

The Biblical View of Abortion (Part 2)

Selected Scriptures

July 10, 2022

*Tom Pennington, Pastor-Teacher
Countryside Bible Church, Southlake, Texas*

Well, this morning, I want us to continue our study of the issue of abortion. Last week we began; of course, this is everywhere in the news, this is something that everybody's talking about, not just believers. And so, it's so important for us to understand what the Scripture says about this issue.

Now let me begin by doing as I did last time. And that is, giving you a summary of what the Scripture teaches, and today, we're going to see that fill out. But let me tell you the basic message of Scripture on this issue. And it's this: Scripture teaches that God made man in His own image. It affirms the sanctity and personhood of all human life from conception. And it stands clearly opposed to abortion. That's what the Scripture teaches that we're seeing unfold together.

I also want to mention, as I did last week at the start of this message, if you're here this morning and you have had an abortion, you have in the past defended abortion, you've encouraged others to get an abortion, perhaps even provided an abortion, but you have repented and believed in Jesus Christ; let me affirm again what I affirmed last week. If you are in Christ then your sins, all of them including abortion, are completely forgiven, separated as far from you as far as the east is from the west. And as you sit here this morning, you are clothed in the righteousness of Jesus Christ. He sees you as pure and spotless as His own Son. It's important for us to understand this issue, but if you're a Christian and abortion is in your past, it's not that you should feel guilt any longer. "Therefore, there is now no condemnation for those who are in Christ Jesus."

But it's incumbent on us as God's people to be people who understand the times. And these are the times in which we live.

Now as we look at this issue so far, last week we considered these points. And if you weren't here, let me encourage you to go back and catch up because this is really foundational to what we're going to look at today. But last time we looked at the functional definitions of exactly what

we're talking about, we considered the historical background both in ancient history as well as in American history, we looked at its current expression and how its practiced, how it's exactly performed, we looked at the spiritual foundations, that is, where does this come from? And in the end, it traces back, according to our Lord Jesus, to Satan himself because in John 8:44 Jesus says Satan is a murderer and has been a murderer from the beginning. And he mixes lies in to accomplish that murder. That was his method in the Garden of Eden, it's still his method today.

Now today, I want us to focus on the biblical arguments against abortion. But first, I want us to consider the flawed arguments in favor of abortion. How exactly is it defended by those who say it's acceptable?

Pro-abortion, or another name they like to use is pro-choice. We'll see in a few minutes why that's not really a good name. But those who are pro-abortion believe that a woman has the right to control her own body and its reproductive rights, and that includes the choice to continue or to terminate a pregnancy. But on what basis do they make this argument? Let me give you the most common arguments used by pro-abortion proponents for abortion. I'm just going to walk through them quickly and give you a quick refutation of each.

First of all, the first argument that's very common is this: it's been accepted and legal in Anglo-American history and law for hundreds of years. This is revisionist history, but it's a common argument used today. In 1973, Justice Blackmun, who wrote the majority opinion in *Roe*, used this very argument. Where did it come from? Well, I noted for you last time, Villanova law professor, Joseph W. Dellapenna wrote a book entitled *Dispelling the Myths of Abortion History*. As I mentioned last week, he supports abortion. But he as a lawyer wanted to set the legal record straight in terms of this sort of recreation, this revisionist history. And so, he builds an extensive case; I think the book has some 8,500 footnotes, to show from legal precedent that abortion was a crime for 800 years until the later 20th century. Dellapenna summarizes his findings in a magazine entitled *First Things* like this, "The new orthodox history", don't miss that expression, "of abortion posits four theses. One, that abortion was always a common practice in human history. Two, that voluntary early abortions were not crimes until the 19th century. Three, that the 19th century abortion statutes were designed to protect the life of the mother rather than the life

of the child. And four, that the statutes were enacted through a conspiracy of men to accomplish several nefarious purposes to subordinate women”. He continues, “This new orthodox history was developed primarily by law professor Cyril Means Jr. in the late 1960’s. At the time, Means was general counsel of what was then the National Association for the Reform of Abortion Laws. He developed this history as part of a deliberate strategy for overturning the abortion laws then in place in the American states. Blackmun took his history of abortion in *Roe v. Wade* directly from Means’ work, citing him seven times.” Now, that’s the new revisionist history. In contrast to that, Dellapenna writes in his book, “the tradition of treating abortion as a crime was unbroken through nearly 800 years of English and American history until the reform movement of the later 20th century”. So, folks. The idea that abortion was widely accepted and legal for hundreds of years is revisionist history. Don’t believe it. It was created to sell abortion to the American people.

A second flawed argument for abortion is that it’s a matter of personal privacy guaranteed by the U.S. Constitution. Justice Blackmun argued in *Roe v. Wade* that there is “a right of privacy” contained within the 9th and the 14th amendments of the U.S. Constitution, and that that right of privacy “is broad enough to encompass a woman’s decision whether or not to terminate her pregnancy”. Now, I challenge you to read the 9th and 14th amendments of the U.S. Constitution and you will discover nothing about a right to privacy. In fact, in his dissenting opinion in 1973, Justice Byron White wrote this, “I find nothing in the language or history of the Constitution to support the court’s judgment. The court simply fashions and announces a new constitutional right for pregnant mothers”. Justice Alito, writing recently in the Dobbs case that overturned *Roe v. Wade* wrote this, “Not only was there no support for such a constitutional right until shortly before *Roe*, but abortion had long been a crime in every single state. At common law, abortion was criminal in at least some stages of pregnancy and was regarded as unlawful and could have very serious consequences at all stages”.

A third argument that’s presented in favor of abortion is that it’s a woman’s right to choose. This is the feminist argument. But it’s not really an argument at all. It simply begs the question. It’s not a woman’s right to choose if the fetus is not her tissue, if she’s merely the host for another human person. So, this isn’t an argument. It’s really just a statement of propaganda.

Number four: It's part of a woman's body and therefore, fully at her discretion. Scientifically that is simply not true. The embryo or the fetus is not part of her body. It is a genetically unique organism. At conception, 46 genes combine – 23 from the mother and 23 from the father, and the result is a unique individual. The child's blood is its own blood. It may even be a different type than its mother. It has its own brain, heart, fingerprints. Listen carefully. Every cell in that embryo's body has a different genetic fingerprint than every cell in the woman's body. From fertilization, it directs its own development under the creative hand of God. It's attached to her body, but it is not part of her body.

Number five. And this is a new argument. When I was younger, the argument was “well, we're not even sure it's life until a certain point”. That argument isn't made anymore. They've changed it. And this is the way that it reads now: biological life begins at conception, but personhood begins at some later point. Now, pro-abortionists offer various theories about when personhood begins. For example, the U.K. Warnock Committee in 1984 said personhood begins 14 days after conception. Others say, no, it's at implantation. Others at quickening. That was a common medieval view. At the capacity to feel pain. Some say, no, personhood comes at viability outside the womb. That's really the position the justices took in *Roe v. Wade*. Many federal courts say that it comes at birth. And tragically, the former bioethicist for Princeton University, teaching our future leaders, says, really, personhood doesn't come until self-consciousness. Think about that. Think about when you were self-conscious. You can see where this will lead in the future. Now, I'll discuss the biblical perspective on personhood shortly. But it doesn't even stand up scientifically, because here's what the standard text on embryology says. This is Patton's *Foundations of Embryology*, “The time of fertilization represents the starting point in the life history of the individual”. That's not a Christian perspective. That's the standard text for embryologists.

Here's another argument that's given in favor of abortion: if abortion is outlawed, women will be harmed by illegal abortions. Now, there are a number of problems with that argument, but let me give you the two greatest ones. First, the maternal death rate from abortion actually fell precipitously between the 1930's and 1970 before abortion became illegal. Why? Because of

antibiotics. So, this is not a valid argument. Also, this argument ignores the 100 percent mortality rate for children that are aborted, whether legally or illegally.

Another argument; and this one's a shocking one. This is a new one that's been added recently, but it's out there. And it's this: abortion is morally preferable to adoption. Yeah, you ought to gasp at that. That's shocking. But this is out there. Frame writes this, speaking of this trend. He says, "The fashionable ideologs are now trying to discredit adoption. Raising images of wicked stepfathers and child molestation, even though most adoptions work out well. They fear, unbelievably, that if adoption becomes more widely accepted, abortion may be discouraged. And that", in their way of thinking, "would be a bad result".

And if you doubt this is happening, let me just encourage you to go to the Harvard Medical School website. I was there recently within the last couple weeks. I read an article in which this is exactly what is taught. That it is way too simplistic to think that the solution to mothers who have children they don't want is to just give them up for adoption. Look at all the problems with adoption and essentially, it argues implicitly, that abortion is superior morally as opposed to adoption.

Here's a final argument that's given: it's morally wrong, but it's a decision each woman must make. Over the last 40 years, most Americans have come to agree with that statement. How does that happen? Well, it's not an accident. It's a deliberate strategy. You see, those who are truly pro-abortion; I mean, those who are really trying to sell abortions, do not constitute a majority of Americans. So, the only way to sell their position is to increase their numbers. And how do you increase your numbers? The pro-abortion movement decided not to try to convert everyone to being in favor of abortion, but instead to convince most Americans to affirm that it's each person's right to choose. So, they gave up the pro-abortion language for the pro-choice language. But folks, choice is not an unalienable right. By law, my freedom of choice ends when it risks another person's rights to life and liberty. R.C. Sproul in his excellent little book on abortion wrote this, "It is this principle of self-determination, having a say in my own condition and future that is brutally denied to every unborn aborted child".

So, those are the arguments that are presented. But not we come to the key issue for us as believers. And that is: the biblical correction. What exactly is the truth? The question for us always has to be: what does the Bible say? And so, we're going to begin by looking at the biblical arguments. And then we're going to look at, is what I'm teaching you the scripture is saying, what the church has historically taught the scriptures are saying? So, we're going to take it in two parts.

Let's first of all look at what the scriptures teach, the arguments from Scripture. I'm going to give you several. We're going to work our way through them. I wish I had more time. I didn't want to take another week or two on this issue, but it's important for me to lay them out. So, let me do this.

Here's the first biblical argument against abortion: All human life is made in God's image and deserves to be preserved and treated with dignity. All human life is made in God's image. Look back at Genesis 1:26. This is where it begins. You remember this. On the sixth day of creation,

Then God said, "Let Us make man in Our image, according to Our likeness; and let them rule over the fish of the sea and over the birds of the sky and over the cattle and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creeps on the earth." God created man in His own image, in the image of God He created him; male and female He created them.

Now, understand that this concept of the image of God is a complicated concept, but it includes more than just the immaterial part of us. As one writer puts it; Frame in his book, "The image of God pertains to all aspects of man's being, physical included". God doesn't have a body. But He stamped us, body and soul, with His image. We are made in His image. Now, what's interesting about that is this becomes crucial in Genesis 5:1.

This is the book of the generations of Adam. In the day when God created man, He made him in the likeness of God. He created them male and female, and He blessed them and named them Man in the day when they were created. When

Adam had lived one hundred and thirty years, he became the father of a son in his own likeness, according to his image, and named him Seth.

So, understand what's going on here. Seth received the image of God from Adam and Eve through procreation. Notice, "Adam begot". Now you tell me, he begot Seth in his own image. When could that have happened? When was Adam involved in the process of Seth's birth? Only one time. And that was at conception. And so, he gained the image of God through the procreation process that God had created at conception. Because that was the only time Adam had any contribution to the process of his development and birth. So, this means that the image of God continues to be passed to future generations at conception.

Now, after the fall, man still retains God's image. In Genesis 9, we're told that capital punishment has to happen because man is made in God's image. In James 3, James says we shouldn't curse people because man is made in God's image. So, this continues after the fall. We read it just a few minutes ago in our Scripture reading in Psalm 8. God made man in such a way that he has this exalted position just below God, or it could be translated the angels, but either way both are true. We're made in the image of God. All human life. And that image comes to us at conception.

Second argument: God gives human life and He alone has the right to take it. God is the One who gives life. Foundationally, this is true. Genesis 2:7, "Then the Lord God formed man of dust from the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living being". But it's not just Adam and Eve. Job in Job 33:4 says this, "The Spirit of God has made me, and the breath of the Almighty gives me life". So, whenever life begins; and we know when life begins, it begins at the moment of conception, Job says "the breath of the Almighty gives me life". In Acts 17:25 at Mars Hill, Paul said God Himself "gives to all people life and breath". So, as the Giver of life, God alone has the right to end human life. Deuteronomy 32:39, "I am He, and there is no god besides Me; it is I who put to death and give life". 1 Samuel 2:6, "The Lord kills and makes alive". It's His prerogative as God. In 2 Kings 5:7, "When the king of Israel read the letter, he tore his clothes and said, 'Am I God, to kill?'. And the obvious answer

to that rhetorical question is, not. No. Absolutely not. I don't have that right. I am not God. It is not my right to take a life.

By the way, just as an aside, let me briefly comment on the issue of contraception. This is a question that is a dividing one among believers. Understand this. Most contraceptives do not end the life that has been conceived. They prevent conception. There are a few methods of contraception like the IUD, for example, the intrauterine device, that do end life that has begun. But most of them do not. So, all those forms of contraception that do not end the life are a legitimate cause of Christian liberty. They're an issue of conscience that each Christian has to decide for his own. The Bible does not say thou shalt, or thou shalt not.

Let's move on to a third argument: God condemns and punishes all wrongful taking of human life. Even pro-abortionists admit that the embryo and the fetus are human life. What they deny is that the unborn child is a person. In a moment we're going to see the Scripture says that they are persons; but even if the fetus and the embryo were only human life, it would be morally wrong and a crime because God condemns it.

In Exodus 20:13, "You shall not murder". Deuteronomy 5:17, "You shall not murder". God condemns in His Law, not only murder, but also what we call manslaughter, or negligent homicide. In fact, God demands the death of those who intentionally take a human life. Look at Genesis chapter 9, After the flood, this is a universal command to all mankind. Genesis 9:6, "Whoever sheds man's blood, by man his blood shall be shed, for in the image of God He made man". God says if a human being intentionally takes another life, that human being is to be put to death. Numbers 35:33, "you shall not pollute the land in which you are; for blood pollutes the land and no expiation can be made for the land for the blood that is shed on it, except by the blood of him who shed it". Proverbs 6 says, "There are six things which the Lord hates, yes, seven which are an abomination to Him". And one of those are "hands that shed innocent blood".

That brings us to a fourth argument: human life begins at conception. Now let me unfold several arguments to support that point. First of all, Scripture portrays God as the ultimate cause of conception. God obviously initiated the process of human reproduction. In Genesis 1:28, God

blessed Adam and Eve and “said to them, ‘Be fruitful and multiply, and fill the earth’”. So, God is the ultimate cause and He is still active in it. That’s why you have passages like Ruth 4:13 where we read, “The Lord enabled Ruth to conceive, and she gave birth to a son”. 1 Samuel 1:20, “after Hannah had conceived, that she gave birth to a son; and she named him Samuel, saying, ‘Because I have asked him of the Lord’”. Psalm 127:3, “Behold, children are a gift of the Lord, the fruit of the womb is a reward”. So, understand that God is the ultimate cause of conception.

A second part of this argument is this: Scripture consistently refers to conception as the start of a new life. For example, in Genesis Moses combines the words “conceived” and “gave birth” 11 times, and I’ve listed them there on the screen for you. The point is that conception initiates the new life which enters the world at birth. Conception initiates and then at birth that new life enters the world. As Fowler writes in his book on abortion, “The biblical writers never say the words ‘life begins at conception’, but they consistently refer to conception as the starting point of a person’s life”.

A third part of this argument, that life begins at conception; and this for me is the strongest of all: Scripture attributes moral guilt for sin to individuals at the moment of conception. You remember David in Psalm 51:5? He’s confessing his sin and he says this, “Behold, I was brought forth in iniquity”, that is, I was born in iniquity, “and in sin my mother conceived me”. David isn’t blaming his mother for something. He’s saying, ‘I have been a sinner since conception. This is who I am.’. David’s moral nature was already present in the embryo at conception. It’s impossible then to argue someone isn’t a person who has a moral nature. Again, R.C. Sproul puts it this way, “In Psalm 51, David recounts his personal moral history to the point of conception. An impersonal being, a blob of protoplasm, cannot be a moral agent. If David’s moral history extends back to conception, then his personal history also must extend to the same point”. This is the same point Paul makes in Romans 5:12 when he says, “Therefore, just as through one man sin entered into the world, and death through sin, and so death spread to all men, because all sinned”. When did this happen? It happens in the same way we get the image of God. It happens through procreation. It happens at the moment of conception. That’s why David traces it back to his conception.

By the way, this also raises a question many have. And that is, what happens to babies who have been aborted? It's horrific when you think about 63 million in the U.S. since *Roe v. Wade*. What happened to those babies? Well, for 2,000 years the Christian church has taught that those who are elect, and most have taught that all of them are elect, but the confession goes on to say, incapable of being outwardly called by the ministry of the Word. In other words, they can't hear the gospel and receive it, and it's referring specifically of those who die in the womb, those who die as infants, those who lack mental capacity, and of course young children, and the mentally disabled. It says this, they are "regenerated and saved by Christ through the Spirit who works when and where and how He pleases". That's a different message for a different time, but I believe that is what the Scripture teaches, both about the character of God and about the specific state of those who are not able to grasp their sin or the gospel.

Fifth argument: Scripture consistently treats the unborn as persons, regardless of their stage of development. Again, let me unfold this in a couple of ways. First of all, God forms individuals as persons in the womb. Job 31:15, "Did not He who made me in the womb make him, and the same one fashion us in the womb?". Of course, the classic text on this is Psalm 139. Turn there with me for a moment. David waxes eloquent describing exactly what happens in God's creative purpose. Look at Psalm 139:13, as he prays to God, "For You formed my inward parts;", you'll notice literally "inward parts" is "kidneys" in Hebrew; my organs, you put me together. Verse 13 goes on to say, "You wove me in my mother's womb". As Fowler writes, "The idea of weaving suggests the process whereby the basic frame of man is covered by series after series of sinews, muscles, blood vessels, and tissues. Also notice in verse 13, God formed and God weaved. Yes, there is a reproductive process, but God is at work in that process of development. Verse 14, "I will give thanks to You, for I am fearfully and wonderfully made", that is by You, "wonderful are Your works", God, in my own development in the womb, "and my soul knows it very well. My frame was not hidden from You", literally, my bones were not hidden from You when I was made in secret, and skillfully wrought in the depths of the earth". That's just a figure of speech for the darkness of the mother's womb. Each life is a wonderful gift of the Creator, skillfully produced in the womb by God Himself through the processes He's put in place. Look at verse 16, "Your eyes have seen my unformed substance; and in Your book were all written the days

that were ordained for me, when as yet there was not one of them”. The Hebrew word for unformed substance is a word that refers to the first stage of human development after conception. What we typically call the embryo. When David was an embryo in his mother’s womb, God saw more than tissue. He saw David. A person whose days were determined already.

Another way we can see this argument unfold is that Scripture uses the same terms for children before and after birth. Let me give you a couple of them. “Geber” is a Hebrew word that usually means man, male, or husband. Job 3:3 uses it for a child at conception. At conception. Another Hebrew word, “yeled”, means a child or a boy. Moses uses that word to speak of a child born prematurely in Exodus 21:22. You come to the Greek New Testament. “Brepheos” is a Greek word used of infants and the newly born, but in Luke 1:41, 44, Luke, the physician, uses it of John the Baptist in the womb. No difference between before and after birth.

God relates to those in the womb as persons. Psalm 22:9-10.

Yet You are He who brought me forth from the womb; You made me trust when upon my mother’s breasts. Upon You I was cast from birth; You have been my God from my mother’s womb.

But it’s even clearer than that in Jeremiah 1:5. Listen to what God says to Jeremiah, ““Before I formed you in the womb I knew you””. This was a person in the mind of God before there was even conception. And, “before you were born”, while you were still in the womb, “I consecrated you; I have appointed you a prophet to the nations”. When God looked in the womb of Jeremiah’s mother, He didn’t see a piece of tissue that had no personhood. He saw Jeremiah. In Luke 1:35 of course we have the announcement to Mary about our Lord and Gabriel said to her, ““The Holy Spirit will come upon you, and the power of the Most High will overshadow you; and for that reason the holy Child shall be called the Son of God””. Now you tell me, was there ever a time between Jesus’ conception and His birth when He was not a person? Of course not.

John Stott writes, “The fetus is not a growth in the mother’s body which can be removed as readily as her tonsils or appendix, not even a potential human being, but a human life”. Look at

Luke 1:41. You remember, Mary visits Elizabeth. When she learns that Mary's going to have a child, Jesus, and Elizabeth is already pregnant, verse 41 says, "When Elizabeth heard Mary's greeting, the baby", John the Baptist, "leaped in her womb". Look at verse 44, "For behold, when the sound of your greeting reached my ears, the baby leaped in my womb for joy". Scripture here attributes both cognition and emotion to John before his birth. But look at verse 43. Here you have Elizabeth referring to the 5 to 7-day old embryo. You remember, Mary heard she was going to be pregnant, she immediately got up and, in a rush, went to visit her relative Elizabeth and when she walks in the door, Elizabeth calls the 5 to 7-day old embryo; the time it would have taken for Mary to arrive there, "my Lord". Galatians 1:15, Paul says, "God, who had set me apart even from my mother's womb and called me through His grace". Same kind of concept in Jeremiah with Paul.

One other part of this is that under Old Testament law, negligently; don't miss that word, negligently injuring an unborn child was a crime. Look back at Exodus 21. Now this is a very complicated text, I admit to you. And I don't have time to fully take it apart. I just want to show you quickly what's here. Let me read it and then we'll make a couple of comments. Exodus 21:22, "If men struggle with each other and strike a woman with child". Now first of all, what is very clear in this text is that you have two men fighting and a pregnant woman nearby is accidentally hit. Now let's see what unfolds. "So that she has a miscarriage". Now right away, if you have the NAS '95 you see a note in the margin, and it says, literally the Hebrew says, "her children come out". "Yet there is no injury, he shall surely be fined as the woman's husband may demand of him, and he shall pay as the judges decide. But if there is any further injury, then you shall appoint as a penalty life for life, eye for eye, tooth for tooth" and so forth. Now, some have interpreted what results here to be a miscarriage or a stillbirth. That's how the NAS '95 has translated it. Because the Septuagint translates the Hebrew here as "her infant departs not fully formed". Now that's led some to claim that a not fully-formed child is not a person and only merits a fine if it's killed. But, the Septuagint is a bad translation of the Hebrew. You look up the Hebrew word that's used here in all of the Hebrew lexicons and you will see that the word doesn't mean "formed", it means "injured" or "harmed". And the writer doesn't use the Hebrew word for miscarriage in this text, but rather a verb that's used often of birth, of children coming out. That's often used of normal birth.

So, with that background, what's happening here in verses 22-25 are two possibilities. In verse 22, the first possibility is the mother who's hit inadvertently in this fight, the mother gives birth to the child or children prematurely. Literally, "her children come out". But mother and child are not injured. By the way, let me say that this translation of the mother gives birth to the child prematurely, that's how it's translated in the ESV, that's how it's translated in the Legacy Standard Bible, that's now how it's translated in the NAS as of the 2020 rendition because that's what the text says. So, the mother gives birth to the child prematurely, but the mother and child, neither of them are injured. All that happens is a premature, normal birth. In this case, the woman's husband determines a financial penalty for all the pain and trauma of this event. The judges weigh the justness of that financial penalty and award the appropriate damages to the woman and the husband. That's one possibility.

The second possibility is in verses 23-25. And that is, the mother gives birth to the child or children, but the mother and/or the child is injured. In that case, the judges are to punish the guilty person in keeping with the injury.

So, this passage then makes two important points about the fetus. Listen carefully. Point number one is that legally, it was to be treated equal to the mother. And secondly, harming it accidentally, even causing a premature, normal birth, was a crime. Don't miss that fact. That's very clear. And if the child died, the one who caused it was guilty in Old Testament law in terms of manslaughter. Because it was an accident. But if the fetus were to be injured or intentionally killed, as is often true in abortion, then it becomes murder and life for life is what the Old Testament demanded.

So, here is a summary of all the biblical data that we've considered. This is what Frame writes, "There is nothing in Scripture that even remotely suggests that the unborn child is anything less than a human person from the moment of conception". That's what we've seen. But here's an important question. Is that what people who have taken the Bible seriously historically seen? That's a valid question. Right? Are we just making this up because we're against abortion? Or is

this what the church and even Jewish people have seen in the Scripture? That's an important question. Let's look at it briefly: the historical interpretation of Scripture.

What have others seen Scripture teach on this issue? By the way, if you want to understand how people thought about abortion in the ancient world, read Michael Gorman's book on abortion and the early church. But let me just start with the Jewish sources. What did the Jewish people in the ancient world believe about abortion? Jewish literature is filled with arguments about when a therapeutic abortion; that is, an abortion to save the mother, is moral and legal based on the development of the fetus. But, listen carefully. Abortion on demand was absolutely not accepted.

Let me give you a couple examples. I cut several others from my notes because I don't have time. But, let me give you a couple. *The Sentences of Pseudo-Phocylides* says this, from around the time of Christ, "A woman should not destroy the unborn in her belly, not after it's birth throw it before the dogs and vultures as a prey". Josephus, the 1st-century Jewish historian, wrote, "The law orders all the offspring to be brought up and forbids women either to cause abortion or to make a way with a fetus". That's the Jewish perspective.

But what about the early church fathers? The early church taught that Scripture forbids abortion. *The Didache*, written at the end of the first century, says, "You shall not murder a child by abortion, nor kill one who has been born". *The Letter of Barnabas*, written about 130 A.D., "You shall not abort a child, nor again shall you destroy him after he is born". Tertullian, the early church father, "In our case, murder is once for all forbidden. Therefore, we may not destroy even the fetus in the womb. To hinder a birth is merely a speedier way to kill a human. It does not matter whether you take away a life that has been born or destroy one that is not yet born". Basil of Caesarea, born about 330 A.D., "A woman who intentionally destroys a fetus is guilty of murder and we do not even talk about the fine distinction as to its being completely formed or unformed". And these are just a sampling of many that I could multiply.

Let's fast forward to the reformation – the men on whose shoulders we stand with the truths we believe from the Scripture. What did they teach? Luther wrote, "How great therefore the wickedness of human nature is. How many girls there are who kill and expel tender fetuses.

Although, procreation is the work of God”. John Calvin didn’t mince any words when he says, “The fetus, though enclosed in the womb of its mother, is already a human being, and it is a monstrous crime to rob it of life”.

Folks, Scripture stands clearly opposed to abortion. I’ve shown you that this morning. And, because of that, so have God’s people throughout history.

Now, let me just briefly comment on the hard cases. Because these are the ones that are brought up. And they are hard cases. They’re difficult things. But let’s talk about them. What about when there’s been a rape or an incest? Obviously, both of those are horrific crimes against a woman. Fortunately, for a variety of reasons, conception does not happen frequently in these cases. But if it does, I would encourage every Christian woman to remember that that child is a separate human life and is completely innocent of any crime. Better to carry the child and give it up for adoption than to end its life.

What about when the life of the mother is at stake? Again, fortunately, this is extremely rare. Former surgeon general Everett Koop says that during 35 years of practicing medicine “never once did a case come across my practice where abortion was necessary to save a mother’s life”. But it happens. And when it happens, the first goal is to try to save both. But again, in a fallen world at times that’s impossible. It then becomes an issue of conscience of which to save first, considering issues like survivability. The most common threat to a mother’s life is an ectopic pregnancy, or tubal pregnancy. When the embryo has attached somewhere other than the uterus. In that case, the child will not, cannot survive, and left alone, will also kill the mother. Personally, I believe that this is a case where the mother can act in self-defense, which the Scripture allows. But it’s an issue of conscience that every woman and her doctor and her husband need to work out together.

That brings us then to the last brief point I want to make, and that is the practical implications. How should we respond? I’m just going to give you these points. I’m not going to walk through them in detail, but just something for you to think about. I’ll include some verses that will be on the notes that you can work through. But here are some practical implications.

Number one: Remember, the enemy is the devil. Not the women who have abortions, nor even the providers. Remember Paul said in Ephesians 6, “We wrestle not against flesh and blood”. Our battle is not against human beings. It’s against Satan, who has prompted all this. Don’t ever lose sight, in taking these issues seriously, of this reality. Titus 3:2-3 says that we are to show every consideration to all men because we ourselves were one time foolish, disobedient, deceived, enslaved to various lusts, and so forth.

Number two: Be salt and light. Loving your neighbor. Speaking the truth on this issue. Practically helping those considering abortion. And that will look different for different ones of us in this room. Help them in sharing the gospel of God’s grace in Christ. That’s the ultimate solution. But at the same time, help. Let me just say, by the way, if you’re here this morning and you’re a woman who is pregnant and you’re trying to work this through and you’re weighed down by the weight of raising that child and the expense and everything else involved, please come see one of the elders. We want to help you. And that’s how each one of us should feel about the people we know in our lives.

Number three: Guard your own heart against accepting the counsel of the wicked on this subject. And the way you do that is by delighting in and meditating on God’s Word. Listen, you are not beyond being influenced on the issue of abortion in some way. Because you are being preached at every day from every conceivable source. And the only way you’re going to keep from being influenced is Psalm 1:2. You have to manage your heart. “The righteous man delights in God’s Law”. And, by managing your time. “And he meditates on it day and night”. Let me just say it bluntly. This is a math problem. I know you hate math, but it’s a math problem. If you spend most of your time imbibing the advice of the wicked; from music to entertainment to websites to social media, and you’re embracing the advice of the wicked constantly, and you spend that much time in God’s Word – a thimbleful in God’s Word, then understand this, you will be influenced by the advice of the wicked. It’s just a math problem. It’s going to happen. Instead, meditate in God’s Word day and night.

Number four: Vote for candidates who are opposed to abortion. Don't ever forget that almost a million babies are killed in our country every year. It is a silent holocaust. Think about this. In five years, if that trend continues in our country, to equal the number of children killed you would have to kill every single man, woman, and child in the DFW metroplex to equal that. So, vote.

Let me add a couple more. Pray for our nation and its leaders. Pray for wisdom. Pray for justice. Pray for their salvation as 1 Timothy 2 says. And then, let me finish where I started. If you've been involved in abortion. Or frankly, if you haven't, any other sin, what you need is the gospel of Jesus Christ. You need to repent and believe in Jesus Christ and you can have total forgiveness. Those sins will be removed from you as far as the east is from the west, the Psalmist says. And you will never stand before God in judgment for them again. Why? Because Jesus will have suffered for them on the cross in your place. That's my prayer for you. And if you've already trusted in Christ, trust in the forgiveness that He purchased. Don't live under the guilt of past sins knowing that Jesus paid it all at the cross.