

Scriptures and Doctrine :: Did Jesus really Die as a Substitute for our Sins?- by Michael Brown

Did Jesus really Die as a Substitute for our Sins?- by Michael Brown - posted by TMK (), on: 2014/9/17 9:54

<http://www.charismanews.com/opinion/in-the-line-of-fire/45425-did-jesus-really-die-as-the-substitute-for-our-sins>

Re: Did Jesus really Die as a Substitute for our Sins?- by Michael Brown - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2014/9/17 10:5

from the article:

Did Jesus really pay for our sins on the cross, taking our punishment for us? Did He really die as an atoning sacrifice on our behalf?

In recent years, this doctrine, known as penal substitutionary atonement (PSA), has come under increasing attack, with some Christian leaders claiming that for God to punish His Son for our sins would be an example of "cosmic child abuse" (Steve Chalke).

This past Saturday, I was able to debate this important issue with pastor Brian Zahnd, who was eloquent in his arguments against PSA, claiming that it made our Father into a "monster god" and a "pagan deity."

Re: Atonement issues - posted by Sidewalk (), on: 2014/9/17 11:31

The old argument was between the doctrine of Retributive Justice and Public Justice.

Descending from Calvinistic ideas of predestination, Retributive Justice was the belief that all the sins of God's elect were literally placed on Jesus at the time of His crucifixion, every piercing and blow representing a punishment for the exact number of sins that the Father knew ahead of time would be committed by the elect. It was a one for one deal, and only the sins of the elect were covered.

Public Justice is a completely different explanation of the atonement protocol. Here, Jesus dies a single death, the exact punishment due to any one man for his sin. It does not cover all men, just one- and any man who repents and believes unto salvation is that man.

Thus Jesus atoning death is available to all men, and all who believe and repent will be saved. At the same time, the death of Jesus does not obligate God to save anyone! The provision of God to save men is valid whether all men repented and believed, or none did.

Therefore truly it is incumbent on Christians to reach out to the lost and bring as many as we can to the saving knowledge of Christ Jesus. He can save anyone, but He cannot save those who refuse repentance and faith.

In the end, it is the Holy Spirit who confirms to a believer's heart that the atonement is within. No intellectual argument can do that, it is personal between the Father and His children.

Re: - posted by dolfan (), on: 2014/9/17 11:48

Zahnd posted a blog post of his own in the comments section of Brown's article.

Whether you accept PSA or not, I think an honest reading of Zahnd's blog post response leads one to see that the strength of his argument is mere emotional appeal to modern cultural norms that eschew propitiation in favor of "letting bygones be bygones". He manipulates language by posing questions in such a way that if you assent to them it makes you a "monster". Brown's article puts the lie to Zahnd's method.

Now, I know some here probably reject PSA. Intellectual honesty requires, though, that if the rejection is on the grounds Zahnd asserts then there is no sufficient rebuttal to the witness of Scripture regarding the crucifixion of Jesus. Perhaps more solid argument from Scripture exists, but Zahnd's is simply a hodge podge of Spock era child rearing rhetoric, outright blasphemy (Jesus' death and resurrection simply "recycled our sin into forgiveness"), and New Age spiritualism.

The substantive problem with Zahnd's point is this: God did not need to suffer the death of His Son if He did not Himself

ordain it, will it, and make it so in satisfaction of His own nature of righteousness. He could have simply forgiven us. Zahnd says PSA makes God a "cosmic child abuser" who subjected His own Son and His own Self to an abstract notion of justice that would be higher than God Himself. That is manifestly irresponsible and reckless handling of the Word. Yet, Zahnd creates an even worse problem: if Zahnd is right, God is a part time Father who was content to let the world kill His only Son as no big deal, and God, who wasn't looking all the time, just decided to take advantage of the situation to make his caprice seem like love in "letting bygones be bygones". That is very nice for the ones forgiven, but it says about the forgiver that maybe his forgiveness is not worth having. Zahnd makes God worse than the monster he imagines PSA "makes him": God is complicit in the sin of men. If Zahnd is right, then Madalyn Murray O'Hare was right, as was Paul who said we are, then, of all men most miserable.

Salute Michael Brown for his able defense of the gospel.

Re: A further note - posted by Sidewalk (), on: 2014/9/17 11:48

Regarding the idea that the Father was a monster for murdering His Son- and similar lying distortions from the father of lies, no such thing happened.

It is critical to know two things: that God is responsible for justice in the universe and cannot allow sin to go unpunished. For Him to do that, all the laws of the universe would unravel and explode into chaos.

The other thing is that the choice to die on the cross was entirely in Jesus' hands. He chose it, He did not have to do it since He did not owe anything for sin. The prayer in the garden of Gethsemane holds a key, "Not My will but Thine be done." There were two wills in that monumental discussion, where Jesus inquired whether there was another way to save His disciples and mankind in general.

The Father had no other way to preserve the integrity of the law and pardon the sin, but Jesus had to give Himself. There was no way the Father could slay Jesus, an innocent man, without stepping into sin Himself!

So Jesus "drank the cup" as it were, and gave Himself... for me! And you of course!

So the law is preserved, honor is preserved, love is preserved, and all other virtues are magnified in the relationship between the Father, the Son, and the crown of creation, mankind.

Re: - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2014/9/17 11:50

Quote:
-----Public Justice is a completely different explanation of the atonement protocol. Here, Jesus dies a single death, the exact punishment due to any one man for his sin. It does not cover all men, just one- and any man who repents and believes unto salvation is that man.

Is it not right to say that Jesus Christ died and took upon Him ALL sins and not the sins of 1 person metaphorically? He died for all. He became SIN (the whole of it). The Father turned His face away from His Son because of this.

Re: Public Justice - posted by Sidewalk (), on: 2014/9/17 12:03

Indeed, Jesus died for the whole world and the sins of all. But we know that this does not force all men to be saved. That would be Universalism, and the idea that all men will be saved stems from that first idea that believes all the sins of all men are literally imputed into Jesus' crucifixion.

It would be fair to say from that argument that if all men's sins are covered in the death of Jesus, God has no right to deny anyone entrance into heaven.

The death and atoning power of what Jesus did on the cross enables God to save men, but only one at a time as they repent and believe. Again, Jesus' work is sufficient to save all men, but does not obligate God to save anyone!

Re: - posted by TrueWitness, on: 2014/9/17 12:21

PSA would be considered cosmic child abuse except for the fact that Jesus WILLINGLY accepted his death on the cross . He did it because he wanted to please His Father whom he dearly loved and trusted. And He also did it to gain a bride, the Church. God did not force or otherwise foist the cross on Jesus. In the Garden of Gesthemene Jesus struggled in prayer over this decision but in the end he chose it. Jesus himself said that He laid down his life and no one took it from Him. The Bible says he went to the cross "for the joy set before him." This is all plainly stated in the scriptures.

Re: - posted by Oracio (), on: 2014/9/17 13:48

When it comes to the atonement, I lean toward both a limited atonement and general atonement.

By limited atonement I mean that Christ paid the full penalty for the sins of His elect, thus eternally saving them from God's ultimate wrath because Christ took that ultimate wrath on Himself.

By general atonement I mean that Christ also paid partially for the sins of the non-elect and therefore they are able to live temporarily in this life without immediately being thrown into hell when they commit a sin. Because of this general atonement God can bestow temporal blessings on the non-elect here on earth. Without this general atonement there would be no forbearance of God toward the non-elect.

Respectfully, the view of a full atonement for the whole world doesn't make sense to me. If it was true that Christ actually paid fully for the sins of the non-elect, to me it would have to follow that they shouldn't perish in hell because their sins have been paid for.

Let me give a human example. If someone faces criminal charges and someone else pays their fine fully, that criminal is free to go regardless of whether or not he is repentant.

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2014/9/17 14:14

But Oracio, I could bring a lunch in for all of my co-workers, but only those who actually grab a sandwich benefit. And I'm not about to force anyone to eat.

Re: - posted by dolfan (), on: 2014/9/17 14:24

Not sure how to use the quote function sorry.

"Let me give a human example. If someone faces criminal charges and someone else pays their fine fully, that criminal is free to go regardless of whether or not he is repentant."

I get that. But, as a lawyer, I can tell you that in such cases the interest of justice is redefined as "revenue". :) I have seen cases where someone else paying was actually forbidden. Now, if Billy Joe loans Sammy the money, and Sammy takes it to the court clerk to pay the fine, Sammy "paid" it. But, it is a limitation of the system that someone else can even pay the fine of the guilty. In the case of us and Jesus, He "became sin". Sin was attributed to Him for our benefit. As "sin" was imputed to Him, it was then just for God to demand satisfaction of His own righteous requirements of the law from the blood of His own Son. Of His own sovereign, eternal will He did this. It is not unjust. If He does it, it is by definition right and just, even if incomprehensible to those, like Brian Zahnd, who have eyes but do not see. I am amazed at the gall of Zahnd's argument, as if God's righteousness must pass our muster. Incredible.

Re: - posted by dolfan (), on: 2014/9/17 14:29

TrueWitness said,

"PSA would be considered cosmic child abuse except for the fact that Jesus WILLINGLY accepted his death on the cross. He did it because he wanted to please His Father whom he dearly loved and trusted. And He also did it to gain a bride, the Church. God did not force or otherwise foist the cross on Jesus. In the Garden of Gesthemene Jesus struggled in prayer over this decision but in the end he chose it. Jesus himself said that He laid down his life and no one took it from Him. The Bible says he went to the cross "for the joy set before him." This is all plainly stated in the scriptures."

If Jesus had not willingly submitted to the Father, He would not have been God. In fact, it was impossible for Jesus to n

ot willingly submit to the Father. God cannot lie. God cannot be divided. He cannot contradict Himself. While Jesus certainly was "free" to choose as a human, He could not do other than submit to His Father. The possibility that God Himself could contradict Himself is a non-sequitur. If it were possible, He is not God. Our atonement was vouchsafed in God the Son by the will of the Father and the immutable, undeniable unity of Elohim.

Re: - posted by TrueWitness, on: 2014/9/17 15:10

dolfan-

I agree with you that Jesus' obedience to the Father's will was something that was in agreement with his own will. I reject any arguments that insist or imply that Jesus was forced against His will to go to the cross. (I am not suggesting anyone on this forum holds this position, only Brian Zahnd misunderstands this point). He was willing all along. What I am saying is that Jesus WOULDN'T choose his own will against the will of the Father so that the issue of whether he COULDN'T never comes into play. We venture into a semantic minefield when we say Jesus couldn't have chosen otherwise. The fact that He never WOULD makes speculation on whether He COULD or COULD NOT a moot point.

The reason I say that we enter a semantic minefield when we talk about Jesus not being able to go against the Father's will is that such talk implies that He is FORCED AGAINST HIS WILL in His actions. Nothing could be further from the truth. His will was always one with His father's. Love defers to the will of the One loved. He would not means that He would not allow Himself to be at odds with His Father because He loves the Father and is of one mind with Him. The issue of can't never enters the picture.

Re: - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2014/9/17 15:20

Quote:

-----By general atonement I mean that Christ also paid partially for the sins of the non-elect and therefore they are able to live temporarily in this life without immediately being thrown into hell when they commit a sin. Because of this general atonement God can bestow temporal blessings on the non-elect here on earth. Without this general atonement there would be no forbearance of God toward the non-elect

Where do we see this view in scriptures brother?

Re: - posted by dolfan (), on: 2014/9/17 16:01

True said, "We venture into a semantic minefield when we say Jesus couldn't have chosen otherwise. The fact that He never WOULD makes speculation on whether He COULD or COULD NOT a moot point."

-----â€"â€"-----

It is very easy to slip into semantic minefields on that, for sure. I think we are on the same page on it....except I'm not sure what you mean by partially paid for sins of unbelievers and would take exception on that. There is a general grace that is common to humanity wherein life here is a gift of God in the sense that He does not "snuff us out", so to speak. I do not see where the death of Jesus, per se, affords that grace. The will of the Father that sent His Son to Calvary is the same will that none should perish but all should come to repentance. The possibility, from our vantage point, of repentance unto salvation is indeed the only hope of the unbeliever.

Re: - posted by Oracio (), on: 2014/9/17 16:11

Quote:

-----Where do we see this view in scriptures brother?

Sure. First I'd point out 1Timothy 4:10 which says that Christ is "the Savior of all men, especially of those who believe."

I'd also point out the clear teaching of the scriptures that the soul that sins will die (Ezek.18:4)and that the wages of sin is death(Rom.6:23), meaning not only physical but also spiritual and eternal damnation. Apart from the mercy of God and benefits of the cross of Christ, every person would be thrown into hell immediately when they sinned.

I'll share a piece from John Piper's ministry website(MacArthur also holds this same two-fold view of the atonement btw):

"We do not deny that all men are the intended beneficiaries of the cross in some sense. 1 Timothy 4:10 says that Christ is the Savior of all men, especially of those who believe. What we deny is that all men are intended as the beneficiaries of the death of Christ in the same way. All of God's mercy toward unbelievers from the rising sun (Matthew 5:45) to the worldwide preaching of the gospel (John 3:16) is made possible because of the cross.

This is the implication of Romans 3:25 where the cross is presented as the basis of God's righteousness in passing over sins. Every breath that an unbeliever takes is an act of God's mercy withholding judgment (Romans 2:4). Every time the gospel is preached to unbelievers it is the mercy of God that gives this opportunity for salvation.

Whence does this mercy flow to sinners? How is God just to withhold judgment from sinners who deserve to be immediately cast into hell? The answer is that Christ's death so clearly demonstrates God's just abhorrence of sin that he is free to treat the world with mercy without compromising his righteousness. In this sense Christ is the savior of all men.

But he is especially the Savior of those who believe. He did not die for all men in the same sense. The intention of the death of Christ for the children of God was that it purchase far more than the rising sun and the opportunity to be saved. The death of Christ actually saves from ALL evil those for whom Christ died especially.

There are many Scriptures which say that the death of Christ was designed for the salvation of God's people, not for every individual. For example:

John 10:15, "I lay down my life for the sheep. The sheep of Christ are those whom the Father draws to the Son. You do not believe, because you do not belong to my sheep." Notice: being a sheep enables you to become a believer, not vice versa. So the sheep for whom Christ dies are the ones chosen by the Father to give to the Son."

Source: <http://www.desiringgod.org/articles/what-we-believe-about-the-five-points-of-calvinism#Atonement>

Re: - posted by Oracio (), on: 2014/9/17 16:58

Another scripture that came to mind is 2 Peter 2:1, "But there were also false prophets among the people, even as there will be false teachers among you, who will secretly bring in destructive heresies, even denying the Lord who bought them, and bring on themselves swift destruction."

So that scripture says that there were false teachers whom the Lord "bought". I'd take that to mean a partial, temporal purchase, if those false teachers never repented and trusted in Christ while on earth.

Re: , on: 2014/9/17 18:18

Really, brothers, it sounds like you are playing semantics. Either Christ died to save us from sin or He did not. Either the wrath of God was appeased at the cross or it was not. So which is it?

Dare I may also ask did Christ die only for the sins of the elect or the sins of the world?

Bearmaster.

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2014/9/17 19:40

Bear-

That was just being discussed-- see oracio's first post.

I didn't intend for this to turn into a discussion on letter "L" of TULIP.

I don't want to be accused of starting a riot ;)

Re: , on: 2014/9/17 20:10

TMK you are right bro. We don't need a riot but a revival.:)

Re: , on: 2014/10/31 19:24

I heard someone speak against Penal Substitution this way, "If Jesus paid for our sins...why would God need to forgive us."

I.e. If I owe Bank of America 1,000. But Greg pays BoA 1,000. Bank of America can't forgive my loan because it's been paid.

I think the Orthodox/Catholics have a more firm foundation. Christus Victor. That God made a ransom for us, pursued us, and forgave us, simply out of His good, loving nature.

Re: - posted by Sidewalk (), on: 2014/10/31 20:28

This is the doctrine of Universalism. All is paid, all go to heaven, love and joy for all.

It just is not true. The death of Christ on the cross enables God to save those who repent, but it does not obligate God to save anyone.

Re: , on: 2014/10/31 22:02

"The death of Christ on the cross enables God to save those who repent"

Um no. God doesn't require sacrifice to forgive the sins of people.

Second, I'm not preaching universalism. One thief was forgiven. The other wasn't.

All we need to do is to come to God. He will forgive us. Is. 52:3, 54:8-10, 55:7

Re: - posted by Sidewalk (), on: 2014/11/1 0:24

LMH, please don't think I am criticizing your preaching, I am only describing how universalism is founded, and it is a very prevalent notion the true church must confront. To say that God does not require a sacrifice to forgive sin is completely contrary to both the scripture and the natural obligations of the law. It would make God a tyrant who needlessly put His Son to death. We do not want to go there.

The two major views of the atoning work of Christ on the cross are Retributive Justice where all the sins of the elect are individually laid on Christ, and paid for directly. The universalist takes that idea and draws out that it would not be fair to forgive some sins and not all, so all men's sins must be covered. In this view, God becomes obligated to save all whose sins are thus covered and forgiven by the sacrifice.

I contend for a different view, that of Public Justice. In this view, no man's sins are covered unless he actively seeks for forgiveness and to have his sins washed by the blood of Jesus. Thus the phrase, "accepting Christ as one's personal savior." His blood is mighty to save, but useless to those who reject Him. It is because of this that God, through the blood of Jesus, stands ready to save all men as all men repent. He at the same time, cannot save those who do not repent and do not receive the death of Jesus as their own substitutionary death.

That is why I firmly believe that the death of Jesus Christ enables The Father to save all men, but does not obligate Him to save anyone.

And this is the foundation of the evangelistic message to all men to come to Jesus for the remission of sins, turn from your wicked ways, let the Savior's sacrifice be your death for the sins that would otherwise condemn you.

I hope that clarifies and explains why Jesus so forcefully commanded the disciples to go into all the world teaching men to observe all the things He told them. Because without faith and the blood, God cannot save them!

Re: - posted by Oracio (), on: 2014/11/1 11:08

Quote:

-----Um no. God doesn't require sacrifice to forgive the sins of people.

"And according to the law almost all things are purified with blood, and without shedding of blood there is no remission. 23 Therefore it was necessary that the copies of the things in the heavens should be purified with these, but the heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices than these. 24 For Christ has not entered the holy places made with hands, which are copies of the true, but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us; 25 not that He should offer Himself often, as the high priest enters the Most Holy Place every year with blood of another-- 26 He then would have had to suffer often since the foundation of the world; but now, once at the end of the ages, He has appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself."-Hebrews 9:22-26

And there are so many other passages of Scripture you'd have to toss out in order to keep the notion that no sacrifice was needed for the forgiveness of our sins.

Re: The Sacrifice that allows for forgiveness - posted by Sidewalk (), on: 2014/11/1 13:56

As the moral governor of the universe, God is under obligation to both uphold and obey His own law. The most dramatic illustration of this is Jesus Himself who, being in the form of God was perfectly obedient to the law, and was without sin. He thus paid a debt for sin He did not owe.

In other posts I have referenced the conversation between Jesus and the Father in the Garden of Gethsemane. So critical to understand that Jesus made an appeal for some other way to save men without his going to the cross. But there was no other way to preserve the integrity of the law without the sacrifice. The Father had two options for His beloved Son, to return to heaven as He was, alone, or to purchase mankind with this sacrifice. It was not an easy decision as we know from the gospel account. But we know the choice Jesus made, submitting His will to the Father's will.

In the end, the law was preserved, Jesus chose to obey on His own, the Father received His Son in full honor, and the veil between God and man was torn from the top to the bottom. There is a way from the curse of sin to the eternal presence of God. Without that sacrifice, there would be no way.

The most foolish thing any man can do is to reject this most profound loving act of sacrifice and die under the curse of his own sin.

For God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on Him should not perish but have everlasting life.

It is really true!

Re: , on: 2014/11/1 18:28

Ps. 51:16 - For You do not delight in sacrifice, otherwise I would give it; You are not pleased with burnt offering.

I see Jesus showing us that God shouldn't be seen as 'an eye for an eye'.

"God is under obligation to both uphold and obey His own law."

Is. 54:9. God has sworn to not be wrathful. vs 10 goes further 'my kindness won't leave you'. Also, would you say Jesus disobeyed God when He didn't cast a stone to the woman that was caught in adultery? I'd say Jesus was showing us the Father. He doesn't judge us. We...judge ourselves. (John 5:22)

"But there was no other way to preserve the integrity of the law without the sacrifice."

I have to disagree with this perception. God the Father was never angry with His children that He needed to kill His very own son.

God has always been filled with lovingkindness. He doesn't need a sacrifice to be satisfied. This is a pagan view. Instead

d, God chose Israel. It's an unconditional choice of God.

I see God showed us the way to live with the very life of Jesus. Kind of like, "Hey guys...I'm going to do everything right. Let's see what happens." Then our evil system kills God.

Cain killed innocent Abel. etc etc.

I think the best way to accept the loving act of sacrifice that Jesus committed to was to go and do the same; take up our own cross, live the Sermon on the Mount.

Also, when it comes to justice. I view it in the conclusion of Psalm 7. "15 He who digs a hole and hollows it will then fall into his own pit.

16 His mischief will return on his own head;
his violence will descend on the crown of his own head."

Re: - posted by Oracio (), on: 2014/11/1 18:53

Quote:

-----Ps. 51:16 - For You do not delight in sacrifice, otherwise I would give it; You are not pleased with burnt offering.

I see Jesus showing us that God shouldn't be seen as 'an eye for an eye'.

"God is under obligation to both uphold and obey His own law."

Is. 54:9. God has sworn to not be wrathful. vs 10 goes further 'my kindness won't leave you'. Also, would you say Jesus disobeyed God when He didn't cast a stone to the woman that was caught in adultery? I'd say Jesus was showing us the Father. He doesn't judge us. We...judge ourselves. (John 5:2 2)

"But there was no other way to preserve the integrity of the law without the sacrifice."

I have to disagree with this perception. God the Father was never angry with His children that He needed to kill His very own son.

God has always been filled with lovingkindness. He doesn't need a sacrifice to be satisfied. This is a pagan view. Instead, God chose Israel. It's an unconditional choice of God.

I see God showed us the way to live with the very life of Jesus. Kind of like, "Hey guys...I'm going to do everything right. Let's see what happens." Then our evil system kills God.

Cain killed innocent Abel. etc etc.

I think the best way to accept the loving act of sacrifice that Jesus committed to was to go and do the same; take up our own cross, live the Sermon on the Mount.

Also, when it comes to justice. I view it in the conclusion of Psalm 7. "15 He who digs a hole and hollows it will then fall into his own pit.

16 His mischief will return on his own head;
his violence will descend on the crown of his own head."

That is a denial of clear essential biblical teaching on the atonement of Christ and God's wrath and judgment against sin and unrepentant sinners. Since you deny clear teaching from God's Word on the atonement of Christ I'd be willing to bet you'd also deny the clear scriptures on God's wrath even if those scriptures were shared with you (you may already be familiar with them). LMH, I fear for your soul. May God have mercy on you while there is time.

Re: , on: 2014/11/1 19:22

Oracio, Penal Substitution isn't a 'clear essential biblical teaching'.

Second, the ONLY essential biblical teaching is this, "If you believe in your heart and confess with your mouth that 'Jesus is Lord' you will be saved."

Perfect doctrine doesn't give us access to heaven. The perfect person does. :)

Re: - posted by Sidewalk (), on: 2014/11/1 19:24

LMH, there appears to be way too much distance between our trains to come to much consensus. The sacrifice David knew was insufficient in Psalm 51 was the kind of sacrifice one would try to appease an idol with, a bribe to avoid justice. No, David knew that any sacrifice or burnt offering would neither alter God's heart nor suspend His law. He throws himself on God's mercy, and God accepts him based on a promise that will be fulfilled when the real sacrifice is made, Jesus of Nazareth on the cross.

Please understand that God could not kill His Son as the atoning sacrifice. There is no murder here, until of course the local Jewish leaders conspire with the Romans to put an innocent man to death. But that is why the prayer in Gethsemane is so important, Jesus willingly gives His life for His disciples and us by extension.

I'm sorry, but God does not forgive based on His mood or because He has the power to abolish the penalty for any man's sin. Just as James 2:10 points out that if you transgress in one point you are guilty of the whole law, there is none righteous, not even one. God cannot suspend the penalty of even one sin without unravelling His authority over the entire moral universe. It is a very, very big deal!

As to the woman seized in the act of adultery, conspicuously without her male co-offender, Jesus actually invited the accusers to carry out the punishment of the law. Where He might have expressed some syrupy support for this poor woman, he did not. He just suggested that the first stone be cast by someone of the accusers who had no sin of their own. Monumentally clever, he knew that they would watch each other and that if one of their number were to reach down for that first stone a whole new flurry of accusations would explode.

Jesus is writing on the ground, we know not what. He is not looking at the woman or the accusers. But when He looks up, only the woman is standing in front of Him. "Woman, where are your accusers?" They are gone. Not even one man to join Him in a legal condemnation of her sin. Then He says two important things- "Neither do I condemn you," since any accusation must have, by law, two witnesses. "Go and sin no more."

He acknowledges that what she has done was sin. And note that she does not ask for His forgiveness, and He does not offer her that.

Jesus preserved the integrity of the law, brought proper shame on both the woman and her accusers, all with a display of a righteous compassion that fueled the drive to execute Him.

Re: - posted by brothagary, on: 2014/11/1 19:57

woho we,,im hearing you Oraco

One only needs to read through the book to the Hebrews ,it literally and clearly stats the Jesus was a high priest according to the order of mekeseldek.

And and instead of the old offering to god ,the high priest Jesus offered him self once as final sin offering ,hence is why he is called the lamb of god .

The Innocent for the guilty .The spotless for the stained .The righteousness for the unrighteous .

The is clear as crystal ,Jesus perfect righteous, WHO is called the righteousness of god is imputed to us who have believed on Christ ,and at the very same moment that his righteousness is accounted to us the sin baring Saviour effectively takes away our sin ,he sets us free from sin ,The work of baring our sins in his own body on the tree comes into effect

A two fold substitutionary atonement ,his righteous is substituted for sin ,and we become acceptable in gods eyes ,,and th e the wrath of god was poured out of Jesus ,he was bruised for our iniquity's , the chastisement of our peace was upon h im ,the bible say says so ..

So hence he died for us ,in our place and was punished in our stead so we would not suffer in hell .

I wont post the scripture quotes regarding this topic ,but i know most here allready the scripture ,even if some flat out D eni the word of god to there own demise ,

Liberal christianity , is the stength of Satan,and the joy of demons

Re: - posted by Oracio (), on: 2014/11/1 20:04

Quote:

-----Oracio, Penal Substitution isn't a 'clear essential biblical teaching'.

Second, the ONLY essential biblical teaching is this, "If you believe in your heart and confess with your mouth that 'Jesus is Lord' you will be saved."

Perfect doctrine doesn't give us access to heaven. The perfect person does. :)

Jehovah's Witnesses and Mormons would also claim that scripture in Romans 10 for themselves, yet they have a false J esus that cannot save; so do other groups and individuals who deny who Jesus is and what He did on the cross to save us. Many deny essential teachings such as the deity of Christ, His virgin birth, His resurrection and the need to be born a gain through repentance and faith in Christ. Christ's atonement for our sins falls in that category of essentials for salvatio n. Paul makes it clear in 1Cor.15 and other scriptures that an essential part of the gospel is the atonement of Christ for o ur sins. It's one thing to be a new believer and to be completely ignorant in some essentials. But it's quite another to reje ct those essentials once they are clearly shown to you from the Bible. Once you reach that point of willful ignorance and rebellion against essential truth revealed in God's Word, there remains no excuse.

"For if we sin willfully after we have received the knowledge of the truth, there no longer remains a sacrifice for sins, 27 b ut a certain fearful expectation of judgment, and fiery indignation which will devour the adversaries. 28 Anyone who has rejected Moses' law dies without mercy on the testimony of two or three witnesses. 29 Of how much worse punishment, do you suppose, will he be thought worthy who has trampled the Son of God underfoot, counted the blood of the cove na nt by which he was sanctified a common thing, and insulted the Spirit of grace? 30 For we know Him who said, "Vengea nce is Mine, I will repay," says the Lord. And again, "The Lord will judge His people." 31 It is a fearful thing to fall into t he hands of the living God."-Hebrews 10:26-31

Re: - posted by Oracio (), on: 2014/11/1 20:16

Amen brothagary.

Quote:

-----Liberal christianity , is the stength of Satan,and the joy of demons

Exactly.

LMH, your profile says you've been on the SI forum since 2012. I have no idea how long you'd say you've known the Lor d. Even if it's only for those two years, a true believer wouldn't take that long to heartily embrace these basic essentials o f the true Christian faith. I'd highly and sincerely encourage you to listen to Paul Washer's message titled "Examine Your self".

Re: , on: 2014/11/1 21:41

Sidewalk said: "Then He says two important things- "Neither do I condemn you," since any accusation must have, by law, two witnesses. "Go and sin no more."

He acknowledges that what she has done was sin. And note that she does not ask for His forgiveness, and He does not offer her that."

If you don't see the contradiction of your own words. I'm dumbfounded. Jesus says 'neither do I condemn you' then you say 'jesus doesn't offer her that'. Wait what? I'm thoroughly confused. There is no indifference here. Jesus isn't saying 'no worries'. Jesus said He doesn't condemn her. Jesus is revealing the Father to her. When you see Jesus you see the Father. A Father not condemning His sinful daughter.

brothagary wrote: "Liberal christianity , is the stength of Satan,and the joy of demons"

There is no scripture to support your belief. Jesus said, regarding people that were different than His ministry, "For he who is not against us is for us." (Mk. 9:39-40; Lu. 9:49-50).

In addition to that, I don't adhere to 'liberal Christianity'. You can label my beliefs however you feel but I'm of the Christ Victor view. That God loved us and showed us the way.

Oracio wrote: "Jehovah's Witnesses and Mormons would also claim that scripture in Romans 10 for themselves, yet they have a false Jesus that cannot save; so do other groups and individuals who deny who Jesus is and what He did on the cross to save us."

I would propose to you that if they believe in the Jesus of Nazareth, who died and rose again three days later and they confess that publicly, they too will be in heaven. Sure Mormons add some weird things to that "Jesus = Devil's brother". But that one lie doesn't void the everlasting truth that Jesus was God and died for us. God doesn't require an A+ in theology. He requires a broken contrite heart. Think Pharisee and tax collector. Which one was justified? Surely not the perfect theologian.

Re: - posted by Oracio (), on: 2014/11/1 22:25

Quote:

-----God doesn't require an A+ in theology.

Again, we're not dealing with finer points of theology here. We're dealing with elementary Bible truths you must embrace as evidence of true conversion or salvation; especially since you have access to multiple Bibles that all agree and teach clearly those basic truths which you willfully deny.

Another message that may be helpful is Ray Comfort's "Hell's Best Kept Secret". God has used both Paul Washer's "Examine Yourself" and this one from Comfort to soundly save those who've had false conversion experiences. You owe it to yourself to do some serious soul-examination my friend.

Re: Continuing... - posted by Sidewalk (), on: 2014/11/1 22:40

LMH, sorry about your confusion over what I attempted to say regarding the adulterous woman. As to an exchange of repentance by the woman and the giving of forgiveness by Jesus- it just isn't in the text given to us.

My point was that Jesus, in obedience to the law, could not condemn her without a second witness. He did not, as it may appear, tell her that her sin did not count. By telling her to "sin no more" he acknowledges that her behavior is sinful.

I do agree with you that He was revealing the Father to her, as his ministry every day was above all to reveal the Father to every one with whom he had to do. As in John 5:19- "...the Son can do nothing of Himself, unless it is something He sees the Father doing; for whatever the Father does, these things the Son also does in like manner."

Please know that I appreciate the discussion, and have no wish to argue. It should be our desire to grow in love for one another despite the incredibly varied backgrounds we all bring to this world-wide table.

That said, it would be helpful to us here to know a little more about you as your profile discloses almost nothing about you - even your gender. You have a right to as much privacy as you like, but openness facilitates our fellowship, no?

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2014/11/1 23:38

Art Katz has hundreds of sermons on this site. One of these is "Christus Victor."

there are differing views on the atonement. This is understandable as it is a mysterious thing.

Lets not start calling people "unsaved" who have a different view than ours.

Re: , on: 2014/11/2 0:44

I do like your change in tone Sidewalk. And thank you for helping clarify your stance, as I didn't see it in the way you elaborated. I appreciate the exposition.

As for privacy, I like it that way. Jesus went away. This is kind of my 'away'. To discuss ideas and thoughts that I see the Father demonstrating in my life. I'm also in community with a local church but...hey, we are all here because we are missing out on something in our fellowship (or maybe have something that others are needing). For me, that is depth of conversation. Wrestling with ideas, thoughts, and views that we all have as we relate to God.

Christus Victor view is slightly new for me and it's brought a level of depth to my relationship with God that none of the other views could do for me.

Re: - posted by brothagary, on: 2014/11/2 0:51

tmk with respect to ya ,,what iv read here is not about a differing view of the sacrificial atonement ,,but denial of that very foundational doctrine whereby the power of regeneration lies and moves . Whether it be the cause of or evidence of regeneration ,it is the gospel ,and it is what we are to believe to be saved ...

Re: - posted by brothagary, on: 2014/11/2 1:14

The Christus victus view is fine if it is combined with the penal view ,but without at least that combination ,it is not an atonement for sin and totally defeats the purpose of the Gospel by denying the clear teachings of a sacrificial atonement ,by rights it cant be called a view on the atonement ,because it doesnt atone for sin in any way ..

major fundamental doctrines of the Gospels are lost namely propitiation and expiation ,without these things there is no atonement for sin and know power to save ,the Vail remains intact ,therefore know holy spirit is given .

It is a great perversion of the Gospel of Christ ,and a denial of the doctrine of Christ ,the sin barer ..

And i dare say results in another Jesus, and another spirit because it is another Gospel , and rather than eternal life ,eternal death .

The message and reality of reconciliation of fallen man to wards god ,has all its tap roots in the sacrificial offering of Christ as the spotless lamb of god and the highpriest of god ,,this is why and how he is the only mediator between god and man ,without this part of the Gospel ,there is reconciliation as experiential reality ,but only a figment of ones imagination ,no matter how much we can talk about god and Jesus ,it avails nothing ...

Re: , on: 2014/11/2 1:32

Let me remind two people who have said, "This is another Jesus." That calling me not your brother is akin to Cain saying Abel wasn't his brother. It's division. The accuser of the brethren.

I make no statement against you folks but with this lashing at me, saying 'This is another Jesus', I feel I need to speak up, ever so subtly.

I just have a different view. We can agree to disagree. I have no problem with that. Much of the early church would agree with Christus Victor without Penal.

Re: - posted by Oracio (), on: 2014/11/2 1:39

Quote:

-----Art Katz has hundreds of sermons on this site. One if these is "Christus Victor."

there are differing views on the atonement. This is understandable as it is a mysterious thing.

Lets not start calling people "unsaved" who have a different view than ours.

I did some brief research on Art Katz and his view of the atonement and found that he very well seemed to support the penal substitutionary atonement of Christ (Katz mentions Christ's sacrificial "expiation" for our sins). I saw the comments on that "Christus Victor" message and did not see anything that hinted on denying Christ's propitiation for our sins. I'll have to take a listen to it sometime to see if he in fact denies that doctrine. If you know of a statement from Katz which proves that he denies penal substitution please do share. Otherwise I don't believe he denied it at this point.

Throughout the years as a believer I've heard the liberal view that says Christ died only as an example of sacrificial love for us and it has always made me want to puke for lack of better words. Not saying that that's the exact view LMH is promoting here but it sure did seem very close to it in his/her posts.

I did some brief research on the Christus Victor view and the Ransom Theory view and read that mostly Greek Orthodox churches hold to it, that some Anabaptists Mennonite churches hold to it, and that many liberal churches hold to it as well.

In doing street evangelism throughout the years I have always preached that Christ took the punishment for our sins as He hung on the cross and shed His innocent blood. I have always seen that as an essential doctrine of the Christian faith. I have come across many professing Christians who deny certain essential doctrines and I've felt I had to make the decision not to fellowship with them but to call them to repentance and faith in the real Jesus Christ of the Holy Bible.

As with the doctrines of universalism and annihilationism, I see the denial of the penal substitutionary atonement of Christ as essential to both salvation and fellowship.

Brothers and sisters, there is a big push today for all professing Christians to unite and embrace one another and to throw essential doctrine out the window. May we be found among those that are not deceived and swept away but rather hold fast to sound doctrine as we are commanded in God's Word.

Re: - posted by Oracio (), on: 2014/11/2 1:49

Quote:

-----The Christos victus view is fine if it is combined with the penal view ,but with out at least that combination ,it is not an atonement for sin and totally defeats the purpose of the Gospel by denying the clear teachings of a sacrificial atonement ,by rights it cant be called a view on the atonement ,because it doesnt atone for sin in any way ..

major fundamental doctrines of the Gospels are lost namely propitiation and expiation ,with out these thing there is no atonement for sin and know power to save ,the Vail remains intact ,therefor know holy spirit is given .

It is a great perversion of the Gospel of Christ ,and a denial of the doctrine of Christ ,the sin barer ..

And i dare say results in another Jesus, and another spirit because it is another Gospel , and rather then eternal life ,eternal death .

The message and reality of reconciliation of fallen man to wards god ,has all it tap roots in the sacrificial offering of Christ as the spotless lamb of god and the highpriest of god ,,this is why and how he is the only mediator between god and man ,with out this part of the Gospel ,there is reconciliation as experiential reality ,but only a figment of ones imagination ,no matter how much we can talk about god and Jesus ,it avails nothing ...

Very well stated brother. You nailed it and explained it better than I've been able to.

Re: , on: 2014/11/2 1:53

Oracio, thanks for some context. I appreciate that.

"Throughout the years as a believer I've heard the liberal view that says Christ died only as an example of sacrificial love for us and it has always made me want to puke for lack of better words. Not saying that that's the exact view LMH is promoting here but it sure did seem very close to it in his posts."

I see your concern but let me raise this to you. If I love my child. My child knows, through numerous actions, that I love them. Does it prevent them from all harm? What if they fall off the bike? Well, that's a learning lesson. If they hate themselves and cut themselves. Do the scars go away? No.

We are the pearl of great price. Yes, He indeed paid that price.

Oracio, you say, "I see the denial of the penal substitutionary atonement of Christ as essential to both salvation and fellowship." but also say, "mostly Greek Orthodox churches hold to it, that some Anabaptists Mennonite churches hold to it, and that many liberal churches hold to it as well."

Are you saying much of the early church is in hell? Because...if it's essential...wouldn't that be cause for great alarm? That the entire early church got it wrong... Penal wasn't a view until the 1000's AD.

Re: - posted by Oracio (), on: 2014/11/2 1:57

Quote:

-----Much of the early church would agree with Christus Victor without Penal.

There is indeed a claim out there that says that the denial of the penal view of Christ's atonement was prevalent for the first thousand years of Church history. Those who make that claim point out quotes by early church leaders like Irenaeus and Origen to prove their point. But that claim has also been refuted with quotes from those same early church leaders, quotes that show they held to the penal view of the atonement while simultaneously holding to the ransom view.

Re: - posted by brothagary, on: 2014/11/2 1:21

hi love meek and hope ,,

i was making general statements, i would say it like that weather you were opposed to penal substitution or not ,

Why i say anther Jesus another spirit and another Gospel, is because Paul said there were other Jesus and another spirit and another Gospel prevalent in his day ,and in reality if one doesnt believe in the high priest the holy sacrificial lamb of god in the context of an offering for sin as the bible states ,one is not believing the Jesus of the bible nor the Gospel ,and there for cant have the holy spirit ,,because finally the bible says he who is of god heres gods words .

This is a general statement take it personally if you must...

Re: - posted by brothagary, on: 2014/11/2 1:25

thanks oracio but you explained in fine and you quoted clear scripture from hebrews ..

Is that right that the herd to both in the early church ,makes scence

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2014/11/2 8:13

I was not suggesting that Art Katz did not have a traditional view of the atonement- I am sure he did. I just know that he has a sermon called Christus Victor. I haven't heard it in a long time.

"Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures" seems to be all that one is required to understand about the atonement. The exact details of how it works (which is impossible to know) and whether it is limited etc does not seem to matter.

Re: - posted by Oracio (), on: 2014/11/2 10:38

Word of Faith teaching says that on the cross Jesus took upon Himself the nature of Satan, and that He went to suffer in hell and that He had to be born again.

I bring that up as another example of blasphemous and damnable teaching on the atonement. The same kind of damnable blasphemy is perpetrated in other forms of twisting the clear teaching on Christ's atonement.

That "Christ died for our sins" could mean many different things to different groups and/or cults. Again, the liberal churches take it to be simply an example of sacrificial love and deny the actual atonement of Christ for our sins. There is no saving power in those kinds of beliefs.

Re: - posted by Oracio (), on: 2014/11/2 11:45

In case anyone is interested, I came across this article which I believe ably refutes the claim that the penal substitutionary atonement of Christ was not held to by the early church:

<http://www.tms.edu/tmsj/tmsj20i.pdf>

In the article five views on the atonement are discussed, ranging from acceptable views to damnable liberal views.

The article explains that one can believe in different aspects of the atonement as long as one does not deny the penal aspect of it because that is the part of it that actually atones for our sins. So for example, it's okay and biblical to say that Christ's death was a demonstration and example of God's love for humanity; but if you leave it at that and deny that Christ actually atoned for our sins in His body on the tree (1 Peter 2:24), you deny an essential component of the atonement.

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2014/11/2 14:20

"Now I would remind you, brothers, of the gospel I preached to you, which you received, in which you stand, and by which you are being saved, if you hold fast to the word I preached to you—unless you believed in vain.

3 For I delivered to you as of first importance what I also received: ***that Christ died for our sins in accordance with the Scriptures***, 4 that he was buried, that he was raised on the third day in accordance with the Scriptures, 5 and that he appeared to Cephas, then to the twelve. 6 Then he appeared to more than five hundred brothers at one time, most of whom are still alive, though some have fallen asleep. 7 Then he appeared to James, then to all the apostles. 8 Last of all, as to one untimely born, he appeared also to me." (1 Cor. 15:1-8).

Paul's gospel seems to require that one believe that Christ died for our sins in accordance with the scriptures, and that's it- at least in regard to the atonement. I am not saying that other scriptures do not further flesh out the atonement but Paul seems to be getting to the lowest common denominator.

That phrase "Christ died for our sins" obviously carries the idea of being a substitute and of taking on Himself something that we deserved- it was OUR sins for which he died.

A person does not need to understand more than this about the atonement in order to "be saved." If reasonable mature Christians do not all agree 100% on the nature of the atonement then how can a person just coming to Christ be burdened with exact understanding?

Re: - posted by brothagary, on: 2014/11/2 14:30

yep tod i agree wether it is a limated or unlimated ectra as long as it is a believing in christ dieing as a sacrafice for sin ,which would be in acordence with scripture , the finer points can come later ,but we are realy talking about can that fact be denied and replaced another message , do we still have the same gosple ,wich we say infadicly no we dont have t he same gosple ,becasue the atonment itself the sacrifice of christ for sin

Re: , on: 2014/11/2 15:41

TMK said, " If reasonable mature Christians do not all agree 100% on the nature of the atonement then how can a person just coming to Christ be burdened with exact understanding? "

I couldn't say it any better.

To help elaborate my view. <http://therebelgod.com/cross1.html>

Most of the early church would say, 'Jesus paid the price. That price was His life. He paid it to the Devil. To obtain the church.' This is not a protestant view, 80% of the church agrees with this early church belief. Christus Victor/Ransom View go hand in hand.

Not, "God is just. God needed a perfect sacrifice to accept the world. So, He sent Himself/Son to die and appease God's justice."

â€œAs surely as I live,â€™ declares the Sovereign LORD, â€I take no pleasure in the death of the wicked, but rather that they turn from their ways and liveâ€™â€ (Ezekiel 33:11)

The prodigal son didn't need to offer a sacrifice to get forgiveness from his father. The sacrifices of the Pharisee's didn't grant them forgiveness. The contrite heart of the tax collector did. God desires a relationship with us. Song of Solomon. Hosea. David's Psalms. He wants us.

I understand your views and I'm interested in learning more (as that link to Church History views of Penal, I'd like to hear them, as I don't agree that the early church embraced penal). But Penal/Christus whatever your/my view I think we are still brothers and we are love each other; patience, kindness, goodness, etc. And if we weren't brothers...well, love your enemies.

Re: - posted by Oracio (), on: 2014/11/2 19:28

The phrase "according to the scriptures" in 1Cor.15:3 is crucial. Just a cursory look at the Old Testament reveals the need for atonement for sins through a perfect sacrifice. The whole sacrificial system made that very clear to Israel. Just read briefly through Exodus and Leviticus and consider the myriad of times the phrase "to make atonement for sins" comes up in reference to the animal sacrifices that were commanded by God to be made by the priests. This has nothing to do with pagan worship but with the prescribed worship of Yahweh, the one true God revealed in the Holy Scriptures. For someone to say that the idea of a sacrifice being needed to atone for sins is rooted in paganism is to highly insult the character of God. You can also read Isaiah 53 and easily see that Christ, as the Lamb of God and ultimate sacrifice for the sins of the world, was the fulfillment of that whole sacrificial system. Those animal sacrifices were shadows of Christ's ultimate sacrifice as the animal sacrifices did not actually remove sin.

I'd also say that the reason pagans have offered either animal or human sacrifices to their false gods throughout history is because their consciences have told them that a sacrifice is needed to atone for sins.

In Hebrews 10:5-6 the Word of God says (quoting from Psalm 40:6), "Sacrifice and offering You did not desire, But a body You have prepared for Me. 6 In burnt offerings and sacrifices for sin You had no pleasure".

But please don't stop there. This is a large portion of the rest of the chapter:

"Then I said, 'Behold, I have come-- In the volume of the book it is written of Me-- To do Your will, O God.' " 8 Previously saying, "Sacrifice and offering, burnt offerings, and offerings for sin You did not desire, nor had pleasure in them" (which are offered according to the law), 9 then He said, "Behold, I have come to do Your will, O God." He takes away the first that He may establish the second. 10 By that will we have been sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all. 11 And every priest stands ministering daily and offering repeatedly the same sacrifices, which can never

take away sins. 12 But this Man, after He had offered one sacrifice for sins forever, sat down at the right hand of God, 13 from that time waiting till His enemies are made His footstool. 14 For by one offering He has perfected forever those who are being sanctified. 15 But the Holy Spirit also witnesses to us; for after He had said before, 16 "This is the covenant that I will make with them after those days, says the Lord: I will put My laws into their hearts, and in their minds I will write them," 17 then He adds, "Their sins and their lawless deeds I will remember no more." 18 Now where there is remission of these, there is no longer an offering for sin. 19 Therefore, brethren, having boldness to enter the Holiest by the blood of Jesus, 20 by a new and living way which He consecrated for us, through the veil, that is, His flesh, 21 and having a High Priest over the house of God, 22 let us draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience and our bodies washed with pure water. 23 Let us hold fast the confession of our hope without wavering, for He who promised is faithful."

I will also post most of Isaiah 53 here because the atoning sacrifice of Christ is clear throughout that chapter:

4 Surely He has borne our griefs And carried our sorrows; Yet we esteemed Him stricken, Smitten by God, and afflicted. 5 But He was wounded for our transgressions, He was bruised for our iniquities; The chastisement for our peace was upon Him, And by His stripes we are healed. 6 All we like sheep have gone astray; We have turned, every one, to his own way; And the Lord has laid on Him the iniquity of us all. 7 He was oppressed and He was afflicted, Yet He opened not His mouth; He was led as a lamb to the slaughter, And as a sheep before its shearers is silent, So He opened not His mouth. 8 He was taken from prison and from judgment, And who will declare His generation? For He was cut off from the land of the living; For the transgressions of My people He was stricken. 9 And they made His grave with the wicked-- But with the rich at His death, Because He had done no violence, Nor was any deceit in His mouth. 10 Yet it pleased the Lord to bruise Him; He has put Him to grief. When You make His soul an offering for sin, He shall see His seed, He shall prolong His days, And the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in His hand. 11 He shall see the labor of His soul, and be satisfied. By His knowledge My righteous Servant shall justify many, For He shall bear their iniquities. 12 Therefore I will divide Him a portion with the great, And He shall divide the spoil with the strong, Because He poured out His soul unto death, And He was numbered with the transgressors, And He bore the sin of many, And made intercession for the transgressors."

If those scriptures do not convince one of the clarity of this essential doctrine of Jesus' blood-offering for our sins I don't know what will. Those are not the only clear scriptures; other scriptures have already been shared and there are many more.

LMH, you posted earlier that this whole denial of the penal view of Christ's atonement is somewhat new to you. That seems to me to imply some form of apostasy from the biblical gospel. The scripture that comes to mind is 1John 2:19, "They went out from us, but they were not of us; for if they had been of us, they would have continued with us; but they went out that they might be made manifest, that none of them were of us."

I'm not saying for sure that that verse applies to your situation but I thought I'd share it just in case.

If I met you in person on the streets and you shared your view with me I'd try to reason with you from the Scriptures and call you to repentance and faith in Christ as I've been trying to do here. The same would go for anyone else I'd meet who belongs to a cult and has bought into a false gospel and false Jesus. But there comes a point when it is evident that so me will not receive the truth of the gospel no matter how many clear scriptures are shared with them. That's when it's time to disagree and part ways and move on. Paul did not tolerate false gospels and false Jesus'. By God's grace I hope and pray I too never will.

Having said all that, that doesn't mean I don't care about your salvation. True love warns of danger.

"For if he who comes preaches another Jesus whom we have not preached, or if you receive a different spirit which you have not received, or a different gospel which you have not accepted--you may well put up with it!"-2Cor.11:4

Re: , on: 2014/11/2 20:25

Oracio said, "If I met you in person on the streets and you shared your view with me I'd try to reason with you from the Scriptures and call you to repentance and faith in Christ as I've been trying to do here."

This is sad. Jesus challenged the Pharisees, "(John 5:39)"You search the Scriptures because you think that in them you have eternal life; it is these that testify about Me; (John 5:40) and you are unwilling to come to Me so that you may have life."

The fact that you are adamant that I have received a 'different Christ', I must retreat. I don't see the point in talking with someone who doesn't listen. Because it's no longer a healthy debate. Just a time where one digs their heels in. You are entitled to your beliefs. I just flatly disagree with you and was looking forward to discussing more.

Paul's view of a different gospel wasn't written for a 21st century debate regarding Penal/Christus. Paul was talking against the mystical christ, that didn't come in the flesh (gnostic gospel). Or that christ, who wasn't God, just a man.

I don't need you nor any brother to validate that I know God. I'm saddened that you view Penal as essential, yet it doesn't arise in church history until 1000AD. This is a blatant denial of Paul, Peter, Irenaeus, and many of the early martyrs of the church.

Abraham in relationship/friendship with God put his son on the altar. But Issac. wasn't. sacrificed. A ram was. Something ...that can't take away sin. Why because God doesn't desire sacrifice.

I end with scripture: Hosea 6:6, First Samuel 15:22, Isaiah 1:11-17; Amos 5:21-24; Micah 6:6-8, Romans 2:28-29, Matthew 9:13; cf. 12:7,

Re: - posted by Oracio (), on: 2014/11/2 21:19

I remember a few years ago hearing of many protestant evangelicals turning to and embracing Greek Orthodox doctrine. Many protestants saw it as apostasy. In more recent times there have been many protestants turning to Roman Catholicism, which I also see as apostasy. But I'm thankful for the fact that God has His remnant that He will keep from falling away from the faith once for all delivered to the saints. Call me a Pharisee if you feel you must; I cannot deny and stop declaring what my Lord and Savior had to endure for all my wickedness against Him.

Re: what did justin martyr believe - posted by brothagary, on: 2014/11/2 22:00

its clear that penal substatiuon was believed by some early church fathers like justin ...theises by Ruben Videira Soengas

Justin Martyr (c. 100â€"165)

Justin Martyr was born to Greek parents in Samaria during the early years of the second century. Very little is known of his pre-Christian life except that he became a philosopher of the Platonic school and then left in favor of Christianity after a conversation with a mysterious man. He was also one of the most significant Christian writers of the second century, exercising a strong influence over other early Christian theologians. Justin is important for the present discussion because he is within a generation of the apostles, so most likely he would have spoken to people who personally met them.

20

Justinâ€™s third most extant work is

The Dialogue with Trypho the Jew

. It contains his reflections about his philosophical journey and his theological explanations about the Incarnation in a conversational format between him and a Jew called Trypho. In this work, Justin reveals his understanding of penal substitution: Then Trypho remarked, "Be assured that all our nation waits for Christ; and we admit that all the Scriptures which you have quoted refer to Him. Moreover, I do also admit that the name of Jesus, by which the son of Nave (Nun) was called, has inclined me very strongly to adopt this view. But whether Christ should be so shamefully crucified, this we are

in doubt about. For whosoever is crucified is said in the law to be accursed, so that I am exceedingly incredulous on this point. It is quite clear, indeed, that the Scriptures announce that Christ had to suffer; but we wish to learn if you can prove it to us whether it was by the suffering cursed in the law. I replied to him, If Christ was not to suffer, and the prophets had not foretold that He would be led to death on account of the sins of the people, and be dishonoured and scourged, and reckoned among the transgressors, and as a sheep be led to the slaughter, whose generation, the prophet says, no man can declare, then you would have good cause to wonder. But if these are to be characteristic of Him and mark Him out to all, how is it possible for us to do anything else than believe in Him most confidently? And will not as many as have understood the

20

Roger E. Olson,

The Story of Christian Theology: Twenty Centuries of Tradition and Reform

(Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 1999), 59.

##

writings of the prophets, whenever they hear merely that He was crucified, say that this is He and no other?

21

After stating that Christ had to die and suffer on account of the sins of His people Justin continues with his argument and explains why He died on the cross but was not cursed for His own sins. Justin says that the curse of God rests on humanity because the Law of Moses curses all those who do not continue with the things written in it, and since nobody has accomplished it, everybody is cursed. That curse does not rest on Christ, since He is the one who saves all that have committed things worthy of a curse. In the flow of this argument Justin says: If, then, the Father of all wished His Christ for the whole human family to take upon Him the curses of all, knowing that, after He had been crucified and was dead, He would raise Him up, why do you argue about Him, who submitted to suffer these things according to the Father's will, as if He were accursed, and do not rather bewail yourselves? For although His Father caused Him to suffer these things in behalf of the human family, yet you did not commit the deed as in obedience to the will of God.

22

In short, Justin believed and taught penal substitution. In fact, for him it explained why Jesus was crucified even though he committed no sin. He was innocent but bore the curse and punishment due to humanity's sinfulness.

Re: - posted by Oracio (), on: 2014/11/2 22:22

LMH, please feel free to continue dialoguing with other brethren here who may be more patient than I have been here. I believe I've said more than enough here and will gladly stand down. It's up to you.

Re: - posted by brothagary, on: 2014/11/2 22:43

Yea im standing down too ,for me and oracio ,this was about zeal for the purity of the Gospel it self ,and this is what sermon index stands for , i hope that this discussion is seen for that .

I know of know biblical revival that came for anything other then the preaching and faith in the sacrificial cross of Christ , the Christ who became a curse for our sakes that the curse would be lifted of our heads

Re: , on: 2014/11/3 0:01

Brothagary wrote: "purity of the Gospel...what sermon index stands for"

Yes. I understand this and I agree that is what this discussion was after. :)

I just want to note, Charles Finney, one of the leaders of the 2nd great awakening had this view of ****edit 2****governmental theory.

(originally, I thought he held Christus Victor without Penal; but either way he wasn't penal)

Source: http://www.gospeltruth.net/1856OE/560730_the_atonement.htm (also, for later readers of this discussion, if this link breaks, Finney was publicly governmental, not Penal, so it should be easy to find with a search engine).

Edit Also, Spurgeon didn't like Finney's view. <http://www.spurgeon.org/~phil/articles/finney.htm>

Also, Oracio, thank you for providing the information regarding your idea that penal is earlier than 1000AD, I will look into it.

Thank you everyone for adding what you could to this discussion. I appreciate everyone's take. Let's abide in Him. Live to discuss another day. :)

Re: Finney and some legacy - posted by Sidewalk (), on: 2014/11/3 11:34

Charles Finney preached Public Justice atonement, with astounding effect. Trained early on as a lawyer, he understood how universal morality could not work without the security of law, and that law was tyrannical without the balance of grace.

Any view of the atonement that casts shadows over the bright love of God will damage the hearer and hinder the spread of the gospel. Likewise, any gospel that dismisses the immutable law of God will prevent those hearers from acknowledging their guilt so that they might repent.

I must go back to the beginning of what I said about the atonement, that God gave us His Son in a death that may be counted as our death to meet the demands of law that God Himself has no authority to suspend. Jesus Christ is His only provision to save us from our sins, He has no other alternative.

Justice and mercy pull at one another, the atonement of Christ allows God to safely extend the mercy without damaging the law.

On a personal level, I believed as I was taught in my Presbyterian upbringing that I was trapped in sin from birth and that Christ forgave all my sins past present and future. Other than a few wimpers of conscience, there wasn't much to restrain my appetite for sin. I plunged right in. It wasn't until I met someone who introduced me to Finney and the scriptures he used that I realized that I had been foolish and deceived. When I took responsibility for my sin, I was at last both cleansed and forgiven. Suddenly the law and the mercy of God made sense, and I have never been the same. Theologically I hold with the doctrine of Public Justice atonement, because through the atonement I came to a deep love for my Savior .

Before this I respected God, but truth be told I didn't like Him at all. My condition was His fault, and I could not create in my mind or heart any love for Him.

We each have to make our own peace with all of this. But I believe good theology will remove the veils and barriers to the intimacy God wants with His children. "As the deer panteth after the waterbrooks so my soul longs after Thee!" This is how it should be for all the children of God.

Re: Finnel's view, on: 2014/11/3 12:26

"Public Justice atonement"

I had to google that as, I wasn't familiar with those terms. The governmental theory, I've heard of.

Anywho, I stand corrected with regards to Finney, he held a governmental theory of atonement. Some of the stuff I read and heard sounded like Christus Victor. But...looking at a few other commentaries, he was of the governmental (or public justice) view.

Neat, learned something new. I was misinformed.

Talk to yall later.

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2014/11/3 15:30

Quote: "Before this I respected God, but truth be told I didn't like him at all. My condition was His fault, and I could not create in my mind or heart any love for Him."

This statement has depth and is worthy of much consideration.

Some doctrines, or points of doctrine, when taken to their logical conclusion, lead to a God that is not very likeable. Why is this?

Re: - posted by dolfan (), on: 2014/11/3 17:17

Whatever description you might give it, the Scriptures say this:

"He" Christ

"Was" In fact, it happened

"Wounded" Made to experience bodily suffering via lacerations, etc.

"For our" As a consequence of or in the place of, i.e., substitute (as in, "I'm Mrs. McGillicutty and I'm teaching for Ms. Jones today.")

"Transgressions" Sins, violation of law. All transgression is sin.

"He" Christ

"Was" In fact, it happened

"Bruised" Made to experience contusions to His body via severe blows

"For our" As a consequence of or in the place of, i.e., substitute

"Iniquities" Faults, sins

"Upon him" Christ endured, bore

"Was" In fact, it happened

"Chastisement" Reproof, Correction, Discipline, Rebuke

"That brought us peace" That, for us, in our place, for our benefit, brings us to a place of wellness and peace with God.

"With" Also, or by

"His stripes" Or, wounds, see above.

"We" You and me

"Are healed" Mended, cured, repaired, made whole

Isaiah 53:5 teaches that Jesus endured for me and for you -- in our place, in our stead -- piercing, wounding, bruising, chastisement so that by them in Him, we could be reconciled --- or, brought to peace/healing/mending --- with God. The piercing, wounding, bruising, chastisement was ours to bear, but God chose --- indeed, preferred! (Isa. 53:10) --- to pour it out upon His only Son.

It can be called by any name or phrase, but it cannot rightly be called other than what the Scripture calls it. The best descriptor for it that I've ever read is "penal substitutionary atonement."

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2014/11/3 17:54

Agreed, Dolfan.

But LMH seems to be raising a couple of points(although I am not 100% sure he has stated this thusly- I havent gone back and read everything again):

If penal substitution theory is true (and I am not saying it is not), then at least two items must be dealt with:

1) God tortured an innocent person and let the guilty (us) get off scott-free. It's awfully nice (at least for us), but is this just?

2) If God put all of our debt and punishment on Jesus, then there is nothing to forgive us for- in fact God has ****no reason**** to forgive us because Jesus has paid our debt in full. But scripture seems to suggest that God forgives us.

Once again- I am not arguing against the penal substitutionary view. What I am saying is that it raises at least these two points that are worthy of consideration, and appear to be the two primary points raised against this view.

Since this is a discussion forum I would hope we can discuss this without accusing other brothers of being unsaved, heretics, etc.

Re: - posted by dolfan (), on: 2014/11/3 18:32

1) God tortured an innocent person and let the guilty (us) get off scott-free. It's awfully nice (at least for us), but is this just?

These questions are excellent ways to explain the uniqueness of the Gospel. For example, Islam is wholly without justice. There is sin, but there is no punishment. Instead, God subjectively holds His hand close to the vest about whether your good works please Him enough to let you slide. In Buddhism, there is no sin, per se but endless chances to climb toward "god" by reincarnation and living "better".

The question, as put, blames God for Jesus' death. God did not torture or kill Jesus. Jesus yielded Himself to the only possible means of redemption of God's creation. It was wholly voluntary. Truly, that God condescended to become flesh at all is so far beyond "justice" that we have nothing left to argue against Jesus' own submission of His flesh to the cross. That God the Son emptied Himself of glory to become human is not just, if we insist on using human ideas of justice, which is what we do when we posit that Jesus' death was somehow unjust or too much. It is just because God justifies us by it, not because it meets our notions of fairness. We are not "scott-free". We still die. There is a price for our freedom and redemption, too.

2) If God put all of our debt and punishment on Jesus, then there is nothing to forgive us for- in fact God has ****no reason**** to forgive us because Jesus has paid our debt in full. But scripture seems to suggest that God forgives us.

Our punishment is upon Him, but this does not relieve us of culpability. In fact, our culpability is made more visible and knowable in contrast to His innocence. Until I believe and repent and obey the Gospel, my sin is not really upon Him. I have chosen not to accept the pardon of my sin. As to me, in such a case, God has every reason to lay upon me the punishment for my culpability. Only when, by His own act, He removes my guilt and justifies me by His grace, am I made clear of my culpable actions (sins).

Re: - posted by tbsounde2 (), on: 2014/11/3 18:55

Brother Oracio and Dolfan, I just want to start by saying that I am tremendously blessed by you guys and your heart for the Lord. I have been encouraged many times from your posts and the time you take to write out such well thought out responses. I have definitely been troubled by the things I have been reading on this thread and it reminds me of the importance of continuing to look onto Jesus and staying true to His Word and gospel that He has entrusted to us. We know that this world is going to get darker and darker and things get more and more confusing and the enemies lies more and more subtle as we approach the coming day of our Lord. But I just wanted to encourage you guys to keep fighting the good fight of faith and just let you know how much I appreciate you guys.

Brother TMK, I just thought I'd try taking a shot at the two questions/issues you raised, which I think are definitely legitimate questions that arise as one tries to earnestly and diligently apply logic and reasoning to their beliefs and

convictions.

1) This is where the Trinity comes so marvelously into play and it's importance highlighted. Just as you mentioned, for God to torture an innocent person and let the guilty go scott-free would make Him unjust, but if the Triune God (the Law Giver) decides to take the punishment upon Himself, He is fully just in doing so because He is the Law Giver. I've heard it put this way once: there was a king who instituted a certain law as the authority of the land and decreed that anyone who breaks said law was to be whipped with 40 lashes. Some time later, it was brought to the king's attention that someone had broken that law. Much to the king's sorrow, that individual happened to be his own mother. The king now had a serious dilemma on his hands. By pardoning his mother without punishment would make him an unjust king, but on the other hand how could he watch his own mother be whipped with 40 lashes which would probably kill her. So after thinking it through, the king came up with a solution. With all the people of the kingdom assembled wondering what the king would do, he called for the prisoner, his mother, to be brought out. He began to recite the law and the punishment that was to be given as a result of breaking it. He then identified the prisoner before all, confirming her guilt and then called the guards to tie her to a pole and prepare their whips. And just as they were about to commence, the king stopped them, took off his kingly robes, came between his mother and the guards, embraced her, then told them to commence with their whipping. The king, as the law giver, justly took the punishment his mother deserved so that she could justly be forgiven of her trespass.

2) This would be true if forgiveness was not contingent upon anything, but we know from scripture that it is contingent upon faith. An example would be as follows: a prisoner is pardoned for his wrong doing and allowed to go free, but it is ultimately up to the prisoner to walk out of the prison. Or another one is this: a person is dying of an illness, a cure has been purchased for him, but it is up to him to take it.

Also, I am surprised that Romans 3:25-26 hasn't been brought up yet in this discussion regarding penal substitution (unless I missed it). I personally thought it is one of the clearest verses in support:

25 whom God put forward as a propitiation by his blood, to be received by faith. This was to show God's righteousness, because in his divine forbearance he had passed over former sins. 26 It was to show his righteousness at the present time, so that he might be just and the justifier of the one who has faith in Jesus.

Re: - posted by brothagary, on: 2014/11/3 19:12

Im back ,standing up

dolfan raised most of the points from scripture ,hard to denie those points

tmk your first point you take god and the Gospel out of biblical context ,by simplifying and seeing it like that ...

First of all one needs to remember Jesus is called the everlasting father who the eternal father used to create all things seen and unseen . So the creating of man and the fall and curse upon fallen man was accomplished by Jesus him self ,it was always planed by the father and the son that the creator son would merge into creation and condemn sin in the flesh take upon him self the curse that he him self delivered to Adam and his seed ,satisfy justice only the son could achieve this and that was always the plan,so this had nothing to do with the out would turcher that we saw the romans achieve by there own free choice ,there was something much deeper going behind the seens ,and dare i say Christ was taking and absorbing in hell what was also meant for us only the everlasting son could take the everlasting punishment that was waiting for us , the foundations of the earth the heavens and eternal hell were layed by the eternal son and only the son was the one who could break the burning chains and nullify the hungry mouth of hell ,and remove the summons that was to consume the elect ,,,

If it was a righteous and just thing for god to punish sin according to his own wrath on earth and in hell ,then it could only be god him self who must come in the flesh take upon him self the righteousness punishment by taking upon him self the sin of his people justifying them by his own blood and regenerating them by his own holy spirit and sanctifying through his own life ,there was no other way to save a doomed race ,and yet uphold his holy righteous law , to be the just and the justifier was the only way

God could show his hatred for sin, his love for his law which comes from his own nature ,and at the same time show his love ,and his Gracefilled mercy to a race who deserve nothing but hell .

The cross was the pinnacle of gods own holy nature being expressed in its purest form with out contradiction ,or injustice ,his Holiness his love and Justus remain consist and fully active through this redemptive atonement.

Tod the cross is where forgiveness is it is how he forgives one just needs to remain at the cross ,this is why we obey Jesus and eat the bread and drink the wine in remembrance of him till he comes back ,and remember what Jesus went through to obtain perfect holy justifying forgiveness , for us .

Re: - posted by dolfan (), on: 2014/11/3 19:16

Bro Tbesounds, one of my delights in SI is the healthy, constructive discussion. I admire that in so many here, and also in my brother TMK. These are questions that demand answers. If we hope for men to believe the gospel, we must be ready to at least explain it in basic terms. These question are some that most/many today will avoid for fear of being shown ignorant. Let's engage them, learn our weakness of thought, submit what we think are "good answers" to the brethren for our own testing. I love this kind of sharpening and hope that none of this seems combative.

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2014/11/3 21:09

Like I said guys-- at least for me you are "preaching to the choir" because I agree with you-- but your answers are excellent and help to clarify the issues.

Tbsounde- I am not sure if bringing the Trinity into a discussion ever simplifies it, but I get your meaning.

Re: - posted by Sree (), on: 2014/11/4 2:19

I have not posted my understanding so far. Let me try answering these 2 questions here, based on the way I interpret the scripture.

Quote:

1) God tortured an innocent person and let the guilty (us) get off scott-free. It's awfully nice (at least for us), but is this just?

The entire suffering of Jesus as prophesied by Isaiah in Chapter 53, starts with Isiah crying as -

Who has believed our message
and to whom has the arm of the Lord been revealed?

yes it is truly unbelievable that God will come to earth in a human form, suffer like us but without sin to set an example, die the most painful death for our sins. Now for our justification he rose from death. Who can believe this? Only those to whom God is pleased to reveal this secret. We are only here to exhalt Jesus as he is and what he has done. If it appears unjust to people then it is left to them. The beauty of Gospel is it is unbelievable.

Quote:

2) If God put all of our debt and punishment on Jesus, then there is nothing to forgive us for- in fact God has **no reason** to forgive us because Jesus has paid our debt in full. But scripture seems to suggest that God forgives us.

God forgiving our sins has nothing to do with Jesus. I know I will be attacked for what I am saying. Forgiveness existed even before Jesus came to this earth. David says blessed is the man whose sins are covered. So forgiveness existed even in OT. All a man has to do is to turn to God like Prodigal son and say I am sorry for what I have done.

Now the difference between OT and NT is, we have something more than forgiveness, this is Justification. In OT only sins are covered, which means they still exists somewhere but has been covered or hidden. In NT God after forgiving us, he also justifies us. Justification is God looking at us as if we have not sinned. God will look at us like how he looked Jesus.

This is positional, based on my faith in the blood of Jesus. Only those who repent and stand by faith are justified. Justification is not based on work but based on my position in Jesus. This justification though is available for the whole world, it is not applicable because they do not take this position in Jesus.

Sacrifice of Jesus is like God writing a open check to all. But only those who accept this check and deposit it in Bank with faith will inherit the fund. Else they will never get the fund.

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2014/11/4 6:01

Quote: "If it appears unjust to people then it is left to them."

Please understand I am playing something of a devil's advocate here. But when you make the above statement it seems like you are saying that what God did with Jesus at the cross WAS just. In other words in that instance it was just to allow an innocent man (Jesus) to be cruelly tortured and murdered in the most heinous way imaginable but NOT punish the guilty party at all. (I know that Dolfan mentioned that we are punished- i.e. we die etc. but Jesus did not die for our physical lives).

The problem with this is that it is a "legal fiction." Just calling something "just" does not mean that it is. A dog has five legs if you call his tail a leg, but regardless he in reality only has 4 legs. And what do we always say-- that God is always just. He is both loving and merciful but this is always tempered by his justice. For example, in discussions regarding an eternal hell the statement is always made that yes, God is loving but his justice must be satisfied.

So the objection regarding #1 is how does the idea of penal substitutionary atonement REALLY reflect the justice of God? I agree that it reflects his mercy and love, but how does it square with justice?

Someone below gave the example of a king taking the whipping for his wife. But that is not justice, because the king shouldn't have been whipped at all. It is something else, like a nice story and an example of love and mercy.

Re: - posted by brothagary, on: 2014/11/4 6:30

Jesus laying down his own life and suffering was definitely not unjust, to suggest that any part of the Gospel like the father punishing Jesus was unjust is well what word can I use without seeming harsh, insane. The Bible says the chastisement that brought us peace was upon him, this action was righteous and just because it was Justice that had to be performed. The one who created men and cursed them for sin said I will bear the punishment and I will justify them and make them holy. I will change even their nature to be like mine so in the eyes of men they will be justified.

The thing is only the law giver has the right to bear that punishment, because he is God and forgives the guilt because ultimately all sin is against God himself, it is breaking his law, because of this it is just for Jesus to take our punishment and for the father to crush him for us..

How can anyone say that has the Holy Spirit that it was unjust what happened without rejecting what is written, and the Holy Logic behind the salvation plan, the result is to say God was unjust.

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2014/11/4 7:37

Gary you are appealing to emotion but not reason. What you seem to be possibly saying is that since God is God He can do what He wants; i.e. He doesn't always have to be perfectly just. He can pardon people who don't deserve to be pardoned and punish someone else who is innocent in order to pardon the guilty.

But if you say that God can "suspend" his justice in that instance you leave yourself open to the possibility that He can suspend his justice in other areas.

Re: - posted by dolfan (), on: 2014/11/4 8:19

And there is more to the issue than the justice of the death of Jesus. The glory of God is also in the balances of justice here, and it is that glory that justice serves. After all, the whole creation exists for His glory.

Jesus prayed before His crucifixion in John 12.

27 "Now is my soul troubled. And what shall I say? Father, save me from this hour?" But for this purpose I have come to this hour. 28 Father, glorify your name. Then a voice came from heaven: "I have glorified it, and I will glorify it again." 29 The crowd that stood there and heard it said that it had thundered. Others said, "An angel has spoken to him." 30 Jesus answered, "This voice has come for your sake, not mine. 31 Now is the judgment of this world; now will the ruler of this world be cast out. 32 And I, when I am lifted up from the earth, will draw all people to myself."

"...for this purpose I have come to this hour. Father, glorify your name."

In the counsel of His own will, He, being God and thus the sole personage of perfection and justice, the One by whom justice itself is defined, determined before that His glory in the sight of His fallen creation should be revealed in such a way that those who would believe would run to it and those who would not would mock it.

What the question posed really asks is not "was God just" but "which would be more just...for God to forsake His own glory and spare His Son, or for God to glorify Himself by crucifying His Son?"

If anyone thinks God would be more just to withhold His glory and spare His Son, then Jesus would not have forsaken His glory, He would have counted equality with God a thing to be grasped and He would not have been found in the likeness of sinful flesh, let alone subject Himself to a cross.

The king who spares his mother's life does not do it to glorify His mother. He does not glorify himself, even. He glorifies the rule of law, but even then that rule is depersonalized as a force that must be satisfied. Not so with our God, whose law is not to preserve His sovereignty as are the laws of men. His law is to reveal Himself and his nature and His glory. When His law is satisfied in the death of His Son, He is glorified personally. His great mercy and love are, indeed, made real in the eyes and hearts of men. His perfect justice is known and He is understood as God in the truest sense of understanding that can occur.

Re: - posted by Sidewalk (), on: 2014/11/4 11:23

Sree makes an excellent point:

"Now the difference between OT and NT is, we have something more than forgiveness, this is Justification. In OT only sins are covered, which means they still exist somewhere but has been covered or hidden. In NT God after forgiving us, he also justifies us. Justification is God looking at us as if we have not sinned. God will look at us like how he looked Jesus. This is positional, based on my faith in the blood of Jesus. Only those who repent and stand by faith are justified. Justification is not based on work but based on my position in Jesus. This justification though is available for the whole world, it is not applicable because they do not take this position in Jesus. "

There is a difference between pardon and forgiveness. Forgiveness is the personal, the repair of a relationship. Pardon is the legal part, becoming free from the demands for punishment under the law. In Christ we may have both- the restored relationship and the legal pardon.

A classic example of the difference between forgiveness and pardon is President Richard Nixon. The man received a pardon, but was never forgiven by the American public.

So both forgiveness and pardon while somewhat separate, are necessary.

Romans 10:10- "For with the heart one believes unto righteousness, and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation."

Re: - posted by brothagary, on: 2014/11/4 14:53

H Tod ,i dont think im appealing to emotions because it is the emotional natural man that finds the sacrificial system unjust ,neither would i be appealing to natural mans reason ,because even the old covenant seems unreasonable

the message of the cross in all its aspects {expiation and propitiation } is non reasonable to the natural man

to somebody who has god in side them appealing to the sourventy of god and as dolphin said the glory of that god, is what is reasonable ,remember the cross of Christ is foolish to those who are perishing but to us who are being saved it is the power of god ,

Our job is not trying to explain to the Carnal natural man how this is a reasonable transaction , just preach it as we believe it and pray the holy spirit opens there hearts to the message

Re: - posted by brothagary, on: 2014/11/4 14:55

i dont know side walk i think the bible teaches we are justified the same way abraham was by faith

Re: - posted by brothagary, on: 2014/11/4 19:23

Tod i was thinking a problem is that gods idea of Justis is different from worldly Justis you only need to look at gods judgment in the bible like the great flood to see god righteous judgment is different from the natural mans ,so when you ask the question how does gods wrath being poured out of Jesus reflect gods Justis ,think about looking at it through a biblical definition of gods righteous judgment rather than through our fleshly mind which would be the natural way of defining things like Justis and righteousness

Re: faith and justice. - posted by Sidewalk (), on: 2014/11/4 19:36

Gary, we are justified by faith, even from the incredible revelation Luther had that works were not a part of our salvation, unto the theology most evangelicals still embrace. But we are not forgiven because God is in a good mood, or looks at someone and decides He likes him. Jesus died because the legal component of our salvation stood in the way of God's mercy.

If God were to forgive man outside of the law, Satan would rightly be in His face with a just accusation faster than a fat guy on a doughnut. No, God must uphold His law and no man will be able to say he was unjustly condemned because someone other person was excused. Without the atonement of Jesus Christ, all compassion, faith, weeping, and repenting is useless. God's law will be neither mocked nor suspended.

Think about a courtroom scene where a criminal murder defendant apologizes with tears and complete sincerity to the family of his victim. There may be a great emotional outpouring, forgiveness extended, regrets abounding. But the law has been broken and the guilty must be punished. He can say he is sorry, but the victim is still dead.

Now the judge may impose the minimum sentence, and the murderer may get a parole- as mercy seeks the least punishment possible. Well and good, but without reasonable punishment justice breaks and other murderers will cite the case precedent to also escape punishment from their crimes. This is extremely destructive to societal order, and one reason that third world hell-hole countries remain as they are.

God's law is good, it is intended for the public blessing, it is intended to be written on our hearts so that we would live like Jesus did and does. The whole new covenant is about the law being transferred from being an accusation against us to a virtue within us. When Christ comes within to live, He becomes an internal law by which we live in a regenerated state.

Any problem with that?

Re: - posted by brothagary, on: 2014/11/4 19:47

yea i was talking about justafication thats all, sree said they didnt have that under the old but it is a new thing ,,but i see the scripture says abraham was justified by faith as we are ,i dont have any problem with what you just wrote .

Re: - posted by brothagary, on: 2014/11/4 19:50

Unless your saying that we are forgiven apart from faith or that the effects of gods forgiveness as we experence it peoson ly , are apart from faith ,then i would not agree with that

Re: - posted by Sidewalk (), on: 2014/11/4 20:38

Not to fear, Gary, without faith it is impossible to please God, just as without the shedding of blood there is no remission of sins.

The gospel of John declares the critical message of how one must exercise faith in Jesus over and over again, there can be no doubt that He is looking for faith everywhere, and in everyone.

Only His Holy Spirit can burn in your own heart how overjoyed He is to find faith working there!

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2014/11/4 21:26

quote: "you only need to look at gods judgment in the bible like the great flood to see god righteous judgment is different from the natural man."

Well, in the instance of the flood, God punished evil doers. The better analogy to what took place on Golgotha is if God had killed Noah, who "was a righteous man, blameless in his generation" so He could spare the evil-doers.

But we have little difficulty seeing how that would not be just, at least to Noah. It might be a nice thing to do for the wicke d, but not for Noah- even if he agreed to the idea.

You can call what God did with Jesus whatever you want, but you can't call it justice because then you are just re-definin g the word. Justice is when a person gets what they deserve- that is, they get what is fair. WE are the ones who deserv ed to be punished, not Jesus. But Jesus was punished for OUR crimes. It is truly wonderful, and yes he was a substitut e, but it wasn't just. That is why some people object to the idea of penal substitution and lean toward Christus Victor bec ause that view takes justice out of the equation.

Re: - posted by brothagary, on: 2014/11/4 21:51

if it wasnt justis ,then it must have been unjust

Re: - posted by brothagary, on: 2014/11/4 21:57

maby im taking you out of context ,i mean every thing god does is just and good and righetous so the flood was righeou s judgment and when Jesus took our punishment the father was just in punishing the son

Re: - posted by brothagary, on: 2014/11/4 22:01

Either the action was a righteous action or an unrighteous action a just action or an unjust action ,it was evil or good ,,th eres no room for neutral action by god

Re: - posted by Sidewalk (), on: 2014/11/4 22:37

Gary!

God did not punish Jesus! He had no right or reason to punish Jesus whose perfect righteousness made Him immune fr om the punishment due to sinners.

Rather, God the Father received Jesus' death as a way to pardon sinners who believed into Jesus' death as their death. Jesus willingly gave Himself to that end, choosing to accept death on the cross for the purpose of saving mankind. God the Father could not pardon sin without the sacrifice, and could not put the Son to death- that would be murder and as w e all know, murder is against the law.

If there is anything about Jesus I could pinpoint as the reason I love Him with every fiber of my being it is that He chose to die for me, an undeserving sinner, when He did not have to. In the garden of Gethsemane he uttered these words- "Not My will, but Thine be done." He laid down His life that I might live.

Re: - posted by brothagary, on: 2014/11/4 23:15

Well that is just denying scripture ,The bible says well Jesus said i will strike the Shepard and the sheep will be scatted referring to what the prophet said when he said strike the Shepard .The chastisement that brought us peace was upon him .He was smitten of god the bible says .It pleased the lord to crush him ..tom ill go with the word of god any day of the week rather then a made up theology suited to water down the Gospel ... ,brother i didnt say Jesus didnt willingly go to his death

Re: - posted by brothagary, on: 2014/11/4 23:40

You know i think a lot of people also ignore the scripture Paul wrote when he was speaking about the roman authority's being gods servants to execute wrath,they dont bare the sword in vain ,but are gods ministers to punish ,it was this very authority that god used to punish his own son ,those writings of Paul also testify that god used the powers that be to accomplish the propitiation

You cant say in one breath that the bible says god has ordained the governing authority's and that there is no authority except from god ,and that authority's are gods ministers to execute wrath and then say ,but that is not that case during the passions of Christ ,its just denying another clear teaching in scripture ,thats blind fold theology

Re: - posted by brothagary, on: 2014/11/4 23:53

When we move a Little further from the physical suffering of Christ ,we move into the realm of hell or Sheol ,were we are told in scripture the pain of death could not hold him ,this shows that Jesus suffered the pain of death the death hold of hell for a time before the resurrection ,,he did not just go to the place in hell called Paradise where there was no pain ,, but that death it self was a place of torment and paings , heres some random translations from bible hub about that place Christ was in .

But my point being that he suffered gods wrath in our place

The pain and pains of death that well take hold of sinners when they die ,and you and i had Christ not did the unthinkable for us

New International Version

But God raised him from the dead, freeing him from the agony of death, because it was impossible for death to keep its hold on him.

New Living Translation

But God released him from the horrors of death and raised him back to life, for death could not keep him in its grip.

English Standard Version

God raised him up, loosing the pangs of death, because it was not possible for him to be held by it.

New American Standard Bible

"But God raised Him up again, putting an end to the agony of death, since it was impossible for Him to be held in its power.

King James Bible

Whom God hath raised up, having loosed the pains of death: because it was not possible that he should be holden of it.

Holman Christian Standard Bible

God raised Him up, ending the pains of death, because it was not possible for Him to be held by it.

International Standard Version

But God raised him up and put an end to suffering of death, since it was impossible for him to be held by it,

NET Bible

But God raised him up, having released him from the pains of death, because it was not possible for him to be held in its power.

Re: - posted by tbsounde2 (), on: 2014/11/5 0:30

Hi brother Tom,

You wrote: "God did not punish Jesus! He had no right or reason to punish Jesus whose perfect righteousness made Him immune from the punishment due to sinners"

Maybe I am not understanding properly what you were trying to get across. Could you expound on your statement a bit further. I just want to make sure because people use words differently sometimes and so we might need to try to start by defining what you mean by the word "punishment" because if we are using it in the traditional sense of the word, then the Bible is quite clear that God did pour out our punishment upon Christ. For example, in Isaiah 53 which explicitly says that Christ was punished on our behalf and Paul's statement in 2 Corinthians 5:21 that says that Christ was made sin by the Father for us (not saying that Jesus had any personal sin, but getting to the idea that our guilt was laid on Him and He received the full extent of the punishment that we deserve). If we also think to the sacrifices for sin under the Law, we find that it is God who requires punishment be made in order for pardon to justly be given. Though it is man who obeys and performs the sacrifice, it is ultimately God who is punishing by His ordaining of it and the person doing it merely an instrument. Now, it is clear that such sacrifice was merely a shadow of what was to come as made clear in Hebrews and that the sacrifices of bulls and goats is not able to truly forgive sin. This is where Romans 3:25-26 really comes into play explaining that God was basically looking forward in time to what He would do to His Son on the cross, who is the perfect and spotless Lamb that takes away the sins of the world, and was punished on our behalf like the bulls and goats and lambs were, but these being merely symbolic, whereas Jesus being the real deal to which even these things made prophecy.

Brother Todd,

I think we should spend a bit more time on what you brought up, as in your statement that God punishing Jesus is unjust. Am I correct in assuming that you believe in the Trinity, that God is One but in three persons (obviously a mystery that is hard to comprehend)? I am taking it that you do believe this. This is important as a starting point because if God were not triune, then it would indeed be unjust for God the Father to punish God the Son. But, and once again acknowledging that it is a mystery, if the Trinity means that God is One, then one can conclude that God the Father punishing God the Son means that He punished Himself. So based on this premise, I bring up the next point that in my opinion, the rules of justice seems to get a bit tricky when it comes to the Law Giver Himself. Although God is not subject to His own Law as if it was above Him (as was mentioned by brother Tim), we have to make note of the fact that it is a part of Him, not just merely something outside of Him that He gave, but actually a part of who He is (not saying that the Law is God, but that it is from the depths of who He is, reflection of Himself so to speak). To carry this thought on, we also see that God isn't just and merciful because He does those things, but that He does justly and mercifully because He is, period; the I AM. So His justice and mercy are not merely some external act, but a part of who God is. This is not the easiest to comprehend, because for us, we know things by means of demonstration, but God needs no demonstration, He could have sent every one to hell for their sin and still be a merciful God, because He (who has no lie or falsehood in Himself) said that He is. So now to bring it home, because God is just and because His Law is a part of who He is, which also makes Him the Law Giver, any sin that is committed requires punishment by God Himself, not the Law as an external thing, but by God Himself who is the Law. And it is His own self, not justice as an external thing, that needs to be satisfied. And it is here that God chooses to punish Himself, to satisfy Himself, so that He can be fully satisfied in forgiving us, and be completely just in the process because justice wasn't external to Him as if He needed to please it, but that He needed to satisfy Himself according to His own nature. This is my reasoning, or at least my best attempt at explaining why I conclude that it was just for God the Father to punish God the Son (essentially Himself).

Re: - posted by brothagary, on: 2014/11/5 1:02

well said will

Re: - posted by tbsounde2 (), on: 2014/11/5 1:11

Brother Tim,

You wrote: "His law is to reveal Himself and his nature and His glory."

I got quite excited when I read that statement as I know exactly what you mean and wrote a poem about it a while back if anyone cares to read it :)

It's called "vessels of mercy"

*for people who listen to Paul Washer, you'll see that I quoted him toward the end of the poem

when i look out into this world what do my eyes behold?
a revelation of God's character and the truth begins to unfold

angels in radiant glory all surrounding His throne
all assembled for one purpose and for one purpose alone

God, clearly visible yet still not fully known
creation anticipating as they inwardly groan

for the revelation of God's character, for it to be shown
through the blood of the Savior and by it to atone

the vessels of mercy on which is the demonstration of His love
for prior to, there was no knowledge of such an amazing love

only rumors and myths and legends herewith

for love, mercy, justice, righteousness, and kindness are qualities inherent within God
but without a demonstration just an empty, meaningless, baseless facade

for how can you know what kindness is without it being shown
or righteousness and justice without a hell for sinners to be thrown

that before lucifer fell, creation did not know
what God's perfect justice was until judgment was shown

made clear for all creation to now see
that God is just and so all must agree

but this story on it continues
for there is still much more that will enthuse

and make creation shout for joy
so continue to incline your ears and let your hearts be filled with joy

for the revelation of His character did not end merely with judgment
but continues with, for us, a greater adornment

for He chose to show mercy to adam and eve
although they sinned and God's heart they did grieve

but He went down to their level and made for them clothes

even though they disobeyed and willfully opposed

but even in mercy one thing remains clear
sin cannot just be pardoned and thus we are brought to fear

for although God can overlook for a time being
His justice demands and creation agreeing

that all who sin must be brought to trial
or else His holy name and character be completely defiled

and thus we are brought to a seeming contradiction
for how can a holy, righteous, and just God just pardon our felonious conviction

and it is here my friends that we see the greatest depiction
of who God is through His only begotten Son's crucifixion

but let us elaborate on this before moving on
on this Christ and the injustices all but foregone

for although being God, He did not consider equality with God something to be grasped
but humbled Himself to the form of a bondservant, obedient to death, even on a cross

born in a filthy manger, to a poor peasant family
not of affluence or privilege or any other thing to which we esteem

thirty years of life for three years of ministry
sinless and perfect by every standard and decree

but forsaken and abandoned by not only His people
but those closest to Him, even His very own disciples

beaten, flogged, spit on and robbed
of His nobility, His dignity, His majesty, and beauty

but the fulfillment of God's wrath was not found in these things
but we must look further beyond mere superficial things

and thus we now find ourselves kneeling before the tree
looking upon His nail pierced hands and the Lord making His plea

My God, my God, why have you forsaken me
for as it says in isaiah chapter 53

that it pleased the Lord to crush Him

not the romans, not the jews, not the whips, or the nails or the cross, or even the crown of thorns

but as it says, that IT PLEASED THE LORD TO CRUSH HIS OWN SON

and this my friends is the righteous and just love of our Father
what He demonstrated to creation that they would no longer ponder

the mystery of the ages now made plain for all to see
the angels in heaven falling to their faces because of you and me

for our salvation was not an end but actually a means
for God to reveal His love so that all creation may see

let me further elaborate on this pointâ€

that from all of creation God chose us to be
the object to receive His incomprehensible love and mercy

not angles or stars or heavenly hosts
but lowly dust, you and me, made for His boast

for it is in the revelation
of Godâ€™s character through demonstration
that the entirety of creation
may come into deeper realization

of His infinite and immeasurable character and worth
filling all of creation from heaven to earth

but wait my brothers and sisters gathered here this day
there is still some more of this truth you must hear today

for there is still much more left to this amazing story
and in it you will understand more of our Fatherâ€™s glory

for the day we leave this earth to enter heavenâ€™s door
we will fully understand the purpose to which we were created for

creation waiting in great anticipation
asking themselves what God will do for this holy nation

a nation composed of all those who overcame
by the blood of the Lamb and the testimony of His glorious Name

these vessels of mercy refined through the fire
of trial and persecution unto the Lordâ€™s sovereign desire

then, all of a sudden, God comes arrayed in His infinite glory and splendor and majesty
and begins to pour out an immeasurable amount of love, and grace, and kindness, and mercy

upon us which causes us to fall to our faces and begin to worshipâ€

and now, the rest of creation witnesses firsthand this demonstration of Godâ€™s love and then also proceed to fall to their faces exclaiming â€œonly God can do such a thingâ€

and say that we were to sleep and wake the next day, the entire process starts again, with creation looking intently at us asking themselves, what is God gonna do for these vessels of mercy today. and then God, comes in His infinite glory and splendor and majesty and begins to pour out even more love, and grace, and kindness, and blessing, and favor and then we along with the rest of creation, fall to our faces in worship exclaiming â€œonly God can do such a thingâ€

that heaven is basically a place where we will, for all of eternity, dwell in, comprehend, and receive, the infinite love of God; that each passing day far exceeds the day that came before it and this for all of eternity, to search out Godâ€™s love forever and ever

so you see our salvation was not an end but actually a means
for God to reveal His love so that all creation may see

that from all of creation God chose us to be
the object to receive His incomprehensible love and mercy

not angels or stars or heavenly hosts
but lowly dust, you and me, made for His boast

for it is in the revelation
of God's character through demonstration
that the entirety of creation
may come into deeper realization

of His infinite and immeasurable character and worth
filling all of creation from heaven to earth

in and through His vessels of mercy
in and through His vessels, you and me

Re: - posted by Sree (), on: 2014/11/5 1:43

Quote:

Quote: "If it appears unjust to people then it is left to them."

Please understand I am playing something of a devil's advocate here. But when you make the above statement it seems like you are saying that what God did with Jesus at the cross WAS just. In other words in that instance it was just to allow an innocent man (Jesus) to be cruelly tortured and murdered in the most heinous way imaginable but NOT punish the guilty party at all. (I know that Dolfan mentioned that we are punished- i.e. we die etc. but Jesus did not die for our physical lives).

TMK, I understand that you are playing a Devil's advocate. I love playing such roles as well!

The point I was trying to make is based on Isaiah 53:1 is that God has to reveal us about the sacrifice of Jesus and not human logics. Because it is beyond our logics or justice system. To me based on the revelation it is the only possible solution for my sins. It is height of his love for me, I am not willing to see whether the action is just or unjust according to my standard.

Now to place a logical argument is very difficult because Justice is a relative term. What is Just according to one person may be unjust to another. For example Capital punishment is a just according to many courts but not according to certain courts and nation. Now if a guy like Hitler stands before a court then even the most liberal court will grant him death penalty. But there will always be people who will oppose this judgment calling it injustice because it has not given any room for Hitler to change. But the argument here is the court gave the death penalty not because it hated Hitler but because of the severity of his crimes. Now his crimes are so severe that the court has decided that he is no longer fit to live. Even though there is a very low chance of him changing his heart and living as a normal human, still based on the severity of his crime, this is his only possible judgment.

Same way the severity of my sin is so deep that God was left with no other solution than to send his perfect son as a sacrifice for me. Just like Hitler's death penalty might appear injustice but that is the only possible solution to save the mankind. God expressed his plan for Jesus the moment Adam sinned, he knew that only via Jesus he will be able to crush Satan and the way he has corrupted mankind.

Re: Continuing... - posted by Sidewalk (), on: 2014/11/5 1:56

Let me assure any reader that I consider these matters of how the atonement of Jesus Christ works to our eternal salvation to be of utmost importance and as holy as any thing we might discuss. I come from a background of religious instruction that was highly destructive to my pursuit of God, and I witnessed others who did not survive, did not come to peace with God.

My mother-in-law being a prime example, dying under a cloud of gloom, anger and confusion- whose haunting words to us were "God has His favorites, and I am not one of them." She refused to move from that demonic doctrinal lie, having been brought up in the same Presbyterian traditions that affected me.

Paul said in II Corinthians "we destroy arguments, and every proud obstacle that exalts itself against the knowledge of Christ." Obstacles that obscure the love of God or the honor of His relationship with His Son will cause a person either miss the power of His love or even worse create a seed of doubt or contempt that takes away the prospect of intimacy.

Suggesting that the Father put Jesus to death is in my opinion, a mistake. It was our sin that killed Him, and Jesus' own will allowed it to happen. In the Garden He let it be known that He could have called legions of angels to intervene and rescue Him- which He chose not to do.

Jesus the Man did not want to die on the cross, but Jesus the Son of God was determined to do the will of the Father.

When Jesus was transfigured on the mountain, He had put on the immortality that was eternal life. He had walked as a man, tempted at every point, and had arrived on that mountain as a man without sin, completely acceptable in the presence of God. He could have ascended back to heaven at that moment, with complete personal honor.

One problem- He would be there alone.

He had spoken the parable of the man who found the treasure hidden in the field who went and bought the whole field- rather than just removing the treasure. The treasure is that immortality, that glorified completeness He wore for a brief time, then took off so that He could go buy the field. In all of this Jesus Himself is making the decision to follow after the Father's will in obedience.

"He did not count equality with God something to be grasped, but rather emptied Himself and became obedient, even to death on a cross."

Isaiah 53 is the foremost Old Testament prophecy concerning the atonement, and indeed the poetic tone could be construed to say that God was killing His Son. But it was not as if the Father had captured and killed Jesus against His will while He was still a young man making a difference in His world! The need for this sacrifice was already known by The Son while He was yet with the Father. He was indeed the Lamb slain before the foundation of the world. The plan of salvation was conceived before any man drew a breath, it was conceived out of the perfect love that was the essential character of the Father and His Son.

But in all of this we cannot help but to see Christ's obedience as central to the accomplishment. God became a man in Jesus Christ, fully man, fully God. It was the man Jesus who replied to Satan's sneaky question regarding the stones- "If You are the Son of God, turn these stones into bread." Jesus' wise reply "Man shall not live by bread alone..."

He was determined to be fully a man, and to defeat Satan as a man! Had He not become fully man, the atonement itself would not have held validity for us.

There is so much here, but it is late and my wife is snoring nearby. I shall be back...

Re: - posted by brothagary, on: 2014/11/5 3:54

Brother please dont let your past create your theoligy

Death its self was the result of gods judgment on the human race it was the curse ,,just the fact that christ died shows th at he came under that judgment And the bible is clear that it wasnt just any death but one that was according to the detemend poupus and the forknowlage of god. He smited and brusied and crushed his son for us

Re: - posted by brothagary, on: 2014/11/5 4:27

Brother iv had my fair share of demonic deception try to drag me into the pit ,in the way Gnosticism,and drug induced mystical seeking for god ,most of us have had a bumpy ride ,so im not with out sympathy ,but your conclusions dont take in the facts that the first great awakening produced exceptional fruit through the propagations of reformed doctrine even the great arminian Wesley taught this Gospel ,,so i must say brother you are wrong to say that doctrine was faulty ,maybe you right ,for sure that hypa Calvinism is a stumbling block for evangelism every true believe would agree with that reformed or not

But dont get me wrong my argument is not relay with you but the idea being expressed that god didnt need to atone for sin Christ didnt need to die which was being expound earlier even you seem to not appreciate that

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2014/11/5 6:27

Hey Gary-

In the OT, how (in general) did God pour out His wrath on the rebellious Israelites?

Once that question is answered it becomes clearer about what some people believed took place on Calvary, and the events leading up to it.

Re: , on: 2014/11/5 9:25

BTW, I just wanted to commend everyone with discussing this further. It seems you guys are sifting through various matters and learning more about each respective perspectives. Watching at a distance gives me great joy right now. :)

Re: Walking it out - posted by Sidewalk (), on: 2014/11/5 11:04

Gary... Love ya Bro!

It is not my past that determines my theology, my biggest problem is that I am old and have a lot of past!

The references I make to my early perceptions of God go back 50 years, and I have learned a lot since then. I am determined to be a seeker of truth whatever the cost, and I am willing to change my views and behavior as new truth is revealed. But it must meet a very high standard, and at this point believing that somehow God was able to kill His innocent Son doesn't square with what I know about the law of God. The conversation will have to go on, I guess.

I do believe that we are given by the Spirit things that confront our individual situations, meaning that the theologies created by our pasts are known to Him, and in His wisdom and grace He leads us though to truth that results in intimacy. It is apparent that the things that bother me don't bother you- and that is not a problem really.

But if you seek Him with an honest heart, praying for that closer walk, He will undoubtedly reveal to you the individual issues that hinder. I say that because, being old, I have not only been down that path, but I keep going back to it. I crave intimacy with Christ, enthralled by what Paul had, what John "The disciple that Jesus loved" had, and even what I have seen in my contemporary brothers and sisters.

And thank you LMH for getting this great conversation rolling!

Re: - posted by dolfan (), on: 2014/11/5 11:30

I have to confess that one question posed by TMK, and it is one worth giving time to, is new to me. I never thought of -- and frankly never heard the criticisms from either unbelievers or those who reject PSA -- the question, "Was God unjust in laying our sins on the innocent Jesus?" There is this much of TMK's "devil's advocate" question that remains unaddressed in the thread, so far as I can see:

"You can call what God did with Jesus whatever you want, but you can't call it justice because then you are just re-defining the word. Just is when a person gets what they deserve. ... WE are the ones who deserved to be punished, not Jesus. But Jesus was punished for OUR crimes. It is truly wonderful, and yes he was a substitute, but it wasn't just. That is why some people object to the idea of penal substitution and lean toward Christus Victor because that view takes

justice out of the equation."

Now, y'all, that is as fair and direct a way of putting the issue as we could want. Fact is, we generally (most believers, I think) do not have in our equipment box a succinct or satisfying way of answering this objection. Now, in all fairness, an answer need not be succinct or even satisfying in order to be true, but given our admonition to be ready to give an explanation for our hope, it is something that I believe the Holy Spirit and the Word of God are already prepared to reveal to us the truth of the matter. Not that many/most would be convinced, and I am hopeful and confident of God's grace for those who still think in terms of a "ransom theory" or "Christus victor", etc.

I don't back away from anything I've said, but it still doesn't arrive at the answer to the question, and I think TMK is correct in pointing that out. I'd like to skip away from the discussion thinking we've exhausted the objection, but I don't think we have even really wrapped our arms around it yet. The good news is -- at least I hope -- that the issue does not require greater minds than ours to comprehend it since we also have the Holy Spirit to reveal all truth to us.

There is a measure of something in my mind that reasons from the Bible thusly -- There are some things too great for me to comprehend, and who am I to say to God that He owes me an explanation of why He chose to do what He did in Christ. Over the years, in my personal walk and life, I have abandoned prayers and meditations and inner questions that use the word "why". Truly, I stopped years ago asking God "why" about anything. It has been liberating, and it has helped me to trust Him and to ask other questions such as "what, Lord", "how, Lord", "when, Lord", "is this right way you want me to do this, Lord", etc. I will share a little bit of my home life on this ---- my wife is still a "why"-er. She is burdened, it seems to me, with the need to know "why" about most everything. It is her inclination to draw conclusions as to "why" this or that happens. It is also a source of frustration for her because I don't. I start with the assumption from Scripture that God is doing, and that He is working things together for the good of those who love Him and are His called for His purposes. There are many mysteries as to the reasons for things happening and for the words and actions of people; I don't waste time asking for those reasons anymore. In that same line of thinking, in my own admitted bias that may indeed be wrong but I think it is not wrong, I come to this question put by TMK. Who am I to ask Him why?

And, in this thinking, I find some warrant for it in Romans 9, and I am unsure how much it fairly bears on TMK's question but I think it might somewhat.

There, to shorten this already long post, Paul argued regarding God's sovereign choice of Israel as His people, that when Jacob and Esau were yet in the womb, "though they were not yet born and had done nothing either good or bad -- in order that God's purpose of election might continue, not because of works but because of Him who calls -- was told, 'The older will serve the younger'. As it is written, 'Jacob I loved, but Esau I hated'."

He went on: "What shall we say then? Is there injustice on God's part? By no means! For He says to Moses, 'I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy, and I will have compassion on whom I have compassion'. So then it depends not on human will or exertion, but on God who has mercy." He goes on to say that God even raised Pharaoh up in a way we may humanly call arbitrary, but, as I alluded to earlier about glory, Paul points out that God said Pharaoh's ascension and arrival at conflict with Israel was by God "that might show power in , and that name might be proclaimed in all the earth."

Then, Paul comes to where I can understand a little something about it -- "You will say to me then, 'Why does He still find fault? For who can resist His will?' But who are you, O man, to answer back to God?" He continues and concludes, essentially, that it is just because God selects His own ways, and that He is not unjust in His ways even if we cannot assent to them. He says of those who do not assent to them, "They have stumbled over the stumbling stone."

Admittedly, this passage does not address itself to the crucifixion directly. But, it is through the crucifixion that Jesus actually makes effective His covenant of promise with Israel, His elect. And, there is an element here of "who are you, O man, to answer back to God" when the Word says there is no injustice with Him.

So, we start with that conclusive premise -- God is just, and He is just in electing Israel, and He is just in the means of establishing the covenant with Israel that is of faith through the blood of Jesus, which happened on Calvary.

Now, let me ask this as an intermediate question. Would God be unjust if He did not do what He said He would do? I submit to you that the answer is 'yes'. I submit to you that the very meaning of the word 'righteousness' means God doing what God said He would do, and that our 'righteousness' is our God-enabled obedience, our doing what He says. Though there is much more to be said about righteousness, let's avoid that rabbit trail. The question is asked only for this point

nt -- If God did not do what He said He would do, He would be unrighteous and, therefore, unjust.

God chose Israel and was just in doing so and the Bible clearly teaches us we have no standing to ask why not some other way. God also chose His Son's death on the cross as the means of achieving His covenant with Israel AND achieving what He said He would do regarding the writing of His law on the hearts of those who would believe. If God is just in the one, how is he unjust in the other?

Is justice found in the means? Or, is it found in the motivation? I ask this because God's motivation was to write His law upon our hearts, to make us inwardly empowered and able to meet the righteous requirements of the law. "I will give you a new heart and put a new spirit within you; and I will remove the heart of stone from your flesh and give you a heart of flesh. I will put My Spirit within you and cause you to walk in My statutes, and you will be careful to observe My ordinances." Ezekiel 36:26, 27. "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, so that the requirement of the Law might be fulfilled in us, who do not walk according to the flesh but according to the Spirit." Romans 8:3, 4.

It seems to me that God is just in His motivation, and sovereign in choosing the means of accomplishing His purposes.

TMK, is the question then posed by you -- and if not by you then by those who reject PSA on the grounds of injustice or from the ability to reconcile the means of God through the cross with God's justness -- really about what seems to be unjust means? Isn't the motivation itself wholly just? And if so, and if there is no other means to arrive at that end, doesn't that mean that God chose also meet even the very humanly imperfect definition of justice?

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2014/11/5 12:35

Whew doggie, Tim. That's a mouthful. But I think you may be on the right track at least in how to defend the PS view. By the way, I'm with your wife-- definitely too much "whying" for my own good. My wife is more like you.

In the Christus Victor view, Jesus did die as our substitute and in fact did bear our sin and guilt by VOLUNTARILY experiencing the full brunt of that rebellious and demonic kingdom that we have allowed to run rampant on this planet. In order to save us he experienced all of sins' consequences that we should have experienced. And here comes the "victor" part -- by doing this he busted down hell's gates, destroyed sin's power, erased the law that condemned us, and in so doing allowed us to walk in right relationship with the Father.

The VOLUNTARY nature of what Jesus did is what removes "justice" from the equation. Those scriptures that suggest God poured his wrath on Jesus may then be read as He ***allowed*** the forces of darkness to have their way with Jesus.

That was what I was getting at when I mentioned how God dealt with rebellious Israel in the OT-- he brought or allowed other nations to wreak havoc with them.

I have never really thought much about the atonement. Since I was a wee tyke I knew that Jesus died for my sins. I still believe that, but this CV view may be worthy of further consideration.

Re: - posted by brothagary, on: 2014/11/5 14:13

i love you to tom and i do appreciate you post most of the time ,lol

Re: - posted by Sree (), on: 2014/11/6 0:56

One of the clearest arguments against JW and other denominations that reject trinity is - if Jesus was not God and one of the 3 persons of trinity then it makes God an unjust person to put our sins on Jesus and to sacrifice him. Thus if anyone believes that Jesus died for their sins then they should also believe in trinity. These 2 truths cannot be separated.

Re: - posted by Sidewalk (), on: 2014/11/6 11:35

Sree, you are spot on! Without the trinity, there is no foundational relationship of love in the Godhead, no moral character in God's being. We would be left with Allah, a proven theological disaster.