

Presbytery June 2014 D Macleod Address Part 2

Disclaimer: this is an automatically generated machine transcription - there may be small errors or mistranscriptions. Please refer to the original audio if you are in any doubt.

Date: 20 June 2014

Preacher: D Macleod

[0 : 00] I want to start at this point by asking what is between those disciplines, the biblical systematic. And we saw that the biblical is of course systematic because it organizes. We can't think without! organizing your thought and certainly biblical theologians are highly organized scholars.

But in systematic we make the opposite plea here that it also supports the biblical discipline. It involves one exegesis and also biblical theology and gathers all these up into one final coherent whole.

So briefly, what are its distinctives? The major distinctives are systematic organizing the material on a topical basis. On a subordinated basis not, they could originally assess biblical theology, but in terms of the great biblical concepts which one finds in Revelation. It is often suspected that, as I suppose in supposing, alien philosophies of the student doctrine or non-biblical concepts of the student doctrine. Karl Barthes refused to elect himself because of what he saw as problematic in that area that meant they gave the alien concepts of philosophy and imposing those on theology. He also subjected, of course, to a confessional approach because he thought that was equally a sweet jacket. He gave us what he called church normative. He gave us what he called church normatics. They don't see much improvement in the normative or when it gives the alternative terms, but that's what he did.

Now, these topics are subjects which occur and recurrent in the Bible. We find them time and time again. And there are five or six basic loci, which all of you are aware of, theology as such, doctrine of God, anthropology, history, soteriology, and physiology and perhaps some suseptology, depending on your range of material.

[2 : 21] But those are the five that have to create sub-humanism. But within these, of course, there are also a large number of what we might have to do with the sub-humanism. And we have to recall some concepts such as the Trinity, the divine attributes, creation, providence, the sub-humanity of God for ordination. These are all in theology proper.

And Christology, again, we have the sub-humanism, the incarnation of Christ, his work of atonement, his exaltation.

Or perhaps the three, four doggies, prophet, priest, and king, that are all alternative ways of recognizing material. But the epithel is more based on biblical guidelines. It's an iterating point, having made that comment that only in Hebrews is Christ called a priest. But it has become a major category in the form of theology that they do this through the through place the deep port office of Christ. They assume that they're quite valid because it's so widely endorsed by the epithel of the Hebrews.

And of course, again, those other ideas of theology and so on. What I would say perhaps in that area is that these are almost as an abstruse concepts. Some of them do sound abstruse.

And some can remain abstruse. But remember that, in secularism, we also cover experiential and practical realities.

[4 : 03] For example, Calvin's Institutes in Book 3 has a great extension on the Christian life as part of his systematics. And that includes such issues as Christian liberty, for example, and assurance, which are by no means abstruse or practically aware of the issues.

And we might also, under the same rubric, cover such things as repentance, conversion, faith, perseverance, all of them again experiential.

And ethics too was seen by Calvin and by many others as part of systematics, based on the Ten Commandments.

six-week course of this called a physiology, 24 lectures. This year is going into Systematics 2, which already occupied 96 lectures, and some have wanted to, 24 to 96, to give us a flag what we want. But obviously, they did a defective. It's going wrong something. Now, my concern is that, listening into your own discussions today, the doctrine of the church is so important. As long as I took it, there aims to theology in the sense that the church is a community of the redeemed. The same as having baptism in the theology. Because the New Testament, there is no separate baptism on conversion. When there is conversion, there is baptism. And I think that link perhaps has been sometimes rather randomly broken in some of our theology. I do it all the time. But the broken issue should be from the eventual calling to faith, repentance, and baptism. That is the profile of the theology. I think the scripture is so fairly good. But my concern is that the church is God's chosen instrument for the blessing of the world. We are able to have seed. And in the the church is God's chosen instrument for the blessing of the earth to be blessed. And if the church becomes dysfunctional as it has, to some extent, lack of self-reflection, self-reflection, self-reflection, then it's in opposition to the blessing of the world. And that's why the kind of Lachlan-decent approach to theology is something deeply wanted. It is important to ask what is the Lord's idea of the church, and what are the notes of the church, and what are its ministries. And to have clarity on issues of that kind. How should a church be organised? And you have a choice. You can say what we think as as Western business people, we go this way. And then you say the New Testament are a different way. And you have a choice.

Do you choose what made you choose the most efficient business-like way of doing things? Some American corporations, directors, and so on. Or do you go with the Presbyterian Church or the New Testament with its the New Testament? It's a college of overseers, and its connections of where the the, in my opinion, where the Vatican court is the local accession, the local church. And where that church is again overseen and turned by the Presbytery, and in turn by the Synod. So you have a review of the Lord by what the Protestant my darling called the Ephelium. Now of course only in rare circumstances, such as the superior at all medal in the Ephelium, the local church autonomy is a pretty important but the particular principle. And it's interesting to remind ourselves that in Scotland, post-officacy, the Catholic formation, there were no Presbyterians for several years. And Father the Indian John Knox had died before they had Presbyterians. So the idea that Presbytery the Vatican court is not one that had me to teach endorsements from the Symbolic [14:29] American thinking. The Vatican court, the Vatican church is still the local church. And that local church is linked or gathered into any other church. They linked to any church in the whole world. And one of the intriguing themes from Scottish theology which gave me much attention to the church, the so called Second Reformation, the Benedict Coulterford and George Gillespie and the Catholic Church and so on. But they had this view that when you sat at the Lord's table, you know better mind this fear of sitting at a table when somebody wasn't pushing me there. And the powers that can cause, I'm not going to sit at the table without pushing. And they said, look, when you sit at the Lord's table, you sit at the table with every other communicator of the whole world. Now, it's something that was, I think, most interestingly present, but in this facsimile, it was a unifying factor. And it's a challenge, I'm not going to acknowledge it entirely. Who are Christians? The

Baptised and the Communicants. Now, we would never think of those things who would become so accustomed to dismissing these sacraments as far as I define the criteria. But they were at one time precisely that. They were identified criteria. And it has helped me often to know on the Lord's table morning that as I sit at the Lord's table, I sit with all those in the church with me, all others in Scotland at the Lord's table, and all over the world from this day are sitting at the Lord's table, because we are born in Christ. You know, we can't choose a progressive institution. God has his own adoption policy, and he doesn't consider us on that policy.

And so, that's where we are. So, I'm just suggesting to you that these issues of arrangement, and so on, there are really some quite interesting issues as to the logical progression and so on, and that is the second feature of the system that I want to comment on briefly. That is this. That is, interestingly, organic connections between the various components of the truth. Because, at at the last, uh, through the shmone, and there is a modern system of theology. Now, of course, that can be horrified or subtle, but because the, uh, the, the, the, the, the, the, the, the 70 million years system. Now, obviously, that is a principle of the modern system. And within that system, uh, every secret truth, uh, is affected by every other truth, relates to that.

Uh, there is a support suit. And error in one department, where it would definitely, uh, generate error in another department. You know, you affect one member, one component part, then you affect every single, uh, component part.

And so we have to ask ourselves, not only how you are angels most of the times, but, how are they connected, the, the one, uh, to the other? Now, there is one remarkable point that maybe we should take to heart here, and place in the heart of our students. And it is this. The, absolutely, the fundamental importance of our views of sin. And it is the gravity of sin that means that we need an atonement. An atonement, uh, of such magnitude that God's own son.

[18 : 29] That's the virtue that God's own son takes their place under the curse of the law. Minimizes sin. As, uh, Abelard did. And, uh, uh, uh, And, uh, that's it, said, you haven't pondered the gravity of sin, he said.

And that, he said, is where you've got wrong, Alba Larrie. And only because sin is so brave to justify God's bruising his own son on the cross of slavery.

And only because of her sin for us to believe in your birth when the life is in, then a little more improvement will do. But if we get in the test of us that sin, then I think we would want to do. We need to be resurrected and raised up with Christ, more and again back in the spiritual home.

And again, because of the gravity of sin, we need proven in grace. Because there is no point of conflict in my heart with the gospel or with the glory of God.

And so, I need God's grace to renew my heart. He does it sovereignly. Because I simply can't take the initiative. And it's not surprising that Augustine's very early debate was in the ancient controversy for original sin.

[20 : 01] And all he says and does is link to that great doctrine. And in a very important way, the natural lives trust, most fundamentally, all evangelicals together.

Whether it be Spurgeon, Wesley, Whitfield, Baxter, these things don't difference in many departments. And yet, all of them agree on this great fact.

Wesley is a great servant on original sin. More succeed than Edwards, but no less urgent than Edwards.

And he may have deviated from what you are on some other issues, like perfectionism and so on, but nevertheless, here, he is one with us.

That's true of all your generation. The reading takes its start in what we think, on the significance and gravity of the form of man.

[21 : 01] And all those other connections, the person and what of Christ. Why has he to be God and has he to be man? And so on, and so on.

You work out all these connections. Karl Barth, sometimes suggested, and a treatment has suggested often, as you say, in terms of his conclusion, that sometimes he suggested that you can start at any point on the physical technological spectrum and develop from that point the whole system.

Because the whole system is in every element of the system. You can start the information with Christology and everything to that.

So we want to look at how those doctrines are linked together. the other point that might just wonder here is that systemality is about finality.

It's topical, it's different connections, and it is final. Now, I say final in the sense that that was a contrast with biblical theology.

[22 : 25] Biblical theology is never final, because of its historical timeline. you can ascertain what Moses said, that's not final, it's true, but it's not final.

What Isaiah said, again, that's not final. And even what Paul said, and James said, and John said, but no one of them has spent the whole of God through one given topic.

And so systemality waits until the final process concludes and the camera is closed. It deals with a closed camera, the final self-disclosure of God, God's last words we spoke.

And it also deals with the Bible comprehensively, and it puts all that all the hearers and all the shawar and all the writers have said.

And it says, take it holistically, what message are the giving tools. And so that says, it is a finality that everybody does not have, because it deals with the closed camera, and with the total comprehensive self-disclosure of God.

[23 : 44] Now, of course, in Isaiah, there are main words about incarnation, there are main words about the sacrifice of Christ, and in the Psalms, again, there are main words not similar messianic themes, and there are hints in the CO2 of eschatology, which are brought into the New Testament, the Doctrine New Testament, but Isaiah is not final, there are words that come after Isaiah, and there are others that speak besides Isaiah.

Even the New Testament, or justification, we must hear James as well as all to get the poor picture. And when we have done that, you have the finality that is adherent in systematics.

Now, it follows from that fact that systematics is dogmatic. Now, this is a problematical word, because dogmatism is found in the modern culture, and we have to be careful what we are dogmatic about, and we imagine it's both wrong things.

But, and dogma, in the world is used in different ways in theology, but what I'm driving at here is this, that if we have the truth of God, and it is fine the truth of God, and we are saying, thus said the Lord, then that is a dogmatic statement.

If I say that Jesus Christ is the Son of God incarnate, no postmodern hesitation should reduce me to say that that is not a dogmatic statement.

[25 : 40] It is categorically true. that he is the Son of God incarnate. Again, we are justified by faith without the works of the law, by faith alone.

That again is a dogmatic statement. So, we have to be careful not to put our humility and modesty in the wrong place. We have to realise that we have no way to speak what is not God's word, and it is God's word, we write dogmatic about it.

Now, of course, there is uncertainty, and we must be aware of that. But when we are certain that this is what God has said, then we have a dogmatic statement.

Now, many other things are involved in that, which I first learned before, like I had them. in the official sense of the word, dogma is an officially accredited statement on the part of the church, the decrees, for example, of Acts 15, of the Catholic Jerusalem.

These decrees were dogmas, and Isaiah is a dogmatic statement. In other words, what the church is spoken upon, pronounced not officially, is, in that special sense, a dogma of the church.

[27 : 09] And, the most important of them are described in the great ancient the Chimedic of Crees, of Nicaea, and Castador. These encapsulate the dogmas in which we are all, as Christians, agreed to do.

They decrease their dogmas. Again, in the Reformed tradition, we have our own Reformed Crees, and so there are Reformed dogmatics. And, at the most fundamental level, these are the doctorates, which, again, have been agreed by the Reformed truths, which are not consensus, but a great number of particular doctrines.

But, right beside that, there lies the fact of a hierarchy of truths. And, in other words, that some are more important than others.

Now, this is a dramatic attitude discovery. Kalman saw this very clearly, not all dogs are of equal importance, because not all will be with equal clarity.

And, we can disagree as Christians, some, and yet, they're looking at each other as brothers and sisters. Another division is a totimunity.

[28 : 25] I'm not going to my demise, that these are particularly, which are fundamental. But, what better is is the mathematics, is the existence of proportion. We know what things are really worth contending for, with might and may, with might and may, because there are such fundamental importance.

Not all are equally important. Kalman, again, says, time again, this covers particularly, if you can't argue, then I wouldn't worry too much about it. On some doctors.

But another she's adamant. And we need that sense of proportion. Now, systematics, that's distinct from a creed of statement, doesn't go to confine to fundamentals.

A creed of confession should be a certain fundamentals. But, systematics makes over the whole of revealed truth. And it would venture to express the fear of God's word on each and every topic or every slight of God's word on that topic at all.

So, because of its finality, it is a dogmatic statement. Yet, it's also true that theology is provisional.

[29 : 48] Provisional because it lives under constant judgment of nature. And God may cause more right to break out of this word and revise on opinions on certain things.

To quote one example of that, if you get any kind of pre-20s discussions of the type of man, it is seen immediately as an antithesis or the opposite to the Son of God.

God divine nature of human nature. Of course, promise Daniel is revealed to the divine and his function. There's a divine title from Daniel chapter 7.

The pre-existent fellow of the ancient of days who comes to the clouds of heaven, clouds of glory. It is not a reference to humanity, but to his pre-existent Christian status.

So, our mission is called for. It takes something else. We can go to the old world of sanctification or sanctification or even why.

[31 : 03] In the Christian there are two men, the old man, the new man. And that was the accident. We know that we have this almost split person and this internal laugh between old man and new man.

But John and others brought out this alternative approach. In fact, there's no old man. He was crucified across the Calvary.

And I'm a new man, a new person. Now, in my new person there is the flesh. But I'm going to people the old man is the average of itself.

And that old man is kaputu. It's the wrong man. And you can't pay for anything because it's not going to be paid for anything. I saw you out of the theology all the time.

There's another text in which the theology is around. it's this. But revelation is not yet completed. I've spoken of it for many years and well.

[32 : 13] But of course there's another world, another age to come. And in that age of all terms which I see not to look as darkly but face to face.

And so in that you see of close encounter the eyes of God we shall see depths of glory that at the moment are undisclosed to us and which are undisclosed to us who will not be given a lot of actually assimilating.

And part of the glory of that remember is this that we come to another timeline that is the unending major of discipleship something that is everlasting be growing in the knowledge of God so that at every point of the process there is progression and there is provisionality always more light.

When I have been there ten thousand years prior sharing us a sandwich to see God's praise when first began and I will put it to you that even the incarnate Christ in this human nature is difficult to know God as Father better than the passing day.

Now it's not reminding his opinions or abundance of all thoughts but it's bringing ever new discoveries of the glory of God and so in that sense there is no reality there is no provisionality which means that we look for further insight for a change of our current position but more we look for more revelation of God's glory in the world to come.

[34 : 14] I want to move on now in conclusion to maybe where I should have begun this but chose not to. theology of preaching or theology of the preacher how does it bear on our own ministries and I want to see it very quickly first of all how it bears on an exegesis now we've had this already how he raised his dematics or theology in general to exegesis the temptation to arrest the scripture to twist the text to accommodate our own particular systematic prejudices the danger that a capitalist could use the text to prove that God did love the world because the system is the determinant of the approach here and of course that is a real danger whether you are a dispensationalist or a charismatic or a calibrist or a baptist he would bring more appeal about which would bring more prejudices into the arena and that almost forces danger he was a preacher once reputed the enemy who whatever the text almost had three headings very convenient headings

I can assure you first he would say I worry about the text secondly I worry about application and third they worry about baptism every ceremony that was in the temple started so that shows how it got not to be done to be a system to be able to text a distorted way on the other hand you cannot divorce Jesus from your system you bring it with you and again think of scientists dispassionate impartial calm observer of phenomena unfaithful of course he's nothing of a kind he brings his paradigms with everything that you share to the motion whether it be in biology or in physics chemistry or whatever they have a paradigms the is the is the is the paradigm or unfortunately the the the paradigm but the paradigms are there the the the conditions of temperature and pressure and he doesn't reinvent the wheel and say well I can't be any preconceptions to this for example he has to accept well the earth is not flat and he has to accept that they are close with the sun and not the other way round and he brings these preconceptions these paradigms with them now

I'm suggesting to you that system I performs that same function you have your paradigms you are over you and you come to the text with that come me heads at you of Bible teaching as a whole and you will then come across a text that doits you to quote one obvious example that also refers my father is greater than I plain subordinations obviously not a divine person at all because this text is saying that Jesus is inferior and subordinate to God but then you have your paradigm you know the overwhelming weight of the evidence that Jesus was a cultist of his own divinity and is acclaimed and worshipped as such throughout the New Testament and so you have heard him say stop here and you see this text of the light of your whole doctrinal party framework you realize that perhaps there is a spiritual mediator who as such is the servant of the

Lord and as the servant of the Lord yes the father is the night Jesus did not capacity as the genotized servant yes the father is greater than him but if you found another text that's in the same thing the same general sentiment and then another and another and another if you say I not here maybe I should rethink something here because there is a gathering body of evidence that does affect my paradigm and that so science progresses because the paradigm is okay but the paradigm was really compromised by certain data or at least by certain mathematics not yet well that is experientially but to be medified eventually of one of moussaros from the scott and that's another point altogether but the paradigm in other words

I bring Nicaea to all Jesus and I can't much do that and I see the whole of the church I know that paradigms are revisable that I see as if you don't do it but in principle lies but as I mentioned once or twice cases I can add to you there is a very great danger in setting those secrets and one reason why the church of England disappeared eventually was because it tied up to the anti-confessionalism that came into the puritan movement the average church who because of their excessive biblical system so as the Bible alone and they said no creeds no evil creed and then you have the emergence in

[40 : 54] Holland and Scotland the divine Christ Feity and there weren't protection against it the one safeguard from the proof that there did not be alienized was a scripture to those creeds and in the church in England there was a great scripture to the mess in creed and Daniel Waterland was raised up to do tremendous work in a couple of return of these in many ways on the trinity and it says if queen made the creeds the protection that the trinity will be confessed in every proof and the Lord see the truth especially in the deity part of the condition of mission to a church to believe in the creed now of course if you can convince us that they didn't undertake to prove that the creed was strong in any sense the Lord said!

that she! wrong! But they said yes not mine and of course the Bible is not a creed and it began you know people quite innocently like Philip Don Christ and Watts they would subscribe and Watts when he was born wouldn't have heard of any creed not was the church wouldn't have heard of any creed our second function here from the creed of the church is what I believe is the church but it was individual the wider tradition of the Catholic church and that was ignored to see what Barth did want a professional theology what evolved by that he even all himself about!

other Christian confessions and that's why the Presbyterian church you could remember his panthrist stories have been expanded but yet he certainly was a panthritic scholar and he was very committed to the life of the church and those ancient creeds and to the theology perhaps not only of Augusti but also Christosho and the Christian parish and so we ourselves we didn't be difficult information Calvin thought goes right back into the Bible and into the church parish!

church and these creeds really are saints and what happened in the church in America became a unitarian church is by large and that's why I would be suggesting this confession is very important as I say to God in a constitution there is no common prayer that's what it is like what you mean that we say every Sunday or you read them but there is in churches there is a common preaching so that every group of the IPC will preach the same message and will not violate the confession that's a guarantee the people have that if we call this minister this man to preach the word to us we can be confident that he will deliver the prayer work of a common tree!

So exegesis again they're influenced by verses to that would be the paradigm to honor Jesus and then feeding the flock theology and feeding the flock now I suggest to you that at this point we consider a theology classroom and look at the students in front of you and what are they for and what are they intended to do some will be shivaris some will be academics although I hope not too many of them and most will be pastors and that's what are they for they're not the man in the street you must you read them to be bothered to or you level to that because they're not the man in the

street Christians they would be pastors and they must be themselves fed to the flock of [45 : 39] Christ and that's why we're here to teach them to help them to expose them to the great doctrine of the world white christian church because they are pastors who will be to feed the flock now that is I think tremendous theology and it basically that's your body but there is great pressure on today to become social workers or entertainers master of the ceremonies and it is so important to say look you most of you are going to be pastors of central congregations and I am here to give you the message and feed the flock of christ that's what this is all about so you can feed the flock but then I ask you to think of something else look at the text these people are going to be is now that's what preaching is as

Calvin insisted our job is to explain the text that is the beginning and end of a! so if I can quote Carl Bart again Bart that seems to be covered in production of circles he didn't like them because he got in the way of the text!

very often there's some discussion on the state of the word today and I find that always quite a point to you that when listeners should I assume just put the lives in the weeks of studying come out and tell the gracious doctors what the real word is right because they know the real word from books these people know the real word they want to get to the text and so the deductions to a text to get the text in the shortest space of time in the way from the introduction that's what the text at that a while with the text who are these texts in the rest to the first instance to the man in the!

to the! 20th century pagan or the first century pagan or the hippie humanist artist with guitar whatever they are addressed to the saints that come on the saints in Rome and the saints in Ephesus use gospel and rest again to the things beneath among us the sort of presumed reader of every New Testament book is a church and the books are blessed to that be in this or her needs and so the pastor is called to feed the flock he has given documents with which to feed the flock and his task is to expound those documents that will feed the flock that respect them their faith that inspire them to pursue service to comfort them and their needs and so on feed them feed the church of

God and feed them with the whole counsel of God it's amazing the things that people think they're open their heads of Christians believe and how daft God was who put this to the Bible for ordinary people which you have no one better John's prologue John 17 Romans 6 Romans 8 for ordinary people and then that's what God is saying please what am I privileged was that I began my ministry and congregation in the churches where I knew that the people were better than I and it was extraordinary because of 30 men in worship the number was maybe I'll try to unfortunate but there was only one graduate among the more graduate and so on so forth they were very very working class people but they were really interested in theology and

[50 : 23] I could never have blamed of talking down to them or to say this is all the people says too much for them my first year in Glasgow I preached through John 17 on a first evening and I never felt to dilute this or simplify it it just never got some more because I have a right to assume that these people are hungry and thirsty for the word and that they need to be fed and do I say well I'll feed them with this to make my own mind no God says you feed them with this you feed what I tell them to you because God decides to me I will decide to me and so!

! evangelizing the pastor will do that to accept as well because the people are not converted and they need to be led to the Lord or perhaps in evangelism so in the seed as Paul says in Romans going with the gospel is not known and he will say well here this must be not in the ones you will start with where they are and with atheism and humanism and so on and so forth and you ask Paul when you went to college where did you start what foundation did you lay and he says I deliver to the person of all that Christ died for her sins and you might say

Paul let you! because that is good deception of God you something was profound and difficult the Messiah died what do you mean by that died for sin what is sin died for our sins yes that's what I told about God God there people said to me look peace now the lost of the lost and use the eternal device of great traditions to that God because that's what works whereas the cross as for the human consumer survey that I choose what we want to do the cross well and devoted wasn't what was the first section it was unhorror to them as as to us the idea that you go back to Corinth and see 60

AD and you hear someone telling you that a Jew was crucified just thirty years ago is the savor of the world what on earth madness is that and that's what it was to them those famous graphic one of the the Lord when it portrays a Christian worshipping and his God has the crucified Christ and

below this caption so worships this God this acidite absolutely as a methodology and yet that's when Paul says that's what I started by it didn't seem to reality any foundation that he did you know when Scotland when there was spoken of the 18th century the non-evangelium was the whole idea he said he was educated the natives and then evangelized and education pushed him but Paul didn't say that I didn't push for the foundation of apologetics but I pitched Christ crucified now that might need fine shooting of course that can approach but this is the doctrine of precarious suffering Christ my representative and my substitute he died for her sins I was a message to people who probably didn't know at first what his sin was they had ready to offer to know what it was that Christ died for her sin now you look at the New Testament evangelism look at the great evangelistic texts and see how non-theological they are the most obvious of all of them is John 316 how non-theological is that I had the timidity when I was about 24 to preach on that text of the verse of [55 : 24] John Murray that was twice then as I know he said to him he was not at all he was very encouraging the gentleman John Murray but he said to me I have never preached on that text I have found that sentiment very wide and I was wondering what did you can show if you can preach of John 316 but if you preach of John 316 the dimensions of God's love a love for the world what does the world mean the life in which God's love why gives only God his son what is that gave his only son he gave his only son and then again the asymmetry of it he gave his son what does he ask of us by way of return that whoever believes in him should not perish and want to receive from God's eternal life so here you are explain that text that is the message explain that particular text and you can look at so many of those simple gospels come to me father and I will give you rest or Philip and the Ethiopian chancer he evangelized Jesus the gospel to Jesus for I receive you in the place of Christ to be reconciled to God for him who you know is to be simple for us that we might blame the might of God explain that text the gospel of God concerning a simple gospel Romans 1 gospel of God the only one of God and what does he say about him he wasn't made to him according to the flesh but he cleared to himself a God of power there was an extra to that text God good news about his son what is God good news about his son what is Paul saying to his son!

There cannot be a! God should give evangelism possible care I don't really have time to go to that but again you have nothing to say we are not and it's so hugely important we are not psychiatrists we are not psychiatrists we are not counselors we don't have to do that therapy we have only one thing the word of God from God about God theology that's all that we have you go through those two moments about the spiritual depression and faith and pride and time and time and time we find this massive theology not to bear upon acute pastoral problems which a magnificent sermon in spiritual depression I think it is on that one thing because we did that we can't be forgiven and so for the promise stemmed from an improvement class which is occasion by faith alone but God's family care so you see going back to Isaiah chapter 40 why do you say my way you did from the Lord have you not known have you not heard that he doesn't get tired the everlasting God's pain that no one doesn't become weary there is nothing wrong with his mind he knows what he's doing your theology is fundamentally flawed and that's why you're saved your way is hidden from the Lord and the remedy for that is proper theology and then theology your worship and not again so what is worship well is expressing your joy your thankfulness and so on hope but it's also about a courage reference and godly fear but the question is how do you generate those emotions go back again to the Lord's supper the great concept of remembrance that we have there is remembrance of me the eucharist that is in thanksgiving is elicited by remembrance or by showing forth the Lord's death until he comes and so the subjective response has something to respond to some are some of jubilation celebration why because god is a great god death of the earth and the spirit of whose is to whom the spirit you see belongs for you saved it made it how do you get people to celebrate by describing celebration or describing joy or refuse life who did get them to do that by describing god to them god's greatness i close for this the great challenge for love to get our lives into mind without theology it's very very easy to be correct in theory and yet so wrong in practice to get a walk of relationships with our neuroses that he has been under the control of what we believe about god and that's why at the end of the day the words about god are an only comfort but they often also a rebuke well

[62 : 00] I shall you pray this for your patience thanks Thank you.