

## MELCHIZEDEK: PAGAN PRIEST-KING OF INCLUSIVISM?

The subject of salvation for those who have never heard the Gospel has long been seen as a theological minefield. From the seemingly insensitive position that any who have never heard the Gospel clearly proclaimed cannot be saved to the widest perspective that salvation will ultimately come to all irrespective of belief in the Gospel, theologians on all sides of the spectrum have weighed into the debate, each with their own worldview and doctrine of God being key factors in their argument. Each position has a number of ‘key texts’ or examples that, they argue, prove their case by example. The discussion is one of great importance for our society, where pluralism is rampant and the doctrine of salvation through Christ alone is constantly undermined to make organized Christianity appear more palatable to a pagan world.

This paper will address one particular example given by those who adhere to the position of *inclusivism*: Melchizedek. This will be done by presenting a definition of inclusivism followed by a brief excursus of how inclusivism functions as a doctrine. It will then be appropriate to analyze Pinnock’s, Clarke’s and Widbin’s assertions regarding Melchizedek. I will subsequently present a response. Finally, I will defend my position against common objections before concluding. In doing so, it will become evident that the oft-cited evidence of Melchizedek as a ‘pagan-believer’ through General Revelation is unsustainable both exegetically and doctrinally; and that, rather than being a key argument for inclusivist theology, actually presents an important argument for the exclusivist position.

### **Definition of Inclusivism**

To begin, it will be key to determine a definition of inclusivism, particularly in contrast with the historic position of exclusivism. Clark suggests the following definition: ‘*Inclusivism* holds that while only one religion is true, followers of other faiths who sincerely

practice their own religion – even if they overtly reject the true one – can be saved because they are really covert followers of the one true faith.’<sup>1</sup> At the heart of inclusivism, therefore, is the apologetic question: how can God condemn to Hell those who have never heard the Gospel, unless they have had an *active* opportunity to either accept or reject some form of God’s grace? For obvious reasons, this has a distinct appeal in our cultural *zeitgeist* where ‘tolerance’ is the buzz word. As Nash notes, ‘Part of inclusivism’s appeal is its response to the problem of dealing with the millions of people who die without ever hearing the gospel. Inclusivists insist that all people must have a chance to be saved.’<sup>2</sup> The inevitable corollary of inclusivism, however, must be either that the purpose of Jesus’ death on the cross was, at best, a grand display of love but unnecessary for salvation, or that there are differing distinctions of salvation. Inclusivists will argue that Jesus’ death was necessary for the salvation of the elect, but that God has also manifested a way for those who have not heard or believed the Gospel to have the opportunity to believe. Therefore, they can suggest that heaven will be filled with many believers who never heard the promises of God, or trusted in the effectual sacrifice of Christ. In arguing this position, they draw heavily from examples from the Old Testament whom they deem were outside the covenant of faith, yet were evidently believers.

The opposing view is *exclusivism*, and is the traditional view held by the church throughout the ages. The exclusivist argues that God saves by means of His effectual calling, or special revelation. No one can come to God except through the Gospel of Christ. This includes Old Testament believers, even if they were looking *forward* to the messianic act of the cross, and even if they didn’t know what the manifestation of God’s fulfilled promises would look like.

---

<sup>1</sup> David K. Clark, “Is Special Revelation Necessary for Salvation?,” *Through No Fault of Their Own*, edited by William V. Crockett and James G. Sigountos, (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1991), p. 37

<sup>2</sup> Ronald Nash, *Is Jesus the Only Saviour?*, (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1994), p. 104

## The Position of the Inclusivist

Contra to universalism and open theism, inclusivists endeavor to hold to ‘the uniqueness and finality of Jesus and [regards] as heretical any attempt to reduce or water down this conviction.’<sup>3</sup> This, however, is one side of the doctrinal ‘tug-of-war’ they are trying to hold in tension. On the other side of the rope is the need to adequately represent God’s grace and love by ensuring He is not maligned by the injustice of malicious ‘bullying’. In doing so, they suggest that, ‘The salvation God so magnanimously gives is, and has been, available in every age and culture and spot on the globe apart from any specific knowledge of God’s historical activity in Israel and his son Jesus.’<sup>4</sup> Therefore, although God promised a serpent-crusher to destroy evil and restore Eden, the opportunity for salvation is not intrinsically bound to His sacrifice. As Nash sums it up, ‘Inclusivists sometimes treat two propositions as synonymous: (1) the claim that God wills the salvation of every human being, and (2) the claim that God gives every human being a chance to accept His grace.’<sup>5</sup> God wills that all be saved, which means that He must in some way enable that to be at least *possible* even if not eventually the final reality. Pinnock states it thus: “If God really loves the whole world and desires everyone to be saved, it follows logically that everyone must have access to salvation.”<sup>6</sup>

The obvious question this raises, therefore, is how God manages to bring this into being. There are people groups as yet still unreached by the proclaimed Gospel of Christ, and they, Pinnock argues, must have some other way of responding to the grace of God. He suggests that God accomplishes this by means of *general revelation*. ‘A key assumption of inclusivism is the belief that general revelation is sufficient to bring people to salvation.’<sup>7</sup> As Pinnock claims

---

<sup>3</sup> Clark H. Pinnock, The Finality of Jesus Christ in A World of Religions in *Christian Faith and Practice in the Modern World*, ed. Mark A. Noll and David F. Wells (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988), p.153

<sup>4</sup> John Sanders, *No Other Name*, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992), p. 216

<sup>5</sup> Nash, *Is Jesus the Only Saviour?*, p. 105

<sup>6</sup> Clark Pinnock, *A Wideness in God’s Mercy* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1992), p. 157

<sup>7</sup> Nash, *Is Jesus the Only Saviour?*, p. 118

that salvation must be available for all people at all times to retain the tension of God's love with God's justice, so too does Sanders, who explains it like this: '...[the] appropriation of salvific grace is mediated through general revelation and God's providential workings in human history.'<sup>8</sup> However, this leads to a further development. Just as God *must* offer salvation for those who have never heard the Gospel, so too must there be a difference between those who responded to the proclamation of the Apostolic Gospel, and therefore enter into a salvific covenantal relationship with their Lord, and those who respond to *some* deity at some point, by some method. Thus Sanders defines the latter as, 'those who are saved because they have faith in God.'<sup>9</sup> In contrast, a Christian will be a 'believer who knows about and participates in the work of Jesus Christ.'<sup>10</sup> This distinction underpins the inclusivist position, and is used to maintain their perception of the justice of God and His desire that all would be saved. To uphold this position Biblically, they make three claims, which Nash elucidates:

'...(1) a distinctively inclusivist understanding of the nature of faith; (2) a recognition that the many Old Testament believers will be in heaven, even though they were not *Christian* believers...(3) an appeal to an alleged Old Testament tradition of so-called holy pagans.'<sup>11</sup>

These holy pagans are frequently cited as being key instances in the canonical record of how God's general revelation proved effective in saving those outside the domains of His special revelation. As Widbin asserts, 'The Old Testament never hides the fact that some outside Israel recognize their dependence on the God of creation.'<sup>12</sup> Rather, 'When encountered by Israelites, such people have *already responded* to God by acknowledging him as Creator and Lord. They have arrived at their decision apart from any contact with Israel.'<sup>13</sup> Widbin demonstrates the

---

<sup>8</sup> Sanders, *No Other Name*, p. 215

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 224-225

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 225

<sup>11</sup> Nash, *Is Jesus the Only Saviour?*, p. 124

<sup>12</sup> R. Bryan Widbin, "Salvation for People Outside Israel's Covenant", *Through No Fault of Their Own*, edited by William V. Crockett and James G. Sigountos, (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1991), p. 80

<sup>13</sup> Widbin, "Salvation for People Outside Israel's Covenant", p. 80. Emphasis mine.

inclusivist position by arguing that the likes of Melchizedek and Jethro were saved by general revelation because they had not yet come into contact with those who held the promises of God's special revelation (i.e. Abraham and Moses respectively). Pinnock's list is even more comprehensive: 'Pinnock mentions Abraham, Melchizedek, Jethro, Job, Abimelech, Naaman, and Balaam. All of these had faith in God even though they lived outside the range of Israel's revelation.'<sup>14</sup>

### **The Pagan Priest-King**

Melchizedek encountered Abram after his victory over the alliance of the kings of Sodom. Here the author is contrasting differing examples of kingship (that of Melchizedek/Abram with the king of Sodom) whilst also demonstrating that Abram is beginning to fulfil his covenantal command.<sup>15</sup> At this meetings of kings, Melchizedek is called 'priest of God Most High' by the author. In the context of the passage, the comparison is not *against* Abram, but with him, together against the king of Sodom, whom Abram had just defeated in battle. Richardson, however, suggests that 'Melchizedek represents general revelation and Abraham stands for special revelation.'<sup>16</sup> This view deliberately maintains that the text treats both characters as pictures of God's differing methods of salvation: 'The former is "a figurehead or type of God's *general* revelation to mankind" and the latter is a type of "God's covenant-based, canon-recorded *special* revelation to mankind."<sup>17</sup> As Tiéno discusses, 'He [Richardson] sees the two as complementary, yet treats them as if they were two distinct modes of divine revelation.'<sup>18</sup> This is a disjointed interpretation of the passage and does not fit into the purpose of the wider narrative.

---

<sup>14</sup> Erickson, Millard J., *How shall they Be Saved*, (Grand Rapids: BakerBooks, 1996), p. 132

<sup>15</sup> Genesis 12:2-3

<sup>16</sup> Tite Tiéno, "Eternity in Their Hearts?", p. 210

<sup>17</sup> Ibid.

<sup>18</sup> Ibid., p. 212

Nevertheless, the fact this Melchizedek, the king of Salem, is identified thus suggests that he had come to salvific faith in God before he had met Abram, and therefore before he had the opportunity to trust in the special revelation of the promises made to Abram by the God. Pinnock makes just this argument when he writes, “We must...remember that Melchizedek worshiped the true God before meeting Abraham, and that Jethro, a Midianite priest, knew God and even instructed Moses before he learned of Israel’s commissions.”<sup>19</sup> Widbin concurs: ‘Are we not to assume that Abram and Melchizedek came by their knowledge of El Elyon independently, perhaps through their distinct revelations of God?’<sup>20</sup> In fact, Widbin concludes his essay on Melchizedek by claiming that ‘In the final analysis, it is virtually impossible to deny that Israel believed Yahweh was active in the world independent of her covenant.’<sup>21</sup> What can be adduced, Pinnock says, is that, ‘religious experience may be valid outside Judaism and Christianity.’<sup>22</sup> Widbin takes Pinnock’s stance and goes further, stating that, ‘Israel’s exclusive calling was to be a testimony to the nations. What happened apart from that was Yahweh’s business.’<sup>23</sup>

The use of Melchizedek by inclusivists, therefore, can be summarized as follows: the fact Melchizedek is identified as a *priest* of God Most High demonstrates a salvific faith beyond the special revelation of God to Abram, and as such acts as a possible, plausible paradigm for salvation outside of God’s special revelation. As they point out, a priest mediates salvation for the people; ergo Melchizedek must have had salvific *responsibility* alongside his own personal salvation. The reasoning for this development is that, just as special revelation is tied to a unique people (irrespective of the Testament in question), so too must general revelation be *untied* to a

---

<sup>19</sup> Erickson, *How shall they Be Saved*, p. 132

<sup>20</sup> Widbin, “Salvation for People Outside Israel’s Covenant”, p. 81

<sup>21</sup> Ibid.

<sup>22</sup> Clark H. Pinnock, *The Finality of Jesus Christ in A World of Religions*, p.159

<sup>23</sup> Widbin, “Salvation for People Outside Israel’s Covenant”, pp. 80-81

unique people, but free to all people at all time in all locations, as Pinnock notes.<sup>24</sup> Creation declares the same message in modern-day America as it did in Salem where Melchizedek reigned. Melchizedek, and therefore unbelievers today, are ‘saved by faith without any knowledge of the revelation vouchsafed to Israel or the church.’<sup>25</sup>

### **A Response**

The position I will argue, however, views the role of Melchizedek as a priest of God very differently. As the narrative of the Bible unfolds, it becomes clear that salvation is given through the revelation of God to man. In the beginning this was through personal interaction between God and man, as seen in Eden.<sup>26</sup> After the Fall God withdrew His immediate presence and used dreams, visions and His voice to communicate with mankind.<sup>27</sup> Eventually the Lord communicated through the Law, detailing His character and the demands for His people, Israel. When the Law failed to captivate the loyalty of Israel, He spoke to, and sent, prophets to declare His word and will. In key moments of salvation history God manifested Himself to humanity, such as in Genesis 17 with Abraham or with Moses at the burning bush and in the tabernacle. This self-revelation and manifestation ultimately occurred when God the Son became man. At each of these expressions of God’s personal and relational moments of revelation, there was a unique delivery of information about the unfolding plan of salvation. All of these find their fulfilment and consummation when Jesus died on the cross as the sufficient substitute and atonement for those whom God has foreordained to save. As Jesus himself claimed in Matthew 24, all the Scriptures concern Him. Therefore, the salvation plan of God is all about Jesus. Outside of Jesus, there can be no salvation, for Melchizedek or anyone else.

---

<sup>24</sup> ‘A person who is informational premessianic, whether living in ancient or modern times, is in exactly the same spiritual situation.’ Pinnock, *A Wideness in God’s Mercy*, p. 161

<sup>25</sup> Ibid.

<sup>26</sup> Genesis 3:8

<sup>27</sup> Genesis 4:6, 6:6, 15:1, 37:5, 9.

The fundamental reason why all must come to salvation through Christ lies in the very nature of God. God is just, and He cannot simply forget the way in which we have rebelled and actively fought against Him. Sin must be punished, and we are all sinners, whether or not we acknowledge that. Therefore, the necessity of salvation being *through the cross* of Jesus cannot be overemphasized. It is because He died in our place that any can be called to faith. In light of this, therefore, how does such a schema fit into the Old Testament narrative, if indeed it can?

Firstly, although we look back upon the cross and the promise given and fulfilled by it to find our salvation, the heroes of the Old Testament looked forward to the saving act of God in hope and anticipation of salvation through it. Granted they didn't know what they were looking forward to, exactly, but they trusted in the nature and character of God to act as He has indeed promised. Their faith that God *would* act is the Old Covenant version of our faith that God *has* acted in Christ. What action is this? The direct promise in Genesis 3 of a serpent-crusher; a Saviour. Old Testament believers trusted in the direct revelation of God they had to hand, which for Melchizedek, who lived in the transitional period between the Noahic and Abrahamic covenants, was the direct revelation given to Adam and Noah. Salvation for an Old Testament member was only possible because of the cross of Christ, even though it was yet to happen within human history. This is clearly expressed by the author of Hebrews throughout chapter 11, where the refrain, 'By faith' is repeated. Paul also notes this in Galatians 3:6-9 where he quotes Genesis and argues that by believing God we enter into the inheritance promised to Abraham.

Secondly, the book of Hebrews uses the character of Melchizedek to demonstrate not that salvation is possible outside of Christ, but that Christ is required for salvation. The author of Hebrews points out that the priesthood of Melchizedek differs from the priesthood of Aaron, and that the priesthood of Aaron was insufficient in granting salvation in and of itself:

Now if perfection had been attainable through the Levitical priesthood (for under it the people received the law), what further need would there have been for another priest to arise after the order of Melchizedek, rather than one named after the order of Aaron?<sup>28</sup>

---

<sup>28</sup> Hebrews 7:11



What is being argued is that the law is insufficient for salvation unless one comes who, despite being outside the law, perfectly fulfills it and takes upon Himself the punishment for mankind's failure to uphold it. The effectual nature of the law can only be found in the substitutionary atonement of Jesus, who is a guarantor of a better covenant.<sup>29</sup> And if the Law is insufficient for salvation 'outside Christ,' how much less sufficient must general revelation be? Wellum points out that, 'Christ fulfils all that the Levitical priests foreshadowed and typified, including the sacrifice they offered,'<sup>30</sup> but that He also, 'Eclipses the Levitical priesthood regulated by the old covenant in a new order foreshadowed and typified by Melchizedek.'<sup>31</sup> Therefore, rather than being an example of salvation outside special revelation, Melchizedek is used by the author of Hebrews as a typological expression of the New Covenant, the covenant inaugurated by the completed act of God through the cross, as promised in Genesis 3.

### **Objections and Response**

#### **Contention: No Direct Revelation**

The question, however, is then asked, 'How does this fit into Abram's experience in the Genesis 14?' After all, it must be conceded that Melchizedek was a real person, and a real priest of God, even if he was a type of Christ (but with no direct revelation).

One common resolution to this apparent conundrum has been to suggest that Melchizedek is actually a theophany, a pre-incarnate manifestation of Christ. Although this reasoning can be argued through the exposition in Hebrews, this view doesn't seem correct. More plausible is that Melchizedek was aware of God the same way Jethro was made aware of God: proclamation. For Pinnock and Clarke *et. al.*, to successfully argue that Melchizedek is an

---

<sup>29</sup> Hebrews 7:22

<sup>30</sup> Wellum, *Saving Faith: Implicit or Explicit?*, pp. 16-17

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*

example of salvation outside special revelation, they must present the argument that there has been no special revelation to him.

### **Response: That's Conjecture**

However, I contend that this is an argument from silence, because no such statement is made in Scripture. Rather, we see in Scripture that all mankind finds its ancestry through Adam and, subsequently, through Noah.<sup>32</sup> Thus all humanity had at least an ancestral link to the great act of special revelation given in the time of Noah: judgment through the flood, and the covenant promise that God would protect and sustain the earth, keeping the chaos of the waters at bay forevermore. Inclusivists must argue that this knowledge and tradition had been completely and utterly suppressed for their position to be tenable.<sup>33</sup> For Melchizedek to be an acceptable example of salvation outside general revelation, he must have existed outside the tradition of Noah, in which God had clearly manifested His presence, expressed His eternal character and made a covenant promise to His creation. That Melchizedek can be called 'priest of God Most High' suggests that He trusted in God because He trusted in the promises of God given directly to his forefather, Noah. It does not easily follow that, by having this title, he came to faith by himself in a vacuum, simply through general revelation. As Erickson succinctly states, 'Sanders, Pinnock and Richardson all claim that he [Melchizedek] possesses a knowledge of God (presumably saving) through general revelation, but without offering any evidence to that effect.'<sup>34</sup> And elsewhere he states that, 'The problem with attempting to utilize Melchizedek is that we do not really know enough about him to assign a status to him and his testimony,'<sup>35</sup> and

---

<sup>32</sup> Genesis 10.

<sup>33</sup> External, contemporary knowledge of the creation and flood narratives suggest this is highly improbable.

<sup>34</sup> Erickson, *How shall they Be Saved*, p. 155

<sup>35</sup> Ibid.

therefore to create a doctrine around Melchizedek, about which Scripture deliberately says very little, is dangerous because it risks leaving the Biblical text behind.

### **Objection: Outside Abrahamic Covenant**

Another criticism is that Melchizedek is outside the Abrahamic Covenant, yet still a priest of God, therefore the explanation of his salvation requires general revelation.

### **Response: Transitional Period is Anomaly**

Whilst it is true that it was through this covenant that the narrowing focus towards Israel was first clearly established, it cannot be argued that this places Melchizedek outside any possible realm of special revelation, because Adam and Noah had received covenants and promises that specifically impacted all of mankind; both had experienced extreme judgment from God for sin and both had descendants with whom they would no doubt share their knowledge. Therefore, in a manner that would be commanded in Deuteronomy 6, we can safely surmise that the passing of knowledge from one generation to the next occurred and that, in light of the nature of God's mercy, He chose men and women He would grant mercy to, even if we do not know the full extent of that mercy. Erickson, again, elucidates succinctly,

Is he [Pinnock] really saying none of these people had special revelation? If he is defining the revelation vouchsafed to Israel or the church narrowly, then this may be conceivable in the sense that these people antedated both Israel and the church. However, the revelation that Israel had included even the revelation that came to Abel and Noah, for example.<sup>36</sup>

Evidently the progression of revelation that eventually came to the nation through Moses included the revelation of Adam and Noah; therefore such knowledge about God was already in the world and available to be known.

It must also be noted that this period is a transitional period in which Melchizedek was a priest of God Most High under the Adamic and Noahic covenants, but not the Abrahamic, as it

---

<sup>36</sup> Ibid., p. 188

was still in the process of being instituted. As a unique figure at a unique, transitional period of human and salvific history, he cannot act as a paradigm of salvation for all people in all of time.

### **Objection: No *Need* for Christ**

A further critique of the orthodox position I have outlined above is that, ‘People can receive the gift of salvation without knowing the giver or the precise nature of the gift.’<sup>37</sup> In saying this, Sanders suggests that simply a faith in ‘God’ is sufficient for salvation, and that it is not found in, ‘possessing certain minimum information.’<sup>38</sup> Pinnock states, ‘The Bible does not teach that one must confess the name of Jesus to be saved.’<sup>39</sup>

### **Response: Not According to Scripture**

Any brief excursions through the New Testament would suggest otherwise. Fittingly, Paul counters similar teaching in Galatians,

Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law by becoming a curse for us – for it is written, “Cursed is everyone who is hanged on a tree” – so that in Christ Jesus the blessing of Abraham might come to the Gentiles, so that we might receive the promised Spirit through faith.<sup>40</sup>

Paul explicitly states that the blessing of Abraham is finally fulfilled through Jesus. Salvation must come to the nations through the cross of Jesus: it is granted to the nations (i.e. Gentiles) as a free gift. But it is not an open, universal salvation. Rather, Paul continues, ‘the Scripture imprisoned everything under sin, so that the promise by faith in Jesus Christ might be given to *those who believe*,’<sup>41</sup> stating clearly that, ‘for in Christ Jesus you are all sons of God, through faith. For *as many of you as were baptized* into Christ have put on Christ.’<sup>42</sup> Baptism

---

<sup>37</sup> Sanders, *No Other Name*, p. 255

<sup>38</sup> Pinnock, *A Wideness in God’s Mercy*, p. 157

<sup>39</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 158

<sup>40</sup> Galatians 3:13-14

<sup>41</sup> Galatians 3:22

<sup>42</sup> Galatians 3:25-26

comes expressly after repentance for sin and a clear profession of faith. Therefore, ‘If you are Christ’s, then you are Abraham’s offspring, heirs according to the promise.’<sup>43</sup> What Paul has made clear is that no one can come to salvation except through faith in God’s unique promises to Abraham, and fulfilled in Christ. Melchizedek, although he probably didn’t know of those promises, was trusting in the character of God to fulfil His promises to Adam and Noah, which were being further clarified and added to in the *concurrent* revelation to Abraham, and ultimately fulfilled in Christ at the cross. Is this general revelation? No, it is relying on direct revelation already present *at the same time* Abraham was awaiting the full explanation of His own covenant. Melchizedek would have been a recipient of special revelation before he met Abraham, either by direct communication with God, or by the tradition proclaimed from father to son. Although he looked forward to the cross through the haze of prophetic promise, he nevertheless did look forward, and trusted in the Lord to fulfil that which He had promised.

### **Conclusion**

To conclude, this paper has demonstrated that the inclusivist position claiming Melchizedek as an example of faith outside special revelation is untenable when placed within the larger body of Scripture. It has been acknowledged that, although Melchizedek is an unusual character in Scripture, he is not presented as an archetype of salvation through general revelation, but rather is a type of Christ whereby faith comes through grace in the completed action of God’s ultimate plan. It was also noted that, as a descendent of Noah, Melchizedek did not exist in a world where knowledge of God was non-existent, and that to suggest he came to faith in God by his own analysis of the world was a view neither presented in Scripture nor, ultimately, allowed by it.

Is Melchizedek therefore inclusivism’s prized pagan-priest through belief by general revelation? No, he was a pagan-priest, faithfully awaiting the arrival of the Promised One.

---

<sup>43</sup> Galatians 3:29

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Clark H. Pinnock, The Finality of Jesus Christ in A World of Religions in *Christian Faith and Practice in the Modern World*, ed. Mark A. Noll and David F. Wells (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988).
- Clark Pinnock, *A Wideness in God's Mercy: The Finality of Jesus Christ in a World of Religions* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1992).
- David K. Clark, "Is Special Revelation Necessary for Salvation?," *Through No Fault of Their Own*, edited by William V. Crockett and James G. Sigountos, (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1991).
- Millard J. Erickson, *How shall they Be Saved*, (Grand Rapids: BakerBooks, 1996).
- John Sanders, *No Other Name*, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992)
- Ronald Nash, *Is Jesus the Only Saviour?* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1994).
- R. Bryan Widbin, "Salvation for People Outside Israel's Covenant", *Through No Fault of Their Own*, edited by William V. Crockett and James G. Sigountos, (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1991).
- The Holy Bible, English Standard Version (Illinois: Crossway, 2001).
- Tite Tiénou, "Eternity in Their Hearts?," *Through No Fault of Their Own*, edited by William V. Crockett and James G. Sigountos, (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1991).
- Stephen Wellum, *Saving Faith: Implicit or Explicit?*