

Pastor Jeremy M. Thomas
Fredericksburg Bible Church
107 East Austin
Fredericksburg, Texas 78624
830-997-8834 jthomas@fbgbible.org

B0848 – December 28, 2008 – Ethics, Values, & Law

We're going to review the Mt. Sinai event, and as a little memory jog keep in mind that all of these events that we study are pictures of great truths of Scripture, you'll be ahead of 90% of believers just to know these events, and to be able to think through what God did in each of these events, which is basically what the truth is that God wants us to know about Himself. The key thing to keep in mind is that this is not private religious opinion, this is public global revelation. Paganism has as its agenda always, everywhere, to suppress this. We're living in a very dark world, which has an agenda behind it; people aren't neutral out there. We're living in enemy territory and we're naïve and stupid if we don't become aware of that. We're in a war, and this stuff is flying all around us, and the center of the attack is to make these events disappear from human memory, to suppress them, to distort them. There are different techniques to do that but the goal is always to completely block out this history.

The Call of Abraham, the Exodus and Mt. Sinai represent another kind of threat to the pagan mind because these events stress God's interference in history. The fact that God has to interfere means that history is abnormal because it's fallen, therefore history is not normative and therefore statistical studies and Gallop poles, getting the mean of distribution doesn't give you the normal. It gives you the normal sinner. That has all kinds of implications that have to be thought through. So these are disruptive truths, they disrupt pagan man's agenda.

Last week at Mt Sinai we showed you the parallels between the Sinaitic Code and the treaties of the Ancient Near East, what were called Suzerainty-Vassal Treaties. These treaties were documents that defined a relationship between kings, the idea was that you had a great king and a lesser king who

entered into some sort of a relationship, and the great king defined the relationship and the relationship was in treaty form. If you do this then I will do that, it was all very personal and as a covenant it measured each king's behavior; here's the standard and how is each king behaving with respect to the standard? Why do we mention this? Because from this point forward we want to stress that the way the Bible speaks of law is not the way society speaks of law, and the pagan mind and the Christian mind are at odds over what law is all about. We want to think this through because the NT is basically rules and regulations also, and society is filled with laws too. So you never get away from law.

We went through each of these six, we showed you the parallels to each one of these six parts between the Sinaitic Covenant and the Ancient Near Eastern Treaties. This kind of legislation was used to define a relationship and so YHWH, God, has a relationship with Israel. That's the analogy. And the relationship is a Father-Son relationship. Therefore, the content of the law has personal address in it. Most law codes aren't like that at all. If you look at most law codes you see if this-then this, if that then that, if so and so does this, then this is what will happen, if so and so does that, then this is what happens, etc. It's all if-then, if-then, if-then, that's the format. But woven into that in the Scriptures YHWH says, "I want you to circumcise your hearts. I say to you that you will come before Me and worship Me. You will bring your sacrifices before Me." There's this personal dimension going on mixed in with the "if-thens." So why do we stress this? Because the law is defined in terms of a personal relationship and that isn't in your national law code. The personal element is completely absent from every ancient and modern law code. In Israel we have the personal law code defining a relationship between A Father, God, and His Son, Israel, Exod 4, "Out of Egypt I have called my son," now we know that the greater fulfillment is in Christ, He's the ultimate Son of God. But what's happening is that God is reigning and His reign is exercised in terms of a personal relationship. Therefore history is intensely personal.

Let's analyze this just a little to get more background for this law code, we want to make sure we understand what law is. Here we have God and man, the Creator-creature distinction. The Creator has certain attributes, He is sovereign, He is holy, He is omniscient, He is loving, He's omnipresent, He's omnipotent, He's immutable, He's eternal. Those are His absolute attributes.

Man is made in God's image as a theomorph, and he has attributes that correspond to God's. We close the box because man is finite; in God's case we leave the box open because He's infinite and can't be boxed in by human language. What's the analogy in man's life to sovereignty? What faculty do we have that corresponds to God's sovereignty? Choice or will. What faculty corresponds to God's holy character, what is it that's sort of a receiver that's tuned to that in every man's heart? Conscience, so man has a conscience. What corresponds in man's heart to God's omniscience? Our desire to know and think, the human knowledge base. Love corresponds to God's love. This is the spiritual and personal correspondence in man.

Here's the problem. If God reveals the law, it's coming out of His infinite character and He's talking to this finite character. That's the law in Scripture. God is the law-giver at Mt. Sinai. If God is the law-giver, then the law expresses His holiness, His knowledge of all things, and is also coming out of His attribute of love. Law isn't given out of hatred. The law was given out of genuine love, because it's the constitution of God's kingdom. What happens if man tries to take over God's role, tries to function as lawgiver? If man tries to rule over man, and create some sort of quote "law," what is the difference between God's law and man's law? That's the heart of the issue here. If God is the One who is giving the law, the law comes out of omniscience, absolute holiness, sovereignty, justice, love and immutability as the Creator, if man tries to make law what's it coming out of? His finiteness. For example, take man's knowledge. How can man generate legislation that is good from his finite resource of knowledge? He may generate what seems good from his limited data set but how does he know all the implications? He can't. That's a fundamental difference between God's law and man's law. Man's law is coming from limited resources.

Once we have man generating law, we're in a dangerous position because he is stupid. And in the Bible, God and God alone generates law. Think about this, from the day we were in fifth or sixth grade we learned there were three functions of government, the executive, the judiciary and the legislative. In Israel, who was the executive, later on he was the one person who really led the country. Who was he? The king, before him the elders, remember the elders of Israel, they were the executive branch. Second, you read passage after passage about how to hold courts, laws of evidence, penalties for crimes, what branch is that addressed to? The judiciary branch, the courts.

Question—where’s the legislature? Why, in this nation of Israel, do you have that branch missing? I don’t read anything about a Congress, I don’t read anything about a Parliament, I don’t read anything like that. Why not? The serious reader of Scripture, if you’re going to read Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers and Deuteronomy, and you think while you’re reading, you should certainly ask, “Hey, where did the law come from?” They’re holding court, what laws are they basing their decisions on? We know where it came from, it came from Mt Sinai, there’s no question about what the legislation was. But it’s interesting and it brings us back to this way of thinking about Scripture that I want to stress.

Think about this Mt. Sinai event. Why did God choose to intervene most directly at the legislative level, and back off and let man do the executive and judicial? There’s a reason for that, and this is not to say that, Gentile nations shouldn’t have any laws, but what is it to say? *It is to say that when man makes his laws, it would be kind of smart if he based them on God’s laws.* That’s the whole point you want to see.

Now, we talk about values, ethics and law. I tie those three together. A lot of people say well, those are three different things. That’s right. Values are things that people hold to, personal values, ethics, the study of standards in society or what standards should be, and then law defines what has been legislated. In our society here’s the problem. We have laws here, and we have different people with different values, say this is one set of values over here, values one, values two, values three, etc. these are values of different groups that are all mixing together into the legislative branch of government and everybody’s compromising to get a law code, it’s just a blend of all the value systems out there. That’s the chaos in the law code, and it’s going to happen as long as you have sinners who come from different perspectives. That’s the doom of autonomous man, man has chosen to reject the word of God, and therefore the laws of nations, including our own, don’t come from the word of God. We don’t have in the Constitution laws directly from God. Men made those laws.

But what we want to see is that the values are separate from the laws, but in the Bible, the laws, the values and the ethics all come together in the Book of Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers and Deuteronomy. Those four books, after Genesis, link these three nouns together. It’s able to link those three nouns

together because God, who is the author of all three of them is speaking them out of omniscience. And when He talks about law the law He's talking about is different than human law. Just like we talked about biology, we talked about geology, we talked about history, and now we're talking about law. It doesn't take too long when you open the Bible that you are getting into every area of life. What are you talking about this is a religious book? This is a book that touches on every subject. I'm sorry if that offends you but I didn't write the Bible, I just read it.

So let's contrast the Biblical view of law with the pagan view of law. On the Biblical basis ethics, values, and law come from above. God spoke them out of His infinite omniscience. But on the pagan basis ethics, values and law come from man's finite knowledge and therefore are 'provincial and transient.'" Who said that, remember the words "the provincial and the transient," they came from a U.S. Supreme Court Justice who went as juror to Nuremberg Germany in 1945. What did he conclude when he had to face the attorneys that were defending the Nazi's? Here you had the S.S. Corps, Goebbels, for example, sitting there in the court room, and the attorneys that defended the Nazi's argued that you cannot prosecute Nazi's because the Nazi's were simply following German law. Weren't they? Of course they were, they made the policies, and they were enforcing the policies. Did they kill Jews for the sake of Mother Germany? Of course they did. They had to get rid of all the inferior beings, thought the Germans. So you get rid of Gypsies, handicapped children, Jews and blacks. That way the gene pool is purged from all the junk DNA and we can get on with creating the perfect human race, which just happens to be us. Were they wrong according to German law? No, they could not be convicted on the basis of German law. So how do you convict them? To what standard do you hold them responsible to if it's not German law? This is a tough question, this was a profound question and in 1945 the only way the world could convict the S.S. people was to say there's another law that stands above German law, and we will convict those men on the basis of that higher law. But that law wasn't written down, that law wasn't the United States Constitution, that wasn't the laws of the British Parliament, that wasn't Spanish or French law, or Italian law. What was this law? Let's think about what Justice Jackson said we can't convict on the basis of laws that are 'provincial and transient.' What did he mean when he said they're provincial? Limited in space, limited to a country; German law applies to Germans, English law applies to English. The legislation by definition applies only to

the country that made it, therefore it is provincial. Of course, 60 years later we're trying to resolve this problem by making international law, then we can legislate anything we want and there will be no one on the outside of the system who could possibly reform it because everyone is encased in the system. And it will be a totalitarian dictatorship, a one world order. That's just around the corner. But 60 years ago Justice Jackson was able to qualify law with a second term, it is also "transient" and that term is inescapable even if you do enact international law code. What does he mean by transient? What did he mean that human legislation is transient? What happens to human legislation if you live more than ten years? It changes, you're driving on Monday and the speed limit is 55, on Tuesday the sign says 70. What happens if I drive 70 on Monday? I get a ticket. What happens if I drive 70 on Tuesday? Nothing. Seems a little unfair and unjust. But this is what happens? The law changes so what was lawless on Monday is lawful on Tuesday? Give me a break here. But that's the point. Human law is transient. So Hitler came along and on Monday killing Jews was wrong but on Tuesday killing Jews was legal, and I killed on Tuesday not Monday so I'm within the law. That's stupid, we all smile at this, but this is the dilemma of pagan law, it can't break free from the provincial and transient.

We operate on the basis of the Bible, and people laugh at us, you Christians, what is wrong with you, you believe in an ancient book. And we think we have to defend ourselves as if they have all the answers and we're the weak ones. No-no! Get away from that, you're the strong ones. It's the unbelieving people trapped in darkness that are the real fools. This is really foolish, because on a human basis all you can ever generate is something that is provincial and transient. And when you come to something like the Nazi's in 1945 you start groping to find some basis on which to judge, so here all the great lawyers of the world and they say, "Well, we've got to convict these guys, look what they did, they gassed handicapped kids and I feel that is wrong, my heart says that's not right" and so these men to get the conviction based that purely on how they felt, an imaginary law, there was nothing written down, no legislature passed a law. From the Christian point of view we know what the higher law is. What is it in all of them that corresponds to God's holiness? Every one of those people in that courtroom had a conscience. They all knew it was wrong what the Nazi's did, including the Nazi's. And by convicting the Nazi's, they were saying, "Yes, we all have a conscience, deep down we all know what is right and what is wrong."

Now we address the pagan view of law. The pagan starts with his mind and tries to make law. He desperately wants to do this. Take Adam in the Garden, when that man ate of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil he tried to become his own moral authority. He tried to mark out the structure of the universe. Yet once he did that he was assuming a role not rightfully his, he was assuming the authority of God, and here's the key. *When man does this he is left completely on his own to build values, ethics and law that can never rise above the arbitrary will of man.* That's a dilemma for the non-Christian, when He rejects God's law he's left to his own devices. It's purely arbitrary legislation. He never knows exactly where to draw the line between what he can do and what he should do. We know there's a restraint on it because he has a conscience. But in his view man is a biochemical machine that arose out of chance evolutionary processes. And out of this come values, ethics and law? I had to go to college to get two advanced degrees to really learn that, and pay \$100,000 in tuition? What a waste. So he is trying to build out from himself values, ethics and law. But on the basis of his limited experience and reason he can never get absolutes. Even in innocence, this is the astonishing record in Scripture, even in innocence Adam needed God's word to interpret his environment correctly and know which trees to eat and which not to. Didn't God point out to him which tree not to eat? Do you think if God hadn't told them a thing it would have been obvious to Adam and Eve that it was a bad tree to eat from? They're in innocence here, no sin around. Isn't this fascinating that even when man was sinless God still has to tell us the structure of reality. Now if that's true when we're sinless how much more now that we're sinful? Adam before the Fall can see pretty well but even then he needed God to tell him things he could not see. Now I'm fallen and I'm walking around blind, think I might need a little guidance? So it's a tremendous argument that even the sinless innocent man needs God's word. If we're to know certain things God must reveal them and in a theological sense anything that a human being knows truly is only because God revealed it to him. It's never attained in a purely autonomous fashion.

Then what happens, now here's something neat that. What we're learning is how pagans think and its how our flesh thinks, really we're learning about our own depraved hearts. But we want to notice something. At this point there's a fork in the road, and paganism has to do one of two things and it always does one of these two things, and it bounces back and forth between

these two things like a pendulum and you can see tendencies in your own heart. The first tendency is what we call **Licentiousness**. These are the people who redefine good and evil so that evil is good. Open your Bible to Rom 1:32. If there was a legal society in the ancient world, it was Rome, so it's ironic therefore that Paul addresses the precise group in the ancient world known for their laws, the Romans, with these words. He says these people, unbelievers, "although they know the ordinance of God, that those who practice such things are worthy of death, they not only do the same, but also give hearty approval to those who practice them." Look at that last clause? What does that mean legislatively? If you really think that way how would that influence your legislation, if you were the law makers? What would you do if you thought that way? Let's read it again, "not only do they do these things, but they give hearty approval to those who practice them." Would you, therefore, start working with the law so what is evil is good and what is good is evil? This is pretty nasty here but it comes naturally to the pagan. Legislate a new morality that fits with his nasty lifestyle. Take euthanasia, get rid of the old timers. We say that's murder, what do the courts in many countries say? "That's mercy." What happened, they legislated that which is evil to be good. This tactic, and this is the psychology behind it, we've got to understand why do we sinners think this way, there's a dynamic, a spiritual dynamic in our hearts that causes this, and we still fight it as Christians. This tactic appears to relieve the pressure of the conscience, if I tell my conscience this is the law, this is right, this is right, and I get other people saying this is right, what am I trying to do to my conscience? I'm trying to turn off my conscience. Law becomes a tool, peer pressure becomes a tool, a tool to turn off my conscience. It's called searing the conscience, hardening the heart. The NT has a lot of names for it. When you do this to your conscience your life tends toward licentiousness. You get very loose living out of this option. Licentiousness perverts standards, twists them. The result is nearly always chaos and social breakdown. Everyone does what is right in his own eyes. Certain types of people gravitate to this, and in fact, if you think about your own flesh you'll see there are areas in your life where you tend to do this; we all have zones in our life where we tend to be licentious.

The opposite reaction is covered in the next verse, and that's the **Legalistic** option. Pagans swing back and forth, back and forth between these two extremes and neither one of them is right. In Rom 2:1 Paul says, "Therefore

you are without excuse, every man of you who passes judgment,” notice, “passes judgment,” see the word judgment or judge, that answers to verse 32 of “approve.” See the two verbs correspond. In verse 32 the licentious option approves evil; in 2:1 legalism judges evil. So in verse 1 it looks like it’s pretty good because legalism at least recognizes there is right and there is wrong. We have this tendency to be legalistic. But here’s the problem, and by the way, think about the results of this. The licentious option always leads to what, eventually? Social breakdown, chaos. Since the licentious option always leads to chaos, then what is it that becomes the threat? Here the man of the flesh is, he wants to go out and raise hell, but he finds out after 3 or 4 weeks that there’s wreckage all over the place. There are consequences to this stuff. Now what’s the threat? What does that do in the psychology of the flesh? I’m threatened by the debris, by the chaos I’ve created, I want some order here, please give me some stability. So there’s a cycle here, you go licentious, that breeds chaos, I’m frustrated so now I want the opposite of chaos, I want order. But how do I get order? I go into legalism. So the flesh swings between these two positions. Paganism has always done this, he can’t stand chaos for long and doesn’t have any ultimate security in God through His Son Jesus Christ, so he generates laws for society, “Hey, lets get some order here.” That’s Rom 2. This is the tactic usually used by those who are very intellectual. “Oh, I have this great vision of this orderly society,” and they work it all out. Do you know who the big guy in western civilization was that did this? He wrote a big book that affected political thought for 2,400 years? He was the guy that used to be read in English classes before we started reading nihilistic people like Hemingway. Plato. He wrote a book called *The Republic*. He was a failed Greek politician, so he retreated into his little monastery and he started thinking, what was the ideal society; he called the ideal society the republic, wrote the book about it, and he became the great political philosopher. The result, however, of the legalistic approach, is usually embarrassing failure and a licentious swing

Why is that? When we started out we said when man tries to do his thing, he doesn’t have these infinite resources, he has finite one’s and further, now they’re fallen, so when I try to do something only the Creator can do perfectly I end up failing. You see now this is a serious dilemma of the flesh, and when we’re out of it, we oscillate back and forth, back and forth, back and forth between on the one hand the tendency to say, “The heck with it,” and go into kind of a chaotic depression, and then we wallow around in that for a while

and don't like it, then we say, "I'm going to have order." And we do this for a while, and then that doesn't work, so then we swing back over here. Apart from the grace of God, a person who is a non-Christian has no rest, he only has these tendencies, back and forth, back and forth, no wonder these people get frustrated and worn out.

Let's turn to 1 Sam 16:7. We want to stress an interesting thing that happens between Samuel and one king. I take you to this passage because in context, perfect passage in context, this is picking out a political leader, and Samuel has been sent by God, so you can conceive of Samuel, if you want to visualize this as God Himself, the Lord Jesus Christ. Samuel stands as representative of the Lord, and he approaches looking for the next king of Israel, and he makes this significant point. "But the LORD said to Samuel," because the Lord's coaching Samuel on the choice, "Do not look at his appearance or at the height of his stature, because I have rejected him;" the BIG guy didn't qualify. Now here's the key, "for God sees not as man sees, for man looks at the outward appearance, but the LORD looks at the heart." When God gave the law at Mt. Sinai, and it was done His way, what was it addressed to and by whom? It was addressed all the way down to the depths of our hearts by one who could see the depths of our hearts. The law of the OT is addressed to the heart, and we see this now, if we come to Mark, because Jesus kept running into these Pharisee types, we'd classify them as the legalists, they were so smart and intellectual, they had a law for everything. But what they did, we can do, in fact it's done all the time in the courts. What they did was take a law addressed to the heart by the King of kings and reduce it to some external law code. They had a whole book of these called the *Mishnah*. Try this one on.

Listen to how stupid this is, I mean, the Pharisees were the police, walking around a society enforcing all this junk. "An egg may not be put beside a kettle on the sabbath so that it shall get cooked. Nor may it be cracked with hot wrappings," see somebody had worked out a sneaky way to cook eggs, you put it just near the kettle or you can take a hot wrapping and wrap the egg so you're not doing any work. So they legislated against all the egg cooking gimmicks. Here's a continuation of the egg cooking, "Nor may it be buried in hot sand or the dust of the road so it gets roasted." So we had four ways that people were cooking their eggs on the Sabbath day without doing any work. I mean, these people were geniuses, and the Pharisees had to go around, and

some guy would figure out a new way to cook an egg on the Sabbath day, so they'd pass another law. They had all these laws; a whole section devoted to cooking eggs. And this is how the legalist gets order.

Now look at Mark 2:23. Now let's see if we can visualize this. Watch this one. "And it came about that He was passing through the grain fields on the Sabbath, and His disciples began to make their way along while picking the heads of grain." What they're doing is just grabbing a head of grain, flicking it to get the grain out and eat it. Snacking! ²⁴"And the Pharisees were saying to Him," and the verb here is they kept saying to Him, they didn't say this once, they kept saying it over and over, oh, look at that, oh, look at that, oh, look at this guy, etc. They probably had box lunches for themselves while this was going on. "And the Pharisees kept saying to Him, See here, why are they doing what is not lawful on the Sabbath?" Now by not "lawful on the sabbath," they meant this; this *Mishnaic* law. It's a violation of this law. Somewhere in there was the grain passage, and article 35.7, paragraph 2 said you couldn't flick grain in the field on the Sabbath. Imagine the scene. These guys are the lawyers, they've been studying that thing ever since they were 17, they know this... you think you know your Bible, they'd quote this sucker by memory. They're following Jesus around, keeping tabs on Him, you're doing this, you're doing that, your breaking this law, your breaking that law. Excuse me, may I ask a question? Who are you accusing of breaking the law? Think of it. Who's being accused of breaking the regulations? The guy that gave it on Mt. Sinai. So you kind of think that there's something wrong with the way these guys are reading their Bibles? Something is wrong about their little regulations. If you're so screwed up that you take the guy who gave you the Law and tell Him He broke it, and He's really an idiot, but you, you're such an expert in the Law, you tell Him what He meant. That's what's going on, that's the irony of this scene in Mark 2. So in verse 25 Jesus gives them a little hint about how they ought to be interpreting Scripture, "And He said to them, Have you never read what David did when he was in need and became hungry, he and his companions." He says, since you guys are such experts, did you ever read what David did when he was in need and became hungry? That was slick, because who was David? He was the king, and they all looked to great King David, the Pharisees, "Oh boy, David, that was the golden age of Israel." Why don't you read his life, when you're over there in the OT, what did he do when he got hungry, he went into the tabernacle and took the showbread right off the golden table and scarfed it down. You think it's wrong

to flick grain, David stole bread from God's house, so how do you like that, did your precious David violate regulation 35.7? You'd better believe he did. What is Jesus getting at? Let's think through lest we drift into a licentious mode. He's not saying that the Law is bad, but what they had done to the Law was bad. They had reduced the law down to a petty regulation that was to be kept, "Don't get caught in the field flicking grain," and that was it, it was purely an external obligation. "I don't do that so I pass the test." But in doing that, and we all do it, but when you do that you're thinking of the law as merely a product of man, it's not addressed to my heart, it's not addressed to my conscience, it's just an obligation. And so when we've done that we've effectively shielded ourselves from Him with whom we have to do. The flesh is so good at this and because I want to feel like I'm a good boy my flesh tends to reduce law to my petty abstentions. Conclusion, verse 27, "And He was saying to them, 'The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath. ²⁸Consequently, the Son of Man is Lord even of the Sabbath.'" We could get into a lot here but the idea here is that once you get into paganism you wind up with a see-saw, going back and forth between licentiousness and legalism, licentiousness and legalism, and both are wrong, because both of them are attempts to live apart from a close personal fellowship with the Lord. That's why the Code of Hammurabi doesn't look like the Code of Moses; the Code of Hammurabi is made by Hammurabi. The Law of Moses was not made by Moses; it was made by the God of Moses who spoke that law, all the way down to the depths of our hearts.

The thing that Law always leads to is what Jesus pointed out here when He said "I am the Lord of the Sabbath," is that if you have law in a Biblical sense, it's given by someone and that someone is Lord. Lordship is always the presupposition of law, because in law I'm responsible. Law is supposed to define right and wrong, I'm held accountable for right and wrong. Accountable to whom? See the dilemma. In a pagan fleshly attitude, what is the answer to the question, "To whom am I responsible?" When there's a Gillespie county building code, or the State of Texas code, or the Federal Law codes, when you're faced with those, to whom are you responsible? You're responsible to society through its lawmaking agencies. But that's not Scriptural; you are responsible for that but only because God tells us to be responsible to that. We are ultimately responsible to Him and Him alone. That's real law, and that's what's missing. So the nature of Lordship is that Lordship is the presupposition of Law, you can't have Biblical law without a

Lord behind that law, with whom you have to do and with whom you have a personal relationship.

Here's an illustration. Jesus said in the Sermon on the Mount, "You have heard it said do not kill lest you be in danger of the court." Now where had they heard that? From the Pharisees. So what was the motive not to kill somebody? You might go to court and get thrown in the slammer! They didn't care about the heart attitude, it was just don't do it because if you do you might get caught, jail time. Now what did Jesus say? If you are angry at your brother you are guilty before the court. In other words, anger in the heart is murder in the heart. They never raised a knife with their physical hand but they had in their heart and therefore they were guilty. See how He, the original lawgiver at Sinai, is directing them back, back to the true heart intent of the law. Because as long as they kept the law disconnected from their heart they were disconnected from the Lord Himself.

In conclusion, I hope we've shown the difference between biblical law and pagan law. Biblical law, because it comes from the verbal speech of an omniscient God into history, is flawless, it combines the elements of ethics, values and law all rolled into one package. Whatever laws he makes in Exodus and Leviticus and so forth, when you see that you're getting a taste of a person who knows all the implications, He has, so to speak, all the factors in the equation. We don't have that when we go to make law. All we have is our finite knowledge and experience and what we generate out of that is, of course, flawed, it creates more problems and we make more laws to fix that, but that contradicts statute 101 and before you know it we're making stupid laws like you can't bowl on the neighborhood sidewalk or plant a garden in the street. There are thousands of dumb laws out there but it's just an effect of a deeper problem, that really man is not sufficient on his own to generate law. And when we step away from His word, we turn Him off then were left on our own. The problem is we're not sufficient on our own, we need His revelation to make just law.

Alright, next time we'll get into a debate that's cropped up in recent years, the Lordship/Free Grace controversy and we'll see if these events of the Exodus and Mt Sinai don't shed some light on the resolution of that problem. And we'll move into the doctrine of revelation. Can God speak into history,

can He get that speech in writing through human authors without error and so forth. That's the doctrine that comes out of the Mt Sinai event.

[Back To The Top](#)

Copyright (c) Fredericksburg Bible Church 2008