

***Pastor Jeremy M. Thomas***  
***Fredericksburg Bible Church***  
*107 East Austin*  
*Fredericksburg, Texas 78624*  
*830-997-8834    [jthomas@fbgbible.org](mailto:jthomas@fbgbible.org)*

**B1040 – October 3, 3010 – Doctrine Of Impeccability Applied**

Let's begin by turning to Matt 12:34. I want to begin looking at some of the problematic passages we've discussed in connection with the impeccability of Christ. To work our way there, we've looked at the Birth of the King and in connection with that we talked about the hypostatic union doctrine. Remember that the Birth of the King introduces into history the God-man. Because He is the God-man, because He is undiminished deity and true humanity in one person that sets up everything else that we study in connection with Jesus Christ.

When we come to the Life of the King what doctrine have we studied? His kenosis. Kenosis is His emptying. What was His emptying? He emptied Himself of the independent use of His divine attributes. God the Son, when He became incarnate, could have exercised, *could have* exercised His omnipotence on any occasion. For example, when Satan tempted the Lord Jesus Christ to turn stones into bread, He could have done that. But He refrained from doing that because it wasn't His Father's will, and He accepted that humble role. So kenosis reveals the attribute of humility, and it shows that in the Christian worldview the key or cardinal virtue is the virtue of humility before God, a submission to His will; not my will be done but Thy will be done. Everything else rolls from there; humility has to be there first. Then we can move. The process of us moving from pride of arrogance to humility is repentance. That's a definition of repentance. It's a change of mind with respect to who we are as creatures relative to Him. So Jesus Christ always and forever demonstrated this humble creature attitude.

Having studied the doctrine of kenosis we moved on to a second doctrine that falls out of the Life of the King; the doctrine of impeccability, i.e. Christ's perfection. He was impeccable, He was perfect, He lived a perfect life. We

started this doctrine by giving a series of Bible references that make people question His perfection. “Jesus calls His opponents ‘snakes,’ ‘hypocrites,’ ‘adulterers,’ ‘children of hell,’ and ‘whitewashed gravestones’ (Matt 12:34; 15:7; 16:4; 23:15, 27). In spite of His own teaching not to call people fools in Matt 5:22, Jesus calls His enemies fools in Matt 23:17. In Mark 11:13-14 Jesus curses a defenseless fig tree. In Matt 15:26 He calls a seeking Gentile woman ‘a dog.’ At least twice He appears abrupt with His own mother (Matt 12:48; John 2:4). In Matt 8:21 Jesus is harsh toward traditional Jewish family loyalties, and in John 2:15 He assaults businessmen, damages their wares, and blocks public access.” Needless to say, the Lord Jesus Christ manifested some behaviors that would be seriously criticized today if people read the Bible. So we’re going to look at them by way of introduction today. In Matt 12:34 He speaks very harshly. He says “You brood of vipers, how can you, being evil, speak what is good? For the mouth speaks out of that which fills the heart.” That’s pretty rough talk. How’d you like somebody to call you a snake? And the snake is a metaphor for you know who, so this is what He’s basically calling people in the street when He’s confronting them.

We show these passages to show that it’s not quite so easy to talk about Christ’s life when, because people tend to and we all tend to do this, we talk about Christ and what we’re really taking about is an image we’ve projected of who He was and how He acted. We need to correct that with the text of Scripture, because He wasn’t what we’re projecting. And the problem comes when we compare the actual data to our projected standards and we conclude that Jesus didn’t fit our standards. There are many things Jesus did that we would say are un-Christ-like. Yet He’s the model of Christ-likeness. So if we aren’t living according to the model He gave us then we’re the one’s that are un-Christ-like, not Him. The Church doesn’t like to hear this because they’ve projected and projected and projected and they’ve lived and lived and lived, all according to a false image of Christ and the only thing you can conclude is they tried to be Christ-like but they were un-Christ-like. We don’t project the standards. To project standards is the height of rebellion against God’s standards. Christ is the standard. And we need to adjust to Him.

Turn to Matt 15:22 for another one. “And behold, a Canaanite woman came out from that region, and began to cry out, saying “Have mercy on me, Lord, Son of David; my daughter is cruelly demon-possessed.” In verse 23, because she’s a Gentile, look at His reaction, “But He did not answer her a word.”

How's that for good manners? "And his disciples and implored Him, saying, "Send her away, because she keeps shouting at us." Apparently she was a very persistent woman, she kept saying it over and over, so the disciples said let's get her out of here, tell this lady to buzz off. <sup>24</sup>"But He answered and said, 'I was sent only to the lost sheep of the house of Israel.'" That's a true expression, because remember that the Messiah's role in history was to come to Israel and present Himself as the Messiah so He could bring in the Kingdom of God. This is why Jesus was sent. He wasn't sent to talk to this lady. Not yet. He's going to after the cross and after the resurrection the thing will go out to the world, but not now. In verse 24 Jesus correctly responds to this woman, "I was sent only to the lost sheep of the house of Israel." Over and out. But v 25, "she came and began to bow down before Him, saying, 'Lord, help me!'" <sup>26</sup>And He answered and said, 'It is not good to take the children's bread and throw it to the dogs.'" How's that for a nice Christ-like statement? These are in the Gospels and when you read the Bible you have to, in your imagination, put yourself in the situation to see this. Many people aren't prepared to see this side of Jesus, because they don't read carefully the text of Scripture and the portrait the Holy Spirit is painting here of the Savior. Of course He's doing it to bring things out of her. This could be a whole sermon in itself because this is how He works with us often times. When you pray to Him, sometimes you don't seem to get an answer and you wonder and you seem to get the cold shoulder and what turns out afterwards is that that was a little maneuver on His part to get you to do something. This is one of those neat little give and take situations that's going on here. So he says to her, apparently impolitely and rudely, verse 26 "It is not good to take the children's bread," that is the Jews. The bread of the Jews is salvation, it's the Messiah, so it's not good to take the spiritual blessings of the Jews "and throw it to the dogs." That is, give it to the Gentiles. That's very Jewish...an intensely Jewish Jesus here! From start to finish the Lord Jesus Christ was a Jew of Jews. The Church has lost something when it loses that Jewish background. Verse 27 "But she said," a very quick-witted woman, not to be outwitted, she replies to Him, "Yes, Lord; but even the dogs feed on the crumbs which fall from their master's table." This woman had her theology straight, somehow the Holy Spirit had worked in her life so she recognized something about Jesus, because notice the position she takes in that phrase, "but even the dogs feed on the crumbs which fall from their master's table." This isn't a case of the master bending down and saying let's give a treat to the little puppy. That's not the picture.

The picture she has is that the people aren't even paying attention to the dogs, they're just wandering around the table and some crumbs happen to fall off and the dog comes over and licks them up. In other words, she recognizes that there's a blessing to be had almost as a peripheral incident to the plan of God for Israel. Of course, Paul develops this theme in Romans 11: that we are the branches that have been grafted in, but we're not the natural branch, we're the grafted in branches, respecting this Jewish tradition. You can't escape it when reading the Bible that we're not center stage.

So here she submits, she says okay, I'm a dog, but even a dog can eat the crumbs from the master's table. Now look at the response; look at this response on the Lord's part, because He knew this was going to happen, He was just trying to bring this out of her, like He does with us. Verse 28, "Then Jesus answered and said to her, 'O woman, your faith is great; be it done for you as you wish.' And her daughter was healed at once." So He recognizes in the statement of verse 27 that she had perceived who He was, she'd linked Him with the salvation of the world, she realized that salvation to the world comes through the Jewish nation. She respected that, she didn't challenge it, she didn't put her two cents in, well, I believe everyone has their own path to God. None of that stuff. She submits completely to the Jewish program. If that's the way God's designed the plan of salvation I salute and say "Yes Sir", and I go with it. She had her theology together. The point we're making here is the Lord would not pass our standard of manners here. Jesus would be labeled a racist by our society's standards.

Turn to Matt 12:47, another situation to look at. This one shows you how blunt the Lord Jesus could be, even within His own family, watch this one. "While He was still speaking to the multitudes, behold His mother and His brothers were standing outside, seeking to speak to Him." This is your own family waiting on you, they're out in the heat of the day they didn't have air-conditioning, and they don't have lazy boy recliners. <sup>47</sup>"And someone said to Him, 'Behold, Your mother and Your brothers are standing outside seeking to speak to You. <sup>48</sup>But He answered to the one who was telling Him, and said, 'Who is My mother and who are My brothers?' <sup>49</sup>And stretching out His hand toward His disciples, He said, 'Behold, My mother and My brothers! <sup>50</sup>For whoever shall do the will of My Father who is in heaven, He is My brother and sister and mother." That doesn't seem very nice. One of the interesting facts of history, when He said these statements, probably the only believer in

His family was His mother. His sisters and His brothers, presumably in the Gospels from notes on them, none of them were believing in Him (John 7:5). That's actually a good source of encouragement, because you may come in a family where you've been faithful to witness for the Lord, and live the Christian life, and yet nothing happens. The family just goes on its merry way to hell, literally. You begin to get a sense, and often Satan will do this to you - throw you the curve ball, it's your fault, you're not living the life right, and it's your fault that they don't become Christians, you screwed up. If that's so, how do you explain this one? The Lord Jesus Christ screwed up? Didn't live the Christ-like life in front of His brothers and sisters, that's why they didn't believe? That can't be. See how silly that reasoning is. This refutes that kind of reasoning. They didn't become Christians, the ones who did, until after the resurrection (1 Cor 15). We don't have all the data but there's not any evidence of it in the Gospels other than His mother, Mary and we find Jesus strikingly distant and harsh with all of them.

There are these startling things about the way He acted and things He said that bothered people, including those who wrote the NT, because they're recording these events. Somewhere the Holy Spirit laid it on Matthew's heart (Matthew is writing) oh yeah, I remember that day, I'm going to write about it. I was there when it happened and I want the readers of my gospel to see what I observed of the Lord Jesus Christ, and here's one of the things that happened one day, I'm going to tell you about it, it was a real ripper. So he put it in his Gospel, and it's there because the Holy Spirit wanted to show us the true portrait of Christ.

This all has to do with this question of the impeccability of Christ, His perfection, His moral perfection. Was He perfectly sinless? According to the Creator's standards, yes He was. According to our standards, probably not. But it shows you how far off our standards are. What may seem right to us isn't necessarily right, that's why we have this book, that's why it's so critical to know this book. Southern hospitality is not exactly this book. This book is a Jewish book and through the lens of Jewish culture embodied in Jesus Christ God revealed the true standard. Did He learn obedience to the Father? Yes He did, He had to be sanctified.

Look at this from the standpoint of what we've learned so far in the hypostatic union. In the hypostatic union Jesus Christ is God; Jesus Christ is

man. As God, He doesn't need more holiness; as God He is complete in every way. We go through the attributes of God; God is sovereign, God is love, God is holy, God is omniscient. God's holiness doesn't have to be added to, purified or perfected. God is unchanging; He is the same yesterday, today and forever, another divine attribute. Since God is immutable and holy, His holiness doesn't need to change. There's no growth process in God.

But Jesus Christ as man developed physically, He developed spiritually. He developed righteousness. He developed righteousness? How did he develop that? He developed that by handling the trials and pressures of life by faith, obeying His Father. Here was a trial, He obeyed. Here was another trial, He obeyed. Here was a pressure, He trusted the Lord. Here was something, He trusted the Lord. Here He obeyed God's will, so forth and so on. This went on and on and on day after day. He spent time with the Lord. In Isaiah 50 the Lord Jesus Christ was awakened in the morning. The Father would call to Him, and teach Him in the morning, every morning, morning by morning He would do this. So He was always looking at Scripture, He was always in training, learning to discern in His humanity the Father's will. He learned the Scriptures like no one has ever learned them, a tremendous student of the word of God. And through applying it in the pressures of life He developed righteousness.

The point is that Jesus had to be sanctified, and there are passages in the Scripture that prove that. In the book of Hebrews you can see several passages that speak of that process. What we want to do is carefully remember. Back when we studied the OT we went through the doctrine of sanctification. As far as the Phases of Sanctification go we spent a lot of time on the first two. On one hand the position, we went through the Call of Abraham and the Abrahamic Covenant promises mark out the position, that's not going to change, that's the nation's position under God. Jesus had a position under God in God's plan. But Jesus Christ also had experience under the Sinaitic Covenant. We studied the Sinaitic Covenant and Israel was given things to do, to respond to. Jesus was under the Sinaitic Covenant and He had to apply what He was learning from the Sinaitic Law and apply that perfectly in His life.

We said the Aim of Sanctification is to develop loyalty to God, and that's true of the Lord Jesus Christ. He had to develop loyalty to God. He didn't come with it all there; He generated it by walking by faith and obeying.

As far as the Means of Sanctification being both Law and Grace; grace is somewhat problematical to use that word in Jesus Christ's case because He really didn't need grace in the way we define it here; grace is God's initiative toward sinners. Jesus wasn't a sinner. But Law, certainly; dependence on the Holy Spirit, certainly.

As far as the Dimensions of Sanctification, the existential present and long-term growth. He lived in the existential present but again, it's hard to apply that to Jesus Christ because that dimension is related to personal sin and Jesus Christ didn't have any personal sin. So he was never convicted of sin, therefore He never confessed any sin and was never restored to fellowship. He was always in fellowship. I do always the things which please My Father. Well, if always means always then He never had any sin to confess. But in terms of the long term growth, yeah, He did grow over the long term. It was a straight ride, always upward growth; it wasn't a bumpy ride - it was a smooth ride for Jesus Christ.

As far as the Enemies of Sanctification; the world, the flesh and the devil. He had to put up with the world. Think about it. Here's purity, the Lamb of God without spot or blemish walking through a horrid, stinking death camp and coming out the other side without sin. Think of the magnitude of that accomplishment. He had to face the devil, head to head, temptations for 40 days and 40 nights, not just three temptations, we hear sermons on the three temptations of Christ, it wasn't just three temptations. We read of three, but if you read the text carefully it says 40 days and nights of temptations. We just getting a sampling in the Gospels of what He had to face as far as temptations from the devil. The flesh, again, He didn't have to face that enemy because He never sinned and the flesh is acquired by sinning. So there is one trait that is inherited contrary to Darwin. Lamarck argued for the inheritance of acquired characteristics and in one case he was right, once sin is acquired it's inherited, father to son, father to son down through the human race, but by the virgin birth He avoided that inheritance so He didn't have the flesh. But apart from that all that is true of our sanctification was true of the Lord Jesus Christ's sanctification. There's a precise analogy,

because He is true humanity that means that the Lord Jesus Christ can rightly be our model. He gives us a model of what righteousness looks like for a person. Where His sanctification and our sanctification are different concerns the issue of sin which involve grace, confession of sin and the flesh. But the rest of the sanctification was like us and Jesus Christ, in His humanity, was sanctified.

We defined the doctrine of impeccability, and we said theologians have done it two ways, primarily because of the vocabulary. One of them is *non posse peccare*, 'not able to sin,' and the other one is *posse non peccare*, 'able not to sin.' 'Not able to sin' means something different from 'able not to sin.' 'Able not to sin' means there's a possibility that He would sin, that there's a window of opportunity there. He was able to go positive or negative in each circumstance in life. But 'not able to sin' is stronger in that it says that He will never go negative.

The difficulty is if He is not able to go negative, was He really tempted? That's what theologians have struggled to say. This is why we said that if you think of it in terms of human responsibility and divine sovereignty it helps, because the first thing, 'able not to sin,' is clearly and undeniably a human situation. 'Not able to sin' has clearly and undeniably a divine situation, meaning that in the plan of God it was certain that the Lord Jesus Christ would never sin. That's His sovereignty. What happens is if you combine God's sovereignty and human volition in the same person? You've got them united in one person. So as God, Jesus Christ is 'not able to sin'; as man He is 'able not to sin'; because they're in one person. However, both statements apply, one to each nature. But as a person altogether, He's looked upon as 'not able to sin.' It's very difficult to state because the language we're trying to apply can't totally encompass Him.

That's why "the first statement, 'not able to sin' refers to the uncreated..." *uncreated*, remember Creator-creature distinction, always think of Creator-creature distinction. "Not able to sin refers to the uncreated divine nature. The verb 'able,'" watch it now, "the verb 'able' here takes on meaning from divine sovereignty. The second statement, 'able not to sin' refers to created human nature. In this statement the verb 'able' takes on meaning from human experience. Because of the hypostatic union, both must apply to Jesus Christ. *The verb 'able', therefore, has different meanings in the two*

*statements. No logical contradiction exists.*” This is what happens in a lot of discussions and it’s going to happen, we’re going to get wrapped around an axel in the death of Christ. For whom did Christ die? People like to make a big issue out of this. I’ve often sensed that we’re talking by one another when we talk this way. I’ve always gotten that feeling and it comes about because of meanings that we’re importing into these words. You’ve got to be careful about that.

What happens, if you look at that sentence, the verb to be “able”... (and this is a good illustration of Aristotelian logic versus Biblical logic), people say what do you mean there are two logics? Here’s an example of what we’re talking about. If you think of this verb as having a single meaning, ability, and you’re going to apply it to the dog, to the cat, to a person and to God, all in the same way. Whether you’re using it for the cat, the dog, your brother or God, you’ve made a mistake. That verb does not carry the same meaning because you’re projecting it as a universal and putting underneath the universal God, man, cats and everything that exists. Now do you see what you’ve done? Continuity of Being. You’ve slipped into paganism unintentionally. We’ve talked about that. That might have seemed abstract to you before; we kept saying Continuity of Being. Here’s an example, right here. We’ve got this abstract verb, “able,” and we think it has this impregnable, stable meaning wherever it’s used and in whatever context it’s used. Then we proceed to apply it to the cat, to a man, and to God. Then we say, ooh, we’ve got a contradiction here. We wound up with a contradiction, how can Jesus be “able” and “not able?” See, the Bible has contradictions in it.

What’s the answer to this? The answer is that the verb “able” takes on different meanings depending on which side of the Creator-creature distinction you’re talking about. The Creator-creature distinction is primary and human language has to submit to that distinction, the Creator-creature distinction precedes human language. It therefore comes under Him. So when I use the word “able” for God I do not mean the same thing when “able” is referring to man. And therefore I don’t have a contradiction.

Let’s see a verse in the OT that points this out because it’s going to come up again and again and again, we might as well clear the air. Turn to Isaiah 40, that’s a critical OT chapter that deals with the Creator-creature distinction.

In Isa 40:25, this is the warning against the pagan use of logic, where we invent universal meanings of words and we apply them across the board as though it always means the same thing in different context. And it's not true. Isaiah 40:25 blows it out of the water. "To whom then will you liken Me that I should be his equal?" That's the challenge God offers us. He says if you think that I can be identified with something in creation, that I possess qualities that are identical to a creature, you're mistaken. If that were true, you could make idols, and He doesn't permit us to make idols. What's the commandment? Don't make any graven images. That's forbidden. God is the Creator and everything else is created, and words do not mean and cannot be applied the same way. There are similarities. If there were no similarities then we couldn't know anything about God. His sovereignty is like our act of choosing, that's true, it's *like* it, but it's not the same thing. Think about it for a moment.

We walk along with our chooser, and we walk in the midst of circumstances, we walk in the midst of a body that runs by biological mechanisms. We breathe air that's full of molecules. We come into an environment and within that environment we choose, but do we have total control over the environment like God in His sovereignty does. Surely not! So therefore isn't it true that choice means something different when God chooses than when man chooses. Can you take that word "choose" and say that that word means the same thing when God chooses and when man chooses? No you can't, not if you have any respect for Scripture.

The problem we're getting into here is we have to be very careful in how we use words when we cross over from God to man, man to God, God to man, man to God. Every time you do that you'd better think. Because God is infinite and incomprehensible, we are finite and comprehensible, therefore we depend on the Scripture for guidance. We have no other source of what He's really like, except what He's told us that He's like. We could sit here and endlessly speculate what God is like, but that's just us, we're down here as creatures.

Therefore, that's the argument for why we have to go to Scripture as our only and total authority. If the Scripture is not our total, complete and final authority, then we're left with speculation, which gets into the next doctrine we're going to look at. Hopefully that clears up some of the problem. Granted,

you don't feel totally comfortable with this, like you don't feel totally comfortable with the Trinity, how can God be three and one? But the discomfort that you feel is actually a testimony to your finiteness and your creaturehood. That discomfort means that finally in the last analysis I can't totally encompass God, and that's simply an admission that He's incomprehensible, in the final analysis. We want to comprehend Him because what does Eccl 3:11 say? What has He put in our hearts? The sense of eternity, He's put in our hearts. But Eccl 3:11 goes on to say "but we cannot find out the end from the beginning," so that tension that you feel, I just want to get this together somehow, and yet we can never get it all together.

That's good, because if we could get it totally explained it would mean we understand God as He understands Himself, and that implies that we're omniscient. So we have to be careful. We have to be accurate; I'm not arguing for sloppiness here, I'm just arguing for a sense of humility about what our capacities are in our understanding. Remember the cardinal virtue of humility, and I have to take my place as a creature, you have to take your place as a creature, underneath God, and say I understand this about you God, straighten out my thinking if it's screwed up, but I will never totally understand You. You know what? That means that in eternity, in heaven, it will never be a dull and boring place. There are an infinite number of lessons to learn about God, endlessly, a well that will never run dry of mystery, of surprises, of things we never dreamed of that He pulls off forever and ever, over and over again, a new drama every day, a new act, an act that follows that act, and it just goes on and on and on, never ending, because our God is an infinite source of drama.

That's the impeccability issue and now we go to three implications. There are more but this is just to show you the value of this doctrine, it's not theory, it's not for the theologian in abstract ivory towers. This truth is revealed in Scripture for a very important reason. How you get these applications and a good way to study Scripture, whenever you try to learn a doctrine, always learn it in the context of the passages it appears. Where's kenosis? The doctrine of kenosis appears in Phil 2:5-8. So if you want to see the way the Holy Spirit intended the truth to apply, go back to the context of Phil 2:5-8 and ask what's being discussed? It's a very practical thing; the cardinal virtue of humility. Paul was the kind of guy that I think if you asked him how he brushed his teeth in the morning you would come up with some big long

dissertation about how Christ died on the cross and the Trinity, because for him all truth was related, there was no such thing as mundane trivial stuff.

Here are some of the implications of impeccability. “First, it reveals something about evil and human responsibility. Often well-intentioned Christians try to answer the evil problem by claiming that it was a necessary corollary to having genuine human choice in history. In Jesus’ case, however, there was genuine human choice without evil.” Right? We agree to that, human existence without evil. “Was Jesus supposed to sin in order to prove” He wasn’t a robot. Surely not. “Was Jesus supposed to sin in order to prove He had genuine choice? To err is *not* necessarily to be human,” did you ever hear that expression, to err is human; people use it all the time. Next time you hear that, say well, not necessarily, I know one exception. It’s a wonderful conversation opener to the gospel because it allows you to stop somebody short and then they’re asking you, you don’t have to shove it down their throat, they’re asking for it. So they open their mouth, you feed them the data. Evil is not necessary to prove genuine responsibility exists. The answer to the problem of evil rests on prior things we’ve taught early in the class, we used the diagram of evil to sketch the issues.

“A second very practical implication of impeccability follows from the first. If to err is not necessarily human, and if Jesus was the ‘test case’ that proves this in history, then what happens when we share His nature?” Got the question? Jesus Christ’s nature is perfect. If it’s really perfect and proven out to be perfect in history, what happens when we believe the gospel and are regenerated by the Holy Spirit and come to share His perfect nature? Now His impeccable nature resides in us. This set us up for certain passages in the NT (e.g. Rom 7:25; 1 John 3:3-9; 1 Pet 1:23). If you don’t go along with this thing you’re going to have trouble with some NT passages, because this comes out again and again in the NT epistles, and interpreters of the Bible hit grease when you look at what some people say about some of these passages.

Let’s turn to one of the trouble passages, 1 John 3:5, because this talks about the nature of Christ in the believer, and it says something that’s troubling. “And you know that He appeared in order to take away sins; and in Him there is no sin.” That’s talking about His impeccability, now we’ve got a vocabulary word we can attach a doctrine to that passage. So when we read

it, now we've got some substance here, we can connect it and link it. "... in Him there is no sin." Next verse, 6 "No one who abides in Him sins; no one who sins has seen Him or knows Him." That seems to lay an impossible burden upon Christians. Actually, we have to get into this when we get into the epistles, but this is a case where the solution to the interpretation of that passage hinges on the impeccable nature of Jesus Christ. When he says that "no one who abides in Him sins," he's talking about when Christ's nature manifests itself it never sins... when it's manifested. Of course we can sin, because John tells us we do. John isn't teaching perfectionism the usual way it's stated here, because we know from the first chapter, he says if we say we have no sin we're liars and the truth is not in us. So it's not perfectionism in an absolute total way, but it is a perfectionism of the nature of Jesus Christ that He manifests through us when we abide. The problem is we don't abide all the time, we get out of fellowship, we grieve the Holy Spirit, etc., but the life of Christ remains impeccable, just as it was in the Gospels. That is impeccability, and that's the thing that John latched onto. And John says this more times in his writing, probably because John was so impressed with Jesus, he was the closest apostle to Him. Think of who John is here, he saw an awful lot of the impeccability of Christ and he really had a firm grasp of this, so when he talks about Christ's nature, he's got to continue that idea of impeccability.

The third implication of impeccability is that it demonstrates that you can get God's qualities and man's qualities together without a contradiction. People say, well, God's sovereignty is incompatible with free choice. That's because God's sovereignty and free choice are being defined wrong. They're being defined without reference to the Creator-creature distinction. One is a Creator quality, the other is a creature quality. And they don't contradict because we see in the Person of Jesus Christ human choice and sovereignty worked fine. Do you see why Paul said in Col 2:8 you've got to start your philosophy, your serious thinking, and your categories with what? Not according to the elements of the world, the basic categories of the world, he said don't start there, you'll be deceived, start with Jesus Christ. And by Jesus Christ he wasn't talking about some Jesus stories, He was talking the hypostatic union and all the truths of Christology there because he's arguing against the Gnostic Christ. So you have to start with the Biblical Christ. That's where you start. Whatever you do philosophically you'd better be sure that it fits the yardstick of the hypostatic union. So however you define

human choice and God's sovereignty, your definitions have to fit the person of the Lord Jesus Christ who was both Creator and creature. He wasn't schizo, these two things weren't fighting each other, and they worked together perfectly. How do we do that? However we talk about human responsibility and divine sovereignty we have to respect the Creator-creature distinction. That's why the Creator and creature in hypostasis is so central to all of these truths and discussions.

Next time the last doctrine related to the Life of the King and that's a doctrine very much at the fore of debate in the Bible vs modern science discussion, the doctrine of infallibility. That deals with a little bit different thing than impeccability. It deals with the question could Jesus Christ have made technical errors, errors related to history and scientific details and remain sinless, without any moral error.

[Back To The Top](#)

Copyright (c) Fredericksburg Bible Church 2010