

Sola Fide Debate
Drake's Concluding Essay

Nick's third Rebuttal was so full of redundant demands that I have already addressed numerous times that I am not going to reply to everything as I am tired of repeating myself. I will give attention a few things he said:

Nick states that "If Christ is merely restating the Law and Prophets, that's not fulfilling them."

>>>But Nick, are you seriously stating that all the Prophets were fulfilled in Christ's Ministry? The New Heavens and the new earth are here? The final judgment has come?

Nick says, "They assume that laying on of hands means transfer, but that's untrue! A good proof for this is that Leviticus 3:1-2 is speaking of the Peace Offering (nothing to do with atoning for sin), and yet it gives virtually identical instructions to lay on hands and kill."

>>>This is getting so silly I don't even care to go into much detail. Alfred Edersheim, a Jewish Scholar converted to Christ, who is possibly the most qualified person in the history of Christianity to speak to this issue says in his *Temple--Its Ministry and Services*, Chapter 5,

"Laying on of Hands

But this was only the commencement of the service. Women might bring their sacrifices into the Great Court; but they might not perform the second rite—that of laying on of hands. *This meant transmission and delegation, and implied representation*; so that it really pointed to the substitution of the sacrifice for the sacrificer."

<http://www.ccel.org/ccel/edersheim/temple.vii.html>

One wonders where Nick is getting this stuff. Even the peace offering would have a representation to it for the sacrifice to apply to the person offering the sacrifice.

Nick says, "David is repenting of his past sins, not lamenting over future ones. And if 32:1-2 is speaking of future sins, then Paul botched his justification lesson in Romans 4:6-8, since that means Paul wasn't including past/present sins being forgiven."

>>>Nick, verse 8 is not the only one in that chapter. Read the previous verse. I understand I said, verse 1 and 2 were future. I was mistaken. Verse 1 is present and past. The passage that Fisher quoted was from verse 2 only regarding future remission.

In reply to my first question, Nick basically admits my point that I expounded on in my third rebuttal. He admits that Christ bore the curse of our sin, which curse only began with Moses. Therefore, everyone who came before Moses was either sinless and went to heaven, sinful and went to hell, or sinful and saved outside of Jesus Christ. Yet Peter made very clear that there was salvation in no one else but Jesus Christ. (Acts 4:12)

To my second question Nick says, “thus, God cannot “arbitrarily” overlook sin, but that is not the same as unconditionally forgiving sin. If God calls Christians to unconditionally forgive our neighbor, then certainly God is capable of this as well.”

>>>Putting man and God on the same level of moral obligation is impossible. God has no authorities to honor in command 5. God has no body or passions to commit sexual sins in command 7. God created everything and so there is nothing for God to steal in command 8.

Nick continues, “And since God is immutable, He never suffers or grows from anything we do, so in this case even making Satisfaction doesn't “change” his disposition.”

>>>The Reformed view does not teach that God changes his disposition to the elect. They are loved from eternity in the Covenant of Redemption. Samuel Rutherford states in his Covenant of Life Opened, Chap 4,

"WHETHER the Elect unconverted be under wrath is a doubt to many. It is true, they are servants of sin, Rom. 6. 17. Blind, and under the power of Satan as Reprobats are, Acts 26.18. By nature children of wrath, even as others, Eph. 2.3. Ans. Their sins committed before their Conversion, are according to the Covenant of Works, such as deserve everlasting condemnation, and they are jure and in relation to that Covenant, heirs of wrath, as well as others. 2. But we must distinguish between a state of election and everlasting, though unseen love, that they are under, as touching their persons: and a state of a sinfull way that they are born in, and walk in as others do, untill they be converted. As to the former state, it is true which is said, Ier. 31.3. I have loved thee with an everlasting love. See also, Rom. 9. 12,13. Eph. 1.4. so that God never hates their persons. 3. The punishment of their sins and the wrath they are under is two ways considered. 1. Materially in the bulke, and so they are under Law-stroaks and Law-wrath, that is Law-punishment, as others are, Eph. 2.3. and so the other places are to be taken. 2. The wrath is to be considered formally, and so it is denyed that the punishment of the non converted elect, because of their sinfull way is any part of the Law-vengeance or curse which Christ did bear for their other sins committed by them after conversion."

<http://reformedlayman.com/CovenantOfLifeOpened/THE%20COVENANT%20OF%20LIFE%20OPENED.htm>

Nick vindicates an argument I made before in my first rebuttal essay (“If his active obedience to

God's law was not required for our justification, why didn't God just have him killed right out of the womb of Mary? Why wait 30+ years?") when he says, "St Thomas Aquinas teaches that Christ humility in becoming man was of infinite value and redeemed the whole world the moment of his conception (cf ST 3:46:1; 3:48:1)". Nick continues, "but the Cross was a tool to best express God's love for us and humiliate the Devil. God could have wiped out the Devil or any sinner the moment they sinned, but there was some stroke of genius behind saving the world through the worst sin imaginable, murdering God." He offers no statement whatsoever to establish the necessity of eternal punishment and even makes an argument for a Universalist view in Thomas Aquinas. In their naïve attempt to rescue God from the ominous doctrines of Calvinism the enemies of Penal Substitution fall headlong into a more gross and monstrous conclusion. On Nick's Theology God didn't have to send people to hell as a satisfaction of justice for their sins, but as an arbitrary choice of his good pleasure he will forever enjoy watching millions of human beings suffer in everlasting torment for no other reason but that he arbitrarily felt like it.

To my third question Nick states, "For Drake's Third Question, he asked: "3. Inherent righteousness only looks to the present and the future, but sin in the past is ignored. This God will not forget without a satisfaction (Psalm 130:3, Psalm 143:2). How can a present act of righteousness remit a past sin and can an imperfect righteous deed satisfy for an offence against a perfect and eternal dignity?"

"Sins of the past refer to guilt stored up and spiritual damage done to the soul. Through sanctification, the spiritual damage is undone. The guilt is forgiven upon repentance."

>>First, guilt is not damage to the soul. Corruption of nature and an infused tendency to sin, is damage to the soul. Guilt is a legal declaration. Moreover, Guilt is not something temporal. Guilt is terminal. God said that the soul that sins shall die (Ezek 18:20, Gen 2:17) and that if remission was offered it required the shedding of blood (Heb 9:22). If a man steals something, he is a thief. Later on he may receive forgiveness and remain a forgiven thief but he is a thief nonetheless.

Nick continues, "When Drake asks how a "present act of righteousness" remit a past sin, I'm not sure I follow his question, since the "present act" of repentance (manifested Sacramentally through Baptism) is explicitly stated as the act that remits sin (Acts 2:38)."

>>Nick is confusing the sign with that which it signifies. The Westminster Confession 27.2 says,

II. There is, in every sacrament, a spiritual relation, or sacramental union, between the sign and the thing signified: whence it comes to pass, that the names and effects of the one are attributed to the other.[6]

[6] GEN 17:10 This is my covenant, which ye shall keep, between me and you and thy seed after thee; Every man child among you shall be circumcised. MAT 26:27 And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it; 28 For this is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins. TIT 3:5 Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of

regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost.

To my fourth question Nick says, “And this has nothing to do with an “imperfect righteous deed” somehow buying off God, since the Christian acts through the power of Christ and Holy Spirit. Thus, any good work done by a Christian with proper disposition is very pleasing to God.”

>>>Here we see the very confusion of the Roman Catholic system with respect to justification. Notice the paternal context Nick is trying to drag this debate into to create a straw man scenario where his opponents view, which is designed for a juridical context, seems unrealistic. I had clearly stated in my OE,

“Firstly, this forensic act of God in justification does not see God as a creditor and a private person

but as a ruler and Judge giving sentence concerning us at his bar. (2) Justification is the act not of a subordinate Judge, who is bound to the formula of the law, but of a supreme magistrate and prince, to whom alone belongs, in virtue of his autocratic right, the showing of favor to the guilty and the relaxation of the rigor of established laws. (3) That God does not here sit on the throne of justice that he may act according to the strict justice of the law, but on the throne of grace that he may act according to the gospel forbearance. (4) That he so acts from mercy as not to do injury to his justice, which (since it cannot suffer his laws to be violated with impunity and sin to go unpunished) necessarily requires some satisfaction to be made to it. (*Turretin*, pg. 27-28)”

Thirdly, the fact that Christians perform works through Christ and the holy spirit does not qualify them as justifying works. Westminster Confession 16.V says,

“We cannot by our best works merit pardon of sin, or eternal life at the hand of God, by reason of the great disproportion that is between them and the glory to come; and the infinite distance that is between us and God, whom, by them, we can neither profit, nor satisfy for the debt of our former sins,[16] but when we have done all we can, we have done but our duty, and are unprofitable servants:[17] and because, as they are good, they proceed from His Spirit,[18] and as they are wrought by us, they are defiled, and mixed with so much weakness and imperfection, that they cannot endure the severity of God's judgment.[19]

*[19] ISA 64:6 But we are all as an unclean thing, **and all our righteousnesses are as filthy rags;** and we all do fade as a leaf; and our iniquities, like the wind, have taken us away. GAL 5:17 For the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh: and these are contrary the one to the other: so that ye cannot do the things that ye would. ROM 7:15 For that which I do I allow not: for what I would, that do I not; but what I hate, that do I. 18 For I know that in me(that is, in my flesh,) dwelleth no good thing: for to will is present with me; but how to perform that which is good I find not. PSA 143:2 And enter not into judgment with thy servant: for in thy sight shall no man living be justified. PSA 130:3 If thou, Lord, shouldest mark iniquities, O Lord, who shall stand?’*

“I'm not sure where you even got this, but it's simply untrue. There isn't a quote from a Catechism or anything suggesting justification by an imperfect righteousness.”

>>>You are saying that your righteousness BY WHICH YOU ARE JUSTIFIED is something you do. You are avoiding the problem. You have to believe that your obedience is perfect righteousness. These two verses function well to refute that idea:

LUK 17:10 So likewise ye, when ye shall have done all those things which are commanded you, say, We are unprofitable servants: we have done that which was our duty to do.

ISA 64:6 But we are all as an unclean thing, and all our righteousnesses are as filthy rags; and we all do fade as a leaf; and our iniquities, like the wind, have taken us away.

Nick's reply to my fifth question is to re-assert that men are united to Christ with no metaphysical explanation. He does not have a complete theory. He re-asserts the objection that I have answered numerous times. I completely understand that Christian salvation includes an infused righteousness. However, that reflects SANCTIFICATION, NOT JUSTIFICATION. How many times do I have to say this Nick before you stop deliberately accusing the Reformed view of denying what it has openly affirmed numerous times?

Just as Steve Hays admitted he could not explain the Trinity and the Hypostatic Union, Nick and Rome cannot explain union with Christ. How can the finite composite nature really unite to the Monad without being consubstantial with it? It remains a mystery.

In conclusion, Nick's answers to my five questions are indicative of the complete incompatibility of Roman Theology with the Bible. He has no revealed ethical theory, he has no epistemology and he has no metaphysic. He has attacked a straw man Anabaptist view of sola scriptura. Nick has basically established my primary objection to Anabaptist Christianity *in toto*. Nick does not have a clue what to do with the Law of Moses and that is why he doesn't understand Justification by Faith Alone. This is because Tertullian and the early Church replaced Moses with the Monastery very early in Christianity and I believe it even began in the New Testament period (1 Tim 4:1-3, Col 2: 20-23). This Hellenistic pagan philosophy that the Greeks inherited from the Ancient Mystery Religions was the ontological basis for the Hierarchicalism that developed very early in Christianity and culminated into the Papacy. It is Gnostic to the core. Irenaeus says in *Against Heresies* (Book III, Chapter 2)

“The heretics follow neither Scripture nor tradition.

1. When, however, they are confuted from the Scriptures, they turn round and accuse these same Scriptures, as if they were not correct, nor of authority, and [assert] that they are ambiguous, and that the truth cannot be extracted from them by those who are ignorant of tradition. For [they allege] that the truth was not delivered by means of written documents, but *vivâ voce*: wherefore also Paul declared, But we speak wisdom among those that are perfect, but not the

wisdom of this world. 1 Corinthians 2:6 And this wisdom each one of them alleges to be the fiction of his own inventing, forsooth; so that, according to their idea, the truth properly resides at one time in Valentinus, at another in Marcion, at another in Cerinthus, then afterwards in Basilides, or has even been indifferently in any other opponent, who could speak nothing pertaining to salvation. For every one of these men, being altogether of a perverse disposition, depraving the system of truth, is not ashamed to preach himself.

2. But, again, when we refer them to that tradition which originates from the apostles, [and] which is preserved by means of the succession of presbyters in the Churches, they object to tradition, saying that they themselves are wiser not merely than the presbyters, but even than the apostles, because they have discovered the unadulterated truth. For [they maintain] that the apostles intermingled the things of the law with the words of the Saviour; and that not the apostles alone, but even the Lord Himself, spoke as at one time from the Demiurge, at another from the intermediate place, and yet again from the Pleroma, but that they themselves, indubitably, unsulliedly, and purely, have knowledge of the hidden mystery: this is, indeed, to blaspheme their Creator after a most impudent manner! It comes to this, therefore, that these men do now consent neither to Scripture nor to tradition.” (Christian Classics Ethereal Library Site)

The Gnostics said that to understand scripture you must have the *viva voce*. This *is* the Roman position. Nick has been deceived and I don't pray for his salvation because he has deliberately refused to represent his opponent according to his own terms and deliberately lied numerous times to misrepresent me.

Works salvation is the advantage a tyrannical organization has on its members. When your Church tells you to do something that they have promised will send you to heaven, you'll have a strong reason to do it. That is what is behind Muslim Jihadists and other assassins in the history of the world (Jesuits) who thought they were assassinating Protestant Rulers and Catholic Rulers who tolerated Protestants; to gain eternal life.

I would have been willing to continue this debate if I was confident that Nick would actually follow the arguments and accept the terminology I give to my own doctrines but it seems he will not. Therefore, I must retire.