioned is superfluous as blood has no will. Just look up even the Wikipedia article on John 1:13 which lists commentary by several early church fathers - including Augustine. This is how they divide and contrast the passage.

Mark 13:20 - Does not actually state unconditional or salvation. The citation mentions survival, not salvation. The context of the passage is Jerusalem & Judea in the end times. Elect means the Jewish people, not those unchangeably saved from eternity past. This makes much more plain sense of v22 where 'even the elect' can be deceived by false messiahs, a very real possibility with many Jewish people rejecting Jesus for not reestablishing the physical kingdom of Israel in peace, and thus looking for the 'real messiah' who will rebuild the Temple (as stated by Rabbi Daniel Freitag in his debate against Michael L Brown).

Rev 13:8 - Does not actually state unconditional. From the foundation of the earth just means from the start of world history, see next entry. The passage states that

those who don't worship Christ will end up worshiping the end times beast.

Rev 17:8 - Does not actually state unconditional. The ESV translates this as 'before' the foundation of the earth, which is unjustified when the Greek word is elsewhere translated 'from', including in Rev 13:8 above. Names are added to the book of life starting from the beginning of human history (when people put their faith in God), not before Creation in eternity past.

Rom 10:20 - Does not actually state unconditional. Both the context of Romans 10 and the citation of Isaiah 65:1 are contrasting Jews (who wrongly think their works of Law save them) and Gentiles (who are saved by faith), the Isaiah verse even states 'nation'. The whole running theme of Romans is on this topic, it does not suddenly switch to 'unconditional election of individuals to salvation/damnation' in Roman 9 and then switch back.

1 Cor 1:27-28 - Does not actually state unconditional. I mean, seriously! Look at all the adjectives used in this citation about God choosing the things opposite of human standards, what exactly looks 'unconditional' here?

2 Tim 1:8 - Does not actually state unconditional, works is not an exhaustive catch-all for all conditions. Probably a typo, if they mean 1:9 then it does not state that we are saved before the ages began but that our calling was given, the same theme as Eph 1 where what is predestined is the process for those who are in Christ.

John 10:26-30 - Does not actually state unconditional. Sheep in real life are not born already knowing the shepherd's voice, they must learn it just as John 6:45 clarifies about whom God draws. Sheep is a metaphor for those who follow, if the people don't follow Jesus in the first place then of course they will not believe Him.

John 10:15-16 - Does not actually state unconditional. It does not state why Jesus will bring other sheep, whether it is conditional or not. Absence of evidence is not evidence of absence.

John 6:37,44 - Does not actually state unconditional. Also commonly used proof-text for Irresistible Grace via the 'drawing' of v44. Read the context such in v45, 'those who have heard and learned' are CONDITIONS of whom God draws and gives to Christ. In the preceding John 5:46-47, Jesus states that those who believed Moses (the Old Testament writings) would recognize Jesus is the promised Messiah and thus believe Him. As Steve Gregg says this is not speaking about the Father taking the devil's people and converting them into God's people, it is taking people who follow the Father (Jewish believers in the Old Covenant) and transitioning them to the Son (the New Covenant).

Rom 8:29-30 - Does not actually state unconditional or strictly salvation. Again, what is predestined is the process, not how one comes to believe in the first place. Also, who are 'those whom God foreknew'? Read Romans 11:1-2 for the context, it is the Old Testament believers. This explains why Paul suddenly switches from future tense to past tense just for this portion, glory is always future including earlier on at 8:18,21 but the preceding generations already have died and thus

reached their glory stage. Foreknew (proginosko) just means 'knew, past tense', it is not about some mystical future-sight, in many cases (Acts 26:5, 2 Peter 3:17) regular humans do it. Romans 8:29-30 is rather about Paul citing the already fulfilled promises of God to the Old Testament believers, using them as an object lesson that God will also surely keep His promises stated in 8:28.

Isa 43:20-21 - Does not actually state unconditional or salvation. Read the chapter from the start, it is all about Israel as God's chosen. Count how many times Israel and the synonym Jacob are mentioned. Compare v21's 'people formed' with v1's 'formed you, O Israel'. While you're at it, might as well head over to passages such as Isa 44:1, Isa 45:4, 1 Chron 16:13 where Israel is paralleled with its synonym Jacob, while at the same time chosen is paralleled with its synonym servant/service (not saved/salvation).

Titus 1:1 - Does not actually state unconditional.

Psa 65:4 - Does not actually state unconditional.

Matt 22:14 - Does not actually state unconditional. Again, this parable is full of conditions such as responding to the invitation and wearing a wedding garment! Do Calvinists honestly expect the reader to not even check the context? (Sadly, the answer in many cases is: yes.)

2 Tim 2:10 - Does not actually state unconditional. Actually debunks Calvinism, since taking 'elect' to mean 'unchangeably chosen for salvation' makes nonsense out of Paul's words. There is no 'may' possibility or probability with Unconditional Election, it is a 100% guaranteed certainty! Elect refers to the Jewish people, and you can immediately how it makes much more sense with Paul pining for his race to come to Christ.

Exo 33:19 - Does not actually state unconditional. See also the response to Rom 9:15-16 which cites this passage.

Deut 7:6-7 - Does not actually state unconditional or salvation, not being numerous is just one single condition. And this is clearly about the nation of Israel, a corporate group not individuals. And how many of them rebelled against YHWH? Election is not about salvific status but service roles.

Acts 13:48 - Does not actually state unconditional. Read the context of the event, the Gentiles who are there willingly came to hear Paul speak after either hearing him in the synagogue the preceding time (i.e. they were already followers of YHWH, see the entry on John 6:37,44) or accepted the invitation of the former to come hear Paul's message. Appointed can also be legitimately translated 'disposed' as in the Gentiles were inclined to seek and accept eternal life, the Greek does not indicate that God did the appointing, and the context of the event fits this meaning.

1 Pet 2:8 - Does not actually state unconditional. What is actually predestined here, the people's disobedience? Or is it rather that stumbling occurs if people disobey, just as in the natural world where if you trip on a rock you will fall due to gravity?



John 6:39 - Does not actually state unconditional. More of an Eternal Security passage than anything, actually.

John 17:2 - Does not actually state unconditional.

Rom 11:5-7 - Does not actually state unconditional, works is not a comprehensive list of all conditions especially since it refers to 'works of the Law' and not 'any action whatsoever', avoid Equivocation Fallacy. Since you're here, read v11 and v23 which have Paul interpret Paul and completely debunk the use of Romans 9:19-23 as teaching Unconditional Reprobation to Damnation.

Romans 9:19-23 - Not listed in the image, but is commonly used so I'll just address it too. Does not actually state unconditional or strictly salvation. Vessels are used for a purpose, compare 'vessels for destruction' with the 'bowls of wrath poured out' in Rev 16:1, the vessels carry and disburse the contents. Very importantly, see the potter and clay vessels reference in Jeremiah 18 and Paul's other use of this analogy in 2 Tim 2:20-21. Vessels are for carrying out a purpose and CAN CHANGE THEIR USAGE AND OUTCOME by their responses! The analogy is not meant to convey that we have no agency like literal inanimate objects!

John 15:16 - Not listed in the image, but is commonly used so I'll just address it too. Does not actually state unconditional or salvation. The verse itself states what they were chosen to do. In context, Jesus is referring to the Disciples and not every believer in general.

xoxoxoxoxoxoxoxoxoxox

#### LIMITED ATONEMENT

If the other petals of TUIP are true, then why isn't everybody saved? After all, under Calvinism God does all the saving and preserving Himself. God is sovereign, and if God wants everyone without exception to be saved then who can possibly stop Him? If Christ died for someone, how can His saving power be thwarted? And yet, the plain fact seen in the Bible and in everyday life is that not everyone accepts Christ!

Ergo, God must NOT want everybody to be saved! Christ did NOT die for everyone, but only the Elect! God prefers billions to be damned to eternal hell when He could easily save them - remember, human free will is not a hurdle since God uses Irresistible Grace anyway!

When put that way, no wonder that out of all the bizarre claims of Calvinism, in my experience the most shocking to regular churchgoers is simply "Jesus didn't die to save everyone, only some."

This somewhat explains why Augustine and many Reformers and Calvinists did not affirm Limited Atonement, according to David Allen this includes: Luther, Zwingli, Calvin himself, a slew of other names, 1/3 of the attendees at Dort, 1/4 of the attendees at Westminster, and all modern Four Pointers or Amyraldians. It took Beza and Owens some time afterwards to popularize Limited Atonement as a necessary

explanation for why TUIP doesn't result in Universalism - God simply does not want most people to be saved.

The doctrine of Limited Atonement then needs to be propped up in any way possible - very much less so by the Bible, as has been said it is a doctrine in search of Scriptural support. This is probably why so many of the prooftexts listed are already used for the other petals, when in reality the passages do not even actually mention for whom Christ died for.

As you will see, most of the prooftexts run on the Negative Inference Fallacy - because item A is included, therefore not-A must be excluded! The faultiness of this assumption is easily demonstrated by purporting "Joe loves his sons" must mean he does not love his daughters. Or hey, just go to Galatians 2:20 where Christ died for Paul, so that must mean Christ didn't die for anyone else amirite???

Otherwise, they conflate the intent & extent of the Atonement with the application of the Atonement, "Muh everyone limits the Atonement in some way". Limited Atonement says Christ didn't even intend to cover those who won't accept, His death on the cross was never extended to everyone for their acceptance or rejection. Unlimited Atonement says Christ wants to and did cover even those who won't accept, but it won't apply unless they accept His terms. The difference is between a bad faith versus good faith invitation, a stingy versus exceedingly generous offer.

The other arguments for Limited Atonement use arguments from logic such as the Double Jeopardy Argument - fitting for a doctrine that was thought up as part of the logical entailments of TUIP. There are many ways of addressing this canard, such as by pointing out how it limits (pun intended) the aspects of the Atonement to only the Penal Substitution or transactional, while ignoring the loyalty requirement. But let me sink that attempt straight off by pointing you to Matthew 18:21-35, the Parable of the Unforgiving Servant - in Jesus's own words, the debt that was first forgiven can then be reinstated.

John 3:16-18 - I have no idea why they would lead off with the 'stereotype Arminian text, whosoever, whole world'. Maybe they want to argue that since only those who believe are saved, this therefore limits the application of the Atonement, "Muh everyone limits the Atonement in some way". But Limited Atonement is about the intent & extent, not the application.

Rom 8:30 - Does not actually state for whom Christ died for. You can read more at the entry for Rom 8:29-30 under Unconditional Election.

John 6:35-40 - Does not actually state for whom Christ died for. Usually more used for Unconditional Election or Irresistible Grace, you can see the entries for John 6 there.

Matt 1:21 - Conflates the intent & extent of the Atonement with the application of the Atonement. Christ will save His people from their sins, this does not mean that Christ intended to give His life for ONLY those who will be His people.

John 10:11 - Commits Negative Inference Fallacy. The good shepherd lays down His life for the sheep, but does this mean for nobody else?

John 17:9 - Does not actually state for whom Christ died for. In v9 Jesus prays not for the world, but read on to v20-21 where Jesus then prays that the world may believe. And in world here means everyone and not just the Elect, surely world in John 3:16 also means everyone right?

Acts 20:28 - Commits Negative Inference Fallacy. God obtained the church by His blood, but does this mean He obtained nothing else? Note that the whole of Creation is redeemed by the cross, and all the spiritual powers of darkness are trampled and shamed.

Rev 5:9 - At most can be used to argue that 'all means all types of peoples, all without distinction' which does not in itself discount 'all without exception'.

John 10:14-16 - Commits Negative Inference Fallacy. Again, the good shepherd lays down His life for the sheep, but does this mean for nobody else?

Eph 1:4 - Does not actually state for whom Christ died for. Usually used more for Unconditional Election, see the entry for Eph 1:9-12 under there for who was chosen and for what purpose (it isn't salvation).

Isaiah 53:8,11-12 - Commits Negative Inference Fallacy. The Servant is stricken for the transgression of God's people, but does this mean nobody else? vv11-12 mention that 'many' benefit from this sacrifice, but as even John Calvin's commentary on Isaiah 53:12 states "It is evident from other passages, and especially from the fifth chapter of Romans, that many sometimes denotes all". And even if only those who accept the terms benefit, remember not to conflate the intent & extent of the Atonement with the application of the Atonement.

Eph 2:1-5 - Does not actually state for whom Christ died for.

Eph 2:8 - Does not actually state for whom Christ died for.

John 5:21,24 - Conflates the intent & extent of the Atonement with the application of the Atonement. Who IS the Son pleased to give life to? Those who believe in Him, but this does not mean that Christ intended to give His life for ONLY those who will believe in Him.

John 10:26-27 - Does not actually state for whom Christ died for. See entry for John 10:26-30 under Unconditional Election for more about who these sheep are.

John 12:37-40 - Does not actually state for whom Christ died for. This passage actually debunks Total Depravity, as mentioned in the introduction to that petal it creates a redundancy problem - why use parables to blind those born already unable to see the Gospel?

Psalm 85:2 - Conflates the intent & extent of the Atonement with the application of the Atonement. God forgives the iniquity and sins of His people, but this does not mean that Christ intended to give His life for ONLY those who will be His people.

John 14:21-24 - Does not actually state for whom Christ died for. Jesus manifested

Himself to only the Disciples but not the world, AT THAT TIME - He had not yet been crucified and risen. And note that Judas is the one who makes that statement! As even Augustine says, The Lord redeemed Judas at a price that Judas did not know.

John 17:2,9-10 - Another repetition in v9 which was covered above. They're really stretching to fill in those empty slots!

Acts 10:40-41 - Does not actually state for whom Christ died for. Christ appeared only to those God chose as witnesses AT THAT TIME, it is clear from other passages (e.g. 1 Cor 15:5-8) that Christ then appeared to many others.

Acts 13:48 - Does not actually state for whom Christ died for. Usually more used for Unconditional Election or Irresistible Grace, see this same passage under those sections for more.

Acts 15:14 - Does not actually state for whom Christ died for.

Rom 11:7 - Does not actually state for whom Christ died for.

Titus 2:14 - Does not actually state for whom Christ died for.

Heb 7:25-27 - Conflates the intent & extent of the Atonement with the application of the Atonement. The Spirit intercedes for the saints, but this does not mean that Christ intended to give His life for ONLY those who will be His saints.

Matt 26:28 - Commits Negative Inference Fallacy. The Servant is stricken for the transgression of God's people, but does this mean nobody else? vv11-12 mention that 'many' benefit from this sacrifice, but as even John Calvin's commentary on Mark 14:24 (a parallel to Matthew 26:28) states "By the word many he means not a part of the world only, but the whole human race". And even if only those who accept the terms benefit, remember not to conflate the intent & extent of the Atonement with the application of the Atonement.

xoxoxoxoxoxoxoxoxoxox

#### IRRESISTIBLE GRACE

If Total Depravity is true, then nobody would ever accept God's offer of salvation because they love evil and hate God too much. How then can anybody be saved? God must miraculously overcome their evil nature by changing their desires - since they would naturally resist God due to being sooooo evil, God's grace to change them must therefore be irresistible.

Since they are born dead in sin like literal corpses unable to respond, they must be first regenerated unto new life and then they will have the ability to confess Christ as lord & saviour (hence, Regeneration Precedes Faith - the axiom of Calvinism according to many including Sproul and White). Since they are stone hearted, they must first have it replaced by a new heart of flesh and then they will want God. Since they are unable to even understand the bare basic Gospel offer, their mind must first be renewed so they can grasp and accept the truth of God. And you can once again witness how lenses tinted by Total Depravity cause a

slew of passages to be interpreted in a skewed manner.

As you will see, the majority of the alleged prooftexts merely state that God does a work in people - but does NOT state that this work is irresistible. Other prooftexts do not actually state that regeneration, new life or the Holy Spirit come first AND THEN they believe - conversely, many passages state the exact opposite, that Faith Precedes Regeneration.

John 3:3-8 - Does not actually state irresistibly or that unbelievers are the subject being born again before faith (i.e. presumes Regeneration Precedes Faith). Conflates 'see the kingdom' and 'enter the kingdom' with believing by faith in the Gospel, compare Matthew 7:21-23 where entering the kingdom is 'on that day' which basically always refers to the Day of Judgment, it is a synonym for final salvation. (Tangential note: Matthew 7:21-23 is not about worrying whether you are really saved, scroll back to v15 and it's clear the warning is about false prophets, those who use Christ's name to prey on victims; their fake excuses won't save them from Jesus' condemnation.)

Eph 2:1-10 - Does not actually state irresistibly or that unbelievers are the subject being brought from death in sin to life in Christ (i.e. presumes Regeneration Precedes Faith). See the entry in Total Depravity for Eph 2:1-5 which explains what 'dead' means here, it is not about being a corpse which cannot respond and hence any grace must be enacted on them irresistibly.

John 6:37 - Does not actually state irresistibly or that unbelievers are the subject. See the entry in Unconditional Election for John 6:37,44 to know who gets drawn, the Father is not giving to the Son what is the Devil's.

John 6:44 - Yes, this same verse was combined with v37 in the Unconditional Election list. Here they are split up. Perhaps there weren't enough prooftexts for Irresistible Grace available, so they needed to pad the image?

John 10:16 - Does not actually state irresistibly or that unbelievers are the subject. What does the analogy to sheep intend to convey? It is not that humans have no agency or ability to change like animals! See the entry in Unconditional Election for John 6:37,44 which touches on this same point. And are real sheep born already knowing the shepherd's voice, or do they need to learn it as John 6:45 relates?

Psa 65:4 - Does not actually state irresistibly or that unbelievers are the subject. The context actually indicates this is about believers in YHWH.

Eze 36:26-27 - Does not actually state irresistibly or that unbelievers are the subject. Compare Eze 18:30-32 where God tells them to make themselves a new heart and a new spirit. Also in context, this message is to Israel who will be brought back to the land.

John 1:12-13 - Does not actually state irresistibly or that unbelievers are the subject. More of an Election prooftext, but see the entry in Unconditional Election for more.

Rom 9:15-16 - Does not actually state irresistibly or that unbelievers are the subject.

John 5:21 - Does not actually state irresistibly or that unbelievers are the subject. As already mentioned in the entry for this under Limited Atonement, who IS the Son pleased to give life to? Those who believe in Him.

Rom 11:5-6 - Does not actually state irresistibly or that unbelievers are the subject. Romans 11 is all about the Jews (NB: as mentioned under Unconditional Election, almost always elect/chosen refers to the Jewish people) who can be grafted back into Christ if they stop rejecting Him. The works here and in other places where it is contrasted with grace refers to the works of the Law, i.e. keeping the Mosaic code.

Rom 8:30 - Does not actually state irresistibly or that unbelievers are the subject. Recall how I just mentioned that Romans 11 is about the Jews? Well Romans 11:1-2 explains who 'those whom God foreknew' are, it is the Old Testament faithful. See the entry for Rom 8:29-30 under Unconditional Election for more.

John 6:39,65 - Does not actually state irresistibly or that unbelievers are the subject. Those drawn here are already followers of God, see John 6:37,44 under Unconditional Election for more on this. Why does v65 say 'can come' if it is Irresistible? It should say 'will surely come'.

Heb 9:15 - Does not actually state irresistibly.

Phil 1:6,29 - Does not actually state irresistibly or that unbelievers are the subject. More of an Eternal Security passage than anything, actually.

Phil 2:13 - Does not actually state irresistibly or that unbelievers are the subject. More of an Eternal Security passage than anything, actually.

2 Tim 1:9-10 - Does not actually state irresistibly.

Isa 55:11 - Does not actually state irresistibly. Does not define what God pleases His word to accomplish.

Acts 13:48 - Does not actually state that God worked irresistibly. In fact, nothing is even mentioned about WHY they believed. See this same prooftext under Unconditional Election for the context of this event that indicates those who believed were inclined to accept the Gospel.

Acts 18:27 - Does not actually state irresistibly.

Titus 3:5 - Does not actually state irresistibly.

John 11:43-44 - Does not actually state irresistibly or that unbelievers are the subject. It is not even a passage about figurative raising the dead to life in some metaphorical analogy for the state of sinners, it is LITERALLY raising a physically rotting corpse to life! Nowhere is the example of Lazarus used as a comparison for how unbelievers get saved. In fact, see vv15,42,45 which clearly state that what

Jesus did was to convince the Jewish witnesses (not unbelieving pagans!) to believe that He is the Messiah. See how 'dead' is actually figuratively used under the Eph 2:1-5 entry at Total Depravity.

Col 1:13 - Does not actually state irresistibly.

Psa 3:8 - Does not actually state irresistibly. This one is really stretching it, like they're out of prooftexts to pad the list. No Christian denies that salvation is of the LORD, the point of contention is HOW God chooses to save us.

2 Cor 4:6 - Does not actually state irresistibly. In fact, scroll back to v4 where the minds of unbelievers need to be blinded... What happened to Total Depravity where they were born already unable to see the light of the Gospel?

xoxoxoxoxoxoxoxoxoxox

#### PERSEVERANCE OF THE SAINTS

If God is does everything related to salvation including making someone believe, then surely nobody who is Elect can ever fall away! God will ensure they persevere to the end, no mere human can thwart God's will that they be saved.

With this and the other petals together, you might see why I say that the true acrostic for Calvinism is TULIPE - the last letter being Evanescent Grace, to explain those cases of apparent apostasy. What other logical entailment is there for those who formerly professed Christ - or even were Calvinists like Derek Webb, Tyler Vela, Megan Phelps, Edwin Curley - who now have abandoned the faith? If TULIP is true, then God must have tricked them using Evanescent Grace into merely THINKING they had real saving grace.

In any case, the P petal is addressed differently from the others. I affirm that God has promised to supernaturally aid all believers with persevering in the faith. But these assurance passages also need to be balanced out with the warning passages, exhorting believers not to fall away from the faith. There is no 'losing your salvation' like one misplaces a set of car keys, but there is the danger of wilfully walking away from Christ and rejecting His terms of salvation.

I summarize this views as "Wants Saved, Always Saved" - if you really want to remain with Christ then He will enable you to succeed to the end, but if you don't then He won't force you to remain.