



**The Quandary Limited Atonement Presents to Matrimony in Light of 2 Cor 6:14-16a; Theotokos: the Alexandrian Heresy of Mary as the “Mother of God”**

13. But the most pronounced controversy occurs when Protestant young people become attracted to each other and then through dating discover that one is infralapsarian while the other is supralapsarian.
14. This creates a problem that becomes intensified when they continue the relationship to the stage of compatibility. Emotions influence both to ignore the controversy and continue with the relationship.
15. If they deny the problem long enough they will often arrive at the stage of rapport and become locked-in to a future together and plan matrimony.
16. This is dangerous because the issue that divides them has been suppressed yet it must be dealt with at some point. And after the wedding, and especially after children are born, are not times to bring this monster out of hiding.
17. Here are the two monsters that must eventually do battle:  
Young adults who are infralapsarian have been taught:
  - that salvation is given by grace to *anyone* who responds to the Gospel through faith alone,
  - that one’s assurance of salvation is found in the *promises* given to the sinner who believes in Christ, and
  - that “good works” are not only commanded of the believer but *only the believer can produce them* and then only through the enabling power of the Holy Spirit and the guidance of the Word of God resident in his soul.
18. Young adults who are supralapsarian have been taught:
  - That salvation is predestined for the *elect only* and is appropriated by means of the “gift of grace” which empowers the elect to believe in Christ,
  - that one’s assurance of salvation is found in lifelong *perseverance* in the production of “fruits” or “good works,” and
  - that the *absence* of such perseverance indicates such a person is not among the elect and is therefore reprobate predestined to the lake of fire.
19. It is obvious that these two theologies are at loggerheads. Therefore, when a young man or woman who is infralapsarian considers matrimony with a young man or woman who is supralapsarian, then the following must be kept in mind:
  - The young man is the spiritual leader of the household and the young woman is going to have difficulty pursuing her beliefs in this environment.
  - Without spiritual harmony the stability of the marriage is compromised.
  - The controversy will reach critical point when their children are old enough to be evangelized and, subsequently, taught the Bible.
  - This issue can be avoided in one of two ways: (1) the infralapsarian willingly accepts supralapsarian theology, or (2) the supralapsarian willingly accepts infralapsarian theology.
  - Such a decision should be made before marriage since once married the issue will force one spouse to convert under pressure or for both to compromise their beliefs in an effort to achieve harmony.



20. This is the kind of conundrum today's young Protestant believers face because of the theology created by Theodore Bèza, adopted as Calvinism, and enshrined in the Westminster Confession of Faith.
21. Thus we find in this controversy an illustration of a person who distorts what another says or writes to his own advantage and, by doing so, creates a system that becomes so entrenched that a clear presentation of the truth is compromised.
22. This serves as an illustration of the situation that occurred in the early fifth century that resulted in the Council of Chalcedon in 451.
23. This controversy arose when Nestorius, a professor at the traditional School of Antioch which taught the literal-grammatical-historical interpretation of biblical manuscripts, preached against the doctrine of the hypostatic union taught by the progressive School of Alexandria which stressed the allegorical approach to the manuscripts.
24. Professors at Alexandria were teaching that Mary was the *theotokos*, the Mother of God, and Nestorius understood this to imply that the two natures of Christ were mixed, that is, that His deity took on certain aspects of His humanity and visa versa.
25. Cyril of Alexandria countered by attacking Nestorius for teaching heresy which resulted in Nestorius being deposed at the Council of Ephesus in 431.
26. Nestorius sought to distinguish the two natures of Christ but maintain the principle of one Person and was of the opinion that Alexandria placed too much stress on the deity of Christ at the expense of His humanity.
27. Cyril's counterattack was successful at Ephesus (431) and the ramifications that came out of the Council of Chalcedon (451) led to the demise of literal hermeneutics taught at the School of Antioch and the ascendancy of allegorical hermeneutics taught at the School of Alexandria.
28. This unfortunate circumstance indicates that the outcome was manipulated not only by human viewpoint but also by demon influence.