

**Welcome & Intro :: Hello everyone, I'm new****Hello everyone, I'm new - posted by nuhope, on: 2011/11/17 22:04**

Hi just wanted to introduce myself, I am a born-again Christian who wants to meet like-minded Christians. I do not believe that the Lord Jesus Christ became a sin on the cross and I do not believe that the Father turned His back on Him, was reading some interesting posts here re this and would like to hear from others who believe as I do, thanks.

Re: Hello everyone, I'm new - posted by EvangelTam, on: 2011/11/17 22:07

Hey nice to meet you nuhope,

My name is Evangel Tam.

hmm you might find it hard to find Christians here who do not believe that Jesus did not become sin on the cross and that the Father did not turn His back on Him.

Can I ask where you came to these conclusions from scripture?

Evangel

Re: Hello everyone, I'm new - posted by RogerB (), on: 2011/11/17 22:27

Welcome to the forum nuhope. I don't write much either. Christ was our sacrifice, our substitute. Someone had to pay for our sins with blood. Christ did. Those that refuse him will likewise have their blood spilled outside the camp also, as we see in Rev 14:17-20. I think this stems from Genesis 9: 1:6.

As for the part 2 of your question concerning the father turning his back on him: Since he did take our place, if he didn't die for our sins we would be like those in Rev 14. We too would have been forsaken like it says in Matt 27:46. Jesus experienced being apart from his Father for a while. There was a cost to our redemption.

Re: - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2011/11/17 22:40

Welcome to the SermonIndex website, may God bless you as you benefit from these free resources offered. If there is anything I can help you with please let me know. Here are some recommended audio resources that have blessed many and might be something for you to first take a look at:

Ten Shekels and a Shirt by Paris Reidhead

<https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/mydownloads/singlefile.php?lid=282>

The Revival Hymn by Various Speakers

<https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/mydownloads/singlefile.php?lid=2903>

Judgment Seat of Christ by Leonard Ravenhill

<https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/mydownloads/singlefile.php?lid=235&commentView=itemComments>

His and His Alone by K.P. Yohannan

<https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/mydownloads/singlefile.php?lid=21381&commentView=itemComments>

Re: Hello everyone, I'm new - posted by dietolive, on: 2011/11/17 23:24

Welcome to the forum nuhope.

I agree with what you have written.

You said:

"I do not believe that the Lord Jesus Christ became a sin on the cross"

Like in many other similar passages in the Old Testament, the word "sin" is alone in the passage below. The word "offering" does not exist in Hebrew. It is supplied by the translators because of the sacrificial context.

Exo 29:14 "But the flesh of the bullock, and his skin, and his dung, shalt thou burn with fire without the camp: it is a 'sin' ."

Paul, as "an Hebrew of the Hebrews", and formerly "zealous of the Law", was certainly well aware of the usages of words in the Old Testament. In 2 Corinthians 5:21, he wrote using the word "sin" in the same sacrificial context, but the translators failed to supply the implied word "offering"

2Co 5:21 "For he hath made him to be 'sin' for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him."

You wrote:

"I do not believe that the Father turned His back on Him"

I agree as well. The Father never turned his back on the Lord Jesus. They were working together. This can be clearly seen in the psalm that our Lord was quoting while upon the cross. It tells us exactly what the Father's attitude was towards His stricken Son in verse 24:

Psa 22:24 "For HE hath NOT DESPISED nor ABHORRED the affliction of the afflicted; NEITHER HATH HE HID HIS FACE FROM HIM; but when he cried unto him, HE HEARD."

Be well,
Doug

Re: Hello everyone, I'm new - posted by joliboy11, on: 2011/11/18 7:23

welcome to SI, thank you for SI for sermons like these,

2Timothy 2:16 But shun profane, vain babblings, for they will increase to more ungodliness.

Re: - posted by EvangelTam, on: 2011/11/18 11:39

Hey dietolive,

What translation of 2 Corinthians 5:21 are you using?

Because I looked up multiple translation and they are all along the lines of

He made Him who knew no sin to be sin on our behalf, so that we might become the righteousness of God in Him.

The meaning is very different

Also

Would Jesus crying out

Father Father why have you forsaken me be a clear indication that God did in fact turn away from Christ in that hour and that His wrath was poured out on Him?

also Is 53:10

But the LORD was pleased To crush Him, putting Him to grief; If He would render Himself as a guilt offering, He will see His offspring, He will prolong His days, And the good pleasure of the LORD will prosper in His hand.

Lastly I think your interpretation of Psalm 22 is wrong
In this passage it is the Psalmist who is talking that God will not forsake him because Christ will be forsaken

And yes this passage also talks of Christ
In the end he was not forsaken cuz God raised Him from the dead!

In Christ
Evangel

Re: EvangelTam - posted by dietolive, on: 2011/11/18 12:13

Hi Brother,

You asked:

"What translation of 2 Corinthians 5:21 are you using?

Because I looked up multiple translation and they are all along the lines of

He made Him who knew no sin to be sin on our behalf, so that we might become the righteousness of God in Him.

The meaning is very different"

I am using the old King James Version here.

Yes, if the word "sin", in its sacrificial context, was translated consistently in this passage, the meaning would be different . In the Old Testament, as I showed in my previous post, the hebreisim for a sacrificial "sin offering" was simply the word "sin."

But let me ask you, dear Brother, if we went with the literal translation of the word "sin" alone, and ignored the context, what would it teach us about the old testament sacrifices? Did the animals that were sacrificed in those days, bulls and goats and birds, become actual "sin"? Or were they actually "sin offerings"? What does this hebreisim that Paul uses in 1 Corinthians 5:21 actual mean?

You ask:

"Would Jesus crying out Father Father why have you forsaken me be a clear indication that God did in fact turn away from Christ in that hour and that His wrath was poured out on Him?"

Dear Brother, the Holy Trinity was never divided, but was united in carrying out the mission of the Cross.

Our Lord Jesus was quoting the Messianic Scriptures from the Cross, specifically Psalm 22. When He cried out "My God, my God!, why hast thou forsaken me!", He was speaking from the perspective of the man prophesied of in that Psalm. A "man" who knew no sin, yet a man who was being crushed for ALL SIN... Certainly, from man's perspective; from the perspective of those who heard His majestic voice and beheld His shattered form, He truly was forsaken by God.

Yet, if we carefully read the rest of the Psalm, we found out that from the Spiritual perspective, God the Father NEVER forsook the SON of HIS love. Please read it again. Awesome and sublime thought. The mighty and effectual work of the Cross, planned before the foundation of the world was laid, was carried out in full unison, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost , working together in a "Mystery": in the mystery of GOD HIMSELF, manifest in the flesh...

Dear Brother, if you do not agree, then it must be fine with me. I thank you for taking the time to reason with me.

Be well,
Doug

Re: Doug - posted by Sree (), on: 2011/11/18 12:35

Brother Doug with all respect,

Let me understand you clearly, you are saying that Jesus was a sacrifice for our sins but God did not put our Sins on Jesus? Correct me if I am wrong.

Can you please explain me what this Cup that was bothering Jesus causing him agony.

Luke 22-42:-

“Father, if You are willing, remove this cup from Me; yet not My will, but Yours be done.” Now an angel from heaven appeared to Him, strengthening Him. And being in agony He was praying very fervently.

Galatians 3-13:-

Christ redeemed us from the curse of the Law, having become a curse for us—for it is written, “CURSED IS EVERYONE WHO HANGS ON A TREE”—

So what is your view on Christ becoming a curse for us when he was put on the cross?

Re: Sree - posted by dietolive, on: 2011/11/18 12:54

Hi Brother Sree,

You ask:

"Let me understand you clearly, you are saying that Jesus was a sacrifice for our sins but God did not put our Sins on Jesus?"

No Brother. I am saying that Paul is teaching us in this passage, that like the Old Testament sacrifices, Jesus Himself was as a sacrifice for our sins, but His once, for all, for ever "sin offering", (unlike theirs in the OT), actually MAKES US righteous.

I accept that the opposite view, that when Paul writes the term "sin", he does not mean "sin offering" (like it means in the Old Testament that Paul read), but rather that Jesus somehow became "sin" as far as God is concerned. is believed by many today since the time of the Reformation. So be it. Let there be peace among us.

You ask:

"Can you please explain me what this Cup that was bothering Jesus causing him agony.

Luke 22-42:-

“Father, if You are willing, remove this cup from Me; yet not My will, but Yours be done.” Now an angel from heaven appeared to Him, strengthening Him. And being in agony He was praying very fervently."

The Cup was a metaphor for the Just Wrath of God against the sin of the world. The Man Christ Jesus knew He was going to have to "drink" it.

You ask:

"So what is your view on Christ becoming a curse for us when he was put on the cross?"

My view is that Christ, according to the Law of Moses, (as "contained in ordinances") was to be considered "a curse."

Be well Brother,
Doug

Re: - posted by Sree (), on: 2011/11/18 13:24

Thanks a lot brother,
I am posting again to understand you better.

Quote:

The Cup was a metaphor for the Just Wrath of God against the sin of the world. The Man Christ Jesus knew He was going to have to "drink" it.

So Jesus faced the Wrath of God against the sin of the world on the cross? Is it a right statement?

So Jesus was crying and praying in pain because he was worried about the Pain of Cross? then is it a physical pain that caused our mighty savior to cry and pray. But I have never heard of any martyr of God in NT like Stephen crying in pain and asking God to take the pain away. They all happily accepted persecution and instead prayed for those persecuting them.

Re: Sree - posted by dietolive, on: 2011/11/18 13:38

You ask:

"So Jesus faced the Wrath of God against the sin of the world on the cross? Is it a right statement?"

According to Scripture, it would seem so.

You ask:

"So Jesus was crying and praying in pain because he was worried about the Pain of Cross?"

I don't think He was "worrying" about anything. He was dreading that "Cup", yet was still fully committed to going through with the "mission" anyway. From the height of GLORY, to the depth of WRATH, our Lord demonstrated His love for the Father, (and for us!) Amazing Love...

You say:

"then is it a physical pain that caused our mighty savior to cry and pray."

No dear Brother. That is not what I mean. Please see above.

Jesus was unlike any other martyr. He faced the just wrath of God in His death: something that no other martyr ever has, or ever will face.

Be well my Brother,
Doug

Re: Sree - posted by EvelynMak, on: 2011/11/18 15:51

Dear Doug,

Glad you are posting here. I read through all the posts and wanted to give some input.

First, I agree with you that Christ became a sin OFFERING so that our sins, by the shedding of His blood, may be atoned for (covered over), so that we may be eternally redeemed (bought) and forgiven of our sins (Ep 1:7, Hb 9:12-14, 1 Cr 6:20).

Secondly, however, I disagree on the point that Christ did not become sin. I believe that Christ became sin. But that doesn't mean that Christ himself sinned, for he knew no sin (2 Cr 5:21), but that in the eyes of the Father he "was numbered with the transgressors" and actually "bore the sin of many" (Is 53:11). Again, it says "the Lord has laid on him the iniquity

of us all" (Is 53:6). The word "bore" means to carry, but that doesn't mean that Jesus carried our sins in His hands and God poured out his wrath on the sin in Jesus' hands, but it means that Jesus carried our sins IN His body (1 Pt 2:24) and God poured out his wrath on Jesus himself.

The only way that God could justly pour wrath on Jesus was to make him "become" sin. If he was only a figurative substitute (the way we use the word "offering"), we would still literally, actually "bear" our own sins and thus the punishment for sin (wrath). We all know that Jesus was talking about the cup of God's wrath against sin when Jesus cried, "My father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me" (Mt 26:39). Blood covers over our sins, but more than blood is needed: Jesus' flesh bears our sin (he "became" sin) and he, being the infinite Son of God, was the only one who could swallow and actually bear the infinite wrath of God against sin so that not a drop of that wrath will touch us.

If not for wrath, why else would Jesus sweat blood at the thought of the cross while years later his disciples could sing hymns of joy to their crosses? Jesus knew that the cross was more than just a physical punishment, but it was a spiritual punishment of wrath - and in this spiritual punishment, there was a separation, "My God, my God, why have you forsaken me?" (Mt 27:46). I understand that Psalms 22, where Jesus quotes from, shows that Jesus was not forsaken (v24). However, I do not believe that Psalms 22 was completed at the cross, but that v1-18 was about the cross, and v19-31 were about later events. I believe that when Jesus uttered "why have you forsaken me?" he truly meant that he was separated from God, not just seemingly (to onlookers), but actually (spiritually). Then, v21, which says, "You have rescued me...!" is about how the Father forsook Jesus on the cross, but did not forsake him forever because he sent the Holy Spirit to raise Christ from the dead (Rm 8:11). After the resurrection, Jesus praised God with his "brothers" (v22) and still praises with us, his family, today. Then, v27 says, "All the ends of the earth shall remember and turn to the Lord." Clearly, this was not fulfilled at the cross - this is talking about how at the end of the ages, every knee will bow and every tongue will confess that Jesus is Lord (Rm 14:11). Therefore, it is not only plausible but I believe it is true, that Psalms 22 was not fulfilled at the cross, but is from the cross all the way to the return of Christ. Therefore, Jesus could have truly meant that God forsook him (v1) while later saying that God did not forsake him (v24).

Back to the original verse everyone brought up, 2 Corinthians 5:21, "For our sake he made him to be sin who knew no sin, so that in him we might become the righteousness of God." Because Jesus actually (not just figuratively) spiritually bore our sin, became sin and swallowed the wrath due sin, we might also not only have righteousness but BECOME righteousness.

In Christ
Evelyn

Re: - posted by dietolive, on: 2011/11/18 17:09

Dear Sister,

Thank you for taking the time to look and see if what is being said is really true. I would say that overall, you have well spoken.

Jesus was the perfect offering for our sins. He bore the wrath of God's justice in our place. Amen dear Sister!

But you provoke a few thoughts regarding other points you have made...

1. If Paul really meant that Jesus "became" sin, (in the way that you describe), then to be consistent with the language, the animals in the Old Testament also "became" sin as well. What would this implication mean to you if it were true?

2. Also, again, the Scripture in Psalm 22 says:

"For he hath not despised nor abhorred the affliction of the afflicted; neither hath he hid his face from him; but when he cried unto him, he heard." Psalm 22:24

. The Father did not despise Christ.

. The Father did not abhor Christ.

. The Father did not hide His Face from Christ.

. When Christ cried, the Father was paying attention: He heard Him.

Question: When was Christ being mocked and despised? When He was on the cross, or afterwards?

Question: When was Christ abhorred? When He was on the cross, or afterwards?

Question: When did Christ CRY OUT to His Father? When He was on the cross, or afterwards?

3. What does II Corinthians 5:21 really mean?

It would seem to me that we should look to inspired commentary, when we can find it. Hebrews 9:11-14 is just that. Here we have explained what is really happening in II Corinthians 5:21.

"But Christ being come an HIGH PRIEST of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle...,

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.

For if the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh:

How much more shall THE BLOOD of Christ, WHO THROUGH THE ETERNAL SPIRIT OFFERED HIMSELF without spot to God, PURGE YOUR CONSCIENCE from dead works to serve the living God?"

Hebrews 9:11-14

Here we see the apostle explaining that Jesus did not in some mystical way "become sin" to make us clean. But rather, He was both the Perfect Sacrifice, (the "sin offering"), and the Perfect Sacrificer, (Our great High Priest.)

Therefore, the GREAT difference between the Old and New Covenants is that, whereas in the Old Testament, the blood of the sin offerings merely "covered" sin in the "flesh", in the New Testament, the BLOOD of OUR SIN OFFERING completely WASHES it away.

Amen?

Be well dear Sister.

God bless you and yours this day,
Doug

Re: - posted by Leeza, on: 2011/11/18 22:17

You are so welcome here! Hope you are strengthened and blessed.

Re: - posted by EvangelTam, on: 2011/11/19 0:12

Hey dietolive,

In response to the questions that you asked me:

1. "But let me ask you, dear Brother, if we went with the literal translation of the word "sin" alone, and ignored the context, what would it teach us about the old testament sacrifices? Did the animals that were sacrificed in those days, bulls and goats and birds, become actual "sin"? Or were they actually "sin offerings"? What does this hebreisim that Paul uses in I I Corinthians 5:21 actual mean?"

I believe that the sacrifice of animals did not become sin but rather they were things that pointed to Christ. They were a shadow of the things to come. The people would sacrifice animals and know that it was not enough and it wasn't. It didn't do anything but was a promise from God that the people took by faith. Only Christ the perfect Lamb could become sin. The wrath of God could not be poured out on animals a human had to take it.

"1The law is only a shadow of the good things that are coming—¹not the realities themselves. For this reason it can never, by the same sacrifices repeated endlessly year after year, make perfect those who draw near to worship. 2If it could, would they not have stopped being offered? For the worshipers would have been cleansed once for all, and would no longer have felt guilty for their sins. 3But those sacrifices are an annual reminder of sins, 4because it is impossible for the blood of bulls and goats to take away sins." Heb. 10:1-4

2. "Dear Brother, the Holy Trinity was never divided, but was united in carrying out the mission of the Cross.

Our Lord Jesus was quoting the Messianic Scriptures from the Cross, specifically Psalm 22. When He cried out "My God, my God!, why hast thou forsaken me!", He was speaking from the perspective of the man prophesied of in that Psalm. A "man" who knew no sin, yet a man who was being crushed for ALL SIN... Certainly, from man's perspective; from the perspective of those who heard His majestic voice and beheld His shattered form, He truly was forsaken by God.

I find it hard to believe that in Christ's most critical hour that He would quote a part of Psalm 22 that He was not actually going through at that time. Though this Psalm was written "figuratively", Jesus fulfilled it literally by actually being forsaken and thus crying out: "Father, Father why have you forsaken me..." By this, He fulfilled this Psalm in a greater way.

This being said I am still a little confused about what you are trying to say after reading your last post. Just wanting to clarify:

Do you believe Jesus bore our sin? What does that mean that he bore it?
If Jesus did not bear our sin, how could Jesus drink God's cup of wrath justly?
Is bearing sin an being sin two different things?

Like Evelyn said, "He bore our sins in his body on the cross" (1 Peter)

In Christ
Evangel

Re: EvangelTam - posted by dietolive, on: 2011/11/19 22:07

Dear Brother,

I really appreciate you taking the time to reason this out. What can all this mean? How can we know what is true, if we don't lovingly bear with others and search the Scriptures with all readiness of mind?

You said:

"I believe that the sacrifice of animals did not become sin but rather they were things that pointed to Christ."

I agree totally. What you said is absolutely correct here. My point therefore, is that if Paul's language in II Corinthians "proves" that Jesus became "actual" sin, then the same language in the O.T. would necessarily prove the same of the animals sacrificed back then. On the other hand, if such language doesn't necessarily prove it in the Old Testament as you seem to say above, then the same term doesn't necessarily prove it in the New.

2. I am saying that from "man's" perspective, Jesus did appear to be forsaken. From "our" perspective, He was. However, we must remember that Jesus was both fully man and fully God, a mystery to be sure. What I am saying is that Psalm 22 shows that God the Father actually did not forsake the Son of His Love; His attitude towards His Son was not abhorrence; it was Love.

3. You said:

"Do you believe Jesus bore our sin? What does that mean that he bore it?
If Jesus did not bear our sin, how could Jesus drink God's cup of wrath justly?"

Is bearing sin an being sin two different things?"

Yes, Jesus "bore" our sins. It means that He bore the penalty, the judgement, the wrath for our sins. The term Paul used meant the same in the Old Testament as in the New. The difference is that Christ was the perfect man and therefore the perfect sacrifice that not only removed the penalty of, but actually took away our sins.

Yes, "bearing sin" and "being sin", are therefore two totally different things.

One implies simply that Jesus was still innocent and holy, yet he chose to take our punishment for us, in our place. Thus He won Salvation for us.

The other term, namely His "being sin", implies that God the Father considered His Holy Son to actually be sinful. This notion, a thing almost unspeakable, unthinkable, is yet believed by some in the Church today, and has been for the last few centuries.

Dear EvangelTam: The proof that this doctrine is impossible, is right in my post to Sister Evelyn. Christ was His Own High Priest; His Own Sacrificer. If He was actual sinful in God's eyes, He would have been disqualified from the Office, and His Sacrifice would have been worth less than the animals of the Old Testament. They were at least "innocent" in God's eyes, but if what you have been saying were really true, Jesus was not.

The efficacy of our Lord's sacrifice is not to be found in the notion that God the Father considered the Son of His love to be something He obviously was not. Rather, it is that God the Father saw His Son as being exactly what He was: Perfect. Sinless. Holy. Therefore, His Sacrifice of Himself was perfect, sinless, holy, and therefore it was Perfectly Acceptable.

Such is what the text says on the surface. If others can read deeper, and find something that contradicts the simply obvious surface meaning of the Scriptures, than they must believe that rather. I cannot.

In any case, God bless you and the Reader, whatever your opinion may be in this matter.

Love in Christ,
Doug

Re: - posted by EvangelTam, on: 2011/11/21 23:22

Dear Doug,

It is my pleasure and no trouble for me at all to share my convictions and reason with you through the Scriptures on what the Lord has taught me on this issue. I believe that this doctrinal disagreement is no small thing and is a critical issue of the faith. The Lamb is worthy to receive the reward of His suffering and if what you say is true than Christ is robbed of the fully glory that is due Him for what He did on the cross. I am doing this because I love you and the Church, and more importantly, because of what Christ has done for me and I do this as an act of worship to Him!

1. What I understand from you is that when 2 Corinthians 5:21 says, "For our sake he made him to be sin who knew no sin...". Paul actually is not talking about sin, but about sin offering as in the Old Testament. However, in Leviticus 16:21-22, we find that there are two goats presented on the Day of Atonement, one for a sin offering (as you said) and another one to "bear all iniquities on itself to a remote area". There was a need for this second goat because all the other sin offerings covered over sin (atonement) but were not able to bear sin. Therefore, this second goat which bore sin in the wilderness pointed to Christ, who not only was a sin offering but "bore our sin in his body on the cross" (1 Peter 2:24; I think that Sister Evelyn brought this verse up in her post but there was no response to it) and went into the wilderness of sheol three days and three nights by himself (Matt 12:40).

When Christ died, went into the heart of the earth and resurrected, he condemned sin in his own flesh and therefore condemned sin in all flesh. He had victory over sin while he was on earth and even while he was in death. In Jesus' resurrection, death lost its victory and sting, which is sin; we know this because he was the first fruit of those who will be raised from the dead. Because Christ defeated sin, we also know that in Christ we can defeat sin as well (1 Cor 15:20, 50-57).

To make this more clear, Romans 8:3 says, "For what the Law could not do, weak as it was through the flesh, God did:

sending His own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh and as an offering for sin, He condemned sin in the flesh.Â”

Here we see the word sin offering however the next part of the verse uses the words condemned sin in the flesh referring that the flesh (the body of Christ) condemned sin by taking it upon Himself dying with it and then throwing it away in His death rising victoriously over it!

2. I think I already explained Psalm 22 and how your interpretation is wrong. The verse you used to show that Christ was not abandoned has to do with His resurrection. I did not get a response from that though. This is not about what we see from our perspective it is about the truth of God's Word.

From what I am reading, it sounds like you adhere to the belief that Jesus bore the penalty for sin, but not sin itself.

3. If Jesus only bore the penalty as you say, we would be justified but we wouldn't have power over sin because sin would still be in us since it did not go to Him. Jesus had to bear our sin and defeat the sting of death (sin) so that we, having his own resurrection power, would be able to have victory over sin. Being forgiven of sins is not enough; we must have power over sin. If Jesus was only the perfect sacrifice and did not bear our sin, he would only be the justifier but not the sanctifier. BOTH IS NEEDED ONE WITHOUT THE OTHER ROBS CHRIST OF THE GLORY FOR WHAT HE HAS DONE. Anything that strays from this cheapens what Christ did do that we do not worship Him to the extent that He is worthy of.

4. Yes God the Father did consider His Son to be sinful it says so in His Word

“Therefore, I will allot Him a portion with the great, And He will divide the booty with the strong; Because He poured out Himself to death, And was numbered with the transgressors; Yet He Himself bore the sin of many, And interceded for the transgressors.” (Isaiah 53:12)

He was numbered with the transgressors means that He was considered sinful.

Though it may seem unspeakable and may seem wrong to you it is not to God. It's His truth. The reason why it has been believed in the Church for so long is because it is true. With it we have the resurrection power of Christ in us. Without this doctrine the church is left without the fullness of the power of the gospel of Jesus Christ. Doctrines that subtly change what Christ did is exactly a method that Satan uses to maim the Church since its inception and is something we must be on the guard against!

“Such is what the text says on the surface. If others can read deeper, and find something that contradicts the simply obvious surface meaning of the Scriptures, than they must believe that rather. I cannot.”

Lastly

The surface meaning seems pretty obvious to me:

He made Him who knew no sin to be sin on our behalf, so that we might become the righteousness of God in Him. 2 Cor 5:21

and He Himself bore our sins in His body on the cross, so that we might die to sin and live to righteousness; for by His wounds you were healed. 2 Peter 2:24

It is what it is he became sin on our behalf and also bore it. It's the same in the NIV KJV NASB ESV and all the other major translations.

Dear Doug,

I would encourage you and anyone else reading this to ask God and really seek the truth out! It is not a matter of words or wording but rather it is a LIVING PERSON. Jesus says I am the way the truth and the life and it says in Jeremiah 29:13 you will seek Me and find Me when you seek Me with ALL of your heart!. We cannot understand the scripture just by reading it and analysing the words we need HIS PERSON, HIS SPIRIT living inside of us to reveal Himself to us. It is His Spirit that guides us into ALL truth and teaches us! (John 16) By our own fallen human understanding we will always twist the truth around! That is why so many people can read the bible but still are not saved. That is why the Pharisees memorized the written word and KILLED the LIVING WORD (Christ)

I am going to be straightforward and honest in the most loving way possible:

The wrath of the Father being poured out on the Son and the Son taking on the sin of the world and thus becoming sin is a critical doctrine of the Christian faith that cannot be compromised. Anything more or less than that has strayed from the sound doctrine of the faith as commanded to be kept in the letters.

But as for you, teach what accords with sound doctrine. Titus 2:1

In Christ
Evangel

Re: - posted by lylewise, on: 2011/11/22 9:53

Welcome Nuhope, you sure enter the forum in full stride. A great place to be with so many wonderful brethren.

It is a most interesting post and it begs many questions. Forgive me for human reasoning here but there is a great disgust that comes from thinking of Jesus as a pedophile, murderer, racist, swindler, pervert, glutinous, greedy God hater. I would also question when the wrath was poured out upon him? Were stripes etc. attributed solely to man? In other words, will only the wrath in darkness speak to the time it is poured out?

When exactly was he forsaken? His words upon the cross don't sound at all to be the words of one who has become sin. Being sin, He does not blaspheme or respond in hate to those who hate him. Not characteristic of one who for the first time defines a level of sin that is the accumulation of the sins of all men throughout the ages. Sin in God upon the cross?

The Just for the unjust Who becomes unjust? It makes my head spin.

Re: EvangelTam - posted by dietolive, on: 2011/11/22 10:33

Dear EvangelTam,

1. The two goats both represent our Lord's sacrifice. They are both for the "sin offering", (see Leviticus 16:5.) Two goats were necessary, because one goat alone could not both die and be seen to "bear away" at the same time. The one goat was killed, the other bore the sins (i.e. the defilement of them) away.

But let me again ask the Reader: Do you believe that the scapegoat was considered by God to have committed the sins that it was "bearing away"?

2. I guess we simply disagree on Psalm 22.

3. I do believe that Jesus bore our sins away. Your deep interpretation of all these texts leads you to believe it is necessary to think "bearing sins" means our Lord was actually sinful. Every robbery, every murder, every rape; you say our Holy Lord was a robber, and murderer, a ... You believe saying these things about Him brings Him glory.

What can I say? I abhor to even think such things about our Gracious Lord. What "deep" theology gets around the clear teachings of Scripture, to give us such horrible doctrines?

4. When the prophesy of Isaiah 53:12 was fulfilled, who was it that had considered Jesus a law-breaker; a criminal? I would say it was the law-breaking criminals who killed Him. You have been saying it was His own Father. (This is a strange debate indeed.)

5. Regarding your saying:

"We cannot understand the scripture just by reading it and analysing the words we need HIS PERSON, HIS SPIRIT living inside of us to reveal Himself to us. It is His Spirit that guides us into ALL truth and teaches us! (John 16) By our own fallen human understanding we will always twist the truth around!"

Oh Lord... Who is the "twister", and who is the "straightener" in this case? I suppose, no, I know, that we shall both give an account of the things we have said about our Lord to the Lord Himself on the Last Day.

I believe and tell others that the Father's just wrath against the sin of the world was poured out on His Son. Like Abraham (a "type" of God the Father of old) sacrificing his innocent son Isaac, Jesus Christ's Father was willing to sacrifice Him to satisfy His Divine Justice FOREVER. And they were both willing to do this for our sakes! Bless God forever!

Dear EvangelTam,

I thought to show you something you may have never seen before. If you are yet unmoved in your opinions after these, my feeble efforts, I am truly sorry.

God bless you dear Brother. I wish you well.

Doug

Re: - posted by EvangelTam, on: 2011/11/22 11:27

Hey Doug,

It seems that both of us are not budging an inch to the left or to the right in regard to this matter. That being said I do feel a need to clarify some things that may have been misunderstood in my previous posts. Also I apologize if my previous post seemed to harsh. I want you to know that I did mean those things not a negative way so as to attack you but rather to correct from what I am convicted is true.

1. "The two goats both represent our Lord's sacrifice. They are both for the "sin offering", (see Leviticus 16:5.) Two goats were necessary, because one goat alone could not both die and be seen to "bear away" at the same time. The one goat was killed, the other bore the sins (i.e. the defilement of them) away."

I agree with this first point. The insufficiency for the animal sacrifices here point to Christ whose sacrifice could accomplish both. However again I disagree on your interpretation of bore I think that He LITERALLY bore our sins away so that what the scapegoat was doing symbolically (since it could not being an imperfect animal) Christ did LITERALLY to fulfill this function.

Again the Israelites knew and understood the insufficiency of this and so this also pointed them to Christ!

“I do believe the Jesus bore our sins away. Your deep interpretation of all these texts leads to you believe it is necessary to think "bearing sins" means our Lord was actually sinful. Every robbery, every murder, every rape; you say our Holy Lord was a robber, and murderer, a ... You believe saying these things about Him brings Him glory.”

2. Sorry to clarify when I say that Christ became sin I do not mean that He became a sinner or else He would not be a perfect sacrifice. What I mean is that He took on the sins of the world and bore them literally in His body (flesh). In this way He became sin. This had to happen or else how could the Father justly pour out His wrath on the Son if He did not carry the sin of the world? (though I guess on this point we also disagree)

3. Regarding Isaiah 53. I agree that Christ was counted as a transgressor by people but more importantly in the eyes of the Father. Christ took the place of punishment we should've taken so in court when someone takes the place of a criminal he is seen as the criminal in the eyes of ALL the people and the judge! If this did not happen then the one substituted for would still be seen as the transgressor and not be free! There is an EXCHANGE His righteousness for our unrighteousness in order for this to happen it has to happen literally on BOTH sides of the exchange. But we know that the Father no longer sees us as criminals worthy of death but as righteous Children. Likewise for this to happen Christ had to be regarded as a criminal and transgressor (though He did not Himself sin)

4. As I said before If Jesus only bore the penalty as you say, we would be justified but we wouldn't have power over sin because sin would still be in us since it did not go to Him. Jesus had to bear our sin and defeat the sting of death (sin) so that we, having his own resurrection power, would be able to have victory over sin. Being forgiven of sins is not enough; we must have power over sin. If Jesus was only the perfect sacrifice and did not bear our sin, he would only be the justifier but not the sanctifier. But we know and testify as Christians that His blood justifies and sanctifies. There is power in it!

Dear Doug,

I would still exhort you to pray and seek out this matter and bring it before the Lord. I do see what you are saying but I believe that it is only half of what Christ did and is NOT complete and a half truth is no truth at all but a lie.

In Christ
Evangel

Re: EvangelTam - posted by dietolive, on: 2011/11/22 15:47

Dear EvangelTam,

I would say this has been a worthwhile discussion. And you have well-written again. I appreciate your view, and I respect you for holding to it.

Though I might think rather that I may have proven otherwise, but that is for the Reader, and especially the LORD, to judge.

In the end it seems however, that we Both believe Jesus bore our sin, we Both believe Jesus paid the penalty of it, we Both believe He makes us Holy. We just believe differently about how it was wrought.

I would say after reading your last post, that though you seem to think otherwise, you and I seem to agree more than we disagree... And that is well, and as it should be, for that is the blessed fruit of Brothers digging into the Scriptures together.

I understand you feel you are "contending for the faith"; I don't begrudge you that. You must of necessity therefore, give no quarter to my "lie", as you call it.

Know that I will continue to prayerful study the truth of God's Word. I trust the others of the Church who likewise believe as I have here tried to convey, have and will likewise continue to do so as well.

I ask merely that you prayerfully consider the doctrine you have received likewise. Our mother Church is still repairing the breach of a thousand years of darkness. The Reformation was just a start. While certainly a bright new beginning after a long miserable night of falsehood, it did not restore all.

I would counsel you to hear the testimony of the ancients as well; of the first few generations of the Church too. You may find that the apostles' disciples understood some of the Scriptures differently than the Reformers and our Reformation-influenced modern Church does today.

Finally, thank you for your time. Be well my friend,
Doug