

Scriptures and Doctrine :: Atonement & all things pertaining

Atonement & all things pertaining - posted by Logic, on: 2007/9/15 12:44

Genesis 2:17 But of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, you shall not eat of it: for in the day that you eat thereof **you shall surely die.**

The judgment was death, therefore, the Atonement includes the punishment for sin as our substitute (Penal) so that the judgment of death is carried out.

The Atonement is not disciplinary or the law is not for rehabilitation intended to reform humankind of which it would be if it wasn't penal.

Atonement is the translated word kaw-far' from Hebrew to English which means "to cover" of the Jewish Fast of Yom Kippur (Day of Atonement). It incorporates the words reconciliation, propitiation (satisfaction) and forgiveness. The work of Christ on His cross makes away for salvation while the salvation itself comes from the relationship one has with Him and not just in what he did on the cross.

- 1: Reconciliation = To restore a broken relationship.
- 2: Propitiation = A satisfaction, appeasement of wrath from a transgression of the law.
- 3: Forgiveness = To pardon an offense or an offender of the law.

To understand how the Atonement (sacrifice of Jesus) restores a relationship with God, appeases his wrath, and pardons our sin, we must know what God says.

God uses His law on the account of sin to implement the sacrifice of Jesus on the cross. God says,

Deut 21:23 His body shall not remain overnight on the tree (cross), but you shall surely bury him that day, so that you do not defile the land which the Lord your God is giving you as an inheritance; for he who hangs on a tree is accursed of God.

Jesus was taken off the cross that same day He died so the curse of sin would stay on Him.

Hebrews 9:14-15 How much more shall the blood of Christ, who through his eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God?

:15 And for this cause he is the mediator of the new covenant, **that by means of death**, for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first covenant, they who are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance.

Lev.17:11 For the life of the flesh is in the blood, and I have given it to you upon the altar to make atonement for your souls; for it is the blood that makes atonement for the soul.

Eze 18:20a The soul that sins, it shall die.

Heb. 9:22 for without the shedding of blood, there is no remission of sin

For man to be legally pronounced just, is not impossible, however, there is but one ground of the justification of man outside of grace, that is by obedience to the law.

I repeat, there can be no justification in a **legal sense**, but upon the ground of perfect, and uninterrupted obedience to the law.

Jesus is the only Man that has accomplished this, He performed the law perfectly, therefore, while in His earthly ministry, He would have had a perfect conscience from sin according to (Hebrews 9:9)

Christ was required perfect obedience to the law for Himself, however, since he perfectly obeyed, he did not need to suffer the penalty of death for breaking the law as we who have broken the law do. He could, therefore, suffer the penalty of death for in our place as a proxy.

Romans 3:19a We know that whatever the Law says, it speaks to those under the Law

Therefore, in order for man to be justified; man must be taken out from under the law. This only comes by death which is to satisfy the law. Having been set free from the Law by dying to the Law through the body of Christ. (Romans 7:4)

Since the penalty for sin is death and we die to the Law through the body of Christ (Romans 7:4) we must also rise from the dead with Him (Ephesians 2:6).

When Jesus shed His blood on the cross which is God's altar, God accepted His sacrifice. In verification of God's acceptance

ptance, He raised Jesus from the dead. The resurrection is the basis of our Faith
1Corinth 15:14 and if Christ be not risen, then our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain.

God lets there be a proxy (replacement for you & I) to take the judgment, but the proxy must not be guilty like the one accused or he would be taking the judgment for himself and not for us. So then the only person who could be without the judgment of sin must not be created so that is where the seed of the woman comes in. In the bible, the seed is always from the man, The Hebrew word for seed is zera` {zeh'-rah} it can mean, semen virile (sperm), offspring, descendants, posterity, or children. The man would plant his seed into the woman. God said in

Genesis 3:15 And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel. Notice the term her seed. Mary was the mother of Jesus but Joseph, Mary's husband, wasn't the father of Jesus. Jesus was not from a seed of a man but conceived by the Holy Spirit. Jesus is sinless; therefore He can take our place of judgment.

If it not had been for Jesus, we would have to satisfy the law because of our sin by our own blood. Atonement is the complete legal and retributive justice of God.

Hebrews 10:29-31 Of how much worse punishment, suppose you, shall he be thought worthy, who has trodden underfoot the Son of God, and has counted the blood of the covenant, with which he was sanctified, an unholy thing, and has done one insult unto the Spirit of grace?

:30 For we know him that has said, Vengeance belongs unto me, I will recompense, says the Lord. And again, The Lord shall judge his people.

This verse is implying that if one does not receive the Atonement there remains a retribution of God's wrath for the sin of who ever is not taking Christ as his proxy or scapegoat.

Re: Atonement & all things pertaining - posted by Nile (), on: 2007/9/15 14:58

Hey Logic, good thread!

I think you've outlined the penal substitution view of the atonement nicely. As you may or may not know by now, I don't ascribe to this view. Hopefully this can be a good discussion of the issue. I know I could certainly learn more about the Atonement.

Quote:

- 1: Reconciliation = To restore a broken relationship.
- 2: Propitiation = A satisfaction, appeasement of wrath from a transgression of the law.
- 3: Forgiveness = To pardon an offense or an offender of the law.

The way 2 and 3 are defined here is one of the main reasons I don't believe penal substitution is correct. I have trouble understanding how about 2 and 3 can *both occur*. That is, how can someone offer forgiveness yet still demand judgment at the same time? That is not true forgiveness, and is certainly not true pardon.

Let me give a simple example to explain...

...

Scenario A.

I catch a thief who has stolen \$100 from me.
I demand that the thief pay me \$100.

Scenario B.

I catch a thief who has stolen \$100 from me.
I pardon the thief and do not demand that he pay me \$100.

Scenario C.

I catch a thief who has stolen \$100 from me.
I demand that someone pay me \$100 (I don't care who).

In A, I demand judgment for the crime. I in no way extend pardon or forgiveness.

In B, I extend pardon and forgiveness. I in no way demand judgment.

In C, **I am still demanding judgment**. I deserve to get my \$100 back and that's what I want. **I have not extended pardon or forgiveness**. If I had extended pardon, I would not be concerned with the exaction of the judgment, for I would have **set aside the offense**.

...

My point is, if we as humans can forgive others, truly forgive them, that is, *not require that judgment be executed* (as in B) - why can't, indeed, why do we say that God doesn't do this?

Is God so incredibly angry with sinners, even repentant sinners, that He is unable to forgive them, that He is just so angry He has to take out His wrath on someone? It almost sounds like we're saying that God has angry issues and just needs to "vent His anger".

And don't be confused - I'm not saying in any way that the death of Christ wasn't necessary for forgiveness! Although if you don't understand why I think it was necessary you might be inclined to believe that.

Looking forward to your response!
(And now I need to do some homework!)
Nile

Re: Atonement & all things pertaining - posted by InTheLight (), on: 2007/9/15 15:18

Here is a good place to begin a study on atonement...

from Torrey's Topical Textbook

Atonement, the

Explained

Romans 5:8-11; 2 Corinthians 5:18,19; Galatians 1:4; 1 John 2:2; 4:10

Foreordained

Romans 3:25; 1 Peter 1:11,20; Revelation 13:8

Foretold

Isaiah 53:4-6,8-12; Daniel 9:24-27; Zechariah 13:1,7; John 11:50,51

Effected by Christ alone

John 1:29,36; Acts 4:10,12; 1 Thessalonians 1:10; 1 Timothy 2:5,6; Hebrews 2:9; 1 Peter 2:24

Was voluntary

Psalms 40:6-8; Hebrews 10:5-9; John 10:11,15,17,18

EXHIBITS THE

Grace and mercy of God

Romans 8:32; Ephesians 2:4,5,7; 1 Timothy 2:4; Hebrews 2:9

Love of God

Romans 5:8; 1 John 4:9,10

Love of Christ

John 15:13; Galatians 2:20; Ephesians 5:2,25; Revelation 1:5

Reconciles the justice and mercy of God

Isaiah 45:21; Romans 3:25,26

Necessity for

Isaiah 59:16; Luke 19:10; Hebrews 9:22

Made but once

Hebrews 7:27; 9:24-28; 10:10,12,14; 1 Peter 3:18

Acceptable to God

Ephesians 5:2

Reconciliation to God effected by

Romans 5:10; 2 Corinthians 5:18-20; Ephesians 2:13-16; Colossians 1:20-22; Hebrews 2:17; 1 Peter 3:18

Access to God by

Hebrews 10:19,20

Remission of sins by

John 1:29; Romans 3:25; Ephesians 1:7; 1 John 1:7; Revelation 1:5

Justification by

Romans 5:9; 2 Corinthians 5:21

Sanctification by

2 Corinthians 5:15; Ephesians 5:26,27; Titus 2:14; Hebrews 10:10; 13:12

Redemption by

Matthew 20:28; Acts 20:28; 1 Timothy 2:6; Hebrews 9:12; Revelation 5:9

HAS DELIVERED SAINTS FROM THE

Power of sin

Romans 8:3; 1 Peter 1:18,19

Power of the World

Galatians 1:4; 6:14

Power of the devil

Colossians 2:15; Hebrews 2:14,15

Saints glorify God for

1 Corinthians 6:20; Galatians 2:20; Philippians 1:20,21

Saints rejoice in God for

Romans 5:11

Saints praise God for

Revelation 5:9-13

Faith in, indispensable

Romans 3:25; Galatians 3:13,14

Commemorated in the Lord's supper

Matthew 26:26-28; 1 Corinthians 11:23-26

Ministers should fully set forth

Acts 5:29-31,42; 1 Corinthians 15:3; 2 Corinthians 5:18-21

Typified

Genesis 4:4; Hebrews 11:4; Genesis 22:2; Hebrews 11:17,19; Exodus 12:5,11,14; 1 Corinthians 5:7; Exodus 24:8; Hebrews 9:20; Leviticus 16:30,34; Hebrews 9:7,12,28; Le 17:11; Heb 9:22]

Re: Atonement & all things pertaining, on: 2007/9/15 16:37

I wasn't aware that 'Atonement' means 'to cover', although that is in line with the Old Covenant expectation of the Day of Atonement.

Our atonement through Christ, does much more than 'cover' our sins. (1 John 1:7)

There is an inner cleansing of the soul, the spirit and the mind, as well as healing of these in some measure although many of us need more.

Hi InTheLight,

I did a search on this page for any reference from Romans 6, and it is not in your post. I wondered if that is conscious on your part?

But, I have not checked out any of the texts you *have* offered. Still Rom 6:6 is the only one which says 'knowing this, that our old man was crucified with *Him*, that the body of sin might be done away with, that we should no longer be slaves of sin.'

This seems to be less about the wrath of God for sins, and more about God taking upon Himself to deal with man's bent towards sinning.

Re: Atonement & all things pertaining, on: 2007/9/15 16:49

Hi Nile,

I believe Romans 6:6 deals with an aspect of Christ's death which is controversial amongst those who believe that each man 'falls' individually, rather than that he arrives in this world already in a state of fallenness due to Adam's sin of disobedience, (by which we are all already dead spiritually, going to die eternally, unless we turn to Christ).

This emphasis on the individual sins of individuals, as the cause rather than the SIGN of their fallenness, means that the full meaning of Christ's death and what Paul wrote about it in Romans 6 and Gal 2:20, is not acknowledged by some Christians.

I believe differently.... that in Christ we are also put to death, (with our permission, of course!) so that in resurrection with Him through the Spirit, we are also freed from the sin principle and its outworkings.

Have you ever heard this explanation before?

Re: - posted by Logic, on: 2007/9/15 17:45

Nile wrote:

Hey Logic, good thread! I think you've outlined the penal substitution view of the atonement nicely.

Thanx

Quote:

As you may or may not know by now, I don't ascribe to this view.

Can you deny any of the conclusions that I gave, give some rebuttals, I am interested to find any errors that I have made in my conclusions.

On the matter of forgiveness, I think we need to have some definitions set forth.

Forgiveness is not the deletion of a crime but a covering. The fact of our sin is still real.

For example:

David's sin with Bathsheba. He murdered and committed adultery. God forgave him but the consequences of the sin ar

is still in effect.

A man is still dead and a child was still born from David's sin. The forgiveness of David's sin is that God will not hold his sin against him and never bring it up again to remembrance. That is true forgiveness.

Another example is the if you stole \$100.00 from me and I say that I forgive you but bring the fact of your theft up to you every time we meet, that would not be true forgiveness.

So with God, Because of the legal act of payment for the crime, God is justified in overlooking our sin to never bring it up again.

Quote:

Nile wrote:

In C, I am still demanding judgment. I deserve to get my \$100 back and that's what I want. I have not extended pardon or forgiveness. If I had extended pardon, I would not be concerned with the exaction of the judgment, for I would have set aside the offense.

God is 100% just & 100% loving, God love says forgive but God's justice says the law must be satisfied.

With the definition of forgiveness that I have set fourth makes possible for God to truly forgive us and still satisfy the law.

Quote:

Nile wrote:

Is God so incredibly angry with sinners, even repentant sinners, that He is unable to forgive them that He is just so angry He has to take out His wrath on someone? It almost sounds like we're saying that God has angry issues and just needs to "vent His anger".

In order to keep justice and not sweep sin under the carpet, there needs to be a punishment or payment for the crime.

Quote:

Nile wrote:

And don't be confused - I'm not saying in any way that the death of Christ wasn't necessary for forgiveness! Although if you don't understand why I think it was necessary you might be inclined to believe that.

Tell me, why do you think the death of Christ was necessary for forgiveness?

Quote:

(And now I need to do some homework!)

How old are you that you go to school?

Re:, on: 2007/9/15 20:26

Quote:
-----Nile wrote: Is God so incredibly angry with sinners, even repentant sinners, that He is unable to forgive them that He is just so angry He has to take out His wrath on someone? It almost sounds like we're saying that God has angry issues and just needs to "vent His anger".

Honestly brother, whenever I read many of your posts I think "This guy must have read my mind. I have thought and said the EXACT same thing!" What you just said, I said the identical thing in a discussion on the atonement 2 weeks ago.

I agree with you Nile. The blood atonement was a governmental requirement, not a personal requirement. No blood shed is needed on a person to person relationship when it comes to forgiving sin. A blood atonement is only needed on a government to criminal relationship.

Quote:
-----Logic answered: In order to keep justice and not sweep sin under the carpet, there needs to be a punishment or payment for the crime.

The governmental atonement theory says that God requires blood shed in order to forgive sin, so that nobody believes that they can sin with impunity, and so the atonement is to uphold God's government.

But the governmental atonement says that the blood offering of Christ is substituted with our punishment. The death of Christ was not our punishment. We deserve eternal hell but Christ was crucified on a cross. But the atonement of Christ was substituted for our punishment, enabling God to be able to set aside our punishment (forgiveness by grace).

Re: - posted by InTheLight (), on: 2007/9/15 22:18

Quote:
-----I did a search on this page for any reference from Romans 6, and it is not in your post. I wondered if that is conscious on your part?

Sister, I just directly copied the Scripture references on The Atonement from Torrey's Topical Textbook.

In Christ,

Ron

Re: - posted by Nile (), on: 2007/9/16 17:25

dorcas:

Quote:
-----I believe differently.... that in Christ we are also put to death, (with our permission, of course!) so that in resurrection with Him through the Spirit, we are also freed from the sin principle and its outworkings.

Have you ever heard this explanation before?

hmm, not sure. You might have to explain a little more fully.

Jesse:

Quote:
-----Honestly brother, whenever I read many of your posts I think "This guy must have read my mind. I have thought and said the EXACT same thing!" What you just said, I said the identical thing in a discussion on the atonement 2 weeks ago.

^_^

Logic:

I just wanted to mention this real quick:

Quote:
-----there can be no justification in a legal sense

Then is what sense is there justification? Follow the logical path of this question...and you arrive at Moral Government Theology.

Quote:
-----Can you deny any of the conclusions that I gave, give some rebuttals, I am interested to find any errors that I have made in my conclusions.

I believe that you have many of the right conclusions!

In fact, I would go so far as to say that you probably believe in a Governmental Atonement without realizing it - you just believe that there are other aspects of the atonement as well.

I do not believe that these "other aspects" are necessary or Biblical, but that a Governmental Atonement alone is the sum of everything necessary, the satisfaction of everything required, and the complete fulfillment of every Biblical description of the Atonement.

Quote:
-----A man is still dead and a child was still born from David's sin. The forgiveness of David's sin is that God will not hold his sin against him and never bring it up again to remembrance. That is true forgiveness.

A good argument brother! Consider though, that God's forgiveness of David saved him from the legal penalty...Hell. The death of his child was a reminder of his sin and a chastisement, but was in no way "justly required" by his crime. Do you see what I mean?

David prayed that God would not let the child die. If the child's death was "justly required" of David's crime, then would David have been asking that God do something unjust? Do you see how, therefore, the child's death is not pertaining to a satisfaction of the law?

Quote:
-----God is 100% just & 100% loving,

I agree.

Quote:
-----God love says forgive but God's justice says the law must be satisfied.

I disagree in how you mean it. See below.

Quote:
-----In order to keep justice and not sweep sin under the carpet, there needs to be a punishment or payment for the crime.

I believe it is possible to set aside the law and forgive without requiring any payment.

Go back to my previous example.

Am I being unjust in scenario A, by not requiring payment?

Is it wrong of me to "forgive" the man like this?

Are you saying that for every wrong done to us, we should demand payment of some sort be exacted?

Does this mean that in our courts, there should never be any pardons or mercies given ever?

I would very much like to know how you answer these questions, as I think it's critical to this discussion.

Quote:
-----Tell me, why do you think the death of Christ was necessary for forgiveness?

Awesome :-)

First, let me point out that God cannot forgive in the way I described above for this reason: forgiveness as such would be detrimental to His kingdom. While accomplishing pardon (1 below), it accomplishes nothing of punishment (2 below).

Let me be clear: it is not because God is just "so angry" with repentant sinners that He demands bloodshed. No, it is because a just, good, peaceable, and Moral Government demands it.

Christ's death was necessary to accomplish two things simultaneously, which otherwise cannot be accomplished simultaneously:

1. The accomplishments of pardon. Of having mercy and letting a sinner go free.
2. The accomplishments of punishment. Of which are these:
 - a. Punishment stops/hinders the sinner from sinning more.
 - b. Punishment deters others from sinning.
 - c. Punishment declares and establishes God's sovereign rule and ability to maintain His Law.

With Christ's death, all of these things are accomplished!! AMEN!!!!!!

Aside from why it was justly necessary, Christ's death does so much more!!!

Christ's death puts to death the old man and allows us to be partakers of the divine nature!

Christ's death declares God love for all the universe to see!

Christ's death **actually lessens** the total suffering in the world! Do you know what I mean by this??? Instead of billions suffering in hell for all of eternity, One Man died on a tree in a matter of hours!!! What a glorious trade!!! What a blessed exchange! Praise God!!!

You see, **God was not required by the law to dish out so much punishment in order to be counted just.** No, God merely needed to satisfy the requirements of justice. He did so with the death of Jesus - without dishing out any supposed "wrath" at all! Jesus suffered, oh yes...but His suffering was not equal to the suffering of billions in Hell for eternity...*it did not have to be equal to satisfy justice.*

:-)

Looking forward to your responses.

Quote:

-----How old are you that you go to school?

19 :-P

One last thing, I highly suggest reading "The Atonement" by Albert Barnes. It's online for free, just do a search. I'll post some excerpts from it sometime.

Thanks for the good discussion Logic!
Nile

Re: Atonement and all things pertaining, on: 2007/9/16 18:08

Nile said

Quote:

-----hmm, not sure. You might have to explain a little more fully.

After I left this post for you, I realise I'm not qualified to explain it much more fully or formally, but I notice that Christian (hmmhmm) has posted the links to two talks which cover this, by someone who *is* qualified to explain it thoroughly.

(https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?topic_id19602&forum34&0) https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?topic_id=19602&forum=34&0

You will be able to answer with your comments in that thread, if you feel this one is inappropriate for a more detailed discussion.

Re: - posted by Logic, on: 2007/9/16 20:05

Quote:

-----Nile wrote:

Quote:

-----there can be no justification in a legal sense

Then is what sense is there justification?

By perfect, and uninterrupted obedience to law.

Maybe I don't get your question, I answered this in my first post.

Quote:

-----Nile wrote:

I believe that you have many of the right conclusions!

In fact, I would go so far as to say that you probably believe in a Governmental Atonement without realizing it - you just believe that there are other aspects of the atonement as well.

I do not believe that these "other aspects" are necessary or Biblical, but that a Governmental Atonement alone is the sum of everything necessary, the satisfaction of everything required, and the complete fulfillment of every Biblical description of the Atonement.

I don't know what a "Governmental Atonement" is.

What specific "other aspects" are not necessary?

Quote:

-----Nile wrote:

A good argument brother! Consider though, that God's forgiveness of David saved him from the legal penalty...Hell.

How did God forgive David with out letting the law go unsatisfied?

Quote:

-----Nile wrote:

The death of his child was a reminder of his sin and a chastisement, but was in no ways "justly required" by his crime. Do you see what I mean? David prayed that God would not let the child die. If the child's death was "justly required" of David's crime, then would David have been asking that God do something unjust? Do you see how, therefore, the child's death is not pertaining to a satisfaction of the law?

I agree tha the death of davids child was not "justly required", because the child did not do the crime. It is the soul that sins that shall die(Eze 18:20)

Quote:

-----Nile wrote:

I believe it is possible to set aside the law and forgive without requiring any payment.

If you believe this, you do not understand justice, let alone "divine justice"

Quote:

-----Nile wrote:

Go back to my previous example.

Am I being unjust in scenario A, by not requiring payment?

Is it wrong of me to "forgive" the man like this?

We christians can only foregive because Jesus forgave us, that is the only basis that we can forgive others.

Mat 18:35 So likewise shall my heavenly Father do also unto you, if you from your hearts forgive not everyone his brother their trespasses.

Quote:

-----Nile wrote:

Are you saying that for every wrong done to us, we should demand payment of some sort be exacted

No, we forgive knowing that those who do not repent for the sins and/or debts against us will have their just dessert in the end, that is how we are able to forgive.

Rom 12:19 Dearly beloved, avenge not yourselves, but rather give place unto wrath: for it is written, Vengeance is mine; I will repay, says the Lord.

Quote:

-----Nile wrote:

Does this mean that in our courts, there should never be any pardons or mercies given ever?

The only way that there should be any pardons is because the law gives that authority to those who can pardon. The law says that the president can pardon:

Quote:

-----Constitutional Authority for Presidential Pardons

The presidential power to pardon is granted under Article II, Section 2 of the Constitution.

"The President ... shall have power to grant reprieves and pardons for offenses against the United States, except in cases of impeachment."

Pardons are not just given away at whim by just any judiciary; not just any judge can say at the bench, "I forgive you" or "the court forgives you"

The judge himself needs to have othority from the law to forgive.

Quote:

-----Nile wrote:

I would very much like to know how you answer these questions, as I think it's critical to this discussion.

I hope these are suficient.

Forgiveness is always costly. there is always a price with forgiveness.

The King in Mat 18:22-34 who forgave his servant was paying the debt himself by the lose of the monies owed to him. Just as it is with our sin, GOD the Father is paying the debt himself by the price of His Son.

Quote:

-----Nile wrote:

but His suffering was not equal to the suffering of billions in Hell for eternity...it did not have to be equal to satisfy justice.

I agree, some might figure that Christ would need to have suffered in the amount to which was due for each and every p erson to satisfy justice.

This is to suppose that Jesus needed to suffer an eternal punishment multiplied in intensity, and duration, by the whole n umber of the the human race.

However, the penalty of sin is spiritual death, **not** "to suffer an eternal punishment".

The only reason That the damned suffer an eternal punishment is because they die physicaly without Eternal Life.

To explain further:

If Eternal Life after physical death is in the presence with God, then to die physicaly without Eternal Life is eternal punish ment outside the presence of God.

If one does not stay in the presence of Christ, there is no other place to be, but in outer darkness where there is gnashin g of teeth.

Re: - posted by Nile (), on: 2007/9/16 21:51

Quote:
-----By perfect, and uninterrupted obedience to law.
Maybe I don't get your question, I answered this in my first post.

My point is, this is the only type justification that the law recognizes. Any other type of justification is not recognized by the law.
Since the only justification that the law is capable of has been made impossible, another method of justification must be sought.
We agree so far, I'm sure.

Here is where I'm going with this:
Penal Substitution claims that ultimately, justification comes from the law.

I do not believe this is correct. Our justification comes by the grace of God, not by the law.
I will explain more, but I want to see if you grasp what I'm saying first.

Quote:
-----What specific "other aspects" are not necessary?

Boiled down, these are the "other aspects":

1. Jesus paid the debt we owed. That is, Jesus suffered the wrath of God intended for us.
-I see this no where in the Bible.
2. Jesus suffered for us by suffering *as* us.
-Again, I see this no where in the Bible. I would stop, as the Bible does, at Jesus suffered simply *for* us.

Quote:
-----If you believe this, you do not understand justice, let alone "divine justice"

Or perhaps you do not understand forgiveness. :-)
I was mightily liberated and overjoyed when I first understood *true* forgiveness.

Quote:
-----No, we forgive knowing that those who do not repent for the sins and/or debts against us will have their just dessert in the end, that is how we are able to forgive.

This is the view I held for a long time...I now believe it is wrong.

Is that the only way you can bring yourself to forgive someone, if you remind yourself that they'll be punished if they don't repent? I don't believe it for an instant. I know without a doubt that you, I, and everyone is able to genuinely forgive an offense against us and not have concern for retribution. That is not to say that retribution will not be dealt or that retribution is not good. I am saying that forgiveness need not be based on that - it should be based on love.

Quote:
-----The only way that there should be any pardons is because the law gives that authority to those who can pardon.

What would you say of God? Can He pardon, as in our court systems? Can He forgive someone and not require that any punishment be made?

If no, Why not?

What obstacles stand in the way?

Here is a very pointed that question that I think strikes the heart of the issue.

What is accomplished by punishing a sinner for his sin?

If it can be shown that Christ's death accomplishes everything that would be accomplished if the sinner was punished as he deserved, then Christ death is a sufficient reason to extend pardon to the sinner (the sinner of God's choice - that is, the repentant one), for nothing more can be accomplished by punishing the sinner.

Quote:

-----I hope these are sufficient.

Yep, thanks. I feel like we're actually discussing things as opposed to going around in circles :-)

Quote:

-----I agree, some might figure that Christ would need to have suffered in the amount to which was due for each and every person to satisfy justice.

This is to suppose that Jesus needed to suffer an eternal punishment multiplied in intensity, and duration, by the whole number of the the human race. However, the penalty of sin is spiritual death, not "to suffer an eternal punishment".

Aha, a good point. However, what do you mean by "spiritual death"?
Are you suggesting that Christ died such a spiritual death?

Nile

Re: - posted by Logic, on: 2007/9/17 19:21

Quote:

-----Nile wrote:

Quote:

-----By perfect, and uninterrupted obedience to law.

Maybe I don't get your question, I answered this in my first post.

My point is, this is the only type justification that the law recognizes. Any other type of justification is not recognized by the law. Since the only justification that the law is capable of has been made impossible, another method of justification must be sought. We agree so far, I'm sure.

Here is where I'm going with this:

Penal Substitution claims that ultimately, justification comes from the law.

I do not believe this is correct. Our justification comes by the grace of God, not by the law.

I will explain more, but I want to see if you grasp what I'm saying first.

I agree to this but we must know what the grace of God is.

Grace is the freely given, unmerited favor and love of God, kindness of God.

Grace:

Strong's Greek #5485 χάρις - charis is another word for gift.

Now we must know how a fallen man can find grace with a Holy and Just God.

God must punish sin, He can not have a relationship with a sinner.

How, then, can God show favor to an object of His wrath who spit in His face, who broke relation with Him?

God didn't break our relation with Him, we did by sinning.

There must be a way to make the relationship possible between God & man, that is the Atonement.

Quote:

-----Nile wrote:

Quote:

-----What specific "other aspects" are not necessary?

Boiled down, these are the "other aspects":

1. Jesus paid the debt we owed. That is, Jesus suffered the wrath of God intended for us.
-I see this no where in the Bible.
2. Jesus suffered for us by suffering *as* us.
-Again, I see this no where in the Bible. I would stop, as the Bible does, at Jesus suffered simply *for* us.

1. As for debt:

Mat 20:28 Even as the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to **give his life a ransom for many.**

A ransom is the price paid of that which is demanded.

If Jesus did not need to pay the debt we owed, then what is this verse about?

2. this might just be a matter of semantics, but I will give this to you.

Quote:

-----Nile wrote:

Quote:

-----If you believe this, you do not understand justice, let alone "divine justice"

Or perhaps you do not understand forgiveness.

I was mightily liberated and overjoyed when I first understood true forgiveness.

I think I described my view of forgiveness quite well, could you disagree on any of it?

Please explain "true forgiveness" if it is not as I have.

Quote:

-----Nile wrote:

Quote:

-----This is the view I held for a long time...I now believe it is wrong.

This is the view I held for a long time...I now believe it is wrong.

Is that the only way you can bring yourself to forgive someone, if you remind yourself that they'll be punished if they don't repent? I don't believe it for an instant. I know without a doubt that you, I, and everyone is able to genuinely forgive an offense against us and not have concern for retribution. That is not to say that retribution will not be dealt or that retribution is not good. I am saying that forgiveness need not be based on that - it should be based on love.

Yes, Love, How do we love anybody without knowing that Christ was first loving us?

Likewise, with forgiveness, How do we forgive without knowing that Christ, first forgave us.

Mankind is created with a sense of justice. We know that crimes can not be swept under the carpet through love with no satisfaction of the law that God created in us.

A man murders your wife:

How can you **love** him without reminding yourself that you were first forgiven and that you could have done the same except for the grace of God?

How can you **forgive** him without reminding yourself he will be punished if he don't repent in the end?

Quote:

-----Nile wrote:

Quote:

-----The only way that there should be any pardons is because the law gives that authority to those who can pardon, as in our court systems?

What would you say of God? Can He pardon,

Only on the bases of His divine law, just as our law gives authority to those who can pardon.

Quote:
-----Nile wrote:
He forgive someone and not require that any punishment be made?
If no, Why not?
What obstacles stand in the way?

No.
Because He is %100 just & %100 loving.
If God forgave and not require that any punishment be made, He would not be just; that would devalue HIS Righteousness and Holyness.

Say that the court forgave that man who murdered your wife and now he is back on the streets.
You, the victim, have been devalued as a citizen and in many more ways.

Quote:
-----Nile wrote:
What is accomplished by punishing a sinner for his sin?

If it can be shown that Christ's death accomplishes everything that would be accomplished if the sinner was punished as he deserved, then Christ death is a sufficient reason to extend pardon to the sinner (the sinner of God's choice - that is, the repentant one), for nothing more can be accomplished by punishing the sinner.

Yep.

Quote:
-----Nile wrote:
Aha, a good point. However, what do you mean by "spiritual death"?
Are you suggesting that Christ died such a spiritual death?

Death in the Bible is always pictured as a separation between two things.
Physical death, spirit for body - **Eccl 12:7** then shall **the dust return to the earth** as it was: and **the spirit shall return unto God** who gave it.
James 2:26 as **the body without the spirit is dead**, so faith without works is dead also.
Spiritual death, God from man - **Isa 59:1-2** But **your iniquities have separated you between and your God**, and your sins have hid his face from you, that he will not hear.

Jesus died physically & spiritually on the cross.
Jesus died spiritually when He cried, "Eloi, Eloi, lama sabachthani? Which is, being interpreted, **My God**, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?
He was separated from God which is spiritual death.
However, He gain Spiritual life again when HE said, "**Father**, into your hands I commend my spirit(Luke 23:46)
Jesus died physically when He cried with a loud voice, and gave up the ghost. Mat 27:50, Luk 23:46, John 19:30.

Re: - posted by Eli_Barnabas (), on: 2007/9/17 20:50

Here is an interesting thought to ponder...

Both forgiveness and justice can happen without the nullification of one or the other. Consider, a criminal is put in jail for murder, but the family of the victim forgives him. This does not mean he now doesn't have to go to jail... he goes to jail and justice is served, but at the same time he is forgiven. So both aren't mutually exclusive.

I say this because there are some who say if God forgives us that means there is therefore no justice served, for, they reason, that if justice is served how can that be forgiveness? I say that it can be both and it doesn't have to be one or the other.

Jesus Christ has received the punishment that our sins owed; *"But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities: the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed. All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way; and the LORD hath laid on him the iniquity of us all."* (Isaia

h 53:5-6) This fact does not nullify the free grace of God in forgiving us of our sins. It was a necessity of the law and the curse which required blood, and the law has now been satisfied, and God can now forgive us. It is both.

Just something to consider in this discussion.

Re: - posted by Logic, on: 2007/9/17 22:21

Quote:

-----Eli_Barnabas wrote:
Here is an interesting thought to ponder...

Both forgiveness and justice can happen without the nullification of one or the other. Consider, a criminal is put in jail for murder, but the family of the victim forgives him. This does not mean he now doesn't have to go to jail... he goes to jail and justice is served, but at the same time he is forgiven. So both aren't mutually exclusive.

Consider, a criminal is put in jail for murder, but the family of the victim forgives him. However, they will not let the courts let him loose to ravage the city and murder more people.

There are different ways to forgive, the family of the victim forgave him personally but not judicially. We can not forgive judicially but we may forgive personally without payment, in any way, of the crime; The courts can not forgive personally, but can only forgive judicially according to the law.

God is both a personal God and Law giver/Judge, God forgives personally but judicially, He demands the requirements of the law to be satisfied.

Re: - posted by Eli_Barnabas (), on: 2007/9/17 23:22

Yes, that is what I am saying.

Re: - posted by Nile (), on: 2007/9/18 10:59

Our posts are getting quite long, aren't they? :-P
This will probably take more than one post to cover.

Quote:

-----Now we must know how a fallen man can find grace with a Holy and Just God. God must punish sin, He can not have a relationship with a sinner. How, then, can God show favor to an object of His wrath who spit in His face, who broke relation with Him? God didn't break our relation with Him, we did by sinning. There must be a way to make the relationship possible between God & man, that is the Atonement.

I agree! We differ merely on **why** this necessary and **how** it is accomplished.

Quote:

-----1. As for debt:
Mat 20:28 Even as the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many. A ransom is the price paid of that which is demanded.
If Jesus did not need to pay the debt we owed, then what is this verse about?

He ransomed us, yes. He paid what was needed to be paid, yes. The catch is, what He paid *was not our debt*. There is no reason why it needs to be, and in fact there is no way it could be! The only person who can pay my debt is me, for the law explicitly says that the soul who sins must die. Not someone must die. The soul who sins must die. There is nothing given in the Law to allow someone to die for someone else. Not that I know of.

Quote:

-----2. this might just be a matter of semantics, but I will give this to you.

I don't think it's semantics. Consider what implications I draw from this statement that are contrary to popular teaching: If Christ doesn't suffer as us, then we do not stand before God as Christ. If our sin did not cause God to see us on the cross when Christ died, then Christ's righteousness does not cause God to see Christ when He looks at us. More on this later depending on how you see it.

Quote:
-----Please explain "true forgiveness" if it is not as I have.

After thinking about it, when I said "true forgiveness" I was actually meaning mercy (which includes forgiveness). I think the examples you gave fall apart if you substitute "mercy" for forgiveness.

Quote:
-----Yes, Love, How do we love anybody without knowing that Christ was first loving us?
Likewise, with forgiveness, How do we Forgive without knowing that Christ, first forgave us.

I concede here. "We love for Christ first loved us."

Quote:
-----How can you forgive him without reminding yourself he will be punished if he don't repent in the end?

Here is an important point that I've been assuming but haven't stated:
Forgiveness and mercy should **only** be extended given the following:
The offender is genuinely repentant.
It is deemed wise by all to extend mercy.
Justice is not sacrificed by extending mercy.

If those three are satisfied, then I could forgive the man and not demand his punishment.
So your question is somewhat amiss: we should not forgive unless the person has actually repented. This does not mean to hold a grudge or to be angry. But Jesus says, "If your brother repents, forgive him." Also, I never see God forgiving someone before they repent.

Quote:
-----No.
Because He is %100 just & %100 loving.
If God forgave and not require that any punishment be made, He would not be just; that would devalue HIS Righteousness and Holyness.

But WHY! Dig down deep and ask: WHY would it devalue His Righteousness and Holiness?
(I agree with you, it does! But to understand why is a critical thing to understanding the Atonement.)

Quote:
-----Say that the court forgave that man who murdered your wife and now he is back on the streets.
You, the victim, have been devalued as a citizen and in many more ways.

You're starting to see it Logic! You're getting at the reasons **why** punishment is necessary.
1. The criminal is back on the streets with no guarantee that he will not do more harm.
2. The crime has not been shown to be heinous.
3. Others are not discouraged for committing the same crime.

Now here is what I say: *All these things have been accomplished with Christ's death, thus allowing God to extend mercy and forgiveness all who will repent.*

All of these are accomplished with Christ's atoning sacrifice:

1. **The only ones God will let into His Kingdom are those who have repented and proved here on Earth that they will not be a menace to others in Heaven. That they will not be a menace is sure, because their hearts have been captured by God's love, as demonstrated in the cross.**
2. **Oh the evilness of sin! That only the death of God Incarnate could remove the stain! How much a greater testament of the evilness of sin than the death of billions of worthless sinners! No one in this age or any age to come should ever have any reason to doubt God's hatred of sin, as demonstrated in the cross.**
3. **The death of an innocent man does far more to motivate men than the death of innumerable wicked men. This is an undeniable fact proven throughout history. How much more does a martyr inspire passion and devotion than a filthy criminal punished for his crime?**

Are there any more things that need to be satisfied before a sinner can be justly pardoned? (I might have forgotten something, so this is an honest and rhetorical question.)

Quote:
-----Jesus died physically & spiritually on the cross.
Jesus died spiritually when He cried, "Eloi, Eloi, lama sabachthani? Which is, being interpreted, My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?
He was separated from God which is spiritual death.

What makes you say Jesus was separated from God?
I will post more later on what death I think Christ died.

Joyfully praising God,
Nile

Re: - posted by Nile (), on: 2007/9/18 12:15

Quote:
-----What makes you say Jesus was separated from God?
I will post more later on what death I think Christ died.

Jesus died a death that He was in no ways deserving of.
He was despised, shamed, and mocked.
He was killed in a most painful death, the same death dealt to murderers and thieves.
Indeed, He was put death between two sinners.
Nothing was said of His righteousness.

He was indeed forsaken by God.

...

Now what is this about Him being separated from God? Jesus was in perfect communion with God even while hanging on the cross.

More later,
Nile

Re: - posted by Logic, on: 2007/9/18 14:35

Quote:

-----Nile wrote:

Quote:

-----1. As for debt:

Mat 20:28 Even as the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many.

A ransom is the price paid of that which is demanded.

If Jesus did not need to pay the debt we owed, then what is this verse about?

He ransomed us, yes. He paid what was needed to be paid, yes. The catch is, what He paid was *not our debt*.

What debt or whose, then?

Quote:

-----Nile wrote:

There is no reason why it needs to be, and in fact there is no way it could be! The only person who can pay my debt is me, for the law explicitly says that at the soul who sins must die. Not someone must die. The soul who sins must die. There is nothing given in the Law to allow someone to die for someone else. Not that I know of.

Yes, you were already paying the debt by dying spiritually before your salvation, you were separated from the life of God.

However, the problem is, how to regain that relationship to be unseparated from God.

How do we become spiritually alive again?

We need spiritual resurrection.

The debt of our sin needs paid for us to live spiritually again.

Quote:

-----Nile wrote:

I don't think it's semantics. Consider what implications I draw from this statement that are contrary to popular teaching:

Okay, HE died for us :-). He paid the debt of our transgressions, trespasses, iniquities for us.

Quote:

-----Nile wrote:

1. The only ones God will let into His Kingdom are those who have repented and proved here on Earth that they will not be a menace to others in Heaven. That they will not be a menace is sure, because their hearts have been captured by God's love, as demonstrated in the cross.

In other words, The only ones God will let into His Kingdom are those who have proved faithful.

Quote:

-----Nile wrote:

3. The death of an innocent man does far more to motivate men than the death of innumerable wicked men. This is an undeniable fact proven throughout history. How much more does a martyr inspire passion and devotion than a filthy criminal punished for his crime?

Jesus' death was more than a "motivation" and an "inspiration"

Quote:

-----Nile wrote:

Are there any more things that need to be satisfied before a sinner can be justly pardoned?

I think that you are implying that only a physical death by a completely innocent man was needed for God to have mercy to forgive.

The fact is, that a physical **and spiritual** death by a completely innocent **eternal** man was needed to pay for all mankind.

A completely innocent, created, finite man can only pay for one man and one of that man's many sins, furthermore, that would leave the innocent, created, finite man who paid the debt, dead with no resurrection.

Furthermore, if Jesus' death was a ransom that was paid, then whose debt was paid, if it wasn't ours?

Yes, we were paying the debt of spiritual death before salvation, however, that debt is infinite. We can never be dead spiritually long enough to be completely paid off.

Quote:

-----What makes you say Jesus was separated from God?

Notice what Jesus said, ""Eloi, Eloi, lama sabachthani? Which is, being interpreted, **My God, my God**, why hast thou forsaken me?"

Sinners and those who are already separated from His Father call Him God. Jesus never called His Father God except for this time because He was **counted with the transgressors**(Isa 53:12)

Isa 53:11 says he shall **bear their iniquities...**

Therefore, **Isa 59:1-2** But your iniquities have separated you between and your God, and your sins have hid his face from you, that he will not hear

In other words, your I forsake you because of your iniquities.

What is God hiding His face from us mean?

Furhtermore, how would Jesus not experiance spiritual death if the wages of sin is spiritual death?

Re: - posted by Logic, on: 2007/9/18 14:46

Quote:

-----Nile wrote:

Quote:

-----What makes you say Jesus was separated from God?

I will post more later on what death I think Christ died.

Jesus died a death that He was in no ways deserving of.

He was despised, shamed, and mocked.

He was killed in a most painful death, the same death dealt to murderers and thieves.

Indeed, He was put death between two sinners.

Nothing was said of His righteousness.

He was indeed forsaken by God.
...

Now what is this about Him being separated from God? Jesus was in perfect communion with God even while hanging on the cross.

I am greatly enjoying this conversation with you. I am impressed with you, a 19 yaer old and your knowledg.

I don't think physical death is the penalty for sin.

The reason for my statment is that animals and plants die, but they do not sin.

Furthermore, christians still die physicaly.

If physical death was the penalty for sin, then forgiven christians still pay the penalty of that which they were forgiven of, not to mention the plants and animals paying a price for what they never commit.

Re: - posted by Nile (), on: 2007/9/18 18:36

Quote:

-----What debt or whoes, then?

It was not a debt that was paid, but a sacrifice.

A sin offering.

Quote:

-----Jesus' death was more that a "motivation" and an "inspiration"

Yes, it is much more. Nonetheless, motivation and inspiration is part of what it is.

Quote:
-----I think that you are implying that only a physical death by a completely innocent man was needed for God to have mercy to forgive.

The fact is, that a physical and spiritual death by a completely innocent eternal man was needed to pay for all mankind.

A completely innocent, created, finite man can only pay for one man and one of that man's many sins, furthermore, that would leave the innocent, created, finite man who paid the debt, dead with no resurrection.

I am saying that the physical, public, cruel death of a perfect man, not less than God incarnate, could make way for the pardon of all men. Nothing more is required.

Quote:
-----Notice what Jesus said, ""Eloi, Eloi, lama sabachthani? Which is, being interpreted, My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" Sinners and those who are already separated from His Father call Him God. Jesus never called His Father God except for this time because He was counted with the transgressors(Isa 53:12)
Isa 53:11 says he shall bear their iniquities...

Therefore, Isa 59:1-2 But your iniquities have separated you between and your God, and your sins have hid his face from you, that he will not hear
In other words, your I forsake you because of your iniquities.
What is God hiding His face from us mean?

In what way did Christ bear iniquities?

I believe He bore them in that He died *because of sin* and His death *took away sin*.

I do not believe that Jesus **became guilty of sin** before God.
Therefore, I do not believe that God forsook Him because He was "covered with sin".

I think sin is a choice, not something that can be passed from one individual to another.

Quote:
-----What is God hiding His face from us mean?

Not sure exactly. Not answering prayers, not delivering from trouble, not giving revelation.
What would you say?

Quote:
-----Furthermore, how would Jesus not experience spiritual death if the wages of sin is spiritual death?

If He did not need to pay the wages of sin :-)

Quote:
-----I don't think physical death is the penalty for sin.
The reason for my statement is that animals and plants die, but they do not sin.
Furthermore, Christians still die physically.
If physical death was the penalty for sin, then forgiven Christians still pay the penalty of that which they were forgiven of, not to mention the plants and animals paying a price for what they never commit.

Yes, I totally agree with you. As I said above, I don't see why it is necessary that Jesus pay the penalty of sin. Is there anything in scripture that would leave us to believe this?

The Bible seems to emphasize a blood offering, rather than a payment of debt.

Hebrews 9:22

And according to the law almost all things are purified with blood, and without shedding of blood there is no remission.

Hebrews 9:12

Not with the blood of goats and calves, but with His own blood He entered the Most Holy Place once for all, having obtained eternal redemption.

1 John 1:7

But if we walk in the light as He is in the light, we have fellowship with one another, and the blood of Jesus Christ His Son cleanses us from all sin.

Colossians 1:19-20

For it pleased the Father that in Him all the fullness should dwell, and by Him to reconcile all things to Himself, by Him, whether things on earth or things in heaven, having made peace through the blood of His cross.

Why doesn't say in scripture, anywhere, things like this: "having made peace through the spiritual death of His cross"? (If there are places, by all means bring them up!)

...

I would like us to investigate this question:

What is accomplished by punishing an offender for his offense?

"Justice is done."

Yes indeed. But how? Why is that the punishing of an offender satisfies justice?

I would say:

Quote:

----- The accomplishments of punishment. Of which are these:

- a. Punishment stops/hinders the sinner from sinning more.
- b. Punishment deters others from sinning.
- c. Punishment declares and establishes God's sovereign rule and ability to maintain His Law.

What would you say?

Quote:

-----I am greatly enjoying this conversation with you. I am impressed with you, a 19 year old and your knowledge.

I'm greatly enjoying it also! Thank you for the compliment as well.

Nile

Re: - posted by Logic, on: 2007/9/18 20:15

Quote:

-----Nile wrote:

Quote:

-----What debt or whoes, then?

It was not a debt that was paid, but a sacrifice.

A sin offering.

Yes, Jesus was surrendered for the sake of something considered as having a higher or more pressing claim.

However, He was sacrificed to redeem us:

1Corinth 6:20 & 1Corinth 7:23 For you are bought with a price:

Gal 4:5 that He might **redeem the ones under Law**, that we might receive the adoption of sons.

Titus 2:14 who gave Himself on our behalf, "that He might **redeem us** from all lawlessness and purify a special people for Himself," zealous of good works.

Eph 1:7 in whom **we have redemption through His blood**, the remission of deviations, according to the riches of His grace.

Eph 1:14 who is an earnest of our inheritance, to the redemption of the purchased possession, to the praise of His glory

Col 1:14 in whom we have redemption through His blood, the remission of sins;

Quote:

-----Nile wrote:

In what way did Christ bear iniquities?

I believe He bore them in that He died because of sin and His death took away sin.

I do not believe that Jesus became guilty of sin before God.

Therefore, I do not believe that God forsook Him because He was "covered with sin".

I think sin is a choice, not something that can be passed from one individual to another.

John 3:14 And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up:

The serpent refers to our judgment. Just as Israel looked on the Bronze serpent, they were seeing the judgment of their sin.

So it is when we look on Jesus, we see the judgment that we deserve.

Matthew 26:38 Then said he unto them, My soul is exceedingly sorrowful, even unto death: tarry you here, and watch with me.

Luke 22:44 And being in agony he prayed more earnestly: and his sweat was as it were great drops of blood falling down to the ground.

Why do you think Jesus was so intensely agonized?

It wasn't because He was worried about the coming crucifixion, but for bearing the sin of the whole world and the wrath of God that we deserve.

Quote:

-----Nile wrote:

Quote:

-----What is God hiding His face from us mean?

Not sure exactly. Not answering prayers, not delivering from trouble, not giving revelation.

God can not look upon sin, He hid His face from Jesus.

Quote:

-----Nile wrote:

I would like us to investigate this question:

What is accomplished by punishing an offender for his offense?

"Justice is done."

Yes indeed. But how? Why is that the punishing of an offender satisfies justice?

I'll get back to you on this one.

Re: - posted by Logic, on: 2007/9/19 14:45

Quote:

-----Nile wrote:

I would like us to investigate this question:

What is accomplished by punishing an offender for his offense?

"Justice is done."

Yes indeed. But how? Why is that the punishing of an offender satisfies justice?

I would say:

Quote:

----- The accomplishments of punishment. Of which are these:

- a. Punishment stops/hinders the sinner from sinning more.
- b. Punishment deters others from sinning.
- c. Punishment declares and establishes God's sovereign rule and ability to maintain His Law.

What would you say?

Why is that the punishing of an offender satisfies justice?

Your a, b, & c are secondary to the foundation of justice.

To inflict a penalty for an offense of sin against law is enforcing the consequence of disobeying a command.

The command is, do not sin, the penalty that must be enforced is death.

Law can not be broken and must be fulfilled.

The fulfillment of law is justice.

Some one must die for a crime against Gods law, the one who breaks the law is the one who must pay the penalty of death.

The way that Christ takes our place is that we assume his place on the cross as we are **in Christ; Rom 6:3** Or are you ignorant that all who were baptized into Christ Jesus were baptized into His death?

1Corinth 12:13 For also we all were **baptized by one Spirit into one body**, whether Jews or Greeks, whether slaves or free, even all were given to drink into one Spirit.

Therefore, HE paid the penalty as us in a way, because we are in Him.

Gal 2:20 I have been crucified with Christ, and I live; yet no longer I, but Christ lives in me. And the life I now live in the flesh, I live by faith toward the Son of God, the One loving me and giving Himself over on my behalf.

Re: - posted by Nile (), on: 2007/9/19 21:29

Quote:

-----To inflict a penalty for an offense of sin against law is enforcing the consequence of disobeying a command.

Why are there consequences to disobeying a command?

You can resort to "just because" if you must, but I don't think the "just because" must come here.

Quote:

-----The command is, do not sin, the penalty that must be enforced is death.

Why is there a penalty?

"Just because"?

Quote:

-----Law can not be broken and must be fulfilled.

The fulfillment of law is justice.

The Law must be established and fulfilled, otherwise it will have become a void and useless law.

Quote:
-----Some one must die for a crime against Gods law, the one who breaks the law is the one who must pay the penalty of death.

The way that Christ takes our place is that we assume his place on the cross as we are in Christ

I can see the logic of this, and it makes more sense than imputed righteousness.
Currently though, a governmental atonement still makes the most sense to me.

Nile

Re: - posted by Nile (), on: 2007/9/19 21:42

Quote:

Eli_Barnabas wrote:
Here is an interesting thought to ponder...

Sorry for not replying sooner!

This is kind of taking a step back in the discussion, but I wanted to clarify.

Quote:
-----Both forgiveness and justice can happen without the nullification of one or the other. Consider, a criminal is put in jail for murder, but the family of the victim forgives him. This does not mean he now doesn't have to go to jail... he goes to jail and justice is served, but at the same time h e is forgiven. So both aren't mutually exclusive.

1. "Forgiveness", as it is used here is not what I was mainly referring to. Sorry for the confusion, I meant "forgiveness" as in "forgiveness, mercy, and pardon". I'll use mercy or pardon from now on to avoid confusion.
2. Substitute "forgiveness" with "mercy and pardon" in the example, and it utterly falls apart. I will explain why if needed , but I think it's self-evident.

Quote:
-----*"But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities: the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed. All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way; and the LORD hath laid on him the iniquity of us all."* (Isaiah 53:5-6) This fact does not nullify the free grace of God in forgiving us of our sins. It was a necessity of the law and the curse which required blood, and the law has now been satisfied, and God can now forgive us. It is both.

Amen to that.

Re: - posted by Nile (), on: 2007/9/19 21:52

Quote:
-----Yes, Jesus was surrendered for the sake of something considered as having a higher or more pressing claim.

However, He was sacrificed to redeem us:
1Corinth 6:20 & 1Corinth 7:23 For you are bought with a price:
Gal 4:5 that He might redeem the ones under Law, that we might receive the adoption of sons.
Titus 2:14 who gave Himself on our behalf, "that He might redeem us from all lawlessness and purify a special people for Himself," zealous of good works.
Eph 1:7 in whom we have redemption through His blood, the remission of deviations, according to the riches of His grace.

Eph 1:14 who is an earnest of our inheritance, to the redemption of the purchased possession, to the praise of His glory.
Col 1:14 in whom we have redemption through His blood, the remission of sins;

Amen Hallelujah!

Quote:

-----John 3:14 And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up:

The serpent refers to our judgment. Just as Israel looked on the Bronze serpent, they were seeing the judgment of their sin.
So it is when we look on Jesus, we see the judgment that we deserve.

Matthew 26:38 Then said he unto them, My soul is exceedingly sorrowful, even unto death: tarry ye here, and watch with me.

Luke 22:44 And being in agony he prayed more earnestly: and his sweat was as it were great drops of blood falling down to the ground.

Why do you think Jesus was so intensely agonized?

It wasn't because He was worried about the coming crucifixion, but for bearing the sin of the whole world and the wrath of God that we deserve.

Good stuff.

Quote:

-----The serpent refers to our judgment. Just as Israel looked on the Bronze serpent, they were seeing the judgment of their sin.

Could you expound on this a little more please?

Thanks :-)

Quote:

-----Why do you think Jesus was so intensely agonized?

It wasn't because He was worried about the coming crucifixion, but for bearing the sin of the whole world and the wrath of God that we deserve.

In what way do you think Christ bore the sins of the world?

I grasp the concept presented, but I cannot fathom how it is possible.

btw, do you use firefox? you should. it has an auto spell-checker like ms word, hehe ^_^

Re: - posted by Logic, on: 2007/9/20 16:54

Quote:

-----Nile wrote:

Quote:

-----To inflict a penalty for an offense of sin against law is enforcing the consequence of disobeying a command.

Why are there consequences to disobeying a command?

You can resort to "just because" if you must, but I don't think the "just because" must come here.

God said so:

Eze 18:20 The soul that sins, it shall die.

Or are you asking why does God say so?

I thought I mentioned that:

If God forgave and not require that any punishment be made, He would not be just; that would devalue HIS Righteousness and Holiness.

The law is founded in the Personhood of God.

Moreover, it would make HIM a liar, for HIS word would not be true.

The purpose of the law is to teach one of the character of the Lawgiver, also to guide and to guard us while directing us to the mercy of the Lawgiver(Galatians 3:23-24)

Quote:

-----Nile wrote:

Quote:

-----Law can not be broken and must be fulfilled.

The Law must be established and fulfilled, otherwise it will have become a void and useless law.

The law reflect the character of God, therefore, God does not establish and fulfill the law for the law's sake but for His name's sake.

Quote:

-----Nile wrote:

Quote:

-----The way that Christ takes our place is that we assume his place on the cross as we are in Christ

I can see the logic of this, and it makes more sense than imputed righteousness.

Along with imparted righteousness, imputed righteousness is a fact, it is imputed through faith.

Quote:

-----Nile wrote:

Quote:

-----The serpent refers to our judgment. Just as Israel looked on the brass serpent, they were seeing the judgment of their sin.

Could you expound on this a little more please?

How did looking at the brass serpent heal the snake bites that was inflicted on Israel in the wilderness(Num 21:9)?

We must know why the snakes bit them to understand.

God sent the snakes as a judgment for speaking against God, and against Moses(Num 21:5).

The children of Israel had to admit that the serpents biting them was the circumstance of their sin and when looked upon the serpent of brass, they were seeing and agreeing it is their just judgment; the object of God's judgment is their salvation.

Likewise, when we look upon Jesus, we are seeing and agreeing it as our just judgment.

Quote:

-----Nile wrote:

-----In what way do you think Christ bore the sins of the world?

-----I grasp the concept presented, but I cannot fathom how it is possible.

Not the "whole world" literally, but applicable when faith is acted on, it is available to the "whole world".

Rom 3:24-25 Being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus:

:25 Whom God has set forth to be a propitiation(a way to give mercy) through faith in his blood, to declare His righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God;

Lev 17:11 For the life of the flesh is in the blood: and I have given it to you upon the altar to make an atonement for your souls: for it is the blood that makes an atonement for the soul.

Hebrews 9:12 Neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us.

:13 For if the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of a heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifies to the purifying of the flesh:

:14 How much more shall the blood of Christ, who **through His eternal Spirit** offered himself without spot to God, **purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God?**

In the forgiveness of sins, God had retained the integrity of his character as Holy God Righteous and true, in that he had shown a due regard to his Law, which is a reflection of His character, with out disregarding the penalty of the Law by taking the penalty onto Himself.

Should he forgive sinners without an atonement, justice would be sacrificed and abandoned, it would mar HIS character. God would cease to have any terrors for the guilty, and His judgment would be as to nothing.

In the plan of salvation, he has shown a regard to HIS character by appointing his Son to be a substitute in the place of s

inners; he endured so much as to accomplish the same ends as if those who shall be saved by him had been doomed to die

He bore the sins of the "world" by His Father assuming the sins as His own from those who will have faith in what HE did on the cross.

We are reckoned righteous by reckoning Christ death as ours.

Re: - posted by Nile (), on: 2007/9/20 22:01

Quote:
-----If God forgave and not require that any punishment be made, He would not be just; that would devalue HIS Righteousness and Holiness.

If this is the answer to, "Why is a sinner punished for his sin?" then can we not say that if God's righteousness and holiness could be preserved and upheld, punishment would not be necessary?
The whole point of the question is to show that punishment in it of itself is not what is needed.

Quote:
-----Along with imparted righteousness, imputed righteousness is a fact, it is imputed through faith.

I hope you haven't misunderstood me; I was referring to the doctrinal position on justification called "imputed righteousness" as opposed to the Biblical kind of imputed righteousness.

Quote:
-----He bore the sins of the "world" by His Father assuming the sins as His own from those who will have faith in what HE did on the cross.

What do you mean by this? Did Christ become sinful? Did the Father trick Himself into thinking Christ was us?

Re: - posted by Logic, on: 2007/9/21 11:27

Quote:
-----Nile wrote:
Quote:
-----If God forgave and not require that any punishment be made, He would not be just; that would devalue HIS Righteousness and Holiness.

If this is the answer to, "Why is a sinner punished for his sin?" then can we not say that if God's righteousness and holiness could be preserved and upheld, punishment would not be necessary?

That would be the logical conclusion, I guess. This is purely rhetorical though.

Quote:
-----Nile wrote:
The whole point of the question is to show that punishment in it of itself is not what is needed.

What would you say that is needed "in it of itself"?

Quote:
-----Nile wrote:
I hope you haven't misunderstood me; I was referring to the doctrinal position on justification called "imputed righteousness" as opposed to the Biblical kind of imputed righteousness.

What is the difference between the "doctrinal position" and the "the Biblical kind of imputed"

Forgive my ignorance.

Quote:
-----Nile wrote:
Quote:
-----He bore the sins of the "world" by His Father assuming the sins as His own from those who will have faith in what HE did on the cross.

What do you mean by this?

Christ did not become literally sinful, but maybe presumed as sinful(guilty).
2Corinth 5:21 For he has **made him**, who knew no sin, **to be sin for us**; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him.

"to be sin for us" could be two ways:
To be a sin offering for us
or
To be presumed guilty of sin for us.

For us to be presumed righteous, wouldn't HE need to be presumed guilty?

Quote:
-----Nile wrote:
Did the Father trick Himself into thinking Christ was us?

Please, no sarcasm, I hate it.
I believe our righteousness is credited to us by faith, couldn't God credit our guilt(unrighteousness) to Christ?

Re: A different way of looking at this, on: 2007/9/23 17:55

Hi everyone

I wasn't going to bother with this thread because the subject is so vast, and sometimes controversial.

However, I started pondering on where to begin to study/discuss this afresh, and realised something that doesn't seem to have been mentioned so far (forgive me if it has, not time or mental energy just now to read the thread properly - it's almost 11pm here). Also the following comments are rather off the top of my head so incomplete and maybe not always 100% accurate...

A study of the Atonement has to begin in the Old Testament.

In Genesis 3 when atonement first became necessary, God killed animals to provide Adam and Eve with coverings (fig leaves no good!)

Thus they learned that an innocent victim had to die (they would never in their lives up till then have seen death), and that somehow wearing its skin represented the way back to God - even though they were still banned from Eden.

At the same time there was the promise that One would come who would deal with the Serpent, though he himself would be wounded by it.

Noah was to build an ark of "gopher wood". Apparently the word is from the same as the word Atonement - "to cover" . He and his family alone survived God's judgement upon the earth, because they were within that "covering"

Abraham was shown the same message in another form. When God cut the covenant with him he was not able to walk together with the Lord through the pieces of the sacrifice. Rather Abraham was put to sleep (as Adam was when Eve was created) and the Lord alone walked that bloody path of sacrifice.

Later he was asked to sacrifice his son, but God "provided himself a lamb" instead.

At the time of the Exodus Israel were saved through the blood of the Passover lamb. Again it is salvation from God's judgement. But they were also to eat the lamb whose blood protected them!

Gradually a picture begins to build up. The ritual law was instituted, together with the moral law. Each of the furnishings of the Tabernacle, the priestly garments and the ritual laws and sacrifices, were further pictures of different aspects of the Atonement.

There were different kinds of sacrifices.

One was for sin

Another was for failure in any of the requirements of worship (sins of omission and commission?)

Another was for fellowship with the Lord

Another was in thanksgiving and worship.

Another was offering the whole of oneself to Him

Another was the offering of the first and best of one's increase.

Another was prayer: incense that was also usually offered with oil.

All the furnishings were sprinkled with blood and oil.

At their consecration the priests had blood and oil put on ear, thumb and toe.

The healed leper was also treated in this way! So the unclean, outcast one became (as it were) like a priest through this anointing of healing and wholeness!

And so on...

So many different aspects, so many truths illustrated.

Another aspect is the duty and privilege of the next of kin, who was called the go-el.

He was supposed to marry the widow if his relative died without children

He had the duty to avenge his relative's murder (called the "avenger of blood" in the KJV, but it's the same word, go-el)

He had the duty (if able) of redeeming - buying back - land or persons which had been sold.

We see aspects of this so clearly in the book of Ruth. Including the fact that there was another who had the first legal claim to marry Ruth, but he was unwilling so Boaz redeemed her instead.

Thus the Law, which condemns us, is superseded by Another who redeems us and "marries" us to Himself.

We were dead in sin, slain by Satan, and He avenges us and buys us back from that slavery.

"Boaz", who married Ruth, means "strength" - He is our strong Redeemer...

The Lord indeed has a mighty and strong One!

The whole of the Old Testament Law prefigures Him, and different aspects of the Atonement.

Hallelujah!!!!

We can't argue that one aspect is more correct than others - they are ALL true!

in Him

Jeannette

Re: Atonement and all things pertaining....., on: 2007/9/24 20:13

Hello Nile,

I was sharing this link with someone else today, and accidentally bumped the thread, which led another person to post a mention that these messages are videos. Thought I'd let you know.

(https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?topic_id19602&forum34&0) https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?topic_id=19602&forum=34&0

If I find a text sermon on the same topic, I'll let you know.