

Pastor Jeremy M. Thomas
Fredericksburg Bible Church

107 East Austin

Fredericksburg, Texas 78624

830-997-8834 jthomas@fbgbible.org

B1201 – January 1, 2012

Soteriology - Part2

We're dealing with the Middle Ages chunk of Church History and in this chunk, which ranges from Augustine in the 5th century to Luther and Calvin in the 16th century, the major development, and there were many things going on, don't get the idea this was the only theological thought, there were many great theologians in this period, but so far as the Church's thought, the main development was the doctrine of the atonement. We mentioned a key theologian, Anselm, and his work *Cur Deus Homo? Why the God Man? or Why God Became Man*. Prior to Anselm and, passed down from the church fathers was the idea that the atonement was a ransom paid to Satan. That was held for a thousand years. Anselm observed that the real issue was God's justice and in the Law God's justice required restitution. So he argued that man did owe a price but since man was fallen in Adam he didn't have the assets to pay the price. Therefore, if God was going to be satisfied then He Himself would have to pay the price. And the only way for this to occur was the God-man. The God-man would pay the satisfaction price. So that's the view that fundamentally the cross was necessary because of God's attribute of justice. That met opposition with Peter Abelard who came against Anselm arguing that we have to get the justice of God out of the picture and talk about God's love, God's love is the issue and that's going to so woo me that I'm going to clean up my life and impress God with all the changes I make in my life. This Abelardian Moral Influence Theory has recurred again and again since the Middle Ages. It was held by the Socinians, by the Unitarians, by Liberals and even in some evangelical revivalism. Whenever you hear Christ preached as an inspiring example, a demonstration of the love of God, which by itself isn't false, but if that preaching doesn't go on to describe that the love of God is due primarily to the satisfactory payment that Christ was making on the cross, then what you're hearing is not a sufficient view of the cross, it's missing the most pertinent part.

So that's the objective work of Christ and today we want to move on to the subjective application of the cross. How do we receive the benefits of the cross? This actually was developed at the Reformation, so if you want to segment this off as a distinct period of Church History, then four centuries after Anselm clarified the objective nature of the atonement then the next thing in the logical progression is how do the benefits of the atonement come to me? With this we come face to face with the difference between Roman Catholicism and Protestantism because here's where the Church split, on how we receive the completed work of Jesus Christ. Roman Catholic theology does not differ from Protestantism in its conception of the cross of Christ. They both believe that Christ's death on the cross is the source of the merit. They both believe in the Chalcedonian Christ, they both believe in the Trinity. However, where we disagree is over the issue of how does the merit of Christ come to me?

To look at it we have to look at the issue of sin and its effects on man. You can't talk about salvation and how that's received if you're not clear on sin and the extent of its effects upon man. In the Eastern churches Gnosticism denied, among other things, the responsibility of man. The Eastern Fathers, i.e. the Greek and Russian Orthodox Churches responded by coming down hard on "the liberty of volition." So their reasoning was that the Gnostics were denying that man had free will so they emphasized it. So that's why traditionally early on there was an emphasis on volition in the Eastern part of the Church. That isn't true, by the way, in the Western part of the Church. Why? Because there was a different doctrinal fight going on in the West; there was a different idea to fight against it. "In doing so, however, they avoided delving into the implications of Adam's fall. Western Fathers went further in thinking about the implications of the fall. They, following Augustine and Anselm, saw the fall as corrupting man's volition but not destroying it. I'm going to follow Dr Hannah's discussion of this. He says, "The Fall did not destroy the freedom of the will, but it did limit the choices one can make; that is, humanity is free only to choose evil (choices being a reflection of human nature)." Notice, they were not arguing that your will is destroyed in the fall, you're free to make choices. What they're arguing is that your will has been damaged and perverted so that it makes choices in the wrong direction, always. That's what the Western fathers believed. Left to ourselves, apart from God's grace, we will choose evil every time, not because

we want to be bad people but because we're trying to avoid God. Our natures are contrary to God so we don't want to face Him. We're like Adam, we just hide. So left to ourselves without God's gracious call, where are you now, come talk to me, I'm talking to you, if God didn't do that to us we would forever hide in the bushes. We would recapitulate the story of Adam and Eve over and over in our personal lives. So that's what they meant, it's not that we try to be bad; that's not the picture of a corrupt will. The picture of a corrupt will is that I'm trying to avoid a confrontation with God because I know I'm a sinner.

Now we're going to step back here in church history for a moment. I want to trace where this whole thing got started. It got started with two men, Pelagius and Augustine and the debate is over sin and man's will and the implications for how we are saved. Pelagius was a British monk who had come to Rome (AD354-418). Augustine was the Bishop of North Africa (AD354-430)." Notice they were born in AD354. So both these guys are born in the same year and they had a running argument going with each other. Dr William Shedd said of Pelagius' view, "Pelagius affirmed the freedom of the will, which for him meant that a person always has the ability to choose good as well as evil...such a view of freedom carries implications for the doctrine of original sin. Pelagius denied that human beings derive a corrupt nature from Adam. Rather, Adam's transgression served merely as a bad example to his descendants." The idea is that when you have a baby they're born without a sin nature, they're neutral, nice and cuddly little babies but then they grow up and start doing bad and turn into brats and isn't it interesting, you don't have to teach them to be brats. Go ask 5,000 parents if they ever had to instruct their kid how to be a brat and you'll get the same answer 5,000 times. Well, why is that? See, the problem is that Pelagius didn't explain the universality of sin. Why is it if we are born without a sin nature that the children that are born, every one of them recapitulates the story of Gen 3 in that the child is born good in a Gen 1-2 fashion, like Adam and Eve were created and somewhere along the way they fall in a Gen 3 fashion. So every child recapitulates, so to speak, Adam and Eve.

Well, the fact that Pelagius held to the freedom of the will logically led to the next idea and that is that people can choose to come to salvation all by themselves. Now he wouldn't deny grace completely but God's grace was only there to make a person more readily come to salvation. So we can do it, but

isn't it nice that God helps us along the way. A final implication of Pelagius' doctrine of the freedom of the will and man's ability to come to salvation by themselves is the doctrine of foreknowledge; that God would elect those whom He foresaw would believe with His grace assistance. That's Pelagius.

The guy on the other end of this debate was Augustine. Turn to Romans 5. Rom 5 is the passage that Augustine used to oppose Pelagius. There are some big passages in the Bible, what we might call crux passages and you'll see these in the historic debates and you really should understand them. This was the big passage Augustine used against Pelagius. Rom 5:12, "Therefore, just as through one man sin entered into the world, and death through sin, and so death spread to all men, because all sinned—" now notice this, "death spread to all men, because all men sinned." That's the biblical explanation for the universality of sin. Notice the modern translations have a dash after that last word in verse 12, because it's like a sentence that just stops. So if you stopped at the end of verse 12 you'd say wait a minute, hold it, Adam sinned, sin entered into the world and it spread to all men because I sinned? How did I sin in Adam? Verse 13, "For until the Law sin was in the world; but sin is not imputed where there is no law," in other words, the word "Law" in verse 13 is talking about the Mosaic Law. A Jew would say, well, why is God holding me responsible before the Law of Moses came? How could I as a Jew sin before Moses? But yet before Moses gave the Law you have to say all those people died. So what made them die if they didn't have the Law of Moses to break? Verse 14, "Nevertheless, death reigned from Adam until Moses," notice how he's using physical death and you could say spiritual death is wrapped up in the same package, "death reigned from Adam until Moses," an obvious fact of history, "even over those who have not sinned in the likeness of Adam's offense, who is a type of Him who was to come." So Paul's arguing that because death occurred between Adam and Moses, somehow we must have sinned in Adam even though it's not identical to how Adam sinned, we somehow did sin in Adam. Lamech must have sinned in Adam, Seth must have sinned in Adam, Noah must have sinned in Adam, Abraham must have sinned in Adam, and Isaac must have sinned in Adam. They all died didn't they? So they were under a death sentence. What's the only death sentence prior to the Law of Moses? Gen 2-3. Somehow they ate the tree of the Garden, not in the exact same way Adam did, but somehow in Adam they did eat and that's why Paul concludes in verse 12 that they all died, "death spread to all men," a crux passage. Dr John Hannah explains,

“Augustine argued that by Adam’s first sin, in which the entire human race participated, sin came into the world, corrupting every person both physically and morally. Everyone, being of Adam, is born into the world with a nature that is so corrupted that they can do nothing but sin... For Augustine, the need for grace was central. Our disfigured condition is not so much that we are unable to choose Christ; rather, it is that humanity does not have a desire to know Christ.... Absolute inability on a sinner’s part necessitates a divine initiative and drawing mercies. Further, since humankind is unable to be aware of God’s grace, God could not have determined to save based upon a foreseen response of the sinner.” See how all these things are logically interconnected?

Now you see that early on this was debated and it went on for centuries during the Middle Ages, sort of under the radar because this Pelagius-Augustine debate never really got settled. It kind of got settled but when Luther and Calvin came along it came out into the open because the Roman Catholic Church was saying a similar thing to Pelagius, it wasn’t identical but it was essentially the same thing. One difference was that the Roman Catholics agreed to the unity of all men in Adam and participated in his first sin, however, they had a way of getting rid of it, and they generated the sacrament of baptism. What this did was you take the infant, baptize him and this washes away the original sin in Adam and now the infant has free will, the ability to choose both good and evil. As Hannah says, “Baptism, having removed the guilt of Adam’s sin, leaves the child in a state of innocence with a free will that may or may not choose to sin.” See how similar that sounds to Pelagius? That’s because it essentially is Pelagianism. And Luther and Calvin were reading the Pelagius-Augustine debate and they said now wait a minute, you guys haven’t answered Augustine, you haven’t answered Rom 5. And that’s what’s underneath this issue of salvation because if you grant that men are free from the guilt of Adam’s sin then you have to grant what Pelagius granted, that men can come to salvation on their own and God’s grace is just sort of there to help you get there faster. But if, as Paul in Rom 5 and Augustine and Luther and Calvin argued, we have sinned in Adam and we have a corrupt nature in Adam, how then can we ever be saved? How are the benefits of Christ ever brought to us when we’re not even looking for them? That’s the issue of the Reformation.

In Roman Catholic theology sin was not as deeply problematic in man as it was in Protestant theology. The Catholics spoke of sin only as evil actions whereas the Protestants spoke of sin in terms of our very nature. For example, the idea of baptism in Roman Catholic theology is that it removes original sin, and that what happens is that you have post-baptismal sins that have to be dealt with, and you deal with those by penance, unction...those sacraments are the ways those post-salvation sins are taken care of, mostly penance. But as far as the deep Reformation emphasis on the sin nature, you don't have that in Roman Catholic theology. And there's a bunch of theological issues that are tied into this; it's not just an issue of the sacraments, it's not just an issue of what constitutes faith, but it's an issue of what is sin, how deeply does sin permeate the human condition, God's grace, those issues. All of that was the battleground.

When you come to Luther you have another debate. He goes to battle with Erasmus and you can tell from the titles of the two books what the issue was between these guys. Luther's book was *The Bondage of the Will*. Erasmus' book was *The Freedom of the Will*. So the debate is on the human will again and Luther argued that the human will would only act in accordance with the sinful nature, so you are free, free from righteousness, you don't have any righteousness at all, and you're free to sin, sin as much as you like. Or put more bluntly, everyone can go to hell in his own way, it's just choosing what road you want to travel to get there; you have a right to choose your road to perdition. But there's no desire, apart from God's effectual call, apart from God's grace, in our hearts to come to Jesus Christ any more than there was any desire in Adam and Eve's heart to come out of hiding in the bushes until the Lord in the Garden called out and He initiated the conversation.

Erasmus' argument: Erasmus was a good Roman Catholic, and his argument was that through the sacrament of baptism the infant's original sin was washed away and therefore the will is free; you can make good choices, you can make bad choices, there's nothing wrong with your nature. Here's the Council of Trent on the matter - Trent is a bit later, they had to get this down after all this explosion with Luther and Calvin so in 1545-1563 they hash this out and 95% of Roman Catholicism today comes from Trent, they stated it: "If anyone denies, that, by the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, which is conferred in baptism, the guilt of original sin is remitted; or even asserts that the whole of that which has the true and proper nature of sin is not taken away...let

him be anathema,” let him be cursed. That is a direct attack on Luther and Calvin’s theology out of Rom 5:12. As Charles Clough states, “After the sacrament of baptism, that is said to regenerate, the child is left in a state of innocence with a free will, though, for some reason, still chooses sin.” So they still haven’t answered the problem of universal sinners. Why, if all those little infants are baptized and they have this freedom to do good or do evil, do they all become brats? Why is sin ubiquitous? I mean, what’s the deal, why is it you never have one out of a million that chooses the good, why do they all choose the bad, why do they naturally do that? There’s something wrong here, there’s something abnormally wrong with everybody, including children. And the “something” that is wrong is the fact that we have a sin nature and it doesn’t just get washed away in infant baptism. And it’s not just that our problem is personal sins.

There are three areas of sin and we want to remember these because people usually think of only one of these. The one everybody thinks about is personal sin, that’s acts of sin, thoughts of sin, that sort of thing. Rom 3:23, “All have sinned and fall short of the glory of God.” Most people say okay, I agree with that, personal sin. The problem is there are two other kinds of sin that are involved. One is Rom 5:12, “Just as through one man sin entered into the world, and death through sin, and so death spread to all men, because all sinned—,” notice past tense on the verb sinned at the end of verse 12, all have “sinned.” That is, somehow we all sinned in Adam. Well, how did we sin in Adam? You go on and the argument basically says that Adam is a representative, a federal head of the human race, and we are all under that, and we call that imputed sin, i.e. sin that is credited to our account because we are “in Adam,” who is “a figure of Him who was to come.”

People say imputed sin is unfair; if I was in the Garden I wouldn’t have sinned. Come on! They say it’s unfair but if you notice Adam is a likeness of one who shall come and that “who shall come” is the Lord Jesus Christ. So the federal headship of being in Adam that everybody says is unfair turns out to be a blessing, because being sinful in Adam is the reason why we can be righteous in Christ. That’s why His righteousness can be credited to our account. So you can say it’s not fair, I wasn’t physically in the Garden of Eden and I didn’t physically eat the fruit, but hey, look at the other end of the structure - we’re credited with that sin so that we can have a righteous federal head die for us and credit us with His righteousness. We didn’t

generate that righteousness. So if the federal headship of Adam's sin is unfair then it's unfair for Jesus' righteousness to be credited to our account. Those are similar structures. This is heavy but important theology here.

The Bible insists there is a unity to the human race that goes beyond biological unity. Every one of us carries the DNA of Adam; notice I said Adam; I didn't say Adam and Eve. Why didn't I say Adam and Eve? Because Eve's DNA came from Adam. Eve was created in a special way. People say oh that was just a little mythical story. No, no no! Genesis 2 in the story of the creation of Eve is meant to be literally true, that the woman's genetic makeup was taken out of Adam so that both male and female together are under that one unified head, Adam.

So we have personal sin and imputed sin, but that's not all. There's also inherent sin, or a sin nature, so in Rom 7 Paul deals with that one; what we call inherent sin. The Lord Jesus Christ has to deal with all three of these; the salvation package has to cope with all three kinds of sin. Rom 7:7, "What shall we say then? Is the Law sin? May it never be! On the contrary, I would not have come to know sin except through the Law; for I would not have known about coveting if the Law had not said 'You shall not covet.' 8But sin, taking opportunity through the commandment, produced in me coveting of every kind," see in verse 8 the subject of the verb "produced" is a noun and it is "sin." That sin there isn't imputed sin and sin there isn't personal sin, that is a sin power that is in us, and that's inherent sin. So all three of these are involved, and this is why when you deal with salvation you have got to have a plan that deals with all three aspects of sin. And your understanding of the plan of salvation hinges on your understanding of sin and how deep it permeates the human condition. That's why the Reformers called it total depravity, they just meant that in all aspects of our being we are depraved, we are comprehensively depraved, they didn't mean everyone was as bad as they possibly could be, just that every aspect of their being was tainted with sin. So when we come to the finished work of Christ, how does this handle it? Can the sacraments handle it? Well, if you have a foggy view of sin then this whole discussion about the work of Christ and sacraments gets foggy.

So if, for example, you're thinking, as it happened sometimes in the Reformation debates, only in terms of personal sin, then you come up with some screwy ideas, because now you're talking about the quote from Trent:

“If anyone denies, that, by the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, which is conferred in baptism, the guilt of original sin is remitted; or even asserts that the whole of that which has the true and proper nature of sin is not taken away... let him be anathema.” Well now, we all know that the men who wrote that paragraph at the Council of Trent certainly weren’t teaching perfectionism. They weren’t that far out. So when you see that sentence, “the whole of that which has the true and proper nature of sin is not taken away” by baptism, what they are referring to is some kind of sin the infant picked up by the act of generation. Of course they’re talking a little bit about the imputed sin, the credit, etc. But it’s a little foggy there; it’s personal sin that is the real issue. And you can go back and you can read these documents and when you read them you say well wait a minute, what are these guys talking about? Are they talking about imputed sin or inherent sin or personal sin? You start asking those questions and it’s not clear when you’re reading them, which means that they probably weren’t clear either. That was one of the issues that came out of the Reformation.

Let’s see some of the results of all this. “Trent’s theology *views forgiveness as applying only to past sins,*” plural, “*not past-present-and future- sins*” as a package deal. In other words, in time the atonement of Christ carries you up to the present, not into the future. There’s the difference. In the Protestant gospel of Luther and Calvin, and the people of the Reformation, when you believed all sins past, present and future were forgiven and that’s why they talked about justification as an instantaneous completed thing.

In Roman Catholic theology they use the word “justification” but what they mean is the process of going through the sacraments of baptism, penance, marriage, do some more penance, maybe at death extreme unction, etc. justification is a process that occurs throughout your life. So they use the word “justification” but they do not mean the same thing as the Protestants meant by the word, and unfortunately they didn’t coin a new word, so when you hear somebody say on the Roman Catholic side of the issue, they’re talking about well I believe in salvation by grace, they can literally say that. Of course, they believe in salvation by grace, they believe in justification, but to get into the content of what they mean when they use the words, they don’t mean what Luther and Calvin meant by them. So it gets greasy in the conversations because both sides are using the same words but both sides are

defining the words differently. So you can have a conversation and talk right past one another.

Here's where it gets very practical. The Roman Catholic Church, Mother Church, retained full control over dispensing Christ's meritorious work on the Cross at their discretion. In other words, if the sacraments are the means through which this grace comes to man; and it's the Church that controls the sacraments, guess who's in charge of dispensing salvation? See, you can't be saved outside Mother Church. This is where you see that Roman Catholicism is actually a Church with a lot of power wrapped up in it. This is the core of the power. It's not papal infallibility; papal infallibility wasn't declared until a little over a hundred years ago. That may shock some people but infallibility is the doctrine that was not articulated until the mid-nineteenth century. So the power of Catholicism has been always in the power to control the dispensing of grace through sacraments, and this is what gave them political power and social power and religious power. They control salvation and that means they control you.

I'll give you an example. It's happening right here to a family in our congregation. We have a person who is out of a family that has a Roman Catholic background. The person wants to do certain things in a Protestant Church and this just drives the rest of the family crazy. They can't handle this because this death thing has to happen under one of the sacraments; Unction, there are seven sacraments and unction is the last one, and the priest has to go through this extreme unction and if they don't then they're lost. So you can understand the pain of the people who are devout Roman Catholics trying to think this through, no sacrament at death, no priest, none of that. Well what kind of future does this person have? So we have to understand the mentality of what's going on here and why these family conflicts arise and can become very, very disruptive and not easy to deal with because we're dealing with two completely different systems of approaching this matter.

The next step, let's see what happened. The Roman Catholics all over Europe, along with the Council of Trent, etc. started shooting at the Protestants and here's the bullet they used: you guys are ruining the spiritual lives of everybody on this continent because you're going around France, Germany, northern Europe, and you're preaching to the people in the street and

everywhere else that when they're justified they're completely justified at that moment in time, that their sins have been forgiven, past, present and future and they are righteous in Christ. And that is a big mistake because you just removed all incentive to live a godly life.

See the argument? It's still going on, even in our own circles because there are people in evangelical Christianity that hold the same thing, if you start telling people they can know they are saved then by golly, there won't be any motive to live the Christian life. So let's address the issue of motive. Let's look at the motive. If it's really true that at baptism I am saved from the past sins but not the present sins, then it means that as I walk through my life the motive to live a godly life is fear, I mean, I may not make it to the end and I don't know. I have to keep on this track of the sacraments and if I don't and then I die, boom, oh no. So the motive to live a godly life in Roman Catholicism is fear. It's true, the Bible says live in the fear of the Lord, but is it that kind of fear? Is it the fear that God is a bogey man and He's going to keep my salvation in front me until I shape up? Or is it fear of His character, who He is as an awesome God? That was the issue the Protestants, the original Reformers, Luther and Calvin had to deal with and they are right on the front end of the Reformation.

Their argument was that fear is not the motivation to live the Christian life, where do you read that in the epistles? The epistles are all gratitude, it's a gratitude because God has saved me, I'm looking back on what He's done for me, and then because I am thankful for what He's done then I want to live for His glory. So what looks like a hairy theological thing has a very practical result here. The issue is, is the motivation fear or is the motivation gratitude? To this day there are still people who argue that we've got to have a little fear here because if we don't have a fear people won't follow the road. They're partly right in the sense that there is an area in the NT epistles that does involve the motivation for fear, but it's not fear of eternal damnation, it's a fear of God's discipline in my life temporally, physically, loss of rewards and that is in the New Testament epistles. God has a paddle and He's not afraid to use it. And there's no social worker that's going to intervene with how God disciplines His children. God can discipline very physically; in fact, He can kill us, 1 Cor 11. We read 1 Cor 11 at every communion service, and what does it say? It says for this cause, people that treat communion like it's a big party for the flesh "sleep among you." What's he talking about sleep? They're

not sacked out in the aisle. They're talking about somebody that physically died. So there's the extreme discipline of the Lord, but it's not loss of salvation. If you look at those passages like 1 Cor 5 it, in fact, says that God disciplines a person so that He saves his soul, it's keeping the person saved to take Him out.

So the Calvinists responded by saying, well, there does have to be good works. It's faith alone that saves but the faith that saves is never alone and so they turned the issue away from Christ and made the issue the kind of faith you had in Christ and that has come down to our day.

Then came along the Socinians and they were rationalists, they believed whatever made sense to them. Calvinism did not make sense to them because we're free to make choices and Calvinism is too strong on the sovereignty of God so that's when Jacobus Arminius came along to try to answer the Socinians. So he tried to elevate man's free will again. "Whereas Calvinism saw regeneration as the Holy Spirit overcoming a fallen will, Arminianism saw regeneration as a strengthening of man's natural abilities." The corollary truth was that God foreknew who would believe of their own free will and those are the one's God chose. God seconds the motion.

Out of this theological milieu came more radical departures from Reformed Theology. In our country what's wrecked Bible Christianity more than anything else is the next historical step. "Socinianism led to Deism and Unitarianism particularly in Colonial America." Colonial America, near the end, was not a Bible-waving Bible-thumping society. There were genuine Christians and Christianity had strong influence, but also embedded in later Colonial American thought was a lot of Deism and eventually Unitarianism. "This movement consistently rejected orthodox Christian theology at nearly every point. Having rejected Biblical authority, Thomas Jefferson cut the miracles out of his Bible, he rejected the supernatural, rejected the Trinity, he was a deist and the people that came out of that were the Unitarians and most of them were in the New England states, "They rejected Chalcedon Christology," meaning Jesus Christ is God and man, they rejected "the judicial accomplishments of the Cross," meaning they focused on God's love, they redefined sin and focused on man's freedom of will. "Left with the inexplicable universality of human sin, this movement thought of sin as a mere tendency to follow foolishness that could be eradicated by education"

and take note of this one, because this is still with us politically today, they thought that “foolishness could be eradicated by education and moral example.”

The hope was that through education we could improve society. See this is where the study of history gives you insight into what what’s gone wrong here. What’s the background for this whole point in this definition of sin? If you’ve mis-defined sin you’ll be a sucker for all the self-improvement programs because the self-improvement programs are all founded on a false view of what’s wrong with man. They view it as mere foolishness. Is sin foolishness? Yes it is. Can some of it be restrained? Yes. Sure. But the root of sin is not taken care of by a self-improvement program, or an educational program.

Unless sin is dealt with at the root level, education just makes us sin more effectively. After all, who can murder and kill more people, a people that can design bigger and better bombs. Think of World War II, what was the greatest, the one nation in Europe that was known for its universities? And who started World War II. So the whole point is that education doesn’t save and cannot save because structurally it doesn’t deal with the root of the issue, the sin nature. The gospel does deal with that and the gospel is excluded from the public education system by definition. So that’s why it’s bound to fail, and you will never find in our society today a public educational system that will ever be successful. This is not a slam on the poor people that are trying to make it, the teachers. The Christian men and women that are in there slugging away every day in that system are trying to just have some education happen, we’ve got to have some, but after all is said and done, if there’s not a conversion experience with Jesus Christ you can kiss it off as far as any profound affects it’s going to have because the entire framework of thinking is different. You will never learn the biblical paradigm in the public education system because by definition it is anti-biblical.

Alright, so that’s the story of sin and grace and it shows how they are profoundly interrelated, you cannot understand salvation if you don’t understand sin. Whenever sin is taken lightly man gets his hand in the plan of salvation.

[Back To The Top](#)

Copyright (c) Fredericksburg Bible Church 2012

