

Peccability vs Impeccability

Overview of Christian Theology

By Dr. M. Keith Foskey

sermonaudio.com

Bible Text: Hebrews 4:15; 1 John 3:5
Preached on: Wednesday, January 23, 2019

Sovereign Grace Family Church
13773 N. Main St.
Jacksonville, Fl. 32218

Website: www.SovereignGraceFamilyChurch.org
Online Sermons: www.sermonaudio.com/foskey

If you have your sheets tonight, you'll see it says "Overview of Theology and Doctrine" and the subject tonight is on "Peccability vs Impeccability." Peccability vs impeccability, and so that's going to be the subject. That may be an odd sounding phrase, it's not one that many people have used, it's not a common phrase that people use, so I felt like for us in our beginning, I thought maybe it would be good if we defined it. You know this is part of our larger study on Christology. We've been studying the person of Jesus Christ and in our study of looking at Christology, we've looked at the preexistence of Christ, we've looked at the dual nature of Christ, the fact that he was truly God and truly man, and tonight we're gonna look at his peccability.

And peccability means this, it means the state or quality of being peccable. Is that helpful? Not really, okay. Alright, well, maybe you've heard the phrase, you've heard the term a peccadillo. That phrase comes from the same root. To be peccable means to be able to sin. The phrase peccable or the word peccable means to be able to sin, or maybe another word is to have the capability of sinning. I'm want to ask you, is everybody here tonight peccable? Did anybody say no? I just want to make sure we're being honest. Everybody here is peccable? You all have the capacity to sin? You're all able to sin? Well, now you understand the definition of what it means to be peccable.

You say, "Well, what does this study got, what's this study about, pastor?" Well, this study is not whether or not Jesus Christ did sin but whether or not Jesus Christ could have sinned. That's the question of peccability versus impeccability because we really don't have to ask the first question, and just for the sake of knowing from the Scripture what it says, I want to invite you to turn with me to a few passages. We're gonna do some sword drills here at the beginning, do a few Bible drills, run through a few Scriptures. If you want to write them down, you can. I will certainly read them to you, but these are the passages if somebody says, "Well, how do we know Jesus Christ did not sin?" Well, the Bible tells me so.

Hebrews 4:15 is the first passage that I would look to. Hebrews 4:15 and it says this, "For we do not have a high priest who is unable to sympathize with our weaknesses, but one who in every respect has been tempted as we are, yet without sin." Hear it again, "we do not have a high priest who is unable to sympathize with our weaknesses, but one who in

every respect has been tempted as we are, yet without sin." Now if that was the only verse that we had, that would be enough because it's not as if that passage is in some way ambiguous or that that passage in some way is up for debate. It says that he was tempted and yet was without sin.

So therein is our first explicit reference to the sinlessness of Jesus Christ but there are others. 2 Corinthians 5:21. This is one of my favorite passages to use when I'm sharing the gospel because we call this passage the great transaction passage. 2 Corinthians 5:21, "God made him who knew no sin to become sin for us that we can become the righteousness of God in him." So again, God made him who, what? Knew no sin. Not only did he not commit sin, he did not know sin, and the same is he was not familiar with it in an intimate sense. We talk about knowing things, right? Knowledge in Scripture is not always about what you have up here, but it's about having a relationship, it's about being intimate. You know, Adam knew Eve and they bore Seth, right? So you, knowledge in Scripture is used in many different ways and knowing is relationship. So Jesus knew no sin. There was no relationship. There was no connection. He did not sin, neither was there even a hint of sin in him.

1 Peter 2:22. This is part of a longer passage so it kind of comes in in the middle of the sentence. 1 Peter 2:22, "He committed no sin." I mean, really. "He committed no sin, neither was there deceit found in his mouth." Okay, ambiguous? Not at all. He committed no sin, and the "he" there, the antecedent of "he, he" is a pronoun, all pronouns have an antecedent, antecedent of "he" is Jesus, right? So Jesus committed no sin.

1 John 3:5. 1 John 3:5, "You know that he appeared to take away sin, and in him there is no sin." You know he appeared in order to take away sin, and in him there is no sin.

Alright, now here's something I want to point out about those four passages. Who wrote Hebrews? We don't know. Who do we suspect wrote Hebrews? Ah, I don't suspect it was Paul but some people do and if you suspect it was Paul, that's fine. I'm not going to argue with you but I'll say this, I suspect it weren't Paul based on chapter 2, he says he got his information secondhand. I don't think Paul would say that. The writer of Hebrews says he got it from someone else and Paul got his directly from Jesus Christ. Based on that I would say I don't think it was Paul. I think it was Paul's, one of Paul's companions, possibly Barnabas, possibly Luke, but I don't think it was, and I think, I think there's reason to believe it could've been Luke based on some of the similarities in the writings of the Lukan corpus which is Luke and Acts. But again, if somebody says it's Paul, I'm not gonna argue but my point is I do think it's a different person than Paul. So who wrote Corinthians? Paul. Who wrote Peter? That one's easy. Peter. And who wrote John? John.

So what does the Bible say, a testimony is true if it's based on two or three witnesses, right? We only need one passage of Scripture to tell us that Jesus is sinless, but we not only have four passages of Scripture, we have four passages of Scripture from what I would argue is four independent authors all prescribing or proclaiming rather four independent testimonies of the one sinless Christ. Hebrews, Corinthians, Peter, and John, or the writer of Hebrews, Paul, Peter and John. And that's the explicit testimony.

Now there's implicit testimony. 1 Peter 1:19 it says, "with the precious blood of Christ, which was like that of a lamb without spot or blemish." Now that doesn't say he was sinless, but that uses the language of perfection given to us in the Old Testament. So that's more of rather than saying sinless, he's without spot or blemish is a way of saying sinless. So that's an implicit testimony to his sinlessness.

When Pilate saw Jesus in John 19:4, Pilate went out to him and said to them, "See, I am bringing him out to you that you may know that I find no guilt in him." You say, "Well, Pilate only knew him for five minutes. He wouldn't know if he was sinless." No, but he knew he was guiltless. He knew he was guiltless and, again, that's an implicit testimony to his righteousness. So much of the Scripture testifies to who he was as being perfectly righteous and if you're perfectly righteous, you are without sin, okay?

That last one, John 19:4. Pilate's testimony where he said, "I find no guilt in him." Even when the Pharisees tried to find guilt in Jesus, they had to make trumped up charges. You understand that the court, that there was five different courts that Jesus had to go through and in every one of those courts it was a kangaroo court, trumped up charges, the testimonies against Christ from the house of Annas, Caiaphas and then to the Sanhedrin, then to Pilate, then to Herod, and then back to Pilate again. Then what do they say? They had to bring false charges against him because there was no true charges to bring against the Master. He was sinless. That's, again, an implicit testimony to his righteousness.

So again, is the argument tonight whether or not Jesus sinned? No, and don't leave here thinking it was. I want to make that clear as I start this whole first part. Not that I needed to prove it because I don't think anybody here came tonight wondering if Jesus had ever sinned, but just in case you did, now you don't. If you believe the Bible, you don't believe Jesus sinned. Some people do believe Jesus sinned even though the Bible says otherwise. I don't always use the word "liberal," I don't throw that out there. I think it's too broad a term. But in this sense I'll say this: theological liberals tend to dismiss the texts which say Jesus was sinless as simply being untrue, and the most perverse have even tried to spin it to say that it would more virtuous if Jesus were a sinner because then he'd be more like us. He has to truly empathize with me. Jesus has to have walked in my shoes and my shoes are pretty dirty.

One man even went as far as to say if Jesus never sinned, he couldn't die because the wages of sin is death. Now honestly, that's a proper syllogism but this is proof and I taught this last year when I taught on how to spot a bad argument, I said arguments are based on reasoning and his reasoning is true as far as it goes. If the wages of sin is death and Jesus died, he must have been a sinner. That's his logic. Logic is foolproof until you realize that your premise is faulty. Jesus didn't die as other men died, Jesus gave up his life. He says, "No man takes my life from me but I lay it down on my own accord." Jesus didn't die on the cross because of the nails, Jesus didn't die on the cross because of the stab in the heart, Jesus died on the cross because he said, "It is finished," and he closed his eyes and he gave up the ghost. That's different. I don't get to do that. I can't determine the minute of my death. Jesus did. "No man takes my life from me, I lay it down on my

own accord." So it's different. Jesus was without sin and his death does not, I repeat, does not call that fact into question. Christ's death was a voluntary giving up himself on our behalf.

So Jesus was without sin, amen? Alright, but the next question becomes we know he didn't sin but could he sin? Could he sin? I feel bad because I passed out all the handouts, I don't want to miss anything, have I given you the answer to the first one yet? Can I have one of them? Is there enough to have one back? I hate to ask. I just, I want to make sure I don't miss the blanks. Okay. Alright, so the question, here it is, the question of the peccability versus impeccability of Christ is not whether or not Christ did sin but whether or not he could have sinned. Okay, I did, I gave you the answer to that. That's the answer to the first blank.

Now how many of you are familiar with St. Augustine? How many of you are familiar with St. Augustine? Okay, well, that'll give you a little help. Okay. St. Augustine is about an hour south. Actually it's about 1,500 years backward. St. Augustine, Bishop of Hippo, very brilliant man, wrote many things which have stood the test of time, was used by God to teach many things, and in regard to man's condition, he actually spoke of man's condition in some of the most profound terms to the point that even when Luther and Calvin were later during the Reformation trying to understand man's situation in Scripture, they would often reference Augustine a thousand years earlier, reference his writings because it was just so profound.

Augustine debated a man named Pelagius. Pelagius believed that man was born neutral and that he was not born in sin but that he was born essentially able to do good or bad, that every person essentially is born like a new Adam and so every person is born a free agent, alright? Augustine said, "No, that's not true. Man is born by nature a sinner because he's a fallen son of Adam, and because of that he is by nature a sinner and by choice because he chooses according to his nature and his nature is that of sin." It was actually based on a prayer that Augustine prayed that caused the consternation between he and Pelagius. Augustine prayed, "God, command what thou will and give us the ability to do what thou commandeth." That was the prayer of Augustine and Pelagius said, "No, if God commands it, we must have the ability to do it." And so that was where the debate began and ultimately it ended with Pelagius becoming known as the arch-heretic. Pelagius, I just like the fact that they add the "arch" because he was that bad because he taught such a false view of the nature of man and of the nature of grace because if man is by nature not a sinner, man is not dependent completely upon grace. So much of what was preached in the Reformation was simply a rediscovery of what was preached by Augustine in understanding the necessity and the sufficiency of the grace of God.

Alright, so having said all that, giving you a little history lesson on Augustine, I want to give you four things that Augustine taught about man. He said, man, there are four conditions that we need to understand regarding mankind. The first is called posse peccare. These are Latin. Of course, Latin was the language of the church for a thousand years. Posse peccare means able to sin. The word posse, possible. We get the word

possible. Peccare is where we get the word peccadillo or sin, peccare, is where the word peccability comes from. So posse peccare means able to sin and then posse non peccare means able to not sin. Then you have non posse non peccare which is the inability to not sin. Maybe I should write these down or you guys got them? Are you with me? Okay. And then non posse peccare is the inability to sin. So it's the ability to sin, the ability not to sin, the inability to not sin, and the inability to sin.

When mankind was created, theoretically he was created posse peccare and posse non peccare, the ability to make a choice, the ability to sin or not sin. Adam was given a choice, here's the fruit, eat of it and on the day that you eat of it, you will surely die, right? Now in this perspective we're not speaking from the eternal counsel and decree of God, we're speaking simply from the respect of how Adam would have seen himself. Adam would have seen himself in a position of choice, eat or don't eat, posse peccare, posse non peccare. However after the fall we inherit a nature because Adam chose to fall and he fell in our place. You understand that? The Bible teaches that when Adam fell, he took us with him. We were, as it were, present as he is our head, our federal representative. He fell and he fell like he was like holding us with him as he fell and he takes us all down, and thus we are born in the position of non posse non peccare, we are born in the position of the inability to not sin. This is why sin is a universal problem.

I talked to a preacher one time, he said, "I don't think all men," well, how did he say it? He didn't say he didn't believe any man sinned, he didn't believe all men were by nature sinners so he said ultimately that he thought it was possible that somebody could live without sin. I said I don't because it's the very nature of the flesh. He was wrong? I don't know but he was, that's Pelagius' point, that he was a Pelagian in the sense of he believed in the ability to not sin. He believed in non posse or he believed in posse non peccare, he had the ability to not sin. I said, "No, I believe in non posse non peccare, I believe in the inability to not sin."

Then the last one, non posse peccare is the inability to sin, that's the question of Jesus. Is Jesus posse peccare or non posse peccare? Is he with the ability to sin or without the ability to sin? I didn't give you all that just to make a big headache. I promise even though some of you look like you don't believe me, I gave that to you because what I'm saying is this actually touches on the nature of man. It touches on the nature of man because some people believe if Jesus did not have the ability to sin, then he wasn't truly a man and Augustine looked at it and said look at man's condition has changed. Man went from posse non peccare, posse peccare, he went to the non posse non peccare. He went from the ability to sin or not, to now the ability only to sin. And what does he do? Only sins continuously, right? The Bible says we sin continually.

So among believing Christians, the question is could Jesus sin? Could he sin? I'm not asking for an answer, I'm saying that's the question and usually it goes like this, someone will say this, "If Jesus could not sin, then his temptations weren't genuine because the Bible tells us he was tempted as we are, therefore he must have had genuine temptation and genuine temptation assumes a capacity for failure." Right? That's the argument. That's the logical argument. Put simply this is the simple statement: if Jesus couldn't fall,

he couldn't be tempted, and if he couldn't be tempted, he wasn't truly tempted. Ultimately, again, it's a syllogism, the problem is it's a false syllogism. By the way, do you know what syllogism is, right? If A is B and B is C, then A is C. If all men are mortal and Andy is a man, then Andy is mortal. That's a syllogism. That's a statement of deductive reasoning. However I can give you a syllogism that is false but yet true. I can say all men are green and Andy is a man, therefore Andy is green. Why still the syllogism is correct but it's based on a false premise because all men are not green. You understand?

So the syllogism is this, if Jesus couldn't genuinely fall, then he couldn't genuinely be tempted. That's the syllogism but here's where the failure lies, the failure lies in this: genuine temptation requires the ability to fall, is that true? Ha-ha, some of you don't want to answer. It's okay. It's okay. I'm going to argue that the ability to fail a test does not make the test genuine. You say, "Why do you say that?" Well, I want you to consider for a moment sources of temptation. There are really only two sources of temptation. Is this on your sheet? Yeah, yeah, there's only two sources of temptation. The first one is external and if the first one is external, what do you think the second one is? Internal. You got it. There are only two sources of temptation, it either comes from without or it comes from within. External temptation is sin proposed. Internal temptation is sin considered. I'll say it again because that's important. External, external temptation is sin proposed. Internal temptation is sin considered, or you might say sin entertained, sin desired, whatever.

Internal temptation, external temptation are both legitimate temptation. I wrote a little illustration here. I don't know if this is helpful for you or not. I'll give it to you anyway. Growing up I had a lot of sins that I dealt with, I'm not gonna get into what they were, but by God's grace one that I didn't get, drugs wasn't my temptation. I had no internal desire for that. Now I'm not saying that I didn't have internal desires for other things because I did, but that particular thing was not ever anything that in my heart I said, "Boy, I wanna do that." So does that mean I was never tempted by drugs? No, man, I had many people, "You should try this." Thankfully by God's grace I didn't have a coinciding internal part that said, "Yeah, I should try that." Now there were other things but not that thing, so in that sense there was no internal mechanism that was agreeing with the external proposal that would cause me to give in to whatever that thing was, right?

Now it's just that one thing that I can think of, alright, but you all have something that doesn't cause an internal ring in you, something of the flesh, something that doesn't, it's just not, and what's funny is that's the thing the devil's probably not gonna come after you with because that's not the thing that rattles your cage, as it were, right? Because again, there's two types of temptation, there's the external, sin proposed, the internal, sin considered. I was proposed drugs but I never considered drugs. You were proposed things that you never considered. Here's the question: did Jesus ever consider a proposal? That, this gets to the heart of it, right, because now we're starting to get down to the nitty-gritty. Is it still a temptation? Based on the definition of what a temptation is, by the way, it's the very same word as the word "test." Jesus tested in every way as we are yet without sin. Jesus was led up into the wilderness and he was tempted by the devil, Matthew 4:1. The word "tempted" there is there. What did the devil do to tempt Jesus? He

propositioned him. He proposed to him several things for personal gain. You're hungry, take this bread, turn it into, or take this rock, turn it into bread.

First of all, I just want to ask you a question: would that have been a sin? Well, turning, getting bread from nothing is not a sin because Jesus does that later, feeds 5,000 people with five loaves which he had to make more bread from something. From nothing is what he did. He made it ex nihilo, out of nothing. He created bread by the word of his mouth, showing that, again, he was divine, right? Amazing. Him changing that stone into bread would not have been sin but it would have been a response to the temptation of Satan, and in that sense would have been wrong, right? It wasn't the action, it was the motivation that would have been wrong. There is no place in the text where you can show me that Jesus ever considered, entertained, or desired to engage in the devil's proposal and yet it was still a legitimate proposal. And by the way, that word is the same word in Hebrews 4:15, tempted as we are. He was tempted by the devil. Same word. Same Greek term used there and the same root because how the ends and stems work are different but the root of the word means the same thing.

Jesus having the proposal of the devil is a picture of his temptation. Many times sin was proposed to Jesus externally and in that way he was tempted as we are, however, I would argue it is clear he did not consider the sin. In fact, his only desire according to John 5:30, his only desire was to do the will of his Father. Get it? His only desire was to do the will of his Father and as such he didn't ever consider the sin, and based on that alone I would say he's impeccable because while there can be a myriad of sin that's external, he doesn't have the internal mechanism that's causing him to consider it, therefore he is impeccable. Could he have? I would say no because it would have violated the very nature of his being which was to do the will of his Father. You understand where I'm coming from this.

And somebody asked this question, this is gonna, put on your thinking cap. This is a little deep because people ask this question: if Jesus was impeccable as I seem to be concluding that he was, can we say that he was tempted as badly as we are? I would say he was tempted worse than we are. You say, "How was he tempted worse than we are?" We give in to sin. He never did. You have never had temptation to its fullest extreme because you always give in at some point. Jesus had temptation to its fullest extreme because he never gave in and thus it was added on, added on, added on and he never gave in. He never desired to give in. We've never been tempted like Jesus because we've always at some point failed the test.

I want to read a quote to you from the Believer's Bible Commentary. This is a Bible commentary, it's very, by the way, if you're ever looking for a one volume commentary that's just an easy help, Believer's Bible Commentary is a good commentary if you, you know, it's not, if you're doing a study of a particular book, I'd say go to book studies but for a whole volume the Believer's Bible Commentary, pretty good. This is what it says, it says, "To argue that his temptation was not meaningful if he could not sin is fallacious. One purpose of the temptation was to demonstrate conclusively that he could not sin. If you put gold to the test, the test is not less valid because the gold is pure." Let me say it

again, if you put gold to the test, the gold, it's, the test isn't invalidated because the gold is pure. The test is still the test and the gold is still pure. Jesus was pure gold. I had a little amen. That should have been a big amen. I'm gonna coach you in your amens. It goes on to say this, "If there was impurity, the test would show it up, similarly it is wrong to argue that if he could not sin he was not perfectly human. Sin is not an essential element of humanity, rather it's a foreign intruder. Our humanity has been marred by sin, Christ's was a perfect humanity." Christ's was a perfect humanity.

I'm gonna ask for a few, because I don't want to break this lesson in half. Stick with me for another few minutes. Please just a few more minutes because I want to ask this question: what is sin? Sin is three things. Oftentimes the easiest answer for what is sin in 1 John 3:4 is sin is a violation of the law of God. That's the first answer, sin is a violation of the law. If you violate God's law, you have sinned, amen? 1 John 3:4. Sin is lawlessness. But the Bible also says something else, the Bible says there are other ways to define sin. The second, the Bible says that whatever is not of faith is sin. Whatever is not of faith. Romans 14:23. Whatever is not of faith is sin. You know you can do something that doesn't violate God's law and it still be a sin because Romans 14 says if you shouldn't violate your conscience and if you violate your conscience, you've violated God's law because in that sense your conscience is bearing witness to what God is speaking in your life and you should not violate it. If your conscience says that you need to do X or not do X and you do it or don't do it, you're violating your conscience, the Bible says to you that's sin because if it cannot be done in faith it's sin. Romans 14:23. And also the third thing, it is a sin to fail to do what we know is right. James 4:17. It is a sin to fail to do right. "To him who knows to do right and doeth it not, to him it is sin."

Alright, so we've defined sin in three ways: sin is a violation of the law of God, yes; sin is anything that is not of faith; and three, sin is knowing to do right and doing it not, right? So now I want to ask three questions based on that definition of sin. Could Jesus violate the law of God? I'm gonna say no. Why? Because he is the Lord of the law. He is the Lord of the law. Why is it that when he was doing things on the Sabbath and the Pharisees came and got onto him, he didn't just say, "I'm not breaking the law"? He said, "I am the Lord of the," I don't think he did the thumbs but he said, "I'm the Lord of the Sabbath and the Sabbath was made for man, not man for the Sabbath. I created this." He can't violate his own law because he is the law. Have you ever thought about that? You heard somebody say, "I am the law." Jesus is the law. Jesus and this is important, Jesus came to the earth to demonstrate his righteousness by keeping the law because he is the law-giver. He demonstrates it because he is the law-giver. Born under the law, keep the law for those who are under the law that we might become adopted and redeemed, right? That's Galatians tells us that.

Alright, second question: could Jesus do anything that was not from faith? Remember we're building a case for impeccability here, right? I didn't just come and say he's impeccable, go home. I'm building a case, right? Here's a second point: Jesus could not do anything that was not from faith because the Bible said he did nothing on his own accord, that everything he did, he did because his Father told him to do it. He did everything God said to do. He operated in constant communion with the Father.

Somebody said, "Well, that's not the same as our faith." Well, he prayed and he operated with the Spirit's empowerment and he was a man, and in that sense I would say everything he did was an act of trust in his Father. Alright?

Third thing: could Jesus fail to do what he knew was right? I would say no. I would say no because, again, John 5:30, he said, "I am doing my Father's will. I've come, that's what motivates me, my Father's will." He does what is right. He could only do what is right.

Based on these definitions of sin and the nature of Christ as the God-man, I would have to conclude he's not only sinless but incapable of being anything other than that. But now I want to finish with one last thought. On your sheet it says final thought on the subject of potentiality. Now we're gonna get into biblical philosophy. Biblical philosophy just for a second because, honestly, this whole question is a philosophical question. It's almost like how many angels can dance on the head of a pin because we're not asking did Jesus sin and that's really what matters, right? We're asking could he have sinned, that, somebody will say, "Well, that doesn't really matter." It matters to me because I think it speaks to how we understand his nature but even if you came up and said, "Well, I think he could have," I would ask you how do you come to that conclusion? But I think as long as we both agreed he did not, that's the most important thing but there is a question of biblical or theological philosophy here, the question of potentiality.

What is potentiality? Potentiality is the question of what is potential and really that's the question. The question is not really could Christ have sinned but was there a potential for Christ to sin? Was it potential that he would sin? And we have to consider that in the mind of God there is no potentialities. In the mind of God nothing is potential because whatever certainly will be is known in the mind of God before time began because he determined all things by his divine decree. God decreed that Christ would be the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world, right? In fact, the Bible says, in fact, go with me, I'll show you a passage. This is key. Go to Acts 4. Now I'm gonna use that word "predestined" tonight and you might not like that word and that's okay because that word can be misused, misunderstood, misinterpreted, and all that.

Oops, excuse me. This is not the normal Bible I read from so it's not marked. Well, goodness, where is the passage, brother, where it talks about him being handed up over the predestined counsel of God? Yeah, where is that passage? It's Acts 4 but I can't, I don't see it. You see, I didn't have it in my notes, see what happens? Determined counsel and foreknowledge of God, where is this? If you find it, please tell me because I'm... It's chapter 4. I'm looking at it here. What's that? He was handed over by the determined counsel and foreknowledge of God. Well, yeah, what's that?

"Verse 15, where they conferred among themselves?"

No. Is it 2:23? Thank you, brother. Turn to Acts 2. Thank you. Look there. I had the wrong chapter. I'll have to be taken to the woodshed later. I'm holding you guys an extra minute because I couldn't find my spot.

Acts 2, beginning in verse 22. This is Peter speaking, "Men of Israel, hear these words: Jesus of Nazareth, a man attested to you by God with mighty works and wonders and signs that God did through him in your midst, as you yourselves know--this Jesus, delivered up according to the definite plan and foreknowledge of God, you crucified and killed by the hands of lawless men." Hear that. This Jesus was delivered up by the definite plan and foreknowledge of God. God decreed from the beginning of the world, before the world was created that he was going to send his Son and do the things that his Son was going to do, and that there was going to be a perfect Lamb of God that was hung on a cross, bore the sin of all of his people, and in bearing the sin of all of his people providing redemption for all who would believe on his name. That was the promise and guarantee of God and if there is no other reason to believe in the impeccability of Christ, it is to believe in the decree of Almighty God who determined from the foundation of the world that he would send a Lamb without spot or blemish. God doesn't deal in potentialities. God knew from the beginning because he determined from the beginning that his Son would be without sin.

Impeccability is the logical conclusion based on both the character and nature of Christ as well as the perfect decree of Almighty God.

Let's pray.

Father, I thank you for the opportunity to study tonight. I pray that tonight hasn't just been a, just an opportunity to expand the mind but actually an opportunity to grow better in our understanding of Jesus, for, Lord God, Jesus is not just all the simple things but he is the most sublime of things in that not only was he sinless but because of his nature, because of his holy character he never once even entertained sin in his heart, and yet he was tempted from all sides. He was tempted by the devil like none of us have ever been. Things were put before him and opportunities were put before him that never have crossed our paths and yet he was without sin. Such an amazing thing. Such an awesome reality that our Savior was impeccable. We thank you for that in Jesus' name.