

***Pastor Jeremy M. Thomas***  
***Fredericksburg Bible Church***

*107 East Austin*

*Fredericksburg, Texas 78624*

*830-997-8834    [jthomas@fbgbible.org](mailto:jthomas@fbgbible.org)*

**B1101 – January 2, 2011**  
**The Extent Of The Atonement - Part 3**

To go into this today let's make some preliminary considerations. Bear with me today, this is tough material and there's some considerations that I want you to be aware of. Even if you don't catch all of these just catch the idea that before you go into these discussions you've got to think through the old problem we worked with. When you ask a question you are already taking a position. Most of the time you can't avoid it, but what you can avoid is being ignorant that you're doing it. So when you think about these questions, remember that the questions themselves contain baggage; just accept that as a fact of life and conversation. So when someone asks a question don't race to answer; think reflectively about what baggage is brought to the table in the question. So we'll review some stuff we covered back in Gen 1-3 but this is what I want you to be thinking about.

“With a Satisfactory Atonement alongside the obvious continuation of evil in history, the Protestant mentality centered upon the plan behind the atonement. A plan involves the choice of the planner. In this case, God's sovereignty came to the fore.” What they were trying to do, if you raised the question what is the plan of salvation, if it's not Rome's indulgences, if it's not relics, if it's not going to Mother Church, if it's not crucifying Christ anew in the mass, if it's not any of these things, then what is the plan of salvation? When you start asking what is the plan, you come to the Planner. What was the Planner's intention? What was on His mind? The Protestants began to think about what did God have on His mind when He planned this; if we could find out what He had on His mind we could define His intent, what He intended to accomplish with Jesus on the cross. So it went back and focused on the Planner, which was great. In this case, the sovereignty of God came to the fore. “How is this attribute of sovereignty to be understood? Is it to be understood as an abstract universal that stands over all?” In other words, do

we think of sovereignty as a cause? Aristotle was great on the many different kinds of causes. So have this big universal cause, and we're asking is God's sovereignty a big universal cause? Did you hear what I just said? I've already led you into a trap. The Protestants were asking, "Is God's sovereignty like that Aristotelian category of universal cause?" Ooh, see what was happening? The guys had intellectual tools that they inherited through Scholasticism; they were getting their categories from Aristotle and Plato, the Greek philosophers. They picked up these ideas and began to understand Bible doctrine in the categories that Aquinas had given to the Church. Aquinas had brought in Aristotle and that's how it got into the Church, and the problem was that now we have categories generated by the mind of man that were not subject to Scripture. Remember the verse that we've looked at several times, Col 2:8. Here's an example of how serious that verse is, because we're going to go through some agonizing church history which I believe could largely have been avoided if people had understood what Paul wanted us to do in Col 2:8, "See that no one takes you captive through philosophy and empty deception, according to the tradition of men, according to the elementary principles of the world, rather than according to Christ." We said that the word translated "elementary principles" is the Greek word *stoicheia*, and *stoicheia* if you look it up in a Greek dictionary and find out how it's used, it is used by the Greek philosophers to refer to earth, fire, water, air, all the basic categories. See what *stoicheia* means—basic categories, the basic categories of thinking around which you interpret everything else.

Paul says when you start with the basic categories of the world system and you begin to frame Scripture in the light of those categories, you've got a problem. What Aristotle did was recognize that you have to have an absolute cause, at least he recognized it; most people today run around without a clue. Aristotle recognized it but the problem is that his universal cause was a projection of the mind of man; it was nothing more than a mental world. Now when the Protestants were trying to characterize God's sovereignty they were indoctrinated with Aristotle through Aquinas and so they were asking, is God's sovereignty like Aristotle's category of universal cause? Now do you see the collision with Col 2:8? Paul says when that's your basic starting point you've got a problem because you're now envisioning God's sovereignty as a projection of man's mind about causation. Instead of that, Paul says in verse 8, "take every thought captive to Christ." He pits Christ against *stoicheia*.

What do we know about Christ? We know that He is God and man. We know the hypostatic union. We know the Creator-creature distinction. We know all these things, we know that God is holy, He's love, He's immutable, He's eternal, He's omniscient, omnipresent. He has all these attributes, the essence of God, the Creator-creature distinction, the doctrine of the Trinity, the doctrine of man over against God and the incarnation, all this is wrapped up in *Christos*. That's where you start, Paul says. You don't start with Aristotle, you don't start with earth, fire, air and water; you start your categories with what Scripture gives you about Christ, that's the starting point.

If we think of sovereignty as an abstract property or a universal cause that is independent of both God and the creation, then we conform God to that and we have maintained Aristotelian logic. All I'm saying is this, if you diagram what the philosophers try to do, they try to come up to this point where they can classify everything, including God, man and nature underneath their categories. In other words, God, man and nature are all put in the same box. And the classification system of man sits above all of them and looks down and says God is this way, man is this way, etc. What have you done? You've bought into the Continuity of Being, everything is on one level, there's no Creator-creature distinction. So "if we think of sovereignty as an abstract property or a universal cause that applies in the same way to God and the creation then we haven't broken with Aristotelian logic. We are still enmeshed in the pagan idea of the Continuity of Being wherein both God and man are involved in the same existence." Immediately we find ourselves with an internal logical contradiction: two beings on the same level cannot have total sovereignty. Hence, the tension between God's choice and man's choice, they become billiard balls banging against each other because they're in the same box down here, when the Bible says wait a minute, there are two boxes, there's the Creator and the creature, they're not the same. Man's choice is altogether different than God's sovereignty. They can't come into collision because man and God are distinct. Man is but a finite replica of God, he has this thing called choice down here and God has sovereignty up here, and choice is a finite analogue of God's sovereignty. It's an analogue; it's not identical, it's not on the same level. So it's ridiculous to think they can ever be in conflict once you seriously come to grips with Creator-creature distinction. But they didn't protect that, unfortunately. What had happened was the

scholastic categories took over and they began to frame the Bible, God, sovereignty and all the rest of it in terms of those Aristotelian categories.

Now if you'll follow the debate there's an interesting thing here about church history. "In Luther and Calvin (1509-1564)," (notice the date of Calvin, because most of this is not on the Lutheran side of the Reformation, most of this happened on the Calvinist side of the Reformation), "In Luther and Calvin," Calvin dating from "(1509-1564)" he died a young man. By the way, his life was amazing. Do you know how old he was when he wrote the *Institutes of the Christian Religion* that was the textbook for Protestant theology for the last 500 years? Twenty-one. He didn't go to American Public Schools. "... there is little or no evidence of the limited atonement idea." When you read Calvin and Luther you don't come across any idea of the atonement being limited, even though Reform theologians keep talking to us about limited atonement. It's not in Calvin and Luther, they didn't discuss that issue.

"Their focus," that is Luther's focus and Calvin's' focus, "is upon Christ as the believer's savior and" underline this one, "source of assurance, viz., that Christ died for him," that is for the believer. Wrote Calvin: follow this quote, this is a quote directly from Calvin's *Institutes*, "if we have been chosen in Him, we shall not find assurance of our election in ourselves. . . ." let me read that sentence very slowly a second time, because subsequent Reformed theologians don't believe that and they rejected that. So let's get it straight from what Calvin originally taught, "if we have been chosen in Him, we shall not find assurance of our election in ourselves. . . . Christ [Himself] is the mirror wherein we must. . .contemplate our election'."

In other words, what Calvin was saying is how do I know I'm accepted with God? Because I look at Jesus Christ. It's the same thing Luther discovered, I'm looking at Christ, I'm not looking in my heart, I'm not looking at my personal sins, I'm not measuring how good I'm doing, I'm not doing a fruit inspection of my life, I'm looking at Him. I'm acceptable before God because of Him. Luther and Calvin looked up, not in; two different prepositions. *Up* and *out* rather than *down* and *in*, totally different. And the first guys out of the block in the Protestant Reformation weren't looking in, they were looking out because they knew they were sinners, they knew they never could have enough evidence in their heart to convince them that they were saved, they

all knew that Jesus Christ paid for the sins and that therefore He was their Savior. And their assurance was Him.

“Thus each person at the point of saving faith knows without doubt that Christ died for him or her.” That is fundamental, that’s fantastic! That’s what saving faith is according to the first generation Reformers. Faith, in other words, to Calvin and to Luther, is assurance. You don’t seek to be assured that you believed the right way. You believed and therefore you have assurance you’re saved. What does Hebrews say? Faith is what? The evidence, the assurance of things hoped for. That was the key, and I want to emphasize that because that was what created a problem for the Protestants. This is where Rome attacked with a lightning rod. Rome came in and went ballistic over this point right here. I’m going to show you how. “The elect are those creatures who come to this faith in post-fall history. However God in eternity past viewed His plan, He viewed it as involving real history in which there was a fall.” “Following Calvin a number of Reformers, such as Theodore Beza (1519-1605)” notice the dates, during and after Calvin, “Beza entertained an abstract approach to God’s sovereignty,” here we go, now the heat’s off a little bit and these guys are trying to classify and organize the system, he “entertained an abstract approach to God’s sovereignty that led to the limited atonement doctrine. Their reasoning was simple. God from all eternity had a plan expressed in His ‘eternal decrees.’ Since only the elect are saved, it must be that the atonement was designed only for them. In essence, their argument was a straightforward reasoning from effect to cause. This approach, however, quickly affected faith and assurance. If Christ died only for the elect, then how can I know He died for me? I can’t know that He died for me directly—that would require omniscience—so my assurance must come from inspecting my ‘fruit’, the evidences of the Holy Spirit’s work in my heart.”

“Luther and Calvin had argued earlier that looking inwardly at my fallen nature only leads to anxiety so that one must look *outwardly* to the Cross of Christ instead! The ‘second generation’ Reformers coming after Luther and Calvin, because their system borrowed Aristotelian categories, had to look *inwardly* for assurance. Thus the limited atonement doctrine effectively divorced faith and assurance. In the days of Luther and Calvin, faith *was* assurance that Christ died for me; in the later days of the Reformers assurance could only follow and reinforce faith—to show evidence of election

and the coverage of my sin by the atonement. Assurance thus became for them 'faith in faith' or persevering faith evidenced by the fruit in one's life."

See what happened here? There's a shift here and it looks kind of vague and subtle, but it has very powerful implications. How many people have heard of the Puritans? Everybody's heard of the Puritans. What is your image of the Puritans? Very sober, very devout, very legalistic, etc., a lot of that is boloney. The Puritans were a very happy group of people, they laughed more than most pagans. But the problem the Puritans had, and they had some problems, was they didn't duplicate themselves very well. By the second and third generation they basically phased out because they didn't evangelize their own children, they didn't win the next generations to Christ. Something was wrong here. The Puritans were fine in some areas but they had some failings. Why weren't they able to pass on their culture? Why, after one or two generations, did it fall flat and disappear. What happened? There was something defective. You go back and you read Puritan authors. I don't know how many people have read Baxter or Owens but you can find books "that" thick written by those Puritans that talk about introspection to see whether I'm saved or not... *whether* I'm saved, because they were always conducting fruit inspections on their heart. And its morbid reading because it's all about am I really saved or not; well, I did this so I'm not sure I'm saved.

One of the great economists of history pointed out that a fruitful result of the unfruitful theology was the industrial revolution. You say what did the industrial revolution have to do with the Puritans? The industrial revolution couldn't happen without capital money because the industrial revolution had to invest in machines. Where do you suppose the money came from that was saved, stored up, and invested to finance the industrial revolution? It traces it back to a Puritan belief that a sign of your election was that you would be economically blessed, and they worked hard, and that work ethic that you heard about that was so fundamental in our country, that work ethic actually in some cases can be shown to have grown out of this Puritan introspection that I've got to work hard to give God a chance to show that I'm the elect by blessing me. It was connected to this, there are lots of historical ramifications to this; this is not some little theological point in a closet somewhere. This spilled out, it affected the economy of Europe, it affected us as a country, etc.

But one of the problems in Puritanism was the fact that here's Mr. Christian, but he's not quite sure that he's a Christian, because he's heard this story about election and predestination and he's not sure he's part of the elect because he says, (and this was one of the problems that Calvin had) - he said it's possible for there to be false believers, i.e. people who have a false faith, and finally you come to know if you had false faith or not when your works aren't measuring up. So you never were saved to begin with. And so maybe you think you believed at age 6 but then at age 66 you do some horrible thing and how do you know whether you really believed back at age 6, maybe it was false belief. See what happens? If you don't have assurance at the beginning you can't have assurance at any point following. There's always the danger that you fall away. So the problem of falling away, and it was built on an exegesis of the book of Hebrews actually, began to act subtly to separate faith and assurance. And whatever this faith was, it plagued the Puritans; they weren't really sure that they were of the elect unless it was so manifestly obvious of the Holy Spirit's works in their life. So there began to be this splitting off of faith from assurance.

The limited atonement became dominant in Reform circles. It is widely considered by the first hundred years in Reform circles that Christ died only for the elect, He didn't die for the non-elect. If that's so, now keep in mind what I warned you about, I'm leading you down a path here, remember when someone asks you a question they bring baggage to the table, so be cautious. "Soon after limited atonement had become dominant in Reformed circles, one of the Reformers, Jacob Arminius (1559-1609), rejected limited atonement and taught: 'that. . . Jesus Christ, the Savior of the world, died for all men and for every man, so that he has obtained for them all, by his death on the cross, redemption and the forgiveness of sin; yet that no one actually enjoys this forgiveness of sins except the believer, according to the word of the gospel of John iii.16: 'God so loved the world. . .' And in the First Epistle of John ii.2: 'And he is the propitiation for our sins; and not for our sins only, but also for the sins of the whole world.'" Remember I told you 1 John 2:2 played a role, here it is, and I'm quoting right from the creed, this was Arminius' own position.

"The unlimited atonement, according to Arminius, is for all men potentially, but not actually. What makes it actually apply to me is my act of faith. God chose the elect, in this view, upon the basis of foreseen persevering faith" Let

me read that again, Arminius was a student of the Reformers, he was a solid Reformed guy, and he was in Holland. And what he argued was that the cross of Christ was potentially for all and you come up and you claim your piece of it, by your faith. Oh, and by the way, he added, you've got to keep believing it, because if you don't keep believing it, you lose it, and that's where loss of salvation arose, the idea that you could lose your salvation. That's why we say that Arminianism is distinct from Calvinism because the salvation package in Arminianism was contingent upon your faith...your faith. "Arminius then added that one could lose this faith, in which case it would be shown that he did not have true persevering faith and was not of the elect." Do you notice something similar about Arminianism and Calvinism? Actually this was not Calvin's view; Calvin kept faith and assurance together. This was the second generation reformers. What are they both saying? That the Christian, a genuine Christian, can never fail, that every true Christian will have persevering faith. What do you do with Solomon? What do you do with the Corinthians? What do you do about the shipwrecks of the faith in the NT? Uh-oh, now we've got a problem. All this theological argument, just like it is today, the people that get involved in these theological controversies spend so much time getting involved in the theological controversy they never study the text. What does the text say, hello, you know the text, and what does the text say? So Arminius, to his credit, at least he smelled something wrong, because Arminius did try to do some exegesis, and he did look at 1 John 2:2 and he said something doesn't fit here, no matter what you guys are doing you can't make the "world" in 1 John 2:2 be just the world of the elect, that's not how John uses the word. So somewhere we went wrong here.

So Arminius, again using the tools available to him intellectually, bound up with the idea of faith, etc. opened the door to the belief in the free will of man and that God cooperates with man so that God and man are working together on the same team, what theologians call synergism. It's God and man that control where history is going. "Arminius' teachings were rejected because they seemed to depose God from His sovereignty and replace Him with man's choice. At the Synod of Dort (1619) it was stated over against Arminius that it was by the will of God that Christ by the blood of the cross. . .should effectively redeem. . .all those, and those only, who were from eternity chosen to salvation. . . ; that he should confer upon them faith," which is another thing that comes up now in Reformed circles, faith becomes a gift of God in a

sense estranged from Scripture, "...faith which, together with all other saving gifts of the Holy Spirit, he purchased for them by his death." Look at the logic in that sentence, it's very carefully structured. These guys could make modern lawyers look lost. Look at the grammar in that sentence and how carefully it's stated. What do you notice it says? "That He should confer upon them faith," and then there's a whole set of clauses that describe this faith thing, and it's called a saving gift of the Holy Spirit, which is fine, and what does it say about those gifts? They were purchased for them by Christ's death. What is purchased for them by Christ's death? Faith. Well then, how can the non-elect believe? If the non-elect never had faith purchased for them and you offer them the gospel, was it a genuine offer of salvation? That's the problem Arminius saw.

So now you have these two camps in the Church. Although they're blurred in most churches today because nobody knows what their own church believes, let alone what some other church believes, Arminianism and Calvinism come down in church history like this: Calvinism dominates the Presbyterian circles; largely Presbyterian and Congregational circles tend to historically inherit the Calvinist way of thinking. Of course liberalism has come in and wiped out most of the theology so again I say this is history, this is the genealogy but it doesn't apply perfectly. You can walk into a Presbyterian [Church] and they wouldn't know what you're talking about, even if you were talking about Calvin, some of them. Things have deteriorated in our time. But this is the lineage, Presbyterianism and Congregationalism. Arminianism came down through John Wesley into the Methodist Church, and out of the Methodist Church at the turn of the century came the Pentecostals. And out of this movement came your Charismatics. This begins to explain some of these divisions we see.

Completely independent of this, the Lutherans are sitting over here; they've had their own relatively unscathed history from all this controversy. You have the Episcopalian Church that like the Lutheran Church tried to preserve a lot of the rituals of the Catholic Church, and the Lutherans and the Episcopalians had their own lineage. Except the Episcopalians, the King of England decided he needed some theology teachers, so he sent down to Geneva and he brought some Reform people into the Episcopalian Church. These are the ebbs and the flows.

As I said, don't go out and say that this is true today, because it isn't necessarily true today because it's blown into pieces. They go to the church with the largest youth group, the biggest basketball court or something. But originally you could see the lines of this theology, you could go to these kinds of churches and if you listened carefully to the men in those churches that do know their own denominational teachings, you would hear Jacob Arminius, you would hear you'd better watch out Christian, you may lose your salvation. You come over here and you can here those second generation Reformers saying are you really of the elect, are you really a believer, examine your heart, did you really have true faith to begin with? So those are the two cultural streams that have come down to us in our own time.

That wasn't the end of the controversy by any order. "All Calvinists were not happy with the Dordt statement against Arminianism. They were troubled by the texts Arminius had used which did emphasize the atonement's application to all men (e.g., John 3:16; 4:42; Rom. 5:15-18; II Cor. 5:14-20; I Tim. 2:4-6; II Pet. 2:1; 3:9; I John 2:2). One of these people was Moise Amyraut (1596-1664) who taught theology at Saumur, France. Although his teachings were called heretical in Holland, they were accepted by Calvinists in France. His position was this: 'God wills all men to be saved, on condition they believe—a condition in which they could well fulfill in the abstract, but which, in fact, owing to inherited corruption, they stubbornly reject, so that this universal will for salvation actually saves no one.'" Then he goes on and develops it. This was the source, by the way, of what we call Four-point Calvinism. Five-point Calvinism is TULIP, (T)otal depravity, (U)nconditional election, (L)imited atonement, (I)rresistable grace, and (P)erseverance of faith. What Amyraut did is he questioned this (L), and hence there arose this label that you sometimes hear people talk about, Five-point Calvinism and Four-point Calvinism. That's where it started, right there with Amyraut in the 1630's.

"In the centuries since the Reformation, Protestantism has been divided over this issue. Until modern liberalism destroyed orthodoxy in most denominations, Arminianism prevailed in Methodist and Pentecostal circles while Calvinism in Presbyterian and Reformed circles. Since present day 'Bible fundamentalism' is largely dispensational which originated in the Calvinist camp (broadly speaking), it tends to follow a mild version of

Calvinism,” however, even in Bible churches today things are so fragmented you can’t predict what will come across the pulpit.

Let’s go back in the discussion. I’ve already given you, basically, the discussion up until our time. Now we want to go back. The problems I attribute basically to a failure of the Reformation to really mine the depths of Scripture on this Creator-creature distinction. I bring you now to a very interesting quote. I said that the result of all this was that the later Reformers consciously rebelled against Calvin. Why did they do so? “The later Reformers began to alter Luther and Calvin’s teachings on faith. Catholicism counter-attacked the original teaching of Luther and Calvin (that faith *was* assurance).” How do you think the Catholics attacked? Think about this, it’s very easy to see. You are a Catholic theologian and you want to stop this Protestant movement. You’re losing people and losing people means losing money. What can you do to appeal to the godliest element in the church that these people are heretics? You can’t talk about the reforms, you don’t discuss that because the godly people in the Church would agree with the Protestants, yeah, throw the corrupt guys out, and so that wasn’t the tactic. The tactic was to come around and say you know, we really love the Lord but this Protestant doctrine of assurance of salvation says you can know you’re saved and if that’s so it will lead to license, people will go out and raise hell. That was Rome’s counter-attack, a brilliant move.

They argued that assurance would lead to loose living. So now the Protestants, instead of thinking it through, going back to the Scripture, are reeling politically from this assault, and they’re saying what are we going to do about this. So their answer was to say, you know, we got to build safeguards to this justification doctrine, we’ve got to kind of cool things down here a little bit. So watch what they did.

“Catholicism counter-attacked the original teaching of Luther and Calvin (that faith was assurance) as an incentive to loose living. To defend Protestantism, the later Reformers began to argue that we cannot be assured that we have believed unto salvation unless there are evidences of the Holy Spirit’s work in our lives.” Nobody’s denying the Holy Spirit works in our life, but the argument was that you couldn’t have assurance until you saw those evidences; that’s the argument. “The famous Civil War era” had one of the great Reformed theologians in the south, Andrew Jackson’s theological

mentor, Robert Dabney who taught in Union Seminary in Richmond, Virginia. “Southern Reformed theologian, Robert Dabney pointed out that later Reformers separated faith and assurance.” Here’s Dabney’s own quote, he was in the Reformed tradition, and here’s what he says: “[The first Reformers] defined saving faith as a belief that ‘Christ saved *me*,’ making the assurance of hope of its necessary essence. Now, the later Reformers, and those learned, holy and modest teachers of the Reformed Churches. . . have subjected this view to searching examination, and rejected it (as does the Westminster Assembly) on scriptural grounds.’ Christ, in this view, died only for the elect, and neither you nor I can be sure we are of the elect company until we can experientially prove out in our lives that we have ‘persevering faith’, i.e., faith that never fails until we die.”

Here you have the guy admit it; there was a shift from the original Reformers, Calvin and Luther to the next generation Reformers. And the shift came about as a political/theological response to the argument of Rome that said the Protestants preached a dangerous gospel that gave too much freedom to the individual person, and it could be abused. It reminds you of the gun control lobby. Got to watch out, those guns all by themselves go out and shoot people. Same thing, don’t trust somebody with something, they might misuse it. The totalitarians always think this way; don’t ever empower anybody to do anything because you might lose control of them if you do that, that’s dangerous to do that. So people were held captive, just as they were held by the Church of Rome. Now they are held with a threat that if you have failure in your Christian life you may not really be a Christian. It was felt that this kind of threat was necessary to produce righteous living.

Now the Scriptures do threaten. The question is, do the Scriptures threaten loss of salvation or do the Scriptures threaten discipline upon God’s children, spanking of those in His family? Think of the communion service in 1 Cor 11. What does it say after you get through the bread and the cup? There’s a threat isn’t there. What is it? It’s a threat that if you take this communion all out of line, pulling ridiculous stunts then there’s sickness or physical death for you. They had dead people at Corinth because of the way they took communion. What are those death threats for? To keep the Church in line, but those threats don’t undercut your assurance of saving faith, they are appealing to it, because you are saved, because you are in God’s family act like it. Hebrews says that if you don’t act like it and you don’t get chastised

you're a bastard; you're not even in the family. So the warning passages of Scripture are precisely because we are in the family of God and our Father is holy, and He's not going to let us get away with loose living, He's going to take action. But the action He takes isn't saying ha-ha, I'm not going to let you have assurance of salvation. That's not the way God operates in the NT.

So here's the problem, and the limited atonement fell in the middle of the whole thing because does the atonement cover these things or doesn't it? If I believe in the Lord Jesus Christ am I forgiven for all my sins, past, present and future? If I am then why do I have to confess my sins? If I am then why do I have to go to the judgment seat of Christ? If I am then why do I still die physically? On the other hand, if I am not somehow forgiven for my future sins then doesn't that imply that I can lose my salvation? These aren't the answers I'm just saying that this is tough stuff and these people didn't have all the answers at the time. They were searching for the answers, they were debating and arguing about it and the church was splintering up into different theologies. What we've come to see 500 years later is that there are two things going on here not one. The problem is when you try to bring all this into one single thing, and if you do that you end up with contradictions, there's not one thing there's two. What do I mean? I mean one thing is being born again through faith, at that point I enter the family of God, then the second thing is that now that I'm in the family there's discipline within the family. If we'd lived at the time of the Reformation we could have straightened them all out but that understanding wasn't present in the church for another 300-400 years. So now we know how to deal with the warning passages. They're not warning of loss of salvation. They're not warning you may not really be saved. They're warning people who are genuinely saved that they can come under their Father's discipline.

[Back To The Top](#)

Copyright (c) Fredericksburg Bible Church 2011