

EPHESIANS 1:5

October 6, 1981

Take your Bibles and go to Ephesians tonight, please, to chapter 1 where I want to cover one verse with you tonight that I wanted to cover so badly last week and didn't finish. But I felt it had to be finished before I went south, because otherwise the thing will cool off and then I have to heat the soup all over again. But verse 5 of Ephesians 1, King James says, "Having predestinated us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ... himself, according to the good pleasure of his will":

Ephesians 1:5 KJV

Having predestinated us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to himself, according to the good pleasure of his will,

Darby translates it:

Ephesians 1:5 Darby

Having marked us out before hand for adoption through Jesus Christ [to] himself according to the good pleasure of his will.

Lamsa translates it:

Ephesians 1:5 Lamsa

And he marked us with his love to be his from the beginning and adopted us to be sons through Jesus Christ as it pleased his will.

Knox translates it:

Ephesians 1:5 Knox

Marking us out before hand to be his adopted children through Jesus Christ.

The Amplified translates it:

Ephesians 1:5 Amplified

For he foreordained us to be adopted as his own children through Jesus Christ in accordance with the purpose of his will because it pleased him and was his kind intent.

The New English translates it:

Ephesians 1:5 New English

And he destined us such was his will and pleasure to be accepted as his sons through Jesus Christ.

Good News to Modern Man:

Ephesians 1:5 Good News to Modern Man

God has already decided that through Jesus Christ he would bring us to himself as his sons. This was his pleasure and purpose.

And the New International Version:

Ephesians 1:5 NIV

He predestined us to be adopted as sons through Jesus Christ in accordance with his pleasure and will.

The Revised Version has:

Ephesians 1:5 Revised

Having foreordained us unto adoption as sons through Jesus Christ unto himself according to the good pleasure of his will.

And the...uh...the Aramaic fella. What's his name? Murdock, Murdock.

Ephesians 1:5 Murdock

And adopted us for sons in Jesus the Messiah as was agreeable to his pleasure.

Now we have the word “predestinated” in here; we have the word “adopted” or “adoption,” we have words like: according to, the standard, according to, the standard being, the good pleasure of his will. All of these now will have to be handled in detail.

We begin with the word “adoption” is where I want to start. I have given this previously last year in the background study of this word, but perhaps I've added a few things this year and deleted others, I don't know. But adoption was a kind of will. The adopted son became owner of the property, and the property could pass to a person that was by natural birth outside the family only by his being adopted. The adoption will—the adoption will was irrevocable and it was made in public. The term son and heir are interchangeable. The will of an adopter is irrevocable when it was duly executed. A man could never—an adopter could never put away an adopted son. He may put away his real son on good grounds, but the adopted son has a stronger position than a son by birth, according to Greek and Roman law. There is the truth of the teaching in the Church epistles that shows that sons may be adopted but children may only be born. The two, adopted sons and children by birth, are complementary, but they must be understood separately before the full force of the whole truth which they combine to give can be comprehended.

The adopted son became as much a member of the family as if he had been born of the blood of the adopter, and he was invested with all the privileges of that family. And it was by this means of adoption that the succession was continued among the Caesars. In no case among the Caesars did the throne pass from father to son. Augustus was the great nephew of Julius Caesar and was adopted from the Octavian into the Julian gen household. Tiberius was no relation at all to his predecessor: he was merely the son of Augustus's wife, Livia, by Tiberius Claudius Nero. Nero was the great nephew of his predecessor, Claudius who adopted him in the year A.D. 50.

Adoption was of two kinds: adoption proper and adrogation. The word adrogation is spelled a-d-r-o-g-a-t-i-o-n.

Adoption proper where according to Roman law the father had absolute control over his family having the same rights over his children as over his slaves. By this the child was deprived of the right to own property, and the father could inflict any punishment he thought fit, even to the extent of death penalty. He could sell his child into slavery or do with him as he liked.

In the case of the adoption of a son a legal ceremony took place in which the father

went through the process of selling his child as a son to the *potestas* of the adopter. In other words, I have a child. Under Roman law you want my child to be your son. You want to adopt him. So a legal ceremony takes place in which I go through the process of selling my child to you. This is what the scripture talks about when it says “bought with a price.” My child is passed over completely to the *potestas* of the adopter. That is where I have a child who is not of legal age.

Now, there’s another kind of adoption, when I have a child who is of legal age, and that’s called adrogation. When the child to be adopted grows up to be an adult, he was adopted by the form called adrogation. The law demanded that the adopter should be at least 18 years older than the adopted. And the effect of adoption was fourfold:

- (1) A Change of Family—The adopted person was transferred from one gens to another.
- (2) A Change of Name—The adopted person acquired a new name, for he assumed the name of his adopter and modified his own name by the termination *ianus*. Thus, when Caius Octavius of the Octavian gens was adopted by Julius Caesar, he became Caius Julius Caesar Octavianus.
- (3) A Change of Home.
- (4) New Responsibilities and Privileges—While the adopted son may have suffered many losses, there were...these were far more than counterbalanced by his gains, for he received a new capacity to inherit. In the case of the adopter dying intestate (that is without a will), the adopted son acquired the right of succession, the right of dominion, lawful authority, the absolute power of authority in the family.

In Galatians Paul writes of “the child differing nothing from a slave,” and goes on to say “Thou art no longer a slave but a son.” Paul also alludes to *tutelage* in Galatians where we have such phrases as “kept in word,” “tutor to bring us to Christ,” “under guardians and stewards,” and “children held in bondage.”

So far as the ceremony was concerned, the difference between the transferring of a son into slavery and his becoming a member of a family was very slight. In one case the adopter says: I claim this man as my slave. In the other: I claim this man as my son. The form was almost the same—the spirit that differed.

The apostle here in Ephesians uses as an illustration the Roman practice of legally adopting a child, and thus, not only bequeathing to him the material possessions of the one adopting, but also gives him his civil status. Thus, God takes a believing sinner, regenerates him, and by means of this makes him his child, a born one. Then he takes this child and places him in a legal position as an adult son, *huios*. We thus become joint heirs with Christ, having been raised to a civil status as adult sons in which we become heirs of God inheriting jointly with Christ all that he possesses as an heir of God by virtue of his sonship and work on the cross.

When a slave was appointed heir, although expressly emancipated by the will which gave him the inheritance, his freedom commenced not upon the making of the will, nor even immediately upon the death of the tester, but from the moment when he, the officially adopted son, took certain legal steps, which were described as entering upon the inheritance.

In the last words of a passage of Ephesians 1:14, “to the praise of his glory” is an

allusion to a well-known Roman custom also. The emancipated slaves who attended the funeral of their emancipator were the praise of his glory. Testamentary emancipation was so fashionable and so in vogue as a form of posthumous vanity and pretension, the desire to be followed to the grave by a crowd of freed men wearing the cap of liberty was so strong that shortly before the time when St. Paul wrote, the legislature had expressly limited the number of slaves that an owner might manumit by will.

Now sonship by adoption in the Old Testament was used in the present-day sense of our word adoption, not according to the Greek and Roman laws of adoption.

In the New Testament the Greek word *huiiothesia* issued, meaning the place of a son, and is translated “adopting a son.” The context determines whether the Greek and Roman laws of adoption apply. For instance, the Greek laws of adoption are in Romans 8:15, 23; Ephesians 1:5; Galatians 4:5. But referring to Israel in the present-day sense of adoption is Romans 9:4. In both cases the translation is “adoption of sons.”

Now the words “good pleasure of his will” in Ephesians 1:5. It seems to me (may I have some coffee, please) that the words, “the good pleasure of his will,” in Ephesians 1:5 must be considered a figure of speech. And the entire Research Department concurs with this. In one way when you just first look at it, it appears that those words, “the good pleasure of his will,” make sense literally. But in another way they do not. (Thank you.) You see, whenever the word makes sense literally, that it means what it says and says what it means literally, then it’s never a figure of speech. It becomes a figure of speech when it has usage of words that cannot just be literal.

Now these words, “good pleasure of his will,” are formed from an unusual construction which is exactly opposite of the normal wording, and therefore, because of this unusual construction which is exactly opposite of the normal way it’s done, therefore, it’s a figure of speech. And the figure of speech is called *Hypallage*. It’s spelled h-y-p-a-l-l-a-g-e, which is an interchange of construction or an underchange of it.

Walter, I think I’d like for you to come in please while I’m on this. Maybe we can help the Corps more if you’re sitting here with me. Bullinger in his *Figures of Speech* on page 535 has the word *Hypallage*, or it’s called interchange. It’s interchange of construction. And this word differs from *Antiptosis*. That’s why I’ve got *Antiptosis* here; I’ve got *Hypallage*; And I’ve got this *Antimereia*—what is it? [Walter pronounces: *Antimereia*]. *Antimereia*. All three of these figures are involved here. You see, this *Hypallage*, as I understand this Walter, it’s a...see it’s a...well, if I just read this—makes sense: relates...belongs [mumbles while reading]...united...so that what is said of or attributed to one thing ought to be said of or attributed to the other. In the case of two nouns, the latter in regimen, they are interchanged in sense, not in *Antiptosis*.

We need to maybe define all three things first, huh? Then maybe we could understand better. Okay.

Hypallage is where you change one noun, how is that now Walter?

[Walter Cummins] You have two nouns: one’s the governing noun; and one’s in regimen or in a genitive construction, and you switch their position.

[Dr. Wierwille] You switch it? Okay.

[Walter Cummins] Right. So the first noun that was governing becomes the second noun in regimen and vice versa.

[Dr. Wierwille] Good pleasure of his will. Good pleasure is what now?

[Walter Cummins] That's the governing noun.

[Dr. Wierwille] Okay. Will?

[Walter Cummins] Of will would be the genitive.

[Dr. Wierwille] Right. Good pleasure of his will. The ordinary construction would be the will of his good pleasure.

[Walter Cummins] Right.

[Dr. Wierwille] That's why it's a figure.

Now, this *Antimereia* is an exchange of parts of speech. One part of speech is used instead of another, a noun for a verb or a verb for a noun.

Then this *Antiptosis* is exchange of cases where one case is used instead of another case.

So in *Hypallage* you have one noun used as an adverb? How's that stated now?

[Walter Cummins] As a genitive.

[Dr. Wierwille] As a genitive, okay.

[Walter Cummins] And one as governing noun.

[Dr. Wierwille] Right—one noun as a genitive and another as a governing noun. Now—“*Hypallage* differs from *Antiptosis* in that it relates to an interchange of construction whereby an adjective or other word, which *logically* belongs to one connexion,⁴ is grammatically united with another, so that what is said of or attributed to one thing ought to be said or attributed to the other.” That's sort of neat.

[Walter Cummins] Maybe we should give them an example of these other two, like *Antimereia*, the one you always use is mighty angels [Dr. Wierwille: Yeah], which becomes angels of might, putting the adjective as a genitive construction. But in *Antiptosis*, if you had angels of might, to change it would be angelic might [Dr. Wierwille: Okay]...angelic might, where the first one becomes an adjective [Dr. Wierwille: Right], whereas in *Hypallage* they switch positions. They both stay as nouns.

[Dr. Wierwille] Right, that's why it's undercut. This noun slips under the other. See? Good pleasure of his will. See? So...well, I hope that's as confusing to you as it is to me. {Audience laughter.} You know, I can work this greatly when I sit in the privacy of my own mind and I work these things in figures. It's when you try to explain it to somebody that hasn't worked figures too much that it seems to be more difficult. But—see? Well...

[Walter Cummins] I think your examples here though of *Hypallage* will be self-explanatory.

[Dr. Wierwille] I think this will clear up a lot of mud. I'll try.

Now, do we have this in here? The Greek word *thelēma* (I've given you that earlier you know, long time ago—t-h-e-l-e...long ē-m-a.) occurs 64 times in the New Testament. Of these, 37 times is associated with another noun in a genitive relation.

⁴ See Bullinger's "Figures of Speech Used in the Bible" page 535.

However, the word *thelēma* is itself in the genitive case only 13 times. In nine of these the prepositions *dia* and *ek* precede the word. In all but the four remaining instances *thelēma* is the governing word in the genitive relation (will of plus a noun). The four instances where *thelēma* is being governed by a noun are: “good pleasure of his will” Ephesians 1:5, “mystery of his will” Ephesians 1:9, “counsel of his will” Ephesians 1:11, and then there is one more in Colossians 1:9 “and knowledge of his will”—only four. And this wording is exactly opposite the normal wording which would be “the will of His good pleasure.” That would be the normal way. The will of His mystery. Right? The will of His counsel [unaudible]. The will of His knowledge. That would be the normal way. But the figure is “good pleasure of his will,” “mystery of his will,” “counsel of his will,” “knowledge of his will.” That’s why it’s a figure, and that figure marks the emphasis of that which is important in His Word. Two nouns standing in a genitive relationship exchange places, that’s *Hypallage*. Two nouns standing in a genitive relationship exchange places. For example, in Ephesians the normal expression would be “the will of His good pleasure,” its *Hypallage* is the good pleasure of His will. This means the emphasis is on the first noun named: good pleasure, mystery, counsel. Rather than emphasizing “will,” it emphasizes what His will concerns in each usage.

I think that is significant. All right. I think that’s enough on that one, huh? Thank you Walter. I hope it isn’t muddy for you anymore. All it takes is work. If you’ll work it, you’ll have the understanding it. It’s not that difficult. It’s just a matter of keeping first things first in your mind.

Now, we go to the text proper now, the Ephesians 1:5.

“Having predestinated”—The Aramaic literal meaning is marked before, marked before in the sense of being branded or stamped. That’s the word “marked” (you know), put the seal on you, stamped, branded.

And the words “in love” that were in the Greek in verse 4 open up verse 5 and they are in the Aramaic in the fifth verse. “According to” that would be in love, in love branded us or stamped us to Himself. That’s the Aramaic.

The Greek is the word *proorizō* (p-r-o-o-r-i-z-o), meaning foreordained from *pro* (p-r-o), meaning before, and *horizō*, to define, to make a border. The participle, predestined, is subordinate to the verb, he chose, or he elected in verse 4. It is not temporal indicating time; not temporal meaning He chose us having first predestinated us, but rather it indicates means, not time, meaning He chose us by predestinating us. Does not mean He chose us having first predestinated us. It means He chose us by predestinating us. Thus, the question is not who is predestinated but to what are they predestinated.

There are three Greek words I want you to put down. I will give you all the Scriptures relating to them, and when you have worked all of those that’s all that can be known from the Word regarding it.

The first word is the word is *proginōskō* (p-r-o-g-i-n-long ō-s-k-long ō), *proginōskō*. All of you students know what the word *pro* means and you also know what the word *ginōskō* means. When you put these two together, these two words together the Greek words, they are translated foreknow twice (Romans 8:29; 11:2); translated foreordained once (1 Peter 1:20); translated know (k-n-o-w) once (Acts 26:5); and translated know before (2 Peter 3:17). Now that’s the Greek word *proginōskō*, translated foreknow twice, foreordained once, k-n-o-w once and k-n-o-w before once.

Now the other Greek word is *prognosis* (p-r-o-g-n-o-s-i-s). Medical people understand that one, nurses, *prognōsis*, transliterated directly over into that word of prognosis. This Greek word is translated foreknowledge twice (Acts 2:23 and 1 Peter 1:2).

Now another closely related word is *progonos* (p-r-o-g-o-n-o-s) and *progonos* is transliterated into our English word progeny, offspring. And this word is used twice. Once it's translated forefathers in 2 Timothy 1:3; once it's translated parents in 1 Timothy 5:4.

The reason I'm teaching this again to the Corps is because you must really work this until you have a full understanding of predestination. The Calvinistic teaching of predestination is totally devilish, and it, of course, has ruined many, many lives. And that teaching—it was simply God picks one person, sends him to heaven; He picks another one, sends him to hell because He has freedom to do as He pleases. That is not predestination. The reason God is able to predestinate and chose us by predestinating us was because He foreknew, foreknow, know before. He foreknew that we would believe because of His all wisdom. The word—big word is omniscient. Omniscient, meaning all smart, all wise. He foreknew. Had I foreknown that a little girl would come along at 1:50 this afternoon and they would call her Rebecca Alison (this will cost Alison Heaney a pretty dress, I guarantee ya). Had I had all that foreknowledge I could have said well the Geers are going to have a little baby girl this afternoon at 1:50 Ohio time and they'll call her Rebecca Alison Gear. God has that. He knew us before the overthrow, before the foundation, you understand? That's why the key to predestination is not where He picks out one and sends him to heaven...but because He knows man's choice, freedom of will. And that's why it's so important. He chose us by predestinating us because He knew, He foreknew. Foreknowledge is the key to foreordination or predestination.

And I love the association with the word “progeny.” Just like I taught you if I had known Rebecca Alison was coming along today at 1:50, you see, it puts it in the family. Predestination deals basically with the family, whom He foreknew, those He predestinated.

Now, the word “adoption” as I have taught you at length and told you everything I know about it, simply means He placed us.

And the word “children” in that verse—is the direct object of the adoption. It's adopted sonship. Really something.

And as you work this some interesting things manifest themselves: we are children of Abraham the Word says by adoption. Number two, Jesus Christ paid the price for our adoption. Number three, we are free born, free (not born)...freed slaves, emancipated slaves. Number four, we as sons of God are accepted by God by irrevocable adoption. Number five, we are born of seed.

When I put this all together, my heart stands in utter amazement, appreciation. And it is so big that God did such a wonderful thing for us, His sons and daughters today, that we were called like in Abraham, adopted him in Christ, we are freed slaves, freed *doulos*, *doulos* that are marked, but we are free. And He has irrevocably adopted us and in addition put seed in us. Five things He's given to every born-again believer. Wait until that hits you someday. Then you'll wonder why you're ever long-faced like a cow {audience laughter} or down in the mouth about anything, about anything. Then you'll see that the only reason we could ever be is either we do not know the Word or at the moment we are not believing what the Word says. Otherwise we would not be down; we'd always be up. For even in the midst of hell, Thou art there, the Word says. So in the midst of all the opportunities with

which we could be confronted we still are what the Word of God says we are and we have what the Word of God says we have. And He put us into five major relationships with Him, predestined us. And He did this by Jesus Christ, and He did it to Himself.

And then “according to” again sets the standard for our predestination to sonship.

“...of his will” is that which pleased Him, His will, His intense desire.

And that’s all that’s to that verse, except for the translations. And this is how I translated it literally according to...whatever it is...literal, then usage later. This is literal from the text, verse 5:

Ephesians 1:5 Literal translation according to usage

And in love He marked us out beforehand unto Himself, even placed us as His adopted sons by Jesus Christ, according to the good pleasure of His will.

Expanded according to usage:

Ephesians 1:5 Expanded translation

And in love God marked us, branded us unto Himself, even placed us as His adopted sons by Jesus Christ, according to that which pleased God’s intense desire.

It could either be translated “in Christ Jesus” or “by Jesus Christ.” And you noticed which one I chose. And the reason I chose this after conferring with Walter and our people in the Research Department is because if you’ll notice the verse carefully, very carefully: and in love God marked us, He branded us unto Himself, even places us as His adopted sons—even placed us as His adopted sons through somebody’s work. Which one? That’s why it’s by Jesus Christ. By the work of Jesus Christ.

I gave you 1 Corinthians 7:23 or bought with a price, all that stuff tells you. Placed us as His adopted sons *by* Jesus Christ according to that which pleased God’s intense will. God’s intense will was Jesus Christ, the coming of His only begotten son, and on the basis of that, Corps, we put the translation “by Jesus Christ” rather than “in Christ Jesus.” because “in Christ Jesus” is fellowship; “by Christ”—“by Jesus Christ” is by what he wrought so that we could be finally in him. That’s why we went with the “by.”