

Atoning Death

Fully satisfying to God



A Discipleship School

David Boan

3

Atoning Death

Fully satisfying to God

A Discipleship School

Unit 3

David Boan

All this is from God, who reconciled us to himself through Christ and gave us the ministry of reconciliation: that God was reconciling the world to himself in Christ, not counting men's sins against them. And he has committed to us the message of reconciliation. We are therefore Christ's ambassadors, as though God were making his appeal through us. We implore you on Christ's behalf: Be reconciled to God. God made him who had no sin to be sin for us, so that in him we might become the righteousness of God. 2 Corinthians 5.18-21

Session 2 - In review: stated as an outcome

At the Incarnation, when the Word of God took flesh in the womb of the virgin, Mary, He laid aside His glory and took the form of a servant. He had humbled Himself as He came for us. So we must read the Gospels carefully, knowing that some things are said according to the form of the servant, and some according to the form of the Son of God.

Our whole salvation consists in the very person of the God-man. There is nothing that God works for us which is outside of that wonderful Man. He is the Saviour - and all that He does for us is effective because of Who He is. His person and work are totally integrated.

For the first time then, we have in Jesus Christ someone who can give us a knowledge of God as Father; a revelation that comes from the within inner life of the Trinity. For, to encounter Jesus is to encounter God as man.

In taking our flesh the Word of God took up into Himself all of our broken humanity so that it might be redeemed through His life, death, burial, resurrection, ascension and his return. What was not taken up in the incarnation is not redeemed [restored].

So we must have a very robust understanding of our Saviour as truly man, who has taken our fallen flesh, without ceasing to be God. We must take His humanity as seriously as we do His deity.

In our representative man, chosen by God, we have access to a reconciliation which God worked for us, and we have a life lived, acceptable to God in which we may share through the receiving of the Spirit of that God man.

© David Boan 2013 asserts a copyright that is purely a matter of preserving the material from commercial exploitation. As with all my work, permission to copy it is freely given, provided that it is presented unaltered and not sold for commercial gain.

Table of Contents

<i>1 -Approaching the Atonement</i>	<i>107</i>
102 - Receiving new revelation within known relationships	107
103 - The need to integrate the Person and the Work	108
104 - Salvation “from”: first of two aspects concerning salvation	108
105 - Salvation “to”: second of two aspects concerning salvation	109
106 - Because God is a forgiving God, He finds a way to forgive us.	110
107 - The Death of Christ is not an appeasement; like some pagan sacrifice	111
108 - The death of Christ makes a change between Him and us	112
109 - God’s saving work is all done in the incarnate Son, the one Mediator	113
110 - Christ is God’s elect man for us – and God’s elect man for God	113
111 - Some false ways the atonement has been depicted	114
<i>2 - The Atonement: Foundations in the Bible</i>	<i>116</i>
112 – A ransom for many [Mark 10.35-45; 9.35]	116
113 - Redemption [1]: Padah – in the context of a dramatic deliverance	117
114 - Redemption: [1] Padah - Passover Lamb -Shielded from the wrath	120
115 - 2nd Hebrew word: Redemption: [2] Kipper, kopher – blotting out, the covering of sin and guilt	123
116 - 3rd Hebrew word: Redemption [3] The go’el, the redeemer kinsman	127
117 - Jesus, our go’el Redeemer	131
118 – Reconciliation	132
<i>3 - Studying the Atonement in its own light</i>	<i>133</i>
119 - Moses’ offer is refused because contrary to God’s character	133
120 - Phinehas made an atonement	134
121 – What light does Phinehas’ action shed on Jesus’ death?	137
<i>4 - The death of Jesus</i>	<i>139</i>
122 - In what does the suffering of Jesus as the God man lie ?	139
123 - Christ’s dealings with men on God’s behalf - His Apostolic work.	140

124 - The pain of a person is peculiar to them	141
125 - Distinguishing between an atoning sacrifice for sin and enduring as a substitute the punishment for sin.	142
126 - Types and the antitype - the Mosaic patterns and the work of Jesus	142
127 - It is the contrasts of Christ with the Old Testament types that instruct us	143
128 - A Son's love for God, and a Brother's love to man, is united in Christ	145
129 - Christ's dealings with God, on men's behalf - his Priestly work	145
130 - Jesus absorbs the wrath of God as the perfect Responder to the Father	146
131 - God grieves over our sin as well as punishing for it	147
132 - Christ's sufferings reveal God Himself, His heart and holiness	147
133 - After dealing with our sins, the Lord Jesus interceded for us	148
134 - The meaning of the Blood of Christ	149

Bibliography

Athanasius, *De Incarnatione*

Aulen, Gustav [1930] *Christus Victor: Study in Atonement* [Three main types]

Boan, D.T.C [2004] *Israel's Feasts and Fasts*

[2009] *The Beginning*

[2011] *Fifty Readings on Reconciliation*

Campbell, J. M. (1856,1996). *The Nature of the Atonement*. Carberry, Scotland: Handsel Press.

Denney, J. (1917). *The Christian Doctrine of Reconciliation*. London, UK: Hodder and Stoughton.

Forsyth, P. (1909). *The Cruciality of the Cross*. (CoC, Trans.) London, UK: Hodder and Stoughton.

Forsyth, P. (1917,1988). *The Justification of God*. Blackwood, SA, Australia: New Creation

Denney. James, (1895). *Studies in Theology*. London, UK: Hodder and Stoughton.

Morris, Leon L.[1955], *The Apostolic Preaching of the Cross*, Tyndale

(1983). *The Atonement - Its meaning and significance*. Leicester, UK:

Torrance, T.F. [2009] *The Atonement*, Paternoster

I – Approaching the Atonement

102 - Receiving new revelation within known relationships.

See Boan, DTC [2009] part 31

In encountering a new facet of a person we already know, the new perspective does not necessarily challenge our confidence about what we already know of the person. The experience is like knowing George. You can say, "I know George". Then, when I tell you some things about him and you say, "Really, I didn't know that before!" But I reply, "Given what you know of him already, is it George?" You would say "Of course".

This is true with our current knowledge of God; in coming to see a new side of God's character, we can embrace it without resistance because we know it is not inconsistent with what we know of Him already. In all our knowing of God we can know truly. But that does not mean that we know Him exhaustively. This is true for anyone we know.

Remember that we do have an inward, personal experience. Our conscience has been changed by an encounter with the Word of God. We are living free from condemnation and we are not afraid; we are free to grow a more robust, clearer understanding of the Person we already know. In fact, in the realm of relationships you can only teach people further insights on the basis that they already know the person in question. This is especially true of all Christians, because they "have" the life of the Person within them. Our relational possessions, the knowing of persons, are the only really permanent and eternal matters - they are all that we "have". Persons are a gift of God to one another [See Boan [2009] part 31].

"God has given us eternal life, and this life is in his Son. He who has the Son has life; he who does not have the Son of God does not have life" [1 John 5.11b-12 NIV1976]

We need to be secure in this - for, if you find the ideas presented in these units are different to what you already know, don't become alarmed. For, you know the Person I am speaking of. Whether you have thought of them in the way I shall present them is another matter.

A process like this happens whenever the Holy Spirit confirms new things to us. The Spirit, as He takes up residence in our person, brings us the experience of knowing the Father and the Son. So be quite confident that we know God or, more foundationally, He knows us. It is within the setting of that firm and confident relationship we can be open to Him deepening his revelation of Himself to us by the Spirit.

"the Spirit of truth...will be in you...If anyone loves Me, he will keep My word; and My Father will love him, and we will come to him, and make our abode with him." [John 14.17,23 ASV1960].

"...and our fellowship is with the Father, and with His Son Jesus Christ" [1 John 1.3 ASV1960]

The point of this is that in approaching the atonement, we need to be careful to understand

that the forgiveness of Christ can be quite a solid matter; whether that person has, or has not, a deep appreciation of that work or an understanding of its doctrine.

103 - The need to integrate the Person and the Work.

As we share in the risen life of Jesus, the Spirit increases our understanding, and so we have a deepening revelation of God.

The understanding of the Person of Christ and the Work of Christ are two interconnected matters. We need to tackle them in a way that doesn't split the person from the work. It is not the cross that saves us: it is the Person Who died who saves us. So there is need to maintain a balance in our message. What the apostles preached was Christ: in the first place as resurrected and exalted and then Christ crucified.

As people read the Gospels, they are affected by the life and teaching of the Person of Christ. But eventually, their conscience is led to consider the death, resurrection and ascension of Christ. For, that is a place to where all the Gospels move inexorably as they conclude their narratives. Christ's own experience was that the crowning thing He came to do was to die.

104 - Salvation "from": the first of two aspects concerning salvation

See DS2#92-93 on reconciliation; Aulen, Gustav, [1930] Christus Victor.

To speak of "salvation from" is a retrospective viewpoint. From our perspective, it looks back from where we are now in our experience with God. We have passed from rebellion to God into a quiet submissive obedience. It also looks back to what is accomplished by God for us, in such a way that these matters are a finished work of God, although they are being freshly applied in the experience of new Christians everyday.

Retrospectively then, in looking back, we consider what we have been saved "from":

[1] Salvation from the righteous anger of a holy God.

The atonement worked in the death of Christ deals with the barriers which arise in God Himself when the holy Trinity considers our conduct. [See DS1, # 25-29]. We need a salvation from His righteous wrath - an anger that arises from God's holy hostility to our sin. It is our sin that is the reason for our alienation from Him.

From this perspective, the death of Christ is a **sacrifice**, first introduced to Israel's worship by God as a gracious provision for cleansing from defilement. This is to say that we need Christ who is our propitiation [1 John 2.2], our righteousness and sanctification [1 Corinthians 1.30]. He is also the One in whom we have reconciliation with God [2 Corinthians 5.18-19].

[2] Salvation from bondage to an external, rebellious angelic power

As God saved the Hebrews from their bondage and oppression in Egypt, so the life and the death of Christ has rescued us from bondage to Satan, who gained control of our life through his use of our own commitment to obey him rather than God. From this perspective, God sent His Son to deal with our enemy. God purposes to release us from this condition of oppression and our own weak state within it.

From this perspective the death of Christ is a **mighty victory**. This classical understanding of the atonement has been recognized throughout the history of Christian thinking. [See Aulen, *Christus Victor*]. Because the death of Christ is a victory over Satan it is also from our perspective a **redemption** from slavery to a wicked, controlling power.

[3] Salvation from our own inner alienation and hostility to God.

The atonement clears away the barriers to fellowship between us and God. They are dealt with according to how God sees the problem existing between Him and us.

From this perspective the death of Christ is the **basis for reconciliation**. The results of this reconciliation in our experience, is that our conscience is set at rest concerning our guilt.

[4] Salvation from the results of our own sin and rebellion – death

Christ's death, burial and resurrection fully engage with death for us, so as to completely draw its sting. In the resurrection He brings us, along with Himself, out from death into a new life, which is ours to experience now, and promises the redemption of our body from decay.

So, the death of Christ is the **death of the old man** - the man who merited wrath and damnation. From this perspective, understanding how God deals with us 'in Christ', we know we have been judged, rejected and put to death. This death of the old man becomes for us a settled matter in history - there is no way to go back to this old way. It is because Christ's death for us a settled matter, that it becomes a point of departure from the old to the new.

Coupled with the resurrection that followed his death, Christ's death is **the death of death**. It sets us free from the fear of death and of Satan, who holds all people in bondage through this fear [Hebrews 2.14-15]. For us, adopting Jesus' attitude to death, it is now a sleep from which we will arise.

105 - Salvation "to": the second of two aspects concerning salvation

See Athanasius, De Incarnatione

This aspect of salvation takes a prospective viewpoint. From God's point of view, we see "to what" He saves us. We see his desire for his creation to not be lost, nor to be eternally marred; we see as well his desire for our fellowship to return to Him for our sake. Here is redemption here and restoration of his earlier work.

From our point of view, from within a position of safety, we look forward to where we are now. Our experience as a forgiven, justified people, reconciled to God and enjoying fellowship of common life with Him. This relationship, which has been accomplished for us by the forgiveness of God, includes His declaring us to be righteous in His sight as we put our trust in the atoning work of Christ for us [justified], which removes barriers to fellowship with Him. These preliminary matters prepare us for a shared life with such a holy One.

[1] Salvation 'to' a life shared with a holy God.

If we think of why God has saved us, in the sense of "what is His own purpose"? then we must think prospectively. This emphasises, not the evil from which He saves us but, the good purpose to which He wants to take us, through the atonement. He is saving us to share His life. This is the place to which God wants to raise us.

This prospective view takes up afresh what was in God's mind for us, long before we fell and needed a salvation "from". This shared access, in that it is a work of Christ already accomplished for us, means that we are "saints", sanctified ones, people set apart for this life with God.

[2] Salvation 'to' holiness - to be like Him - to being sanctified.

So the prospective view of the work of the atonement focuses us on the covenant life shared with God; it includes a sense of sonship, the place of free obedience with all the delight and joy that sons know; it includes the increasing practical holiness being grown in our life.

In Christ, from God's perspective this is already an accomplished, finished work 'in Him'. For us, as we live between Pentecost and the Parousia, this is the process of our sanctification.

[3] Salvation to sharing God's eternal, full life; salvation to a living hope.

Prospectively speaking, we are heading towards the day of Jesus Christ, where we expect to be gathered to our Bridegroom. He is currently allowing the Spirit to prepare us for that day and we are waiting for it with expectation.

Currently we, as to our persons, are redeemed. But each of us lives in a body that is not yet redeemed. We expect to be changed to be like our Groom, we await the redemption of our bodies. This is for us the end of suffering and the eternal shared life with the Lord.

106 - God is a forgiving God, so He finds a way to forgive us.

See Daniel 9.8-9

Daniel's prayer of hope, was uttered in the first year of Darius the son of Ahasuerus [538 BC]. He accepted the shame of Israel's rebellion which had resulted in their captivity and exile to Babylon. His hope for restoration was anchored, in no small part, upon the fact that he knew

that God was gracious and forgiving. He said:

"Open shame belongs to us, O Lord, to our kings, our princes, and our fathers, because we have rebelled against Thee. To the Lord our God belong compassion and forgiveness, for we have rebelled against Him." [Daniel 9.8-9 ASV1960]

God has such love towards an enemy that He can act towards him for his good. He has survived our hatred - because He loves us so much. This is the power of the love of God - He has set out from the beginning to forgive us and He has found a way, in the cross, to bring us that forgiveness while staying consistent within Himself.

107 - The Death of Christ is not an appeasement; like some pagan sacrifice.

In considering the death of Christ, we must be sure that we are not considering anything in that death which makes a change to God's Person. We are not considering a "deal", or a "contract" which appeases God, or, in some way, makes Him amenable to us; as is if He was not previously so. There is nothing, external to the inner life of God Himself, that could make a change to his character. The death of Christ on the cross does not change his compassionate heart but it does change the way He can deal with us while maintaining His righteousness.

But to think that the atonement, or sacrifice of Christ, causes God to forgive us, would be to adopt a pagan view of sacrifice which is based upon the appeasement of an angry god by some sacrificial offering. Then, it is thought that because men have offered the sacrifice then the god is mollified and thus the atonement is the cause of the forgiveness. [Under the influence of anthropology there has often been a religious comparison made here.] The product of this thinking is that there is some external arrangement - something extra to God's own character - that effects atonement.

Folks can get a wrong view of the Cross if they simply picked up this pagan view. Where ever the cross is to be preached in a pagan land the clear distinction between the two views of the atonement must be made clear. Otherwise the pagan view simply overlays the gospel language of sacrifice. Where people are not clear about this matter, they are often not sure of themselves with God: nor are they solid in their conscience and so don't endure in the Christian life under condemnation of people or the devil. That is because they think that they must constantly appease God by their works of sacrifice. Their confusion about sacrifice leads to a "works based" life towards God.

What we have to constantly re-call from the Old Testament is that sacrifice, as a way of approaching God when not right with Him, was, in the first instance, His gracious provision for Israel. It is His gift. No sacrifice was ever offered to God which had not, in the first place, been provided by Him.

*"For the life of the flesh is in the blood, and I have given it to you on the altar to make atonement for your souls; for it is the blood by reason of the life that makes atonement."
[Leviticus 17.11 ASV]*

Many Christians live with this error, when they regard God as a Lawgiver, who must be conditioned into being gracious. They may even go on to think that the atonement is the cause of forgiveness and that God forgives us because Christ has died for us. This is not true, for the thinking of the cross as the cause of forgiveness plays the love of the Son off against the requirements of the Father. It produces a falsely-based contrast between the 'god' of the Old Testament and the loving "god" of the New. This is an unlivable split.

God does not love us because Jesus died for us. The truth is the reverse; it is because He loved us and wished to forgive us that He sent his beloved Son to die. The Father and the Son have always loved us from the beginning of the world. So the death of Jesus changes nothing in the mind or heart of God - He has always loved us and He has always willed to forgive us our sins. What Christ's death does change is what takes place **between** God and us; it brings reconciliation to estranged covenant partners.

In all this, we need to remember that it is God who first provides to Israel with sacrifice. So the pattern - or "type", as it is sometimes called - is revealed in advance. It comes to its fullness in Christ in a way that it does not in the type. However, the type is there to show that there is an atoning way of doing things, which, when fulfilled in Christ, reveals the character of God. As He works an atonement to His own satisfaction, we are seeing what He is like as we see what He is doing. His Being and His Act go together.

108 - The death of Christ does not change God, it makes a change between Him and us.

While the death of Christ does not change God it does change the way God deals with us. The prophet, Ezekiel, makes it clear that, because Israel had profaned the Temple, there is a problem between them and God. So God must deal with Israel according to her conduct.

"According to their conduct I shall deal with them, and by their judgments I shall judge them. And they will know that I am the Lord." [Ezekiel 7.27 ASV]

"But as for Me, My eye will have no pity nor shall I spare, but I will bring their conduct upon their heads." [Ezekiel 9.10 ASV and 11.21]

However, if He should deal with us according to our deeds, all would be over for us. The Christian view is that God sees our sin clearly. Yet, He loves us and wants to forgive us. It is this desire in God that is the cause of Him sending his Son. Then the atonement is a manifestation of the love of God to forgive us, but it is not the cause as to why He forgives us. We must never believe that the death of Jesus causes God to forgive us.

It is rather that through God's love, He has, in the atonement:

[1] judged sin publicly. For sin is shown to be sin where God justly judged it.

[2] found a way for us to be justified so that His holiness, righteousness and justice are seen at the same time;

[3] made a way for us to receive His forgiveness for our conduct and our guilt.

109 - God's saving work is all done in the incarnate Son, the one Mediator.

See DS 2, 2013, # 63

The Incarnation, when God takes human flesh, is the foundation to all that God accomplishes through the death of Jesus [See #63 DS02 2013].

The death of Jesus may be considered separately and distinctly both from man's side or God's side, but it is really taking place simultaneously in the God Man. Because Jesus is fully God and fully Man, there can be things offered to God as Man, and there can be matters transacting to man through the work of God done in and through Christ. That is, in One Person, there can be a meeting between God and man. Jesus is the only Mediator between God and man in this way. This mediation takes place in His Person.

*"...God our Saviour, who desires all men to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth. For there is One God, and one mediator also between God and men, the man Christ Jesus, who gave Himself as a ransom for all, the testimony born at the proper time."
[1 Timothy 2.3-6 ASV1960].*

We need to hold fast to the basic truth that there is no salvation accomplished for us which is external to the person of the God man.

110 - Christ is God's elect man for us – and God's elect man for God

Christ, our Representative with God, does a vicarious work on our behalf.

"Vicarious" because what Christ does for us, He does 'in our place' as **a substitute**, doing things that we must not do for ourselves and could not anyway.

"Vicarious" because what Christ does for us, He does 'in our stead' as **a representative**; so that what He does becomes something which now becomes ours because it is His. When we see what He has accomplished for us, and the depth of its application, we become aware how much has been transacted with God for us.

In thinking of Him as our representative, we don't mean it as a member of parliament might represent us; someone we democratically elect [choose] to represent our own interests. The decisive matter is that the Father elected Christ for us; He has put Him forward as His own choice to be the man for us. God has elected our Champion who will represent us, doing

vicariously for us what we cannot do for ourselves.

Although He does things for us, Jesus makes it clear that He is doing this saving work out of love for His Father.

"I will not speak with you much longer, for the prince of this world is coming. He has no hold on me, but the world must learn that I love the Father and that I do exactly what my Father has commanded me". [John 14.30 NIV1960]

In thinking of Him as our representative, we don't mean that He represents us because He is so like us, in some psychological unity we have with Him. At the incarnation, He takes up into Himself all the brokenness of our humanity so that He may redeem us. But what makes His work as our representative Saviour effective is that *He saved us by His difference from us.*

That is, we learn through the incarnation and the atonement in what way He has stood for us with God, as the representative God appointed for us. In that sense He is our Representative. He could not redeem man without representing him - but He is God's choice, not ours and this carries through in all His subsequent dealings with us. The initiative lies with Him, He chose us, we did not choose Him.

"You did not choose me, but I chose you and appointed you to go and bear fruit - fruit that will last" [John 15.16a NIV].

Jesus is God's elect man, appointed for our sake. He is also God's elect man appointed for God's sake. That is, He is the true man, the true image of the invisible God who brings God much pleasure as a man for He lives a life, as man, as the perfect responsive human. He offers to God the obedience that brings Him untold pleasure and satisfaction, as well as bringing Him glory in the sight of all creation. He gathers up all the creation in His redeeming work - for He is the head of all creation as He is head of the Church, His body. Christ is restoring what God had always intended in the first place.

111 - Some false ways the atonement has been depicted.

The question to be asked is, "What is the nature of the Atonement?" For that does not focus upon method but on attempting to understand what it is of itself. We must look to the nature of the thing teach us how to think about it. We can only understand its nature, as it is revealed in its own light.

Here are some pictures and ideas that misrepresent God's grace, we need to be aware of:

[1] atonement is not a *deflection of God's anger*, as if the flash fell on Christ and was deflected away from us by Him.

[a] In this picture God's anger is conveyed using the image of raw, arbitrary power. Whereas God's anger at sin is clearly understood in terms of its invasion into His sovereignty and His hatred of it is springs from its destructive defilement of his shared life with his crea-

tures.

[2] Some of God's own attributes can be *played off against each other*. Watch particularly for any divorce of the Father from the Son and also where justice is set against mercy and judgment against grace. These are seen as being in opposition to one another until there is some adjustment which is said to be worked out by the Son.

[3] We cannot speak of a mollification of God, as if some inducement is being offered to Him, so as to procure grace. Procured grace is a contradiction in terms. The atonement did not procure grace; it flowed from grace. The atonement is not the source of grace; it is the result of grace. The Redeemer was God's gift.

[4] We also do not want to think in terms of *equivalent suffering* based on the comparison that what we deserved is undergone by Christ in our stead. This is to understand atonement in our terms, which are fallen terms and preoccupied with legal language. The atonement does not lie in the suffering at all; but in the obedience, the fruit of holiness.

[5] We also must be careful of speaking of a *transfer of guilt* - as if sin and its impact, is a load, or a packet, which can be transferred from one back to another. Jesus does bear our guilt and shame, but the image is not of putting something on His back, to carry it away, but of Him becoming incarnate and taking up our fallen flesh as He identifies with us.

He bears our guilt and also bears it away by fully absorbing it into His person and dying sacrificially under the condition of sin, but not as a sinner Himself, for us. The Old Testament image of the day of atonement, where the hands laid on the animal signify, not so much a transfer of guilt, but the identification of the offerer with his offering. This focuses on the meaning of the sacrifice for the offerer, not the method of some transfer.

[6] We need to be very aware of what we are doing when we use the word "*penalty*" in connection with what fell on Christ. We must renounce the idea that He was punished by God, for that cannot be true. God was always very pleased with his beloved Son.

Christ did enter the area of our penalty, but it was not his to deserve. Viewed from our side, as guilty ones who rightly fear punishment, it is true that the chastisement of our peace was upon Him. We are saved from penalty which was rightly due. Whatever brought satisfaction to God for Himself is not that He punished His Son; nor was it His Son's obedient suffering, for the suffering it not the focus for God. It was the suffering *obedience* that is so attractive to God in this encounter - the obedience as the Son of God and as true man.

2 – The Atonement: Foundations in Bible

The Epistles of the New Testament operate on the basis that a promised new covenant has been inaugurated with God's people and they integrate the Old Testament themes of sacrifice, propitiation, reconciliation and redemption into the understanding of Christ's death.

112 – A ransom for many [Mark 10.35-45; 9.35]

See Mtt 20.20-38; 23.11; Lk 9.28; 12.50; 22.24-27.

Kittel [1967] vol 4. 328-355; Boan [2011] Reading 34

There are two major statements of Jesus concerning his own death. The first is the word at the Last Supper; the second is Jesus' understanding of his life as "handed over" as a ransom for many [See #102]. The setting here is that of the servant humility of God.

[1] Jesus came as a servant.

The sign of greatness of the Gentile rulers is that they are served. James and John, in asking who is the greatest, had taken their cue from that model. Jesus makes clear that, within His community, within His embryonic 12 men, who are the new Israel, it is not so among them. For they are going to sonship with God, to share the life of God which is very much about care and service. The greatness of Jesus, his "glory" as James and John spoke of it, is the greatness that accompanies being a servant and slave of all.

And the reason why this is so, is shown on the cross which states that He did not come to be served, but to serve, and to give His life a ransom for many. That is, the glory of Jesus is the cross, because it states the sort of glory that a loving triune God alone can have. It is the glory of the God who, in his grace, would stoop to send His Son for us and permit Him to throw his life away for the release and freedom of his own people who He has ordained to share His life as sons; which is to know Him as Father. In the words of H. R. Mackintosh, God "loved us more than He loves Himself".

[2] The free humility of God.

Further, for the Word of God to take flesh such as ours, He has laid aside his glory and taken the form of a servant. Our God is not imprisoned in his greatness and might – He has the freedom of God to stoop and, without ceasing to be God, to become man for our sakes. It is in the context of this greatness, that which is found within God's own life that forms the background for Jesus' exposition of his death.

[3] "...to give his life a ransom [λύτρον] for many."

Over the whole of the New Testament the noun λύτρον = ransom, occurs only here and in the parallel passage of Matthew 20.28. It means the payment of a ransom price that is sub-

tutionary in character. It makes clear that Jesus' death was standing in for the "many", He was to give His life instead of their lives. It involved an exchange.

When we turn to the rest of the New Testament we see that the apostolic writers stay with the Lord's teaching. They use the cognate verb λυτρόω = to redeem, and the cognate noun ἀπολύτρωσις = redemption.

Behind the Greek idea of λύτρον, a ransom, stand three Hebrew terms, padah, kipper and go'el. Each of these words has a picture behind its usage in the Old Testament. To study them opens up for us three aspects of redemption that lie behind Jesus' understanding of his death. The word pictures to some extent overlap. These word studies help us to read our New Testament in the light of the Old Testament usage.

113 - Redemption [1]: the Hebrew word Padah – [a] in the context of a dramatic deliverance

Read Exodus 12.35-36

This reading from Exodus includes both a stunning defeat for the Egyptians and their gods as well as a powerful release from bondage for the Hebrews.

Padah as used in the Old Testament, stresses the cost of the redemption and there is often a substitutionary offering or price entailed - the idea of 'a life for a life'. This is certainly true of the liturgical sacrifices of Israel.

What is redeemed is always a living thing. **Padah** also states what sort of act it is - it is dramatic and powerful. We see this in the redemption of Israel out of the house of bondage.

[1] The overwhelming of a strong man who enslaved God's people.

There will be one more plague [Exodus 11.1] and after it Pharaoh will not only allow them to go, he will drive them out of his country completely. In the sight of the average Egyptian, Moses has been elevated throughout the course of this encounter. So much so that when asked, the Egyptians give of their wealth to the Hebrews so that they may leave. This is truly a plundering [Exodus 12.35-36] of their country, and yet the Egyptians are willing for the plunder to happen, since their leader has clashed with Another, who is stronger. To maintain the Egyptian life style, these Hebrews, these former slaves, these people of God, must go.

[2] "if I by the Spirit cast out demons...the kingdom of God has come upon you"

In the Gospel of Matthew 12.22-37, 9.32-4 it is recorded that Jesus had cast out a demon from a man by the Spirit of God. The Pharisees questioned that it was a work of God at all. Indeed they had attributed the exorcism to Satan. Jesus, through persuasive argument showed that view to be ridiculous.

He went on to portray Satan as a strong man, who had taken the human race into corruption and destruction, and bondage. In the release of this captive man, the kingdom of God, through the agency of Jesus, by the Spirit, has bound that strong man, sufficient to be able to plunder his stolen property and return it to his rightful owner. This picture echoes the 'pa-dah' picture of salvation from bondage which allowed the Hebrews to serve their own God as He called them to be with Him in the wilderness.

Here, as we saw at his temptation [Matthew 4.1-11], Jesus is dealing with Satan in a way that is perfectly proper for him as a godly man to do, working through the Spirit of God. He understands the kingdom is coming through him as he yields to the Holy Spirit's power as the source of this deliverance. This is something that men and women can do under the power of the Spirit of God.

The principle we see here is first the binding of the strong man by a stronger man, then the plundering of his house.

[3] Defeat for those who enslave: redemption for the slaves.

Moses' announcement to Pharaoh is that at midnight, at the height of darkness, the Lord will strike the first born. These first born are the pre-eminent ones, the ones who have the first place in every household and royal house as well. They carry the inheritance of their families in their own persons.

But against the sons of Israel, not even a dog shall bark. In this way Egypt [and Pharaoh in particular] will understand how the Lord makes a distinction between Egypt and Israel. The people who serve Pharaoh will come to understand this as well, for they shall insist that the Hebrews leave and help to finance them on their way. This defeat is not simply a matter of knowing that their leader [Pharaoh] has been defeated, but that each one of them has suffered hurt and has personally come to know the distinction between Israel and Egypt.

[4] The holiness of the relation between God and His people.

When the Lord makes the distinction between the Hebrews and the Egyptians, it demonstrates His conviction that this nation is reserved as holy in the midst of others. To touch what is holy to the Lord of Israel, is to suffer pain, hurt and loss - it is to be overwhelmed by a greater power. It is to see all your glorious ones dishonored and overcome. To treat Israel as profane or common, and not holy, is to imagine that one has control, by force, over them rather than knowing that the Lord allowed it for a time. It is to get between God and his people, desiring them to serve you instead of Him - and that is to attempt to break into a holy and reserved relationship.

[5] An attempt to seize the inheritance of the Lord. [Matthew 21.38,43].

During Jesus' time, the Pharisees attempted to seize God's inheritance and found that the kingdom of God was taken away from them and given to another nation that had the

fruit of repentance within it. So it is that every shepherd and leader of God's people must understand that he is handling something holy, reserved for Another, the Bride of a jealous Bridegroom. They are a people about whom God has made a distinction showing that they were always His by redemption - holy to the Lord.

When God He makes a call on his people to serve Him, one must not get in the way for this is to oppose His will. It is to have your house plundered and to have your slaves taken from you; it is to recognize that they were the property of Another who has come to claim them. It is to come to the realization that those you used were really used illegitimately - as those to whom you had no right. It is to learn that, in a fallen world, it is possible to have power but that does not imply that you have the authority. It is to learn that there is an insane force that will not submit [Exodus 11.9-10] to God in this world. It is a leadership by a rebel over the peoples of the world that will go to its own destruction in pursuit of its exercise of power. It will not yield its will - unlike the people of Egypt, Pharaoh will not let them go.

[6] The Egyptians as governed by a tyrant.

Pharaoh is a type or pattern of Antichrist figure [similar to others we have noted in Scripture Isaiah 14, Ezekiel 26]. He is a man with power over others but driven by satanic forces and desires.

This distinction between the Pharaoh and his people shows that the target of redemption is people, those made in the image of God: they will have their moment, even if held under the bondage of their leader.

And yet there is another side to this wilfulness - it is that the Lord has hardened the heart of Pharaoh. It is that He has cemented Pharaoh in the deception of his rebellion. The Lord's action has forced into the open another distinction. It is between the Egyptians and the Pharaoh; the people can see what is happening. The revelation to the people is clear but not to the Leader who holds power over them.

[7] The Egyptians will have their salvation.

At the time of their exodus [= a road out from] the Lord gave the Hebrews favour in the sight of the Egyptian people [11.3], who understood something of what was happening [11.8] but they were not free to go themselves. One day, there would come a redemption that would include them. It would lead not to the release from a man who mastered them, but from a rebel cherub who enslaved them - Messiah will do it, and all the earth will see it, publicly done, and on a cross.

In history, a people is dealt with in solidarity with their leader such that, if their leader goes down, so do they. But in God's long range plan it will not always be so. Isaiah makes it clear that the Egyptian people, and others who were Israel's immediate enemies, will have a salvation issuing from the work of Israel's Messiah for them.

Isaiah portrays in his prophecy the Messiah using three pictures or themes. Messiah as a

great King [chapters 1-37]; the Servant of the Lord [38-55] and the Conqueror appointed by God [56-66]. Each Messianic characterisation embraces the Jewish and the Gentile world.

The initiative comes from Zion and moves outwards to the Gentile nations. So Zion is first restored [1.26-27] and then the nations flood in [2.2-4]. The Messiah, of the line of king David [11.1] rules over the whole new world [11.6-9]. His unified people are the troops that assault Philistia [11.14], bringing the Gentiles into subjection. As the Davidic rule spreads over the world [chapters 13-27] it covers peoples who were previously outcasts and aliens [19.23-25; 27.12-13].

The Servant is the person who brings revelation to the Gentiles [42.1-4], but He does this by first restoring Israel/Jacob [49.16], becoming the Lord's salvation to the ends of the earth [49.6]. When his saving work is done, [52.13-53.12] the benefits extend to both Zion [54] and also to the world [55].

The anointed Victor is the Redeemer to Zion [59.20-21] but draws the nations into the light that Zion has [60] and so the salvation that Zion has becomes a universal message [62.11-12]. Indeed, the working out of the Victor's role, which is stated implicitly [in 63-7-66.24], includes a Gentile hope, the result of a missionary enterprise [66.19].

114 - Redemption: [1] Padah - [b] in the context of a Passover Lamb that shields from the wrath

Read 1 Corinthians 5.6-8

Padah, as used in the Old Testament stresses the cost of the redemption; there is often a substitutionary offering or price entailed. The idea of a life for a life is entailed. This is certainly true of the liturgical sacrifices of Israel as it is true of the Passover Lamb here

[1] The Passover Lamb as the Gift of God

This event that was to take place was so significant that it is the beginning of the Hebrew year [12.2] from that time on. It is something that every year, made a fresh start. Whatever a past year may hold in the memory of the people, the Passover established the new year as hopeful, and new.

[2] Eating the flesh and relying on God's promise about the blood.

There is to be found from within their daily stock of food a particular item, it is a year old lamb from their flock [12.3,5]. They are to take it on the tenth of the month and separate it from the sheep and the goats. It is for a holy, a separated, purpose - it is going to be eaten, but eaten for the particular purpose God will show. Its meaning rests in the fact that it is something normally eaten, and that it is flesh and blood.

They are to decide on the number of lambs according to their households, but if households

are too small for a whole lamb, then according to what each man ought to eat. This is a matter of eating, in which the whole of the people shall participate, individually and fully - no one misses out; each is catered for and each must be satisfied by what he has eaten.

The lamb chosen must be unblemished. This is a clear sign that the lamb is required by the Lord for a holy, separated purpose [12.5]. Its selection is left to those who have had it for a year among their flock and they select it willingly, releasing it to the Lord's purpose.

It is a personally selected lamb, a personally eaten lamb, but it is killed in concert with the whole of the assembly of the Hebrews [12.6]. It is something in which they all share commonly and its meaning is to be common, consistent with the fact that their calendar will reflect this permanently [12.14].

It shall be killed at twilight in such a way that its blood is released from its flesh for a purpose, to be painted on the sides and lintels of the doorway of the house, visible to a person passing outside. [12.6-7]. From the point of view of the eater of the dead lamb, its blood is shed first, and then its flesh is eaten. Its blood is used with reference to what is happening outside the house, where it is for Another to see and recognise the faith in His word of those in the house; that they are using His provision. Inside the house, the flesh is eaten as all food is, as a provision of life and strength to go forth from the meal in the power of what is supplied.

[3] The blood is salvation "from" God, the flesh is salvation "to" God.

The two actions are to be done on the same night as the judgment will be enacted - they shall put the blood on the doorposts and eat the flesh on the same night [12.7-8]. In this way they draw from the Lamb covering blood that preserves their life in the midst of judgment and they eat of its flesh that gives them life to go forth to serve the Lord in the wilderness.

The lamb shall not be boiled or raw. It shall be the subject of fire. It is roasted quickly and eaten with bread. In this way the two things eaten are flesh and bread.

[4] No leaven [mixture] in the bread [1 Corinthians 5.6-8]

The bread is holy in its function as well; this is shown in that it is to be prepared quickly, with no yeast taking time to rise, and in a holy, unmixed way, where no yeast is at work within it. It is from this time that the presence of yeast [leaven] was seen as a defilement of a holy thing.

"Christ our Passover has been sacrificed for us..." [1 Cor 5.7]

Paul makes an appeal to the Christians at Corinth that they should see the release from the old life has decisively brought about by the death of Christ for them. God had forbidden the eating of leavened bread at Passover time. But now Christians are no longer using external matters of unleavened bread. They are to keep the Passover feast from deep within their own selves, by getting rid of their malice and wickedness and living in sincerity and truth.

The taste of this meal is not sweet, the Hebrews are not enjoying something of culinary qual-

ity. The lamb is accompanied by bitterness, provided by the bitter herbs that accompany the eating. They are eating in a context of knowing their current life among the Egyptians as a bitter situation, from which they require redemption. They have the double experience of being in deep need to escape the wrath of God being expressed, and at the same time knowing that they are safe in the midst of such a dangerous setting for sinners.

[5] Redemption out of divine judgment and alien oppression: both at once

What is clear in the Exodus Passover redemption is that there is this double-sided understanding of the one action of the Passover. Not only are they redeemed out of the oppressive rule of the Pharaoh; they are redeemed from the avenging angel of death sent by God and so what is required is sacrifice. The picture is of redemption “from” evil oppression that is only possible through redemption from the wrath of God and “into” a binding covenant relationship sealed by the blood of sacrifice.

This helps us to understand the New Testament in its release from oppressive demons and the release and freedom from the debt of sin by forgiveness through which we enter into the kingdom of God which is freedom and life. This means the “kingdom of God” in the Gospels is almost an equivalent of redemption.

The lamb shall be entirely consumed by the eaters, for its purpose is entirely reserved for this. But whatever is left over is not to be used as common, or for any other purpose, but burned up completely by morning. You eat it once for all, and yet you make a memorial of it year by year [12.7-10,14].

[6] The whole Lamb is consumed

The whole Passover lamb was dedicated by God to the one purpose. Its life-blood was to be poured out. The Gospels also reveal what a great cost the grace of God was to Jesus. In giving Himself a ransom for many, He poured out his whole life for us so as to bring us mercy and the compassion of God.

[7] They eat to walk away from slavery.

To eat the lamb the people stand - it is a meal not enjoyed for itself but for the purpose for which it is ingested. It is eaten quickly, with an eye to what is happening all around on that night. It is eaten in such a way that, dressed for action, they are about to walk away from an old life. It is the beginning of leaving of slavery, for escaping an enemy, for service to the Lord. It is eaten quickly, as those who are not savouring a nice meal for itself, but to get it into one's stomach so as to walk in the strength of it for as far as this salvation night will take them [12.11].

[8] The Lord's Passover.

The reason for treating this roasted lamb in this way is because it is the Lord's Passover. In Exodus 12.11-12, the Passover is stated in four ways. In 12.11-12 in such a way as you could

attribute the Passover to the lamb eaten or to the event of the wrath of God which He is executing that night. In Exodus 12.11 as the lamb eaten as the Passover; and in 12.12 as the act of the judgment of God upon Egypt as the Passover. And in 12.13 we have what the Passover is in respect of the Hebrews who are being saved.

All of these point to it as a salvation through judgment. 12.12 speaks of what it means for the Lord to Passover the land - for the Egyptians it is a passing "through" their land, it is a destruction - a smiting of the Egyptians [12.23]. 12.13 indicates what it means for the Hebrews - it is that He sees the blood; and because it is there for Him to see then He "passes over" them, so that no plague falls on them [12.23].

[9] : Redemption price entailed for the redemption of the first born.

The 'padah' picture of redemption price as it is exacted from the Hebrews in the wilderness is used in Exodus 13.13,15; 34.20 and Numbers 18.15.

[10] A memorial to be observed.

Hebrews are to observe this memorial permanently, [12.14] and in the promised land to which they are to go [12.25]. That is, their dwelling in the land is always to be constantly controlled by this memory of how they have come to be there - by salvation through judgment. This is a judgment in which their salvation was effected through the slaying of a lamb, whose blood shielded them from the wrath of God and whose flesh was the life strength in which they walked to freedom from slavery into the freedom to serve God in a temporary wilderness place and then finally in a land of their own.

[11] "Do this in remembrance of me..."

In a parallel way, the Lord's Supper becomes for us a continual reminder, to which we return continually by the doing of it, so that we may always know, as Israel knew annually with the Passover Feast, that its life began there as did its redemption from slavery and covenant commitment to God also did. As such, the Lord's supper is the sacrament of continuing life, taken as often as we eat together as an assembled group.

115 – The 2nd Hebrew word: Redemption: [2] Kipper, kopher – a blotting out, or the covering of sin and guilt

The dealing with uncleanness [defilement]; the need to be sprinkled clean.

*Read Exodus 21.28-32; 30.11-16; Genesis 32.6-21;
Leviticus 16 ; Boan[2004] Israel's Feasts and Fasts.pdf*

We saw in #112.4, that the Greek word for "ransom" has three Old Testament word-pictures that lie behind it: the three Hebrew terms, padah, kipper and go'el. We now want to study the

second of these, kipper.

If Padah has to do with redemption from the power of sin, kipper conveys a picture of redemption as the actual wiping out of sin and guilt. It is about effecting a propitiation between man and God. The word root kpr has to do with blotting out or covering. Both the Hebrew verbs kasar = to cover, and machah = to blot out, are used as synonyms for kpr. Kasar is found in Psalm 32.; 85:2-3 and machah in Jeremiah 18.23; Nehemiah 4.5.

[1] The price of redemption [kopher].

In two places, quoted below, the Hebrew noun kopher is used to describe the price of redemption; while redemption is expressed by the verb padah. In its biblical usage, it refers to the sum paid to redeem a forfeited life. See the examples of the ox owner who can redeem his life [Exodus 21.28-32] and the kopher is accepted as a substitute for the life that would otherwise perish in the plague [Exodus 30.12].

This use of the ransom price means a substitute gift, whose worth avails for the covering of a debt. It doesn't mean that the debt is simply wiped; it is covered by the acceptance of the kopher.

"Why should I fear when evil days come, when wicked deceivers surround me – 6 Those who trust in their wealth and boast of their great riches? 7 No man can redeem the life of another or give to God a ransom for him – 8 the ransom for a life is costly, no payment is ever enough – that he should live on forever and not see decay. [Psalm 49.5-9 NIV 1973].

So if the verb padah speaks of redemption from the power of sin, the verb kipper, and the noun kopher, expresses the actual wiping out of sin and guilt.

"His soul draws near to the pit, and his life to the messengers of death. 23 Yet, if there is an angel on his side as a mediator, one out of a thousand, to tell a man what is right for him, 24 to be gracious to him and say, 'Spare him from going down into the pit; I have found a ransom for him' – 25 then his flesh is renewed like a child's; and is restored as in the days of his youth. 26 He prays to God and finds favour with him, He sees God's face and shouts for joy; he is restored by God to his righteous state. 27 Then he comes to men and says, 'I sinned, and perverted what was right, but I did not get what I deserved. 28 He redeemed my soul from going down into the pit, and I will live to enjoy the light'. [Job 33.22-28 NIV 1973].

[2] Jacob covering the face of Esau [Genesis 32.6-21]

The general use of kipper is to express a propitiatory gift, the affect of which is conciliatory. When Jacob is facing Esau, his brother, after a long time, he feels the need to approach with gifts that precede him. He instructed his servants to go before him with the gifts. It is recorded that his thinking went like this;

"For he thought, 'I will pacify him with these gifts I am sending on ahead; later when I see him, perhaps he will receive me'. 21 So Jacob's gifts went on ahead of him, but he himself spent the night at the camp." [Genesis 32.20b-21 NIV 1973].

"I will pacify him" uses kipper and the picture is that Jacob is 'covering the face' of Esau. When

however, we think of atonement as covering in relation to God, kopher is not used of covering God's face – and so conciliating Him - but rather of covering sin before God's face or His presence.

This is because God is the one who atones; He is the acting Subject. He is the one who blots out sins, pardons it [2 Chronicles 30.18-19] and puts it behind His back, invalidates it or annuls it.

[3] The preoccupation with being unclean Lev 11-15

Leviticus 16 begins with a re-call of the seriousness of approaching God in any other way than that which He has specified. Leviticus, chapters 11-15, detail a whole series of ways that uncleanness can settle on a people in regard to God Himself. So we are not surprised that the material of Leviticus 16 is going to deal with that issue, in regard to the very tabernacle of God set among an unclean people.

[4] Yom Kipper - the day of atonement [Leviticus 16]

[i] 1-2 Introduction: outlines, in the light of the death of Aaron's sons, the danger of unauthorised worship. The reason for Aaron's caution was that the holy of holies houses the ark on which was the "mercy seat". It is here that God comes to his people; in the heart of the tabernacle [Exodus 24.15ff]

[ii] 3-5 Animals and priestly dress for the ceremonies.

The basic requirements for the ceremonies included: [a] a bull for the purification offering[b] a ram for the burnt offering, and then [c] two goats and [d] another ram for the congregation.

[iii] 6-10 Outline of the ceremonies

[a] Aaron offers the bull as a purification offering for the priests and for himself[verse 6]; [b] He casts lots to decide which of the two goats will play which part; one will be sacrificed and the other [for Azazel] will be led into the wilderness.; [c] The goat for the purification offering is sacrificed [verse9]; [d] The other goat is brought before the Lord and then led off into the wilderness.

[iv] 11-28 Detailed description of the ceremonies

[a] 11-19 the blood sprinkling rites.

[i] The purification offering on behalf of Aaron and the priests resembles the normal pattern for a purification offering [Lev. 4.3-12] with this difference; that in this case the blood is not sprinkled on the outside of the curtain leading to the holy of holies, it is taken into the holy of holies itself and is sprinkled on the mercy seat on the top of the ark.

These atonement-day rituals signaled that the impossible is made possible; they permit the holy God to dwell among an unholy people [16-17 and also Isaiah 6.3ff; Psalm 15; 24.3ff]. In both the Old and New covenants there is only one mediator between God and man [1 Tim

2.5].

The meaning of these rituals is to cleanse and sanctify the sanctuary and the altars from the uncleanness of the Israelites which pollutes the sanctuary. This makes the consistent coming of God to his people in the tabernacle possible from His side. In this sense, the work of the High Priest in the sanctuary is distinctly God oriented.

[b] The scapegoat despatched [20-22]

After being chosen by lot, the animal is brought before the High Priest and he lays his hands upon its head and confesses the nation's sins. It is then led off into the wilderness by a man appointed for the task [Heb. "a man made ready"]. The 'taking by lot' indicates that the two functions, here divided between two goats, are both chosen by God. The goat, as a bearer of sins, is sent to a land that is "cut off" [solitary land NASV], ie a place separated from the camp – so that there is no chance of the goat returning and bringing back the guilt of the sins upon the people. The sin is separated from Israel because it was "born away".

[c] 23-28 cleansing of the participants. The washing of the inhabitants of the camp is simply so that the camp be not re-polluted.

What the nation had to do on the day of atonement was to afflict themselves and not do any work. The affliction of themselves was a demonstration of true penitence - to examine themselves and repent of their sins. The phrase "afflict yourselves" is rare [Lev. 23.27, 32; Numbers 29.7 of the day of atonement and also Isaiah 58.3,5; Psalm 35.13]. It included sackcloth, fasting, praying with bowed head, self examination and prayer.

[5] The reason for the action of Day of Atonement

1. In setting the context as the preparation for Aaron not to die in the prosecution of his duty the Day of Atonement teaches us that the no man, however holy, can approach the presence of God without appropriate atonement being made.

2. Israel's sin and consequent uncleanness are conveyed to the building in which they worship. Unless they are cleansed, God will condemn his people to judgment. Purification of the Tabernacle from uncleanness is central to the continued dwelling of God.

3. The despatch of the scapegoat, as sending away the sins of the people from among themselves, shows us a picture of the nation's cleansing as a whole people. What took place in the holy of holies was not seen by anyone except the High priest. But the scapegoat picture was seen by all and was a powerful visual aid that sin was real and it needed to be eliminated from the life of the people.

4. The total embargo on work and the affliction of their souls made clear the same point of the serious nature of sin clear.

[6] Sacrificed goat and scapegoat – to "bear" and "bear away" sins [Isaiah 53; See also the Hebrews 9.23-28] There is a parallel between "my servant" and you "my people". A representative

and the servant will be lifted up and prosper, but will, like the people, be marred and seen to be broken in his form.

He will also sprinkle many nations; so there will be a cleansing for mankind done by the servant of the Lord. The setting and the description of the work of the suffering servant brings together the work of the sacrificed goat and the work of the scapegoat as a sin bearer together in the one work of the Lord's Servant.

The work of the sacrificed goat will be to bear sins. This is what takes place within the holy place with one man as the mediator. What this goat points to is what is acceptable to God to bring about this reconciliation. [See Isaiah 53.2a, 5-6,7, 9-10, 11a-c, 12a-c]

The scapegoat will bear sins away from the camp. This goat is dealing with the defiling result of sins as felt by a collected people of God. To lay hands upon the goat and confess their sins is the action done by the High Priest. It means that this goat is going to stand for all of them as it bears the sins away. To bear them away and not return with them must imply a necessary rejection of sins by the people. Here is a cleansing by the removal of the defiling situation sins bring among the people. The removal of the sins secures the removal of defilement. [See Isaiah 52.14, 53.2bc-3, 4,8,11e, 12e].

Propitiation, the central idea in the sacrificed goat, presumes that there is a wrath [anger] and displeasure of God concerning sin. The purpose of propitiation is to remove this displeasure. The anger of God is the reaction of His holiness towards sin.

We need to be clear that propitiation is not the turning of God's wrath into love. It is the other way around. It is the work of the love of God that He makes provision for His wrath to be propitiated. In this way, His love may realise its purpose of bringing us to share in His life. But His purpose is realised in such a way as to be consistent with His glory and the dictates of His holiness."

"In this is love, not that we loved God, but that He loved us and sent His Son to be the propitiation for our sins" 1 John 4.10 ASV

Propitiation does not detract from the love and mercy of God - it indicates the great lengths to which love will go. God is love and as we see, the supreme object of that love is the Persons of the Trinity for each Other. It is because of the holy love expressed within the Trinity that God cannot suffer what belongs to the integrity of His character and glory to be compromised or lessened. This is the reason for the propitiation, this covering of our sin before God.

116 - Redemption [3] The go'el, the redeemer kinsman

See Leviticus 25.8-55; Numbers 35.16-28 Ruth 3.1,9-13; 4.1-12;

Revelation 6.10; Hebrew 2.10-18

Morris, Leon L.[1955], The Apostolic Preaching of the Cross, Tyndale

Torrance, Thomas F. [2009] Atonement, Paternoster, IVP.

The redeemer kinsman is concerned with [1] Redemption from slavery or forfeited rights through a kinsman-advocate, and [2] Avenging of life lost through the kinsman-vindicator

There are two central ideas; the broader one is that of the family obligation of redemption, the narrower idea is that of the concept of the payment of a redemption price.

[1] The meaning of the Hebrew word *go'el*

The primary sense of the meaning of the Hebrew root *g'l* is to resume a claim or a right that has lapsed. So we might think of it as to re-claim, or to re-vindicate. But the setting we have here reflects the family law of the covenant people of God, where a kinsman, a family relative, is responsible for maintaining the family honour and also in preserving the family's possessions. It is these strong family settings, in which this word is used [mostly as the participle] that give it's full meaning. [After Morris, 1955]. We now turn to some examples that make this clearer.

[2] The prevention of the ruin of debtors [Leviticus 25.8-55]

These laws recognise that through circumstances of life, if matters are left unchecked, the rich landowners will be found continuously exploiting the landless serfs. The jubilee checks this process. Occurring once every forty nine years, it provided for the slate to be wiped clean so that a man could commercially begin again with a fresh start. These laws were designed to deal with the fact that a man, having fallen into debt, would either sell his land or even himself. So he became the slave of his neighbour.

[3] The fellow country man can sell part of his property [verses 35-46]

If a man's debt was too large he could sell his land as a lump sum and use that to pay off his debtor. But if that was not enough, then the man could sell himself.

We are not to think of slavery here as a forced matter or a stealing of peoples, as has often been the case in history. In the context of the Law here, the man who fell into debt was allowed to contract himself to his debtor, so as to pay off the debt by his labour. He remained in the society around him and worked his way through his debt. The way of life between the poor man and his debtor is not to be one of degrading servitude, but honouring to the man as he goes about the settling of the debt he owes.

[4] The nearest kinsman – the *go'el* [Leviticus 25 verse 25, 47-55]

In regard to the property that is sold for the debt, the kinsman – redeemer is to come and buy back – redeem – the land that was sold. In that case, there is a reverting of the land to the owner to whom God originally gave it.

In the case of the person who has sold himself into servitude to a stranger, then he has a right of being redeemed. One of his brothers may redeem him, or one of his kinsmen, it may be an uncle, or his uncles' son or indeed, any blood relative. His relative buys him out of his

slavery according to the price of his labour owed to his debtor, up to the Jubilee year.

[a] The matter of Ruth the Moabitess . Ruth 3.1,9-13; 4.1-12

In the book of Ruth, we see that she is widowed and left with no estate and in poverty. In this helpless and difficult position, she is redeemed out of it by Boaz who is her kinsman by marriage. The redemption not only involves her property and the rights through her dead husband, but one which fulfils the duties of those rights as well. It results in the restitution to Ruth of her full place and inheritance in the covenant people of God.

[b] The man in the gap of Ezekiel 22.

In Ezekiel 22 God looks for a man to stand in the broken down wall of Jerusalem, the city liable to His wrath. God looked for a man "among them" - the work required is typical of the go'el person that we see here – a near kinsman.

[5] The go'el as the redeemer kinsman

The go'el acts at the cost of his own person. It is through his person and the relationship that he has been given by God through birth that enables him to act in the case of the forfeiture of his kinsman's right or his position of bondage. The go'el brings about this redemption by rightfully claiming the person's cause as his very own. He stands in for them, assuming the responsibility for them and taking their burdens upon himself, since they are unable to bear it for themselves.

At the Incarnation, the Word of God, in whose image we are made, and who may be fully called our brother [Hebrews 2.10-18], takes unto Himself our fallen fleshly life and makes our situation His. He stands up for us when we cannot stand for ourselves, and makes our issue His responsibility as a true Kinsman. He saves us from the bondage into which we had fallen, and He saves us to the full rights we had forfeited.

[6] The go'el as the blood avenger [Numbers 35.16-21]

The near kinsman has a proper negative responsibility as well. Should his relative be intentionally murdered then he has the responsibility to hunt down the murderer and slay him. In this way, he is a punisher of those who wrong his kinsman.

[a] "How long till you avenge our blood" Revelation 6.10

The living souls under the altar in heaven bring this request before the Lord calling Him "O Lord, holy and true...". Here is their request, made to their redeemer kinsman, who has already showed Himself to be that when he redeemed and saved them. But as to their witness upon the earth, they have been slaughtered for it and so find themselves in the heavenly realms and plead with their kinsman Lord to avenge their murder.

So we see the twin ways in which the go'el can act: either positively for salvation as an advocate; or negatively as the avenger of murder as a vindicator. In both situations there is a full

recovery of rights to the person for whom the go'el acts.

[7] God as the Go'el Himself for his people.

We have seen how the go'el acts as a relative, who redeems people out of slavery through his connection with them by blood or by property. The "person" of the go'el is central in this process. If he is not there for his relative, all is lost. What is wonderful is that this concept is applied to God Himself.

In the Psalms and Job, the person of God is looked to as the Redeemer of the individual man. At the time of the Exodus and also of the return of the exiles from Babylon, God is the Redeemer of the whole covenant people. This concept is extended even to the work that God will do at the end of time. It is because God and His people have an inheritance in one another that God is claimed as the go'el redeemer; to say nothing of the idea that God is the Husband of his people [Jeremiah 3.1ff; 31.31-2; Ezekiel 16.1ff; Isaiah 54.1-8; 61.10,62.4-5 Hosea 2.14,16,19-20.]

[8] Only God can be go'el in the matters of death and judgment.

No one is able to extend to their relatives their kinsman's advocacy beyond the span of their earthly life [Ezekiel 14-20]. No-one can ultimately make another person's cause their own in this case. God alone can step in and bring us life beyond death. Only if God comes to the human situation and stands surety for us, taking our brokenness, frailty, corruption can our life be redeemed. It is not through silver and gold that we are to be redeemed, but through an act of sheer grace of God [Isaiah 52.3,9]. Job anticipates this intervention of God:

"I know that my Redeemer lives, and that in the end he will stand upon the earth.²⁶ And after my skin has been destroyed, yet in my flesh I will see God; ²⁷ I myself will see him with my own eyes – I, and not another. How my heart yearns within me!" [Job 19.25 NIV 1973]

[a] God as go'el redeems us through judgment and leads us to holiness.

b) God is our go'el because He is bound to us in covenant love. He redeems us out of terrible bondage, as is typified by the Exodus out of Egypt and the shielding of the people through the Passover lamb. He does this through his man-servant Moses, who is the mediator of the covenant. Yet, when in Isaiah, God is speaking of a time when there will be a new exodus and a new redeemer, the holy one of Israel, it will also be through His servant. But this servant is one who vicariously bears Israel's sins and God's judgments concerning Israel. This servant is the divine go'el, it is the Lord Himself, acting as Israel's kinsman; acting through sacrifice and atonement at the cost of His own life.

117 - Jesus, our go'el Redeemer

After Torrance [2009].

The New Testament applies the imagery of go'el to Jesus at :

[a] His Incarnation – the Son of God takes flesh which is ours, fallen, broken-humaneity type flesh. We become bone of his bone and flesh of his flesh.

[b] His Death - He has established a new covenant with us, on the basis that He has laid down his life in atoning sacrifice and redemption. He is our redeemer kinsman, bonded to us by covenant.

Paul, taking seriously the Incarnation and so the fact that we are Jesus' bone of His bone and flesh of his flesh, works his own understanding of the marriage relation into Ephesians 5; it is on that ground that Christ is the Saviour of the church.

Paul's understanding of us as being slaves to sin and now set free from its dominion, if not its presence [Romans 6-8], sees Christ as the one who has by His life, death burial and resurrection, brought us out of this bondage into a freedom of life through the incarnate fleshly relative Jesus.

[1] Jesus as the Advocate Go'el

Jesus is the advocate who takes our part and vindicates us against the accusation and judgment of our guilt. He sets us free from all our debts. He calls us, as His disciples, "friends" and not servants [John 15.14-15]; so tightly is He bound to us in covenant love. He is our advocate and expiation from our sin [1 John 12.1-2]. Paul thinks of Jesus as having justified us, so that nothing in heaven and earth could shift that advocacy.

[2] Jesus redeems our inheritance

We, who forfeited our lives, have been purchased back for God by Christ [Revelation 5.9]. So He has claimed his inheritance. Paul uses this idea of "possession" περιποιήσις where we are given to Christ as his inheritance and we are given Christ as ours [Ephesians 1.14, Acts 20.28, 1 Thessalonians 5.9; 2 Thessalonians 2.14, 1 Peter 2.9]. Redemption and inheritance are two ideas that cannot be separated – they are brought together in the go'el picture.

[3] Jesus as the Jubilee

The redemption that was stated in the Year of Jubilee [Leviticus 25.8-55] is directly applied to the day of Christ, for his coming achieves the cancellation of all debt and the restoration of all the rights that we had forfeited as the members of God's household. [See the 'sabbath rest' of the people of God in Hebrews 4.1-10 as paralled in Leviticus 25.1-10].

[4] Jesus the Avenger of death

Jesus avenges our death in sin and destroys death itself, so redeeming us from death. Christ as the Victor is linked with the go'el picture as much as with the 'padah' sense of redemption. He stands in the gap as our redeemer – He is a man from amongst us [Ezekiel 22].

At the end of the age, He also avenges the death of those who have lost their life in witness to Him upon the earth.

118 – Reconciliation

*See Boan, #2009.02 The Beginning part 12
#2009.07 DS01 Part 29*

[1] The use of the word “reconcile” as implies the removal of the grounds of disharmony.

In Matthew 5.23-24 the word “reconcile” demonstrates that [1] the reason for the interruption to the worshipper is the alienation with his brother. And [2], that what he is commanded to do about it is to act so as to remove the grounds of the disharmony.

There is a similar example in 1 Corinthians 7.11 where the expression “be reconciled to the husband” can only be put into effect, not by the estranged wife dropping her alienation from her husband, but, by an action which removes the grounds of disharmony. Once removed, the result would be the of ceasing of the separation and thus the returning to normal marital relations.

Similarly, in Romans 11.15 the expression “reconciling of the world” is used in relation to the Jew-Gentile movement of the gospel. The reconciliation of the Gentiles can be seen to consist, not in the Gentiles having put away their hatred toward God, but in the receiving of the Gentiles into divine favour.

[2] Father and the children

If you saw a family in disarray and the children rebellious towards their father and mother, you could imagine yourself saying to the father, “Are you reconciled to this behaviour?”

The question wants to know his state of mind about the present disorder - it seeks, in a sympathetic way, to understand His anguish and disturbance. For it recognises that there will be some alienation of the father from his children because of their behaviour. His glory as a father, is expressed by their life together.

Reconciliation in the Scriptures deals primarily with God's alienation from us on similar sorts of grounds as the father with his children. God is alienated from us because of our sins and rebellion. The grounds of the disharmony with Him need to be removed.

The father in the example above will act. His action will constitute a judgment - for it is the business of fathers to judge. He will make a judgement and act in accord with it and so bring

order and restoration to the disarray of his family. It is a salvation through judgment. We have examined this previously, studying what is appropriate to a holy God setting things right as consistent with His own character [See #25 DS1,2013].

[3] Distinguishing the act of reconciliation from the result of it

Notice though, that in the first place, the need for the removal of the grounds of the disharmony within himself in regard to his children's activities. Then, as a result of this, they will be reconciled to him as father - the harmony of the family is restored and the life they share together moves forward in its richness and shared joys.

Reconciliation with God has often been thought of as God removing our hatred of Him. He does so of course - but this is to state a result. However the main emphasis of the New Testament is upon the action God takes in dealing with His alienation from us.

Reconciliation, when thought of as an act, consists in the removal of the grounds of disharmony. When it is thought of as a result, it means the resumption of harmonious, understanding and peaceful relations. What is vital to see is that it is the action first, which establishes the possibility of the result, which is second. In looking at reconciliation we shall be emphasising the judging action of God as Father, in which He reconciles the world to Himself.

3 - Studying the Atonement in its own light

In studying the nature of the atonement, it is good to study it in its own light. So we should expect to find some light shed on our subject by studying an actual atonement and then to see what it was that God found acceptable within it. It occurs through an action done by Phinehas. Before we look at that, it is helpful, by way of contrast, to look at an attempt Moses made to stay the wrath of God upon Israel.

119 - Moses' offer of 'atonement' in taking the punishment for Israel is refused because contrary to God's character

Exodus 32.19-35

We have already seen how the holy jealousy of God breaks upon Israel whenever she worships something else. The making of the golden calf by the people, while Moses was on the mountain, is such an occasion. Read carefully Exodus 32.19-35.

After 3000 unrepentant people had died by the Levites' swords, Moses makes it clear that there is still need for their sin to be atoned. As God's anger became evident Moses attempted to make an atonement for their sin. Moses' mind distinguishes between the pun-

ishment for the deeds as something quite distinct from the procuring of the forgiveness.

Further, it is a sin in which all the people are involved, it is a corporate matter. Moses' states his clear intention as he goes up the mountain, "Perhaps I can make atonement for your sin" [Exodus 32.30].

In his conversation with the Lord, he asks if God will forgive them; if He will not, Moses asks God to blot him out of His book. In stating his solidarity with the people of God, Moses reasons that, if God will punish them by blotting them out, He will have to blot out Moses also. He places himself and his relation to the Lord between the Lord's anger with them concerning their sin. But Moses forgets that he has not sinned in this matter, he did not make the golden calf. God makes it clear that whoever has sinned shall be punished, not those who have not.

From this text we see that the inclusion of Moses in the penalty of those to be punished was not an acceptable way of dealing with such a situation as this. Moses thought of it as an atonement - but God did not take it that way. He will not punish the innocent; rather, it is the guilty who will be punished.

What this indicates to us is that the punishment of the innocent for the guilty does not lie in the heart of the meaning of the atonement. Such an action may take place – the innocent suffering - as seen from the point of view of the guilty. But that, when it happens, will be a result of the atonement for those for whom it was done. It does not shed light upon what the atonement is in itself, nor does it make clear what is satisfying to God in an atonement for sin.

120 - Phinehas made an atonement

*Numbers 25 ;Matthew 26.26-29; Mark 14.22-25; Luke 22.15-20;
1 Corinthians 11.23-26; Campbell, [1856,1996] Chapter 5
A record of an actual atonement made*

[1] Ancient types [patterns] show the need and the form of the atonement.

A 'type' or a 'pattern', such as the Levitical sacrifices of animals, in the unfolding revelation of God provided veiled clues as to what it was that God had in mind for the dealing with His wrath and our guilt before Him. These ancient patterns, such as the Passover Lamb or the sacrificial goats of the Day of Atonement, declared the necessity for atonement and they said something about the form it should take. So they anticipated the death of Christ. Yet, it is not until the death of Christ has taken place that we can assess these earlier parallels as being pointers to the reality of the atonement that has taken place in Christ.

[2] The nature of the atonement.

The ancient types spoke of the form and necessity for atonement. Numbers 25 is very important because it actually records that an atonement was made. Because it does, it reveals some light upon what atonement is in itself. In other words, it records the event of atone-

ment in such a way that it begins to tell us what are the important matters to God in what was done. We are led to consider it in its own light.

[3] The covenant setting of the offence

We have seen before that the covenant is enacted by the eating of a meal with God, the cutting of flesh and the spilling of blood and also the binding of persons to be there for one another. When the Hebrews encamped at Shittim, they were invited by the local Moabites, to the sacrifices that they were offering to their gods. The Hebrews who went, ate and bowed down to these local gods. This is described in verse 1 as the people “began to play the harlot with the daughters of Moab”.

Not only were the Hebrews forbidden to intermarry with the local tribes, they had eaten in sacrificial meals and worshipped other gods. This aroused the anger of the Lord against Israel; the “anger” of God concerned the holy, exclusive relationship that He had with Israel. This holy relationship was enshrined and fortified by the covenant relationship that had enacted it. Israel had broken covenant, and the image uppermost in God’s mind, as verse 1 indicates, was that of a wife/bride who had played the harlot. She had taken herself into unions that defiled the precious relationship established with God as her husband.

[4] The jealousy of God: He is angry against Israel.

When men and women think of jealousy it is usually that a competitor has arisen and they are not certain of their place with the one they love. So they are said to be ‘jealous of the new comer’ who, it is perceived threatens their place in the previously solid relationship. Jealousy of this sort arises out of our insecurity; it indicates that we are not so sure of one another. So we focus on the infiltrator.

When we say that God is jealous, it is quite another thing. His jealousy is focussed upon the relationship He has covenanted with Israel. As such, His powerful desire to hold the covenant relationship pure and holy is a jealousy directed towards Israel as His partner. He desires her to not defile the holy thing they have going by introducing any other between them. When she does, as here in Shittim, then the jealousy of the Lord rises up against Israel for playing harlot. God has a zeal for the relationship, and so is jealous of it, that anything should corrupt it or come between them.

It finds expression in the requirement of Moses that the leaders among the men were to execute in broad daylight all those in their group who had joined themselves to the Baal of Peor. It is said that the reason for this is that the ‘fierce anger of the Lord might turn away from Israel’ - that is, the punishment of the offenders would make certain that the whole people would not be destroyed. Later, we learn that a plague had also been sweeping through the people of Israel.

[5] A blatant offence

While everyone was weeping over the consequences, a leading Israelite man called Zimri [verse 14] and a well-connected Midianite woman called Cozbi [verse 15] both went into Zimri's tent. It was a clear and flagrant issue – they were private in the tent and the implications were obvious.

[6] Phinehas, the son of Eleazer, made atonement.

This act of flaunted rebellion was observed by Phinehas. He was Aaron's third son. He arose, took a spear and, going into the tent, he ran the couple through with the spear. Immediately the plague, which had taken 24,000 people, stopped.

Then the Lord spoke to Moses. He made clear the following matters:

[1] Phinehas had turned away the wrath of God. That is, because of his person and work there had taken place a change in the Lord's attitude towards Israel. This change was not a matter of God changing his mind because He had been wrong – it was drawn from the very nature of God through Phinehas himself.

[2] The Lord's reason as to why Phinehas had turned away the wrath of God is now stated. Phinehas had no command to act on, he had no promise of God to motivate him for what he did. And the death of the couple was the external result but not the effective matter before God.

The effective thing - what counted with God - was that Phinehas was jealous with God's jealousy among the people. That is, he had shared with God His own jealousy. There was, in the jealous response of Phinehas a true answer that corresponded with the Lord's own perspective. Phinehas showed he had shared [participated] in what the Lord was experiencing – and he gave the satisfying response that the Lord was looking for. That is, what turned away the wrath was that one man gave the response that answered to the Lord's own life. These are matters that centre upon his person-to-person oneness with the Lord.

[3] The way we know that the wrath of God was turned away as His jealousy for the covenant was met by Phinehas' jealousy in feeling as God felt about the matter, was that the plague stopped "...so I did not destroy the sons of Israel in my jealousy" [verse 12]. An external result was there to be seen. But we need to remember that it is a result – the cause is sheeted home to the shared life of jealousy for the covenant; an answering to God that was satisfying to Him.

[4] This sharing in the jealousy of God meant that God gave to Phinehas His covenant of peace. This covenant of peace, for him and his descendants, is described as a "covenant of perpetual priesthood" – and it is given to Phinehas because he "was jealous for His God and made atonement for the sons of Israel".

121 – What light does Phinehas' action shed on Jesus' death?

[1] - The atoning element in Phinehas' action

There is no doubt here as to what was the atoning element. It was not the mere death of Zimri and Cozbi. It was the moral element, the mind of Phinehas, his zeal for God. He had a sympathy with God's judgement on sin, and this sympathy was the essence of the atoning work.

Our thinking is directed to the relational exchange taking place between man and God where the response of the man is pleasing [satisfying] and appropriate to God because it arises out of the shared perception of what answers to God's own nature and character. It is an answer of the man who has a share in the life of God.

[2] It directs us where to look in the life of the Lord Jesus for what accounts for His atoning life, death and resurrection and ascension. Indeed, it connects for us the understanding of his eternal priesthood so enacted in his atoning death and expressed in the results of his ascension into the heavens.

It asks that we look to the Person of the Lord as the true basis of the atoning death. That is we should seek the meaning of His death not in some theory about how it works, but in His relationship with His Father and the shared life and perfect responses that he gave to the Father for us. The action behind the atonement is filial – the relationship of a Son to a Father. This is the basis of what God finds satisfying to Himself in Christ's death for us.

[3] - How the atonement is connected with eternal priesthood.

This record of Phinehas' action prepares our hearts to understand the foundation laid in the atonement for the eternal covenant of peace and the everlasting priesthood of Christ. The connection between the death of Jesus and the subsequent priesthood of Jesus is made clear. For what the Lord gave to Phinehas, in the light of the atonement he had wrought was [1] my covenant of peace and [2] an everlasting priesthood.

It enables us to see the direct connection of the "new covenant" of peace – and what is peace but reconciliation? - which was inaugurated "in my blood" as we see it in His teaching at the last supper [Matthew 26.26-29; Mark 14.22-25; Luke 22.15-20; 1 Corinthians 11.23-26]. There are profound connections here that are made much clearer.

[4] - Where shall we look for what satisfies God in Jesus' death?

This material directs us where to look in the atonement of Christ for what is satisfying to God. It is not the physical pain and the suffering in the flesh that satisfies God. Rather, it is the moral and spiritual elements in the sufferings - the revulsion at sin that arises from Christ's holy life shared with God. These matters of the spirit and the heart of their shared life are the nerve centre of His sufferings in tasting death for every man. For in His Spirit He was jealous

for the glory of the Lord and also acted in a way that, through his death, there was a judgment upon sin. Sin was seen to be sin. It was a salvation for men and women through God's judgment of sin.

[5] - Wrong and right questions.

This section of the Old Testament also instructs us as to the right questions to be asking of the death of Jesus as an atonement. The question we are not asking God is one of method, along the lines of "How does this work?" That will lead us to the theories of the atonement which can be asked by the intellect but not necessarily arise from a revelation of God's heart.

Rather, the question is one of God's heart and holiness, along the lines of "Why did You accept this? What is there in the death of Christ which satisfies Your holy heart and Person?" It is this last question that will yield results for our conscience. For what satisfies God's own heart will be the foundation upon which we shall find our conscience shall be at rest. And, at the same time, it will show why the cross of Jesus is the revelation of the heart and the holy love of God like nothing else is.

[6] - Vindication of God's righteousness – the justification of God - which precedes expression of mercy.

*See Forsyth, (1917,1988) Chapter 9
Forsyth, (1909) The Cruciality of the Cross,*

Whenever men and women suffer under the hand of God's judgment, they usually resist Him. Often they attack what He is doing as something uncalled for, something wrong and unloving from their point of view. They blame God, when they suffer, even though their sufferings are simply the consequence of their own actions. In this way, they call the rightness of God into question. They act as His judge.

When Phinehas acted, he did so out of deep conviction that God was right and that the blatant act of fornication and idolatry was wrong. In this way, he re-asserted the righteousness of God. He showed that God was right all along - and in showing it he vindicated His righteousness. He justified God in the eyes of men and women.

This vindication of divine righteousness, which is what we see in Phinehas' action, is a necessary step to be taken before we see the manifestation of God's mercy, which is what we see in God's response. For He stops the plague. This will instruct us also in the work of Christ for us. We shall be looking for His work to be a vindication of God's righteousness on a world scale, prior to it being that which is associated with God's mercy for mankind.

This powerful theme will be taken up by Paul in showing that the revelation of the gospel is also accompanied by a manifestation of God's wrath from heaven as an outworking in the world of sinners who suppress the truth of God [Romans 1.16-32]. Then after showing that no one is righteous in the world, but that all are accountable to God, Paul shows that the righteousness of God is seen in the putting forth of Jesus as a propitiation for sin; indicating

that God is just in Himself - vindication of His righteousness - and that He is graciously the One who justifies sinners as a gift [Romans 3.21-26].

“The idea of judgment is bound up with moral order of a very real, immanent, and urgent, not to say eternal, kind... How can Christ be at once the living embodiment of the moral law [and so both standard and judge] and also the living grace of God and the agent of reconciliation? This is the issue in the Cross, and for many it has been its offence. And the line of answer is that the grace is the judgment; that grace, acting by way of atonement, has in its very nature a moral element, which does not leave the indifferent immune, but becomes their judgment. Judgment is the negative side of love's positive righteousness.

...So the justification of God is not given us by Christ; it is Christ; who under the judgment from man took His native place as the judge of all the earth, justifying the God of holy love in His justification of all the world.” (Forsyth, 1917, 1988) page 189-80, 187.

4 - The death of Jesus

122 - In what does the suffering of Jesus as the God man lie ?

As we look at the two sides of the suffering of Jesus, we need to remember that this is separating, for the purposes of our thought, what is actually one integrated matter taking place in the one Person.

[1] From the manward perspective.

The Gospel records of the trial, mockery and crucifixion of Jesus make clear the human suffering, the enduring of dishonour and shame for our sake and the terrible agony of the criminal's excruciating death. The shame of being naked on a cross, experiencing the thirst and bodily struggle and the thrust of the spear, are part of the record. We are reading the record of a public execution; we must not think that the physical agony was not real, nor the personal pain of dishonour and mockery – it was.

In reflecting on the physical agony, we mustn't think that Jesus, as being God, was enabled to endure his suffering. That is, as God, He was strengthened to bear the physical agony - as a sort of miraculous power given to Him at that time. This is to play His deity off against His humanity. In terms of His humanity then, we must think of his faith, that He meets this trial with trust in God to carry Him through in His human physical weakness. This surely is the thrust of

Psalms 22, which Jesus quotes in his agony. While the physical agony for the man was intense however, there is another clearer way to understand where His pain lay.

[2] From the Godward perspective

But if we are to take seriously that He is truly God and man, it is because He is God's Son that his personal dignity gives infinite value to his sufferings. And it is not that His deity makes easy the physical suffering; it is rather that as God He suffers as only the Son of God can suffer, being who He is.

As in all things, it is the person who establishes and gives the meaning to his work. Jesus' sufferings are overwhelmingly great because of Who He is as the Son of God, Who has taken mortal flesh. It is the holiness and love of Christ that makes his pain so specific to Him. And if the sinfulness and the miserable condition of sinners was painful to Christ - then it must be painful *in proportion to how his holiness and love would know it and feel it*.

Some people are preoccupied with penalty. For them it is not the holiness and love of the Saviour which are central. They think of the physical pain and the agony as a punishment of Jesus. That the cross was an infliction of death as part of the criminal code is not to be ignored. But, if we are considering the meaning of the atonement with respect to God it is not the main focus.

123 - Christ's dealings with men on God's behalf - His Apostolic work.

See Campbell, [1856,1996] Chapter 10

[1] Jesus is our Apostle in that He comes from God to men and women as an authorised messenger [Hebrews 3.1]. In his honouring of the Father before men and women, Christ showed a natural flow of love to the Father. For us this means that: [1] He will show us the Father; [2] He will vindicate the Father's Name; [3] He will bear witness to the excellence of the will of God for us - a will against which we rebelled [Isaiah 55.4]. [4] He will witness to the trustworthiness of the Father's heart in which we refused to put our confidence.[5] He will bear witness to the unchanging character of the love in which there was always hope for us, though we had destroyed ourselves. [6] He will show us, in this way, the effect of our sins on the heart of the Father.

[2] He bears witness through His personal human perfection; a perfection that arises from his active decisions made throughout his life as He constantly trusted his father. This is seen in: [a] following the Father as a dear child in love and trust; [b] in his perfect brotherly love in his walk with men, which was loving and long suffering.

In coming to live among us, and taking flesh, He lived in constant contact with the carnal mind of those around Him. In this way he suffered a great weight upon His spirit. This was the source of his great sorrow. In being a Son who is the life of His Father lived out before men,

Christ's honouring of the Father caused men to dishonour Him. His manifestation of this brotherly love was repaid with hatred; and He found that reproach broke his heart [Psalm 69.20]. He was a man of sorrows.

But He found great joy and peace in His walk with the Father. His constant testimony of his experience of "my joy" and "my peace" was a statement of the secret joy and peace which He was experiencing in knowing that He was engaged in the Father's will as an obedient Son [John 16.33; 20.21,24; 17.13.].

His sorrow was also expressed in the atonement: for the Lord, in His death, honoured the Father before all men in that He had a zeal for God.

[a] He was jealous for God, This outgoing zeal is the element in the atonement that halts and arrests the course of God's judgement and wrath on men.

[b] He also had a sympathy with the Father. For when the Father condemned sin in the flesh, the Lord, by undergoing sin's condemnation in being made sin for us, expressed his oneness of mind with the Father. It is this sympathy of mind with His Father which is expressed when He makes atonement for sin.

Both of these witness-bearing aspects, a jealousy for God and a sympathy with His interests, are found exemplified in Phinehas and so clearly, are a part of the atoning work. What is important for us to see is the way and the form in which these sufferings entered into the atonement. It is not that there is simply suffering in the atoning work.

Most importantly, what the sufferings of Christ show is what our sins mean to the Father's heart [Psalm 119.136 "my eyes shed streams of water because they do not keep Your Law"].

124 - The pain of a person is peculiar to them - this is especially true for the God-Man.

The pain of Jesus then, is a peculiar pain like no one of us has ever known. No one knows sin like Jesus, or knows more about sin than Jesus. But He does not know it as a practitioner, He knows it as a holy Son. He knows from His position within the holy intimacy of the Godhead what sin does to the shared life of the Godhead. He knows how it intrudes between God and his creatures. How it is a destructive affront to the holy life of God. For this reason His hatred of sin is from the side of the Son, who has God as his Father in holy love. As His Father hates sin for what it is in itself, so does Jesus. He is aware of the grief and pain that our sins cause the Godhead.

It is precisely because of this holiness and love of Christ that the pain He endures is peculiar to Him, and in no way is a punishment of Him. Rather, it is a pain endured by holiness through being holy, and love through being love, which gives us insight to the weight that is upon Christ as He suffered. For it is in proportion to His hatred of sin, and his love for sinners

that He would suffer. He is suffering what He suffers just because He sees sin and sinners through God's eyes, feeling for them with God's heart. This we cannot think of as penal suffering.

125 - Distinguishing between an atoning sacrifice for sin and enduring as a substitute the punishment for sin.

We must distinguish between the atoning sacrifice for sin as offered to God and the enduring the punishment due to sin as a substitute for others, which was accomplished for man. So, while it is true that Christ suffered as an atoning sacrifice, the atoning element cannot be in what He suffered as a punishment; for, because of the nature of the suffering, it could not be.

From the Godward side, which is the significant side of meaning, Christ's suffering is not to be understood as pain that arises out of the Father punishing His Son. On the contrary, His Father was always well pleased with His Son's work, and especially in his identification with sinners, for which He was specifically sent. As we have seen repeatedly at His baptism, and transfiguration, the Father expressed His pleasure at His holy Son's life as He identified with sinners. In the light of this, the Father is very far from punishing His Son. [See #67 DS2 2013].

From the manward side however, it is true that the chastisement of our peace was upon Him. He has born our sins and carried our sorrows. He is our representative Substitute – chosen by God to be rejected – in that He died – and died for us.

So the central issue in understanding the atonement and the pain and the suffering of Jesus is to see that it is not pain as the pain of a penalty; but pain which He experiences because of Who He is. To Him who was holy and loving, it was the sort of pain appropriate to such a One who died under the weight of our sin and misery.

This is what is presented to us to trust as essential in the sacrifice of Christ and the atoning virtue in that sacrifice. For this is what moved God, and satisfied Him in the atonement. It is this understanding of what He sees in the work of His Son on the cross which will set up a satisfaction within Himself such that it can be said that "God was in Christ, reconciling the world to Himself, not counting their trespasses against them." [2 Corinthians 5.19]. See section 93 of this paper.

126 - Types and the antitype - the Mosaic patterns of sacrifice and the work of Jesus.

See Boan [2004] Israel's Feasts and Fasts Section 5

God instituted sacrifices through Moses [Leviticus chapters 1-9]. They are the burnt offering, the cereal offering, the peace offering, the purification offering and the reparation offering as well as the Day of Atonement [Leviticus 16]. As we have seen, these were a gracious provi-

sion by God for the way His grace was to come to the people of Israel when they had sinned against Him.

In regards to the atonement, they show us the necessity for sacrifice and they say something about the form that sacrificial offering should take. But they do not shed any light on the nature of the atonement itself - indeed, as we shall come to see, they could not.

By their form they show what God requires of us in coming to Him as sinners. They are types or patterns of what should be done. But they offer no explanation as to why they take that form. These unexplained matters would be such things as:

[1] The perfection required in the victim to be slain; why was that? [2] The confession of sins over the victim; what did that signify? [3] The laying on of hands on the victim itself by the offerer; what is the connection? [4] The principle that there is no remission of sins without the shedding of blood: this is not explained?

In all of these above activities, just what is an atonement is, is not made clear at all, until we see some light in the actions of Phinehas and apply it to the work of the Lord Jesus. In fact, Jesus and His atoning work is the antitype - that is, the pattern that is contrasted against the types and which also takes their place. Both these ideas, of contrast [=over against] and "taking the place of" are found in the Greek preposition "anti". For when we see Jesus Christ, it becomes clear that all these elements in the types anticipate something of His Person that is required for His sacrificial work. We can say further, that it is not until his Person is in place that certain elements in the types make sense at all.

It is along these lines that the main questions the types raise in our minds are answered in the Antitype. Such questions as were Campbell's [b1800d;1872]. They were:

- [1] Why must the One who atones be the holy One of God?
- [2] What is it in his holiness that qualifies Him for the bearing of our sins?
- [3] In what sense [and how] have our sins been laid on Him?
- [4] Being laid on Him, how is it that his shedding of his blood is an atonement for them?
- [5] Why do we have redemption through his blood "because" He offered Himself without spot to God, through the eternal Spirit? Why "because"? [Hebrews 9.13-15].

The answers to these questions turn upon Who Christ is and how his heart shared what Phinehas was given to know.

127 - It is the contrasts of Christ with the Old Testament types that instruct us.

Hebrews 10.4-10. [Psalm 40.7-11, John 17.6, 26

In Hebrews is that the questions above are not answered by tracing the points of agreement between the type and the antitype, but rather we are to look at the places where they differ,

in this way a contrast is formed. This issue of contrast is central to understanding what the letter to the Hebrews is saying, and why it is impossible to return to Judaism after knowing Christ.

By comparison and contrast, the writer to the Hebrews presents to us that the antitype has the atoning efficacy the type clearly did not have. Christ's work is supremely adequate, in a way that indicates the sacrifices of bulls and goats manifestly was not.

This is stated strongly in Hebrews 10. The ineffectiveness of the blood of bulls and goats is found, not in the fact that God did not provide them in the first place - He did! Viewed in the light of Christ's coming, their ineffectiveness is found in that they are temporary, provisional, partial and preparatory. Christ's atoning work is permanent, final, real and complete. In the contrastive language of the writer to the Hebrews, the types and patterns are seen to be "shadows"; Christ is the "reality".

"[4] For it is impossible for the blood of bulls and goats to take away sins. [5] Therefore, when He comes into the world, He says, 'Sacrifice and offering Thou hast not desired, but a body Thou hast prepared for Me: [6] in whole burnt offerings and sacrifices for sin Thou hast taken no pleasure. [7] 'Then I said, 'Behold I have come [in the roll of the book it is written of Me] to do they will, O God'" [8] After saying above, "Sacrifices and offerings and whole burnt offerings and sacrifices for sin Thou hast not desired, nor hast Thou taken pleasure in them" [which are offered according to the Law], [9] then He said, Behold, I have come to do Thy will." He takes away the first in order to establish the second. [10] By this will we have been sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all." Hebrews 10.4-10
 ASV

Here we see, amongst other things, that:

[1] the preparation of the body of the Lord was a work of God. At the Incarnation, God was preparing a body through which His heart's desire - our sharing of His life - was to be realised.

[2] This comes about through the will of God. This will is expressed as: [a] not wanting sacrifice according to Law; [b] having no pleasure in burnt offerings and sacrifices for sin; [c] desiring our sanctification through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ; [d] this offering would be once for all, and [e] the taking away of the first [the types] is done for the establishment of the second [the antitype] which is the effective atonement.

We are to understand the "will of God" here [as it is found in Psalm 40, particularly verses 7-11] stands for God's Character and heart. It means that we see in the "will of God" not so much a plan which He wants to execute - for that would declare His intention without shedding light on the nature of the atonement. Rather, it is in the work of Christ in offering Himself that we see the will of God, not as a mechanism, but as a showing forth of His heart - it will be the Name of the Father as revealed through the activity of the Son, who does only what His Father has in His heart.

128 - A Son's love for God, and a Brother's love to man, is united in Christ.

Campbell, (1856,1996) chapter 15

In the Person of Jesus there is a meeting of the two aspects of the atonement. It is the will of God to send Him in the likeness of sinful flesh [Romans 8.3] and to make Him a sacrifice for sin. And so He prepared [Hebrews 10] a body for Him in such a way as to lay the burden of our sins upon Him. Because He is related to us the Son of God came under our burden of sin.

The first commandment, about having love towards God, is expressed by the spirit of Sonship. Then there is a second which is "like" it. This second commandment towards one's neighbour is expressed in the Lord Jesus as a spirit of Brotherhood towards us.

"[10] For it was fitting for Him, for whom are all things, and through whom are all things, in bringing many sons to glory, to perfect the author of their salvation through sufferings. [11] For both He who sanctifies and those who are sanctified are all from One Father, for this reason He is not ashamed to call them brethren [12] saying, 'I will proclaim Thy Name to my brethren, in the midst of the congregation I will sing thy praise.' [13] And again, 'I will put my trust in Him'; and Again, 'Behold, I and the children whom God has given Me.' [14] Since then the children share in flesh and blood, He Himself likewise also partook of the same, that through death He might render powerless him who had the power of death, that is, the devil; [15] and might deliver those who through fear of death were subject to slavery all their lives. [16] For assuredly He does not give help to angels, but He gives help to the descendent of Abraham. [17] Therefore, He had to be made like his brethren in all things, that He might become a merciful and faithful high Priest in things pertaining to God, to make propitiation for the sins of the people. [18] For since He Himself was tempted in that which He has suffered, He is able to come to the aid of those who are tempted." [Hebrews 2.10-18]

Jesus is not our Brother because He takes flesh. He does not become our elder Brother in the Incarnation. It is the other way about; He takes flesh because He is our Brother, and always has been. He and us are from the One source.

From Jesus flowed this brotherly self-sacrificing love which worked redemption for us. He [1] dealt with men on the part of God in relation to us being sinners under the condemnation of a broken law; and [2] is dealing with God on behalf of men insofar that God wanted to grant to us adoption as sons, that is, cause us to grow from being children under law to coming to full sonship so that we may enter into our inheritance [Galatians 4.1-4].

129 - Christ's dealings with God, on men's behalf - his Priestly work.

Jesus is our Priest in that He goes from men to God on their behalf in matters pertaining to God. [Hebrews 3.1, 5.1] Christ is dealing with the righteous anger of God against sin

God's wrath against sin is a reality, whatever we may say about the way it is to be dealt with. There is a satisfaction necessary in God's response to the sins of mankind. So when Christ

is dealing with the righteous wrath of God against sin He must accord to it what is its due. Further, His work of dealing with the condemnation will precede his intercession for us.

The Lord's condemnation of our sins, and of his holy sorrow concerning them, was clearly expressed in his life as in his death. This acceptance of the rightness of the condemnation and the sorrow for the sin, shows the direction of the Lord's mind in dealing with these sins in approach to the Father. As a human, Christ is of one mind with the Father concerning sins - it is for this reason the weight of the sins is realised.

He comes under all the intensity and weight of that wrath of God against sin when, in his humanity, He receives that wrath in a perfect way; He yields to it as being right. He yields to it as One who is at one mind with the Father about what the sin means, and also what the wrath means.

130 - Jesus absorbs the wrath of God for He is the perfect Responder to the Father, as His beloved Son.

Perfect response has absorbed His anger. And only a righteous and holy man could have absorbed it. What do we mean by absorb?

Consider a very human example. Think of the anger of someone stirred up in a powerful way by the action of some other. They work themselves up in their anger and as they go to meet the other they are sure what they are going to say and how they will make their case. It is in their heart to give them a piece of their mind. They burst into the room where the person is and reel off all the things in their anger which they have to express. They speak for a long time, venting their anger with great power. When they stop, they steel themselves for the defensive reaction which they fully expect - in fact that they have probably said too much.

Instead of that reaction there is total agreement. The other person says, "You are right. So right to be angry, I am quite in the wrong!" By their absolute agreement with the anger of the other they have absorbed the anger. For they have made the only right response. The anger is dealt with; absorbed by the beauty of the response.

What Jesus, the child of God, has done in his divine humanity, is that He has said on the cross "I am standing here, drop all your wrath on me and as You do it I am declaring [not by words so much as silently, in my death] to the world "you're righteous". So, this is the judgment of the world, because Christ has declared the righteousness of God and absorbed the perfect response.

He knows about the Father what the rebels never know; except they come to know through Him. He knows that the Father's heart is good towards them. He "Bore the sin of many and interceded for transgressors. Interceded because He answers wonderfully the heart of Father, as He makes the perfect response to wrath.

Although, it is true that, in places such as John 17 we see He prayed for us; we understand “interceded” not so much as referring to His ‘praying’ or ‘speaking’ on our behalf. Here, His interceding arises fundamentally out of the fact that He is the God man. It is deeply connected with the Incarnation – “a body You have prepared for me” [Hebrews 10.5c]. It is Who He is that is the basis for and the underlying power of His intercession for us. In the same way, it is His ‘flesh’ which is the veil which constitutes the basis of the new and living way He has inaugurated for us to enter the Holy of Holies - entering the relationship with the Father heart of God - which is the essence of sonship [Hebrews 10.20-22].

In his humanity, he was “made sin” [2 Corinthians 5.21]. He receives that sin which comes into Him and it finds in Him the perfect response - a deep sorrow for it, and a proper contrition based upon the knowledge of what it means to God. And He has all this whilst bearing no personal consciousness of sin. This confession, this public proclamation, this response from Christ is what was really required of us, but we could not render it. He rendered it for us in our nature as our true Brother.

131 - God grieves over our sin as well as punishing for it.

Throughout this we need to see that the suffering that the Lord has in the flesh is a very different matter than the suffering of the damned and cursed, who suffer sin’s penalty.

The coming of sin into the world brings sorrow - not only for the sinful who are punished, but also to the holy and loving, who feel what holiness and love feel at the presence of sin; powerful revulsion, deep affront, and grief for what it does to relationships. We want to be able to glorify God in the suffering of Christ, which means we do not see it as a penalty the Father exacted upon the Son.

The grieving of God over our sins is not so readily received into the heart as the idea that God punishes sin. That He punishes sin is important, and it can terrify us; and yet the awareness that He grieves is infinitely more important, for it has the power to work holiness in us; it alone can purify us.

This truth is found consistent with the fact that the Holy Spirit, after He has taken up residence in our person, is capable of being “grieved” over our life when it is sinful.

132 - Christ’s sufferings reveal God Himself, His heart and holiness.

We can see from these considerations:

[1] that Christ’s suffering is divine, while it is also human.

[2] God then, is revealed in the actual suffering Christ, as a holy Son, underwent. In this

regard we see that [a] God's righteousness and condemnation of sin, is seen as being in the suffering, and not merely demanding it. At the same time [b] God's love is also seen as being in the suffering, and not merely submitting to it. [3] Christ's suffering then is the form the divine life within Him took in connection to the circumstances in which he was placed. It was not a penal infliction coming from outside Him. It is in this light that these texts make sense: Isaiah 53.10 - He made his soul an offering for sin; Heb 9.26 He put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself and Heb. 1.3 He purged our sins

133 - After dealing with our sins, the Lord Jesus interceded for us

See (Forsyth, The Cruciality of the Cross, 1909) page 203-208

Part of the full response of the Son to the Father was the following up of the confession the Son of God made with His intercession.

Christ's intercession for us did not move God in such a way as to make Him do something that it was not His mind to already do. The intercession flows out of the bearing of our sins. It is this base which allowed Him to go on and lay hold of the hope for man which was in God. Isaiah 53.12b "He bear the sin of many, and interceded for the transgressors"

His intercession then is [1] not an attempt to change the heart of the Father, [2] but a confession which combined three aspects. There is [a] an acknowledgment of the righteousness of God against sin; [b] an acknowledgement of the holiness of God; this is powerfully confessed [c] an affirmation of the hope there is for man that comes from that holy love of God. A holy love that is deeper than wrath, because wrath has its origin in the holy love.

Since the holy love is what determines the nature of the wrath we have confidence that [a] holy love's righteousness was being responded to, and that [b] the mind which expressed holy love agreed that such wrath must be appeased.

For His sacrifice is a sweet smelling savour to God not only [a] because it is a response to the divine condemnation of sin, [b] but also the response to the divine love in its yearnings over sinners.

Christ, who is acting for us is

[1] sufficiently one with us [Christ in the form of the servant]:

[2] sufficiently separated from our sin to feel in His sinless the godly condemnation of them and sorrow for them. Such as Christ in the form of the Son of God would know:

[3] so confessing them before God. He is

[4] sufficiently near to our need of mercy to be able to plead for mercy for us [in the form of the servant];

[5] and yet, at the same time, so abiding in the bosom of the Father, in the light of His love and the secret of His heart, that His intercession for us can take full and perfect advantage of all that is there that is on our side, and wills our salvation [in the form of the Son of God].

134 - The meaning of the Blood of Christ

After (Forsyth, The Cruciality of the Cross, 1909) chapter 4

[1] Jesus did die.

That Jesus died is the important thing. The imagery of the “blood” sets the way that we must speak about His death. If He had died another way it would require a use of different imagery.

[2] It is not the quantity of the flow that we consider.

Nor does it matter how much blood was spilt, a little, or every drop. That would only matter if the virtue was in the blood itself, as a substance. If it were a matter of the quantity, then the sacrifice would not have been complete unless every drop had been used.

[3] Leviticus 17 - sacrifice, and where the value did not lie.

“And any man from the house of Israel, or from the aliens who sojourn among them, who eats any blood, I will set My face against that person who eats blood, and will cut him off from among his people.

For the life of the flesh is in the blood, and I have given it to you on the altar to make atonement for your souls; for it is the blood by reason of the life that makes atonement.”
{Leviticus 17.10-11 ASV}

While Leviticus 17 contains the hints we need, we should be aware of the following limitations in using the image of the blood:

[a] Nowhere in the Old Testament does the value of the sacrificial blood lie in blood itself. For the majority of worshippers in Jesus’ day the origin of sacrifice was forgotten and the rite was practised as if the blood in itself had an atoning value. The symbolic significance was gone. As a result, the New Testament writers had to restore the meaning to the Old Testament imagery - we have to do the same.

[b] It does not lie in the suffering which may accompany the shedding of blood. This is never dwelt upon in the Old Testament.

[c] Nor does the value lie in the life which is symbolised by the blood. Although that is a rich line of idea as applied to the Person of Christ in the New Testament, the sacrificial power is not placed there by the Old Testament.

[d] Nor does the value of the blood lie in the obedience of faith which responds to God's will and grace. The obedience which comes from faith may be necessary to bring a sacrifice but it is not the basis of its acceptance.

[4] Leviticus 17 - Sacrifice, and where the value does lie.

The value of sacrifice lay in it being the will of God, it was God's appointment. What He had ordained there was the machinery of grace for Israel's national purposes. The issue was the nation, not the individual soul. It arises out of grace that God wills to receive the offered life and accounts it for public righteousness. Sacrifice was used individually because it was first corporately established and given.

[5] Jesus' dying was voluntary.

However, it would have mattered a great deal if Jesus had died a natural death, by accident or disease. For what matters is that his life was laid down, not that it was taken from Him.

For His purpose, everything turned on His will to die. Yet, for that purpose it did have to be a death of moral violence - a death inflicted by human wickedness and the violation of the law - to give both the full force to man's sin, and the full meaning to Christ's blood.

[6] Jesus' death is a victory over death.

The acceptable thing to God was not Jesus' demise, or a martyr's effort. His death was acceptable to God because it was the victory over death. Death was abroad and ruling mankind; Jesus' death was death's arrest and capture. It involved a crisis. The resurrection, which followed His death, is the crowning of a real moral crisis and achievement. His death and resurrection are two sides of the one act. His death is redemptive, setting captives free.

[7] For Jesus to "shed His blood" means He surrendered His whole self, lovingly and entirely.

His death was a true moral deed, a conquest, in which His whole personality was victorious and decisive. The shedding of blood, the seat of life itself, means this - that what He did was a total surrender which involved his whole self.

What God is looking for in His own holiness, is not some religious tribute. But God's total intimate Life is seeking a holy self; someone who brings their whole self to this achievement. The essential thing was not self sacrifice, for that can be wilful, futile and mischievous. But sacrifice of the central self - not sacrifice by self, but of self, and of the whole self. It is a sacrifice that was not simply voluntary, but personal, loving and entire. Not till then is it striving unto blood.

And it was an offering of a holy self to a holy God from the side of sin - the human side where sin held sway - and so that sacrifice involved not only substitution but judgment. It brought a satisfaction to God, a settlement, a vindication or a resolution. We see a similar requirement in what Nathan required of David in God's Name. It was not only repentance and confession but satisfaction [2 Samuel 12.7,13-14].

[8] *Blood is spilt in matters sacrificial and also criminal.*

In Jesus' day, the method of execution was by stoning or crucifixion - two methods which require blood to be spilt. Also, the sacrificial offering required the spilling of blood. In this way, the criminal and the religious procedure concurred in a way that they do not for us today.

[9] *Pagan sacrifices presume a different view of God than those of Israel.*

There are two truths, found in Leviticus 17.11 which differentiate Old Testament sacrifice from pagan sacrifice.

[a] "I have given it to you..." Sacrifice is the result of God's grace and is not its cause. When a man uses sacrifice to approach God such a thing is first given by God before it was given to Him. The real ground of any atonement is not in God's wrath but in His grace. Ideas of placating, or conciliating, or of mollification of God are excluded. There is no thought of purchasing God's grace.

[b] It appears that the pleasing thing to God, and the effective element in the matter, was not the death but the life. The blood was shed as a means of isolating the life from the material base of the body and the flesh, and presenting it in this refined state to God. The suffering of the animal was not uppermost here, but as a means simply of getting away the life for its sacred use; a use implied in the kosher prohibition of not eating the body with its blood. Further, the shedding of blood was not a punishment on the guilty or the innocent. Nor was it intended to free the offerer from the death penalty: for such sins as warranted these there was no sacrifice.

[10] *The outward, material sacrifice was a symbol of the real inner sacrifice, which was the offerer's offer of himself.*

The victim, or the gift, signified the hearty submission of the offerer to God's prior gift and provision. It was the living symbol of a life; that is, of an obedient will. It was an individual use of God's public gift to man in the provided way of access. In this way, it was a surrender to God's positive will and this surrender was done in the sacrificial act. It was not a gift to God but an appropriating of God's gift provided by institution of sacrifice itself.

It was not the blood of itself which was effective. Indeed, the prophets only spoke against Israel's use of sacrifices like these when they discerned that they were using them as something magic, which worked by virtue of the blood itself..

So the worship was ethical in its nature and responsive and obedient in its form. The sacrifices were consecrated by self sacrifice - what lay on the altar was the offerer's will. What was precious was not the elements, or the thing, but the act.

The whole of the Hebrew system always tried to down play the place and the value of the gift, and to worship in spirit and truth a seeking, acting and giving God. A widow's mite could be more meaningful than a nation's mint. Compare this with the way Protestantism has al-

ways understood the sacraments - the precious thing was the act, not the symbolising thing.

[11] By "blood" we understand that what is offered up is a life in its most intimate, spiritual and moral form. Then we can say:

[a] that the pleasing, satisfying and atoning thing to God is not the suffering. Atonement is not to be understood along the lines of equivalent pain. Suffering becomes a condition or a form which accompanies the act, and not a factor, in the sacrificial act.

[b] that the essence of the sacrifice is not a thing, or a piece of property. It must be life. Our will is our dearest life, the thing we most cling to and give up last. Our will alone is our ownest own, the only dear thing we can and really ought to sacrifice. The blood as life means the central will, the self will, the whole will, in loving surrender.

This is the sacrifice which is found also in God. The cross in the New Testament does not so much portray God as accepting sacrifice as making it. And then it is not the extremity of physical suffering which is presented but the greatness of the death; not the depth of the agony but the height of the surrender which is the triumph of eternal life.

Seen powerfully in the prelude of Gethsemane, the death of Christ is the active death of self will - a yielding into the holy will of God. But we can also say that it was a death of self will done also by that will.

We make sacrifices which, although costly, do not draw blood from us. They do not go to the centre of our life. But with Christ, his blood means that He drew upon the centre of Himself and involved His total self. The foundations of his greater deep were broken up. His whole personality was put into his work and identified with it - not merely his whole interest or ambition.

Man's sin drew upon all of God's Son, and taxed the Holiest to the maximum. It made call upon what is most deep in Christ and dear to God - Himself, His Person, His vital soul, His blood. The love of God is only shed abroad into our hearts [Romans 5.5] in the shedding of this most precious blood.

[12] *The blood of Christ does not just speak of his great effort, but of His self surrender and of a holiness needed for a grace for all mankind.*

When we speak of the blood of Christ then we don't just mean the effort of his whole self, but the exhaustive obedience and surrender of his whole self. But not in the sense of a "voluntary humility", no self-willed, self-chosen obedience, no self created task as some devotees do. It was complete obedience on a universal scale to the moral requirements of grace. That is, a complete surrender to what the holiness of grace required in a situation of when the whole of mankind, as

a race, sins. [See (Forsyth, *The Cruciality of the Cross*, 1909) p. 203]

[13] Modern understandings of the blood which are not moral in application.

We do need to think of the blood of Christ, but we must interpret it to modern ears carefully. It requires thinking about its ethical terms and avoid all imagery which doesn't make that clear. There are modern understandings which are attempts to do this which stray, viz.

[a] Christ's death is seen as the supreme glorification of heroic sacrifice. He is not moving to the Father's heart because He is a hero.

[b] the manifestation of God's love under the terms of sacrifice. He is not simply showing us here how sacrificial is God's love towards us.

[c] its object is to move mankind to repentance and thus supply the condition for forgiveness, instead of it being of itself God's act of forgiveness. This confuses cause with effect as we have shown.

[14] Atonement has to do with a judgment.

What we must now speak of is the side which has to do with judgment, expiation, atonement. It magnifies the weight of human sin, as the sense of God's holiness grows. This is the side we cannot drop away from Christianity without giving the Gospel away. Individuals can remain Christian while they discard it - but the Church cannot.

Love, pity and kindness are not redeeming love. Philanthropy looks at amelioration of people's difficulties or conditions; not redemption, which is the restoration of persons. Charity does not reconcile, only justice does. There is great need to recover today the moral salt of judgement.

[15] Any sacrifice in the midst of sin is a judgement.

By his holiness being present in such a world, the sacrifice of Christ was inevitable. Holiness must suffer in the midst of sin. It was not offered to man but for man; even though it is true it had immense effects on man. It was first offered to a holy God, to hallow His Name and make it honourable. But this moves us from sacrifice to the graver issue of judgment. This moves us in imagery from temple ritual to criminal execution; from the religious ordering of Israel to the civil code and social order based on God's righteousness. And full self-sacrifice to a holy God involves the submission of self to the moral order and judgement of God. Holiness and judgement are forever inseparable.

[16] As a judgment - sacrifice reveals God's holiness - showing what sin means to God.

We need to take the holiness of God seriously, not as an attribute of God's, but as His essence and nature, changeless and inexorable. The holiness of God is the deeper revelation in the cross than the love of God; for it is the holiness of Their intimate life which gives His love its

divine value. And it is meaningless without judgement - for He could not wipe the slate and write off the loss. He must either afflict with punishment or assume it Himself. He chose the latter course, honouring his Name and law whilst saving the guilty. He took His own judgement.

And His judgment had results which exceed those of punishment - producing results in a holier way.

[a] It was vindicative, not simply vindictive. It vindicated his name and justified sinners [Romans 3.21-26]; not simply caused them to be condemned. It proved the true rightness of His love, not just took revenge.

[b] It re-established holiness and did not just condemn the sinner. Expiation is the exact opposite of exacting punishment - it is assuming it.

[c] Exactment to the last farthing is not required in a full, true and sufficient satisfaction. The law is satisfied by a due confession - a public acknowledgement of the moral situation. Holiness alone can fully assess the morality of the matter. Sin cannot, for it is unholy, and love cannot, for it is self centred. Only the Holy One of God can make a good confession here.

The word confession is used here in its most basic sense. When we confess something we take a hidden, often private, matter and we make it public. So we can confess the truth of a matter which is at the time hidden. Or we can confess the sin of a matter, which was also hidden. What is common is the idea of showing something in public in such a way that it is brought into the light and is seen for what it truly is. This is what it is to make a confession, or to confess something.

By His death Jesus made a practical confession. It was not made in words but in a deed. His death spoke. His death was an experience which was holy to God; arising from the Father's intimate connection with His Son, He knew its meaning and power. Jesus' death was sympathetic to man; for it confessed publicly that this was the result of sin and guilt - it stood alongside sinners with understanding.

His dying was a practical confession of God's holiness far more than man's guilt could have testified to. A guilty man, by his guilt, testifies to the holiness in God. But he does so as one who does not know God's life - his guilt being the testimony that he does not know it. Jesus, on the contrary, as the holy Son of God testifies to the holiness of God in a much greater way. For his death shows what is the cost to the life of God for sin to come into the world. As He confesses, by His death, sin's result - He correspondingly shows its greater seriousness for the life of God.

God requires His holiness to be confessed prior to the confession of sin. For it is by the first, that we come to the deepest expression of the second. As His holiness is seen by the cross, so the confession of sin is also seen by the cross.

[17] Christ's death a confession of holiness concerning sin.

Death, a confession with His blood – the loss of His life – is the only sense in which Christ could confess from his inmost experience. His practical life-engaging confession [showing forth] of holiness from the midst of sinners He loved, is the divine significance of His blood. He stood beside the sinners but He was on God's side in this matter.

Love in sacrifice costs moral pain. It is a pain which is active, which takes the initiative. It is not passive, as in inflicted pain. Not the pain of a sting, which is passively endured; but of wrath, of anger which suffers in order to express itself. It is not the pain of suffering a wrong, which is passive. But it is the pain actively endured as the cost involved in the rectifying of a wrong. It is not the passive pain of grief, suffered because of loss; but the active pain as the cost of bringing judgment. It is the sort of pain which sin gives to God, when in His reaction against it, He judges and destroys its fruit. [We see this in parenting children – there is a sacrificial love which costs us pain in the correction and rectifying of our children's lives.]

In the death of the God-Man two sides of the effect of sin are seen. The blood of Christ stands not simply for the sting of sin on God from God's side; but also for the scourge of God on sin, from man's side. Not simply, from God's side, of His sorrow over sin; but also, from man's side, of God's wrath on sin. Not simply, from God's side, the bleeding of the side which gives creation to a Bride; but also, from Man's side, the bloodshed of the battle that casts down the prince of this world [John 12.31] and destroys his works [1 John 3.8]. There is also a breaking in us of the power of guilt in which we were involved, and an establishing of the holy kingdom.

[18] Christ first justified God – the first step in saving man.

As we saw Phinehas' work pre-figure, Christ's first business in saving was to honour the Father's holy love. He saved man because He vindicated God's Name and so first saved God from being mocked by man. His death was not merely a collision with the historic forces of Rome and the social powers at work in Israel at the time, but the recognition within these of the holy wrath of God at work in the world.

Christ's work was the power so to deal with man's wrath against God [by letting them kill Him] as to accept God's wrath against man [dying on their behalf]. In this way, He made sin further God's purpose of salvation which it had sought to foil or obstruct. The necessity of Christ's death was created more deeply by God's holiness in Him than it was demanded by the perversity of Rome and those in Israel that He exasperated. He died more deeply moved by the reasons He found in His life with God, than He was killed by opponents whom He historically encountered.

It is this element of dealing with the curse, doom, and judgment which is preserved in the historic word of Christ's blood. It is not death that atones, but that supreme act and expression of holy and obedient life that does justice to God's holiness as the Son alone could do;

and which is possible only under the conditions of death, and such a death as Christ died.

[19] Christ experienced sin as God does; and its effects as Man does.

In being “made sin”, we mean that He was treated as sin, although not as a sinner. Christ experienced sin itself as God does, while He experienced its effects as man does.

He realised, as God, how real sin was, how radical, how malignant, how deadly to the Holy One’s very being. The wages of sin is death; death is the result of sin. So, when Christ died at sin’s hands it meant that sin brought death to the holiness of God, for both could not live in the same world. When He rose it meant that what was to live and rule in the world was the Holy God. Sin and death are now conquered.

Dying as man, Christ placed his whole self beside man as accountable, but on God’s side in the issue. While standing with sinners, He was, at the same time, confessing God’s holiness in the judgement, and justifying His treatment of sin.

There is no more sublime order of experience than from the heart to bless and praise a good and holy God in a situation such as this. It is to this order of experience that the work, the blood of Christ belongs.

[20] The justifying of God by Christ is basis of the justifying of man.

Never is man so just with God as when the God-Man’s broken, holy heart calls “just” the judgement of God which he experiences but has not himself earned. And never could man be just with God but through God’s justification of Himself as it is worked in the blood of Christ.

It is only as we see the groundwork laid here for the self-justification of God, that there is a basis for the justification of man. The sinner could only be saved by something which damned the sin. The Saviour was not punished, but, from our side, He took the penalty of sin, the chastisement of our peace. But He did not feel chastised or condemned. But he willingly bowed, with a moral understanding that only the sinless have, to the ordinance of God, the suffering and death which was rightly ordained should attend the sin of his brethren.

[21] The expiation through Christ atoned for His murder.

Often in the New Testament the word for propitiation is translated as expiation. We have seen that propitiation is attached to the idea of sacrifice. It has to do with covering our sins from the eyes of God. In this way, the sinning persons are covered from His wrath. Propitiation is directed towards persons.

Expiation is a matter of crimes - as you propitiate a person, so you expiate a crime. This means that the due penalty for the crime is paid in full. When that happens it is said that the crime has been expiated.

Christ only speaks of his blood at the end of his ministry [except for the ransom passage] at

the Last Supper. Throughout his life He spoke of forgiving grace but without any reference to any expiation. This is because His prophetic words are not enough of themselves; they are an invitation to come, but the cross is the enacting of what makes the coming possible for men and women. As a prophet He could not make the people cleave to Him, or see that He was more than a prophet, He couldn't keep them from murdering the Messiah.

According to the Old Testament, this murder was sin which was high handed, having no expiation - sacrifice for murder was unprovided for in the Hebrew economy of grace. There was no grace for the deliberate rejection of grace. A new expiation must be made which would cover this. The death of Christ expiated the inexplicable sin of killing Him, and the sin of all humanity with whom God was dealing in and through Israel.

We see this powerfully enacted on the day of Pentecost. When the crowd, on hearing Peter's speech [Acts 2.14-36] as to how they have killed the Messiah whom God had raised and exalted, are cut to the heart. Obviously thinking, because they know the Law, that they are without hope in this matter, they find the grace of God has provided for them. There is forgiveness offered them through the death of Jesus - the very One Whom they had killed.

[22] God was satisfied with the death of His Son.

In considering the death of Jesus we can't avoid using the word "satisfaction". To say that God is "satisfied" we do not mean that:

[a] there was a quantitative replacement of anything that God had lost. Nor do we mean

[b] that there was a glutting of God's anger by an equivalent suffering on someone.

What satisfies God in the death of His Son was the adequate confession, by the act and the suffering, of the truth that God is holy when He judges. In this the holiness of God was established before the whole world.

The satisfaction to God was that He was met by a love that was equally holy as his own from the human side, confessing Him as a justifying God of holy love.

There is no compromising of the case by some pact, ritual or judicial exchange, but so that the Holy Father finds the rest of His own conscience in the personal achievement of a holy Son. "This is my beloved Son..."



Janice and David Boan, an Australian couple, live in Perth, the capital city of the state of Western Australia.

They have been married for 46 years and have five children and 19 grand-children. Throughout this time, they have been teaching the Lord's Word among Christians.

After David was ordained in 1967, he served in two Anglican parishes and a School Chaplaincy in Melbourne. They trained for missionary service but after health issues prevented them going overseas, they taught in a community at the Montrose House and later took the parish of St. Jude's Carlton for seven years. Moving to Perth in Western Australia in 1981, David cared for the Anglican parish of St Alban's in Highgate for seven years.

In 1988, they left the Anglican scene to teach into scattered and smaller groups of Christians in some Australian towns. Later the work extended into the UK, Italy, and India throughout 1995-2000.

At the beginning of 2012, in concert with others, their work became more accessible at the York St Silo, at 4 York Street in North Perth. It is here that David and Jan share the work of the putting forth of God's Word.

Discipleship Schools have been running a long time. This

current series represents the most up-to-date version of our current teaching.



4 York Street North Perth WA 6006
www.davidboan.net