

Title: Thinking Biblically About Abortion: Its Gravity, Its Resolution, and Its Response
Primary text: Proverbs 6:16-19

There are six things that the Lord hates, seven that are an abomination to him: haughty eyes, a lying tongue, and hands that shed innocent blood, a heart that devises wicked plans, feet that make haste to run to evil, a false witness who breathes out lies, and one who sows discord among brothers.

1. The sin of shedding innocent blood is a **preeminent moral crisis in Scripture.**

- Duet. 19:10; 27:25
- Psalm 94:21; 106:37-41; 20:8
- Isaiah. 1:15-16; 59:1-7
- Jeremiah 19:3-4
- Ezekiel 22
- Rev. 16:4-6

Key point: While all humans equally share a sin nature and thus justly deserve the judgment of God, the evil acts that spring from that sinful nature are not morally equivalent. Some sins are worse than others.

Is abortion the shedding of innocent blood? Yes, if **the unborn are human**.

- Science, philosophy, and theology support the pro-life argument:
- Pro-life case:

Premise 1: It is wrong to intentionally kill an innocent human being

Premise 2: Abortion intentionally kills an innocent human being.

Therefore,

Conclusion: Abortion is morally wrong.

Pro-life advocates support their formal argument with science and philosophy. They argue from the science of embryology that the unborn are distinct, living, and whole human beings. You didn't come from an embryo. You once were an embryo. They argue from philosophy that there is no essential difference between you the embryo and you the adult that justifies intentionally killing you at that earlier stage of development. Differences of size, level of development, environment, and degree of dependency are not good reasons for saying you had no right to life then but you do now.

In short, humans are equal by nature not function. Although they differ immensely in their respective degrees of development, they are nonetheless equal because they share a common human nature — and they had that human nature from the moment they began to exist.

- Biblical case against abortion:

P1. All humans have value because they bear the image of God (Gen 1: James 3)

P2: Because humans bear the image of God, the shedding of innocent blood is strictly forbidden (Ex. 23:7;

Prov. 6:16-19, Matt. 5:21)

P3: The unborn are human from conception.

Therefore,

C: The commands against shedding innocent blood apply to the unborn as they do every other image bearer.

2. Forgiveness for the shedding of innocent blood requires **the shedding of innocent blood, which Jesus provides by standing in our place condemned as a sacrifice for sin.**

Culture's solution—deny guilt and simply “Shout your abortion!”

Biblical solution—trust in God who justifies the ungodly.

Example: Isaiah (Isa.6)—The most holy man in all of Israel is terrified by a vision of the exalted Lord and he is undone! “Woe is me for I am a man of unclean lips.” God must provide the remedy for the prophet's sin.

Example: Abraham (Romans 4)—He trusts in God who justifies the ungodly:

- Put simply, We are *declared* righteous, not *made* righteous. **But how can a holy God declare unrighteous people righteous?** The answer is found in Romans 3: 21-25—

But now the righteousness of God has been manifested apart from the law, although the Law and the Prophets bear witness to it— the righteousness of God through faith in Jesus Christ for all who believe. For there is no distinction: for all have sinned and fall short of the glory of God, and are justified by his grace as a gift, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, whom God put forward as a propitiation by his blood, to be received by faith.

Note: The righteousness God demands is the righteousness he alone provides (Alien Righteousness—outside of us).

Verses to memorize for a Gospel centered year: Jonah 2:9; Romans 5:6-10; Isa. 53: 4-6; Romans 8:33-39; 1 Thes. 5:9-10; Eph. 2:1-9; Lamentations 3: 19-24.

3. The shedding of innocent blood calls for a **behavioral response** (Proverbs 24:11-12)

Are any of the reasons we might give for not speaking up worth the price of children's lives that might have been saved had we been more courageous?

1-minute defense of pro-life position (we all need to know how to do this):

I am pro-life because it is wrong to intentionally kill an innocent human being. The science of embryology is clear that from the earliest stages of development — from the one cell stage — you were a distinct, living, and whole human being. You weren't part of another human being like skin cells on the back of your hand; you were already a whole living member of the human family even though you had yet to mature. Meanwhile, there is no essential difference between you the embryo and you the adult that justifies killing you at that earlier stage of development. Differences of size, level of development, environment, and degree of dependency are not good reasons for saying we could kill you then but not now.