

“A Study In Scarlet”: The Theology Of Blood And Sacrifice

Kevin Kay

Text:

Introduction:

- I. In **1887**, **Sir Arthur Conan Doyle** introduced his famous detective **Sherlock Holmes** to the world in a short story entitled **“A Study In Scarlet”**
- II. I have **borrowed** that title for this study, because there is a **scarlet thread** that runs all throughout the Bible from Genesis to Revelation – **the scarlet thread of blood**
- III. In the course of our study, we want to examine:
 - A. The **OT Sacrifices**
 - B. The **Theology Of Blood**
 - C. **“Forgiveness”** Under The Old Covenant
 - D. The **Typology** Of Old Testament Sacrifice
 - E. **Penal Substitution**
 - F. **Practical Lessons** For Us Today

Body:

- I. **The Old Testament Sacrifices**
 - A. The **Types** of Jewish Sacrifices:
 1. There were **two bloodless sacrifices**:
 - a. The **meal/grain offering** (Lev. 2:1-16; 6:14-18; 7:9-10)
 - b. The **drink offering** (Num. 15:1-12)
 2. There were **four bloody sacrifices**:
 - a. The **burnt offering** (Lev. 1:1-17; 6:8-13)
 - b. The **peace offering** (Lev. 3:1-17; 7:11-34)
 - c. The **sin offering** (Lev. 4:1-35; 5:1-13; 6:24-30)
 - d. The **trespass/guilt offering** (Lev. 5:14-6:7; 7:1-8)
 - B. The Jewish Sacrifices in **Leviticus**:
 1. **The Burnt Offering** (Lev. 1:1-17; 6:8-13)
 - a. *Other Terms*:
 - 1) **“Burnt Sacrifice”** (KJV)
 - 2) **“Holocaust Offering”** (NAB)
 - b. *Occasions*: Although the burnt offering could be offered by **itself** (Jdg. 11:31), it usually accompanied other sacrifices such as the **sin offering** (Lev. 5:7; 12:8) or the **trespass offering** (Lev. 14:21-31; Num. 6:11-12). This was the most **common sacrifice** and the **most costly**

-
- c. *Offering: Domestic animals*, not wild animals or game, **without blemish** (Lev. 1:3, 10; 22:18-25). Only **the very best** was good enough for God (cf. Mal. 1:7, 13)
 - 1) *Herd: 1 Cow* [male] (Lev. 1:3-9)
 - 2) *Flock: 1 Sheep or 1 Goat* [male] (Lev. 1:10-13)
 - 3) *Birds: Turtledoves or Young Pigeons* [unspecified gender] (Lev. 1:14-17)
 - d. *Blood Rite*: The priest **sprinkled** the blood of the victim on **all sides of the altar** (Lev. 1:5, 11)
 - 1) *Note*: If a **bird** was offered, the priest **drained out** its blood on the **side of the altar** (Lev. 1:14-15)
 - e. *Sacrifice: Entire animal* (Lev. 1:8-9, 12-13; Ex. 29:18) except **the skin** (Lev. 7:8) or a **bird's crop** (Lev. 1:16)
 - 1) No doubt, this is why this sacrifice is often referred to as a "**whole burnt sacrifice**" (Dt. 33:10; Psa. 51:19; 1 Sam. 7:9)
 - 2) *Note*: The burning of the animal on the altar seems to be the **most significant element** in the burnt offering
 - f. *Leftovers*: The **skin** was given to the priest (Lev. 7:8); a **bird's crop** was cast beside the altar (Lev. 1:16)
 - g. *Purpose: Appeasement or Propitiation* ["a sweet aroma to the Lord"] (Lev. 1:9, 13, 17; 8:21; 23:18)¹; **Consecration; Atonement** (Lev. 1:4; 14:20; 16:24); **Obedience** (Gen. 22:1-2, 13; Ex. 24:3-8); **Thanksgiving** (Ex. 18:11-12)
 - 1) Before **the flood**, God's anger waxed hot against sinful mankind (Gen. 6:5), and He destroyed all who were not in the ark (Gen. 7:21-23). After the flood waters receded, Noah offered burnt offerings, and God's anger was appeased (Gen. 8:20-21)
 - 2) **David** appeased God's wrath by offering burnt offerings and peace offerings (2 Sam. 24:25; 1 Chr. 21:26-27)
 - 3) **Job** offered burnt offerings for his "friends" to appease God's wrath (Job 42:8)
 - 4) **Judah** and **Jerusalem** experienced God's wrath because burnt offerings had not been offered (2 Chr. 29:7-8)
2. **The Grain Offering** (Lev. 2:1-16; 6:14-18; 7:9-10)
- a. *Other Terms*:
 - 1) "**Meal**" (ASV)
 - 2) "**Meat**" (KJV)
 - 3) "**Cereal**" (NAB; RSV; Wenham)]
 - b. *Occasions*: The grain offerings accompanied the **burnt offerings** and **peace offerings**, but not the sin offerings or the trespass offerings. Sometimes they were offered **on their own** (Lev. 2:14; Dt. 26)
 - c. *Offering*:
-

- 1) **Various forms** of grain could be offered
 - a) *Uncooked grain*: **Fine flour, oil, & frankincense** (Lev. 2:1-3)
 - b) *Cooked grain*: (Lev. 2:4-10)
 - 1] *Baked in an oven*: **Unleavened cakes** of fine flour mixed with **oil** or **unleavened wafers** anointed with **oil** (Lev. 2:4)
 - 2] *Cooked on a griddle*: **Unleavened fine flour** mixed with **oil** (Lev. 2:5)
 - 3] *Cooked in a pan* [fried]: **Fine flour** with **oil** (Lev. 2:7)
 - 4] *Offering of the first fruits* [Harvest time]: **Green heads of grain** roasted on the fire anointed with **oil** and **frankincense** (Lev. 2:14)
- 2) **Various amounts** of grain was offered depending upon the animal that was being sacrificed as a burnt offering or a peace offering
 - a) *Per Lamb*: **1/10 ephah** of fine flour plus **1/4 hin** of oil (Num. 15:4-5)
 - b) *Per Ram*: **2/10 ephah** of fine flour plus **1/3 hin** of oil (Num. 5:6-7)
 - c) *Per Bull*: **3/10 ephah** of fine flour plus **1/2 hin** of oil (Num. 5:8-11)
 - 1] *Note*: An *ephah* = 3/8 – 2/3 bushel and a *hin* = 1 gallon (BEB, 2138-2139)
- 3) **Salt** accompanied every grain offering² (Lev. 2:13)
- 4) **Leaven** and **honey** were never used (Lev. 2:11; 6:17)
- d. *Sacrifice*: A token **handful** (Lev. 2:1-2; 6:14-15)
- e. *Leftovers*: The remainder was given to the **priests** as a part of their income (Lev. 2:3; 6:16-18)
 - 1) *Cooked Offerings*: Remainder given to **officiating priest** (Lev. 7:9)
 - 2) *Uncooked Offerings*: Remainder given to **all priests** (Lev. 7:10)
- f. *Purpose*: **Dedication; Consecration; Thanksgiving**³ (Lev. 2:14; Dt. 26:1-11); **Appeasement** or **Propitiation** [“a sweet aroma to the Lord”] (Lev. 2:2, 9, 12; 6:15, 21; 23:13, 18); **Remuneration** for the priests (Lev. 2:3; 6:16-18)
3. **The Peace Offering** (Lev. 3:1-17; 7:11-34)
 - a. *Other Terms*:
 - 1) **“Fellowship Sacrifice”** (HCSB; NIV)
 - 2) **“Sacrifice of Fellowship Offering”** (LEB)
 - 3) **“Sacrifice of Well-Being”** (NRSV)
 - b. *Occasions*: The peace offering was a **voluntary sacrifice**, only required on **Pentecost** (Lev. 23:19). The **Passover lambs** might be viewed as a sort of peace offering. At **great events**, peace offerings were offered in **great numbers**
 - 1) The ratification of **the covenant** (Ex. 24:5)
 - 2) The dedication of **the tabernacle** (Num. 7:17, 23, 29, 35, 41, 47, 53, 59, 65, 71, 77, 83, 88)

-
- 3) The **Jordan crossing** into the Promised Land (Dt. 27:1-8)
 - 4) The dedication of **the temple** (1 Ki. 8:63-64)
 - c. *Types of Peace Offerings*:
 - 1) *Thanksgiving*: (Lev. 7:11-15)
 - a) In addition to the animal sacrifice, **unleavened cakes** mingled with oil, **unleavened wafers** anointed with oil, and **cakes mingled with oil**, and **cakes of leavened bread** were offered as a heave offering (Lev. 7:12-14)
 - 2) *Freewill*: (Lev. 7:16)
 - a) This was a **spontaneous act of generosity** prompted by God's goodness
 - b) Anyone who wanted to **eat meat** had to offer the animal as a peace offering (Lev. 17:3-5)
 - c) This rule was **later relaxed** for those who lived far from the altar (Dt. 12:15-16, 20-21)
 - d) **Elkanah** offered an annual freewill peace offering (1 Sam. 1:3-5)
 - 1] Although his sacrifice is not called a peace offering, his distribution of portions to his family indicates that it was
 - 3) *Votive*: When **a vow** was made or completed (Lev. 7:16)
 - a) When **Hannah** prayed for a son, she made a vow to give him back to the Lord (1 Sam. 1:10-11). When Samuel was weaned, she offered a **lavish votive peace offering** (1 Sam. 1:24-28)
 - d. *Offering*: **Domestic animals**, not wild animals or game, **without blemish** (Lev. 3:1, 6). Only **the very best** was good enough for God (cf. Mal. 1:7, 13)
 - 1) *Herd*: **1 Cow** [male or female] (Lev. 3:1-5)
 - 2) *Flock*: **1 Sheep** or **1 Goat** [male or female] (Lev. 3:6-11, 12-17)
 - a) *Note*: **Slightly blemished animals** could be offered in a free will offering (Lev. 22:23)
 - e. *Blood Rite*: The priest **sprinkled** the blood of the victim on **all sides of the altar** (Lev. 3:2, 8, 13)
 - f. *Sacrifice*: **Fat⁴**, **Kidneys**, Lobe of the **Liver** (Lev. 3:3-5, 9-11, 14-16); **Fat tail** [Sheep] (Lev. 3:9)
 - 1) Kurtz suggests that the fat was the "**first, best, and most distinguished part**, and as representing the whole of the flesh. In these portions the whole of the flesh was sanctified and consecrated to Jehovah." (Bold emphasis added, SWOT, 222)
 - 2) To support his view, he mentions several expressions where the word "**fat**" suggests the "**very best**":
 - a) "The **fat of the land**" (Gen. 45:18)
 - b) "**Fat of kidneys of wheat**" (Dt. 32:14 YLT)
-

-
- c) “The **fat of wheat**” (Psa. 81:16 YLT)
 - d) “The **fat of oil** and **fat of wine**” (Num. 18:12)
 - e) “The **fat of the mighty**” (2 Sam. 1:22)
 - g. *Leftovers*: A small part of the remainder was given to **the priests** and the major part was given to **the offerer**
 - 1) *Priests*: Wave **Breast** (Lev. 7:31)
 - 2) *Priest*: Heave **Thigh** [Right Shoulder] (Lev. 7:32-34; 10:14-15; cf. Ex. 29:26-28)
 - 3) *Offerer*: **Remainder** eaten in a meal. This meal was for the worshippers, not God (cf. Psa. 50:12-14)
 - a) *Thanksgiving Offering*: Eaten the **same day** (Lev. 7:15; 22:29-30)
 - b) *Votive or Freewill Offering*: Eaten the **same day** or **the next** (Lev. 7:16-18)
 - c) Eaten only by those who were **ceremonially clean** (Lev. 7:19-21)
 - d) Eaten with **joy** (Dt. 12:5-7)
 - 1] *Note*: The **sacrificial meal** seems to be the **most significant element** of the peace offering
 - h. *Purpose*: **Celebration** because of peace and fellowship with God⁵ (Dt. 12:5-7); **Appasement** or **Propitiation** [“a sweet aroma to the Lord”] (Lev. 3:5, 16; 17:5-6)
 - 1) Because of this **sacrificial meal**, the peace offering was viewed as a **joyful celebration**
 - 4. **The Sin Offering** (Lev. 4:1-35; 5:1-13; 6:24-30)
 - a. *Other Terms*:
 - 1) “**Purification Offering**”⁶ (Wenham)
 - b. *Occasions*: The sin offering was a **regular**, though **less important**, ingredient of regular worship (cf. Num. 28-29)
 - 1) The sin offering was offered for:
 - a) **Unintentional** sin (Lev. 4:2, 22-23, 27-28; 5:15; Num. 15:22-29)
 - b) Sins of **ignorance** (Lev. 4:13)
 - c) Sins of **omission** (Lev. 5:1-4)
 - 2) **Presumptuous sin** [lit. “with a high hand”] resulted in **death** (Num. 15:30-31; Dt. 17:12-13)
 - 3) *E. E. Carpenter*: “It is true that **no specific rite** was available for one who committed adultery or sinned with a high hand. But **God’s fuller revelation of Himself** in the OT included **His readiness to forgive all kinds of sins against Him**, when a spirit of **humility** and **repentance** was present (Ps. 51; Mic. 6:8).” (Bold emphasis added, “Sacrifices and Offerings in the OT,” ISBE, Rev. Ed., 4:273)
-

-
- c. *Sacrifice*: **Domestic animals**, not wild animals or game, **without blemish** (Lev. 4:3, 23, 28, 32). Only **the very best** was good enough for God (cf. Mal. 1:7, 13). **Various animals** were offered depending upon **who** was making the sacrifice
- 1) *Anointed Priest*: **1 young Bull** (Lev. 4:3)
 - a) While all priests were anointed (Ex. 28:41; 30:30; 40:15; Num. 3:3), this probably refers to **the high priest** (Lev. 21:10; Num. 35:25)
 - b) The priests were to be **the teachers** of the people (Dt. 33:10), and especially the high priest; therefore when the high priest **sinned**, he **involved the whole nation**, not just himself
 - 2) *Congregation*: **1 young Bull** (Lev. 4:13-14)
 - a) The “**congregation**” has been variously interpreted:
 - 1] The **Sanhedrin**
 - 2] The whole nation of **Israel** (Ex. 12:3, 6; 17:1; Num. 20:1-2)
 - 3] The people represented by their **leaders** (See Wenham, “Leviticus,” *NICOT*, 98)
 - 3) *Ruler*: **1 Kid** [male] (Lev. 4:23)
 - 4) *Commoner*: **1 Kid** or **1 Lamb** [female]⁷ (Lev. 4:27-28, 32; 5:6)
 - 5) *Poor*: **2 Turtledoves** or **2 Young Pigeons** [unspecified gender], one as a sin offering and the other as a burnt offering (Lev. 5:7)
 - 6) *Very Poor*: **1/10 ephah fine flour** without oil or frankincense (Lev. 5:11)
- d. *Blood Rite*: The procedure **differed** depending upon **who** was making the sacrifice
- 1) *Priest or Congregation*:
 - a) Some of the blood was sprinkled **seven times before the veil** separating the Holy of Holies from the Holy Place (Lev. 4:5-6, 16-17)
 - b) Some of the blood was smeared on the **horns of the altar of incense** (Lev. 4:7a, 18a)
 - c) The rest of the blood was poured out at the **base of the altar of burnt offering** (Lev. 4:7b, 18b)
 - 2) *Ruler or Commoner*:
 - a) Some of the blood was put on the **horns of the altar of burnt offering** (Lev. 4:25, 30)
 - b) The rest of the blood was poured out at the **base of the altar of burnt offering** (Lev. 4:25, 30, 34)
 - c) *Note*: When the offering was **a bird**, part of its blood was **sprinkled** against the **side of the altar** and the rest of the blood was **drained out** at the **base of the altar** (Lev. 5:7-9)
- e. *Sacrifice*:
- 1) *Priest*: **Fat, Kidneys, Lobe of the Liver** (Lev. 4:8-10)
-

-
- 2) *Congregation*; **Fat** (Lev. 4:19)
 - 3) *Ruler or Commoner*: **Fat** (Lev. 4:26, 31, 35)
 - 4) *Poor*: **1 Turtledove** or **1 Young Pigeon** undivided as a sin offering (Lev. 5:8) and **1 Turtledove** or **1 Young Pigeon** as a burnt offering (Lev. 5:10)
 - 5) *Very Poor*: A token **handful** (Lev. 5:12)
- f. *Leftovers*:
- 1) *Sacrifice for High priest or Congregation*: **Hide** and **carcass** burned outside the camp (Lev. 4:11-12, 21)
 - 2) *Sacrifice for Ruler or Commoner*: **Remainder** given to the officiating priest (Lev. 6:26, 29)
 - a) *Commoner*: Remainder eaten by **the priest** (Lev. 6:26, 29)
 - b) *Very Poor*: Remainder given to **the priest** (Lev. 5:13)
 - 3) *Offerer*: **Nothing**
- g. *Purpose*: **Purification**⁸ (Lev. 12:8; 14:19; 15:31; 16:19); **Appeasement** or **Propitiation** [“a sweet aroma to the Lord”] (Lev. 4:31); **Atonement** (Lev. 4:35; 5:13; 18; 6:7)
5. **The Trespass Offering** (Lev. 5:14-6:7; 7:1-8)
- a. *Other Terms*:
- 1) **“Compensation”** (ESV)
 - 2) **“Restitution Offering”** (HCSB)
 - 3) **“Guilt Offering”** (LEB; NAB; NASB; NRSV; RSV; YLT)
 - 4) **“Penalty for Guilt”** (NET)
 - 5) **“Penalty”** (NIV)
 - 6) **“Reparation Offering”** (Wenham)
- b. *Occasions*: “This was a **special kind of sin-offering**, and was offered for transgressions where **restitution** or **other legal satisfaction** could be made, or was made. Its main purpose was to make **expiation** for dues withheld from God...and from man....” (Bold emphasis added, ZPBD, 739)
- 1) The trespass offering was **not part of the regular official sacrifices**
 - 2) It is **difficult to distinguish** between the sin offering and the trespass offering. In fact, it is even **difficult to identify the texts** that deal with these two sacrifices
 - a) Is Lev. 5:1-13 talking about the **sin offering** or the **trespass offering**?
 - 3) Some believe that the **same ritual** was observed for both
 - a) The fact that there was **“one law for them both”** (Lev. 7:7) supports this conclusion
 - 4) However, some scholars argue that the **trespass/guilt offering** had more to do with **offences against one’s neighbor** while the **sin offering** had to do with **offences against God**
-

-
- c. *Offering: Domestic animals*, not wild animals or game, **without blemish** (Lev. 5:15, 18; 6:6). Only **the very best** was good enough for God (cf. Mal. 1:7, 13)
 - 1) *Sin Against Holy Things: 1 Ram* from the flock plus **Silver Shekels** (Lev. 5:14-16)
 - 2) *Sins Of Ignorance: 1 Ram* from the flock plus **Valuation** (Lev. 5:17-19)
 - 3) *Lying And Swearing Falsely: Restoration of Property plus 20% and 1 Ram* from the flock with **Valuation** (Lev. 6:5-6)
 - d. *Restitution:*
 - 1) The offerer restored stolen **property plus 20%** ⁹ (Lev. 6:5)
 - 2) The offerer sacrificed his **trespass offering** (Lev. 6:6)
 - e. *Blood Rite:* The priest **sprinkled** the blood of the victim on **all sides of the altar** (Lev. 7:2)
 - f. *Sacrifice: Fat, Fat Tail*, Fat covering the Entrails; **Kidneys**, and Lobe of the **Liver** (Lev. 7:3-5)
 - g. *Leftovers:*
 - 1) *Priest:* Carcass eaten by **male priests** in a holy place (Lev. 7:6-7)
 - 2) *Offerer: Nothing*
 - h. *Purpose: Reparation or Restitution*¹⁰ (Lev. 5:16; 22:14)
6. **The Drink Offering:** (Lev. 23:13; Num. 15:1-12)
- a. *Other Terms:*
 - 1) **“Libation”** (LEB; NAB; YLT)
 - b. *Occasions:* “The drink offerings were **not independent offerings** under the law, but were made only in connection with **the meal-offering** which accompanied all **burnt-offerings** and all **peace-offerings** which were **Nazirite, votive, or freewill** (Num. 6:17; 15:1-12). They did not accompany sin and trespass-offerings.” (Bold emphasis added, ZPBD, 740)
 - c. *Offering: Wine*
 - d. *Sacrifice:* The amount of the drink offering depended upon **the animal** that was being sacrificed, and it was **poured out** to the Lord, not drunk (Num. 28:7; cf. Phil. 2:17; 2 Tim. 4:6)
 - 1) *Per Lamb: 1/4 hin* of wine (Num. 15:4-5)
 - 2) *Per Ram: 1/3 hin* of wine (Num. 5:6-7)
 - 3) *Per Bull: 1/2 hin* of wine (Num. 5:8-11)
 - a) *Note:* A *hin* = 1 gallon (BEB, 2138-2139)
 - e. *Leftovers: Nothing*
 - f. *Purpose: Appeasement or Propitiation* [“a sweet aroma to the Lord”] (Num. 15:7)
-

7. *Note:* When more than one kind of offering was made (cf. Num. 6:14-17), the order was usually: (1) **Sin** or **Trespass** Offering; (2) **Burnt** Offering; (3) **Grain** and **Drink** Offerings; (4) **Peace** Offering
- First, **sin** had to be dealt with (**Sacrifices of Expiation:** Sin & Trespass)
 - Second, the worshipper **committed** himself to God (**Sacrifices of Consecration:** Burnt, Grain, & Drink)
 - Third, the worshipper **communed** with God (**Sacrifices of Fellowship:** Peace)
(ISBE, Rev. Ed., 4:271-272)

C. The **Law Of The Jewish Sacrifices** (Lev. 6:8-7:38)

- Why **the differences** between Lev. 1-5 and Lev. 6-7?
 - There is a difference in **purpose** or **focus**
 - Lev. 1-5 focus on what **the worshipper** has to do
 - These instructions are addressed to “**the children of Israel**” (cf. Lev. 1:2; 4:2)
 - These instructions are for “**anyone**” (Lev. 2:1; 4:27)
 - Lev. 6-7 focus on **the priest’s role**
 - These instructions are for “**Aaron and his sons**” (Lev. 6:9, 25)
 - Most of the regulations in these two chapters are for **the priests’ information**
 - Only two paragraphs are addressed to **the people** as a whole (Lev. 7:22ff, 28ff)
 - There is a difference in **arrangement**
 - Lev. 1-5: **Burnt, Grain, Peace, Sin, Trespass**
 - Lev. 6-7: **Burnt, Grain, Priest’s Grain** [not mentioned earlier], **Sin, Trespass, Peace**
 - Gordon Wenham:* “In chs. 1-5 the motive for the arrangement seems to be **theological**: the ‘food offerings’ producing ‘a soothing aroma for the Lord’ are grouped together (chs. 1-3), and then come the purification and reparation offerings (chs. 4-5) securing the forgiveness of sins. In chs. 6-7 the sacrifices are arranged in order of **their frequency**. The regular daily sacrifices come first, i.e., the burnt offering, cereal, and priest’s cereal offering. This is followed by the purification offering, which was compulsory only at certain festivals or after someone had sinned. The reparation offering was never offered on a regular basis, but was mandatory following certain sins. Finally, the peace offering was generally an optional sacrifice.” (“Leviticus,” NICOT, 118-119)
- The Law Of The Burnt Offering** (Lev. 6:8-13)
 - The **fire** on the altar of burnt offering should **never go out** (Lev. 6:9, 12, 13)
 - The priests had to wear the **correct clothing** (Lev. 6:10-11)
 - The **ashes** had to be cleared away each morning (Lev. 6:10-11)

-
3. **The Law Of The Grain Offering** (Lev. 6:14-23)
 - a. The grain offering normally accompanied the **burnt offering**
 - b. **All priests could eat** of the remainder of this offering in the **court of the tabernacle** (Lev. 6:16, 18)
 - c. The grain offering had to be **unleavened** (Lev. 6:17)
 - d. All who partook had to be **ceremonially clean** (Lev. 6:18)
 - e. The priests were to offer a **daily grain offering of 1/10 ephah of fine flour**, half in the morning and half in the evening (Lev. 6:20)
 - 1) *Note*: This offering is **not mentioned** in Lev. 1-5
 - 2) **Josephus** mentions this daily offering (*Antiquities*, 3:10:7)
 - 3) It was to be made in a **pan with oil** (Lev. 6:21)
 4. **The Law Of The Sin Offering** (Lev. 6:24-30)
 - a. The sin offering was to **be killed in the same place as the burnt offering**, the **north side** of the altar of burnt offering (Lev. 6:25; cf. 1:11)
 - b. The remainder of the sin offering was to be **eaten** by the **officiating priest** in the **court of the tabernacle** (Lev. 6:26)
 - c. Those who touch the sacrifice must be **ceremonially clean** (Lev. 6:27)
 - d. Blood-sprinkled garments must be **washed in a holy place** (Lev. 6:27)
 - e. **Earthen vessels** used to boil the sacrificial blood must be **destroyed**, and **bronze vessels** must be **thoroughly washed** (Lev. 6:28)
 - f. **All males** among the priests could eat of the sin offering (Lev. 6:29)
 - g. No sin offerings whose **blood is brought inside the tabernacle**, i.e. sin offerings for the high priest or the congregation (Lev. 4:7, 18), could be eaten. It was to be burned (Lev. 6:30)
 5. **The Law Of The Trespass Offering** (Lev. 7:1-10)
 - a. The trespass offering was to be **killed in the same place as the burnt offering**, the **north side** of the altar of burnt offering (Lev. 7:2; cf. 1:11)
 - b. The sacrificial blood must be **sprinkled all around on the altar** (Lev. 7:2)
 - c. **All males** among the priests could eat of the trespass offering (Lev. 7:6)
 - d. The trespass offering had to be **eaten in a holy place** (Lev. 7:6)
 - e. The **remainder** of the trespass offering was to be given to **the officiating priest** (Lev. 7:7)
 6. **The Law Of The Peace Offering** (Lev. 7:11-21)
 - a. *Thanksgiving Offering*:
 - 1) The **sacrifice** of thanksgiving
 - 2) **Unleavened cakes** mixed with oil, **unleavened wafers** anointed with oil, or **cakes of blended flour** mixed with oil (Lev. 7:12)
 - 3) **Leavened bread** (Lev. 7:13)
-

-
- 4) *Heave Offering*: **One cake** from each offering. It was to be given to the **officiating priest** (Lev. 7:14)
 - 5) **Remainder** of the animal to be **eaten the same day** (Lev. 7:15)
 - b. *Votive or Voluntary Offering*:
 - 1) **Remainder** of the animal to be **eaten the same day** or **the next** (Lev. 7:16-17)
 - 2) If anything is eaten on **the third day**, the sacrifice would be **null and void**, and the offender would **“bear his guilt”** (Lev. 7:18)
 - 3) Flesh that comes in contact with anything **unclean** was **not to be eaten** (Lev. 7:19)
 - 4) All who were **ceremonially clean** could partake of the peace offering meal (Lev. 7:19)
 - 5) If a **ceremonially unclean person** ate of the peace offering meal, he was to be **cut off** from his people (Lev. 7:20-21)
 - a) Being **“cut off,”** at least sometimes if not always, meant **death** (Ex. 31:14; Zech. 13:8)
 7. **Fat** and **blood** are not to be eaten (Lev. 7:22-27)
 - a. The fat could be used for **other purposes** (Lev. 7:24)
 - b. The person who **eats fat** was to be **“cut off”** from his people (Lev. 7:25)
 8. The **priests’ portions** from the peace offering (Lev. 7:28-38)
 - a. *Breast*: A **wave offering** [vertical, up-and-down motion] given to Aaron and his sons (Lev. 7:31)
 - b. *Right Thigh*: A **heave offering** [horizontal, side-to-side motion] given to the officiating priest (Lev. 7:32-33)
 - c. Later, the **shoulder**, the **cheeks**, and the **stomach**, from a bull or a sheep, were given to the priests (Dt. 18:3)
 - D. The OT **Sacrificial Ritual**:
 1. **Presentation**: The offerer **selected** and **brought** the sacrificial animal to the door of the tabernacle (cf. Lev. 1:3)
 - a. As already noted, **the sacrificial animal varied** depending on the **type of sacrifice** and with the sin offering, **who** offered the sacrifice
 - b. *Note*: The **tabernacle** was the only spot where sacrifices were allowed to be offered (Lev. 17:1-9)
 - c. There were some **important implications** in this “drawing near”:
 - 1) The sincere offerer drew near to **worship** God
 - 2) He wanted to **honor God**
 - 3) He wanted to **get rid of his sin**
 - 4) He wanted to **live in fellowship** with God and man
 - 5) He **came obediently** bringing the prescribed offering (Morris, AMS, 45)
-

2. **Laying On Of Hands:** The offerer laid his hands upon the head of the animal (cf. Lev. 1:4)
 - a. *Leon Morris:* “The Hebrew verb means something like **leaning on the animal**. It was a **firm contact**, not a casual touch.” (Bold emphasis added, AMS, 45)
 - b. *Gordon Wenham:* “*Lay* is perhaps a rather weak translation of the Hebrew (*šāmak*); ‘**press**’ might be preferable (cf. Isa. 59:16; Ezek. 24:2; 30:6; Amos 5:19). The worshipper was **not just to touch** the animal; he was to **lean on it**.” (Bold emphasis added, “Leviticus,” NICOT, 62)
 - c. This laying on of hands was required for a:
 - 1) **Burnt offering** (Lev. 1:4)
 - 2) **Peace offering** (Lev. 3:2, 7-8, 12-13)
 - 3) **Sin offering** (Lev. 4:4, 15, 24, 29, 33)
 - d. The laying on of hands is **not mentioned** for the **trespass offering**. Payment of **restitution** [the value plus 20% (Lev. 5:16; 6:1-5)] is mentioned instead
 - 1) Therefore some believe that the laying on of hands **did not take place** in the trespass offering
 - 2) However, others believe that **it did take place**, and it was just not specifically mentioned because “it was **self-evident** in the case of the trespass-offerings as well as in that of every other sacrifice” (Bold emphasis added, J. H. Kurtz, SWOT, 247)
 - 3) Furthermore, **confession of sin** is mentioned (Num. 5:7), and that may imply the **laying on of hands** (cf. Lev. 16:21)
 - e. *J. H. Kurtz:* “According to the unanimous tradition of the Jews, **a verbal confession of sins** was associated with the imposition of hands....” (Bold emphasis added, SWOT, footnote 1, 83)
 - f. However there is **no mention of this** in the law of Moses. It only prescribed that **the high priest confess the sins** of the people over the head of **the “scapegoat”** on the **Day of Atonement** (Lev. 16:21)
 - g. The OT does not **explicitly explain** the significance of this part of the sacrificial ritual, and it has been **interpreted in various ways:**
 - 1) **Identification:** The offerer was **identifying himself** with his offering
 - a) He was saying in effect: “This is **my** sacrifice. This is the animal that **I** am offering”¹¹
 - b) This seems so **self-evident** that an act to express it seems **unnecessary** (“Leviticus,” NICOT, 61)
 - 2) **Transferral:** The sins of the offerer were **symbolically transferred** to the sacrificial animal
 - 3) **Substitution:** The sacrificial animal is **taking the place** of the worshipper
 - a) *E. R. Leach:* “The plain implication is that, in some metaphysical sense, **the victim is a vicarious substitution** for the donor himself.” (Bold emphasis added, *Culture and Communication*, p. 89, quoted in Wenham, “Leviticus,” NICOT, 62)

- b) *Gordon Wenham*: “In this gesture he **identified** himself with the animal, or maybe **transferred** his sins to the animal....Thus in giving the animal to God, the worshipper is reminded that **he should die for his sins** had the animal not taken his place. The animal is **a ransom payment** (*kōper*) which **atones** (*kipper*) for the worshipper’s sin.” (Bold emphasis added, “Numbers,” TOTC, 4:228)
3. **Killing The Animal**: The offerer **killed, skinned, and cut up** the animal to be sacrificed before Jehovah (Lev. 1:5-6)
- a. This was **the procedure** for all the bloody sacrifices:
- 1) The **burnt offering** was to be killed at the **north side** of the altar (Lev. 1:5, 11)
 - 2) The **peace offering** was to be killed at **the door** of the tabernacle (Lev. 3:2, 8, 13)
 - 3) The **sin offering** was to be killed:
 - a) At **the door** of the tabernacle if offered for the *high priest* or the *congregation* (Lev. 4:4, 15)
 - b) Where the **burnt offering** was killed if offered for a *ruler* or a *commoner* (Lev. 4:24, 29, 33; 6:25; cf. 9:8)
 - 4) The **trespass offering** was to be killed where the **burnt offering** and the **sin offering** were killed (Lev. 7:2; 14:13)
 - a) *Note*: Since **the altar** of burnt offering is associated with **the door** of the tabernacle (Lev. 1:5; 4:7, 18; 17:6), these different descriptions could be referring to **the same location**; but then again, they might not
 - b) *Note*: If **birds** were sacrificed, they were **killed by the priest** (Lev. 1:14-15; 5:7-8; 14:48-50), presumably because the **small size** of the victim would have made it difficult for one person to do the killing and another to collect and use the blood (Morris, AMS, 47)
- b. The **significance** of this sacrificial element has also been **variously interpreted**
- 1) **Penal substitution**: The death of the sacrificial animal **substituted** for the sinner’s own death because of his sin¹²
 - a) This was the view of the **Jewish rabbis** and the **Church Fathers** (SWOT, 85)
 - 2) **Death to sin**:
 - a) David McClister argues that it represented “**the sinner’s death to his flesh and its desires**” rather than penal substitution¹³
 - b) He argues that this explanation fits what we are told about **Jesus’ death** in the NT:
 - 1] He **died** “to sin” (Rom. 6:10)
 - 2] He refused to be **mastered** by sin (Rom. 6:6)
 - 3] He made a **commitment** to live to God (Rom. 6:9-10) (McClister, PHSS, 104)

-
- c) *Response:* This seems to me to be little more than **assertion** and **assumption**, based upon **limited evidence**
 - 1] Is it likely that those who offered OT sacrifices would have understood that the animal's death signified the **death of their fleshly desires** instead of **penal substitution**?
 - 2] Even if the death of the sacrificial animal did signify the death of the sinner's fleshly desires, how do we know **that's all it signified**? Why couldn't it also signify **penal substitution**?
 - c. There were **some exceptions** to this procedure during special rituals
 - 1) During the **consecration ritual** for the priests:
 - a) **Moses** killed the animals offered for Aaron and his sons (Lev. 8:14-15, 18-19, 22-23)
 - b) On the 8th day, **Aaron** killed the animals offered for the people (Lev. 9:15, 18)
 - 2) During the ritual for **cleansing healed lepers**:
 - a) **The priest** would kill the lamb of the trespass offering (Lev. 14:12-13, 24-25) and the burnt offering (Lev. 14:19)
 - 3) On the **Day of Atonement** [*Yom Kippur*]
 - a) The **high priest** killed the bull of the sin offering for *himself* (Lev. 16:11)
 - b) The **high priest** also killed the goat of the sin offering for *the people* (Lev. 16:15)
 - 4. **Blood Rite:** At this point **the priest** began his work by collecting and manipulating the blood
 - a. *Note:* The **first three steps** of the sacrificial ritual were **the same** regardless of the kind of sacrifice that was being offered, but **differences emerge** with the fourth step
 - b. *Burnt, Peace, or Trespass Offering:* The priest **sprinkled** the blood of the victim on **all sides of the altar** (Lev. 1:5, 11; 3:2, 8, 13; 7:2)
 - 1) *Note:* If a **bird** was offered, the priest **drained out** its blood on the **side of the altar** (Lev. 1:14-15)
 - c. *Sin Offering:* The **procedure differed** depending upon **who** was making the sacrifice
 - 1) *Priest or Congregation:*
 - a) Some of the blood was sprinkled **seven times before the veil** separating the Holy of Holies from the Holy Place (Lev. 4:5-6, 16-17)
 - b) Some of the blood was smeared on the **horns of the altar of incense** (Lev. 4:7a, 18a)
 - c) The rest of the blood was poured out at the **base of the altar of burnt offering** (Lev. 4:7b, 18b)
 - 2) *Ruler or Commoner:*
-

-
- a) Some of the blood was put on the **horns of the altar of burnt offering** (Lev. 4:25, 30)
 - b) The rest of the blood was poured out at the **base of the altar of burnt offering** (Lev. 4:25, 30, 34)
 - c) *Note:* When the offering was a **bird**, part of its blood was **sprinkled** against the **side of the altar** and the rest of the blood was **drained out** at the **base of the altar** (Lev. 5:7-9)
 - d. Why was the blood **manipulated differently** for these various offerers?
 - 1) *Kedar-Kopfstein:* “The **closer** it is brought, the **holier** it is, and the **more significant** the sacrifice.” (Bold emphasis added, TDOT, 3:248)
 - 5. **Preparation Of The Sacrifice:** The offerer **skinned** the animal and **cut it in pieces** (cf. Lev. 1:6, 12a), and the priest put **fire and wood** upon the altar (cf. Lev. 1:7)
 - 6. **Sacrifice On The Altar:** The priest burned the **sacrificial portion** of the animal on the altar
 - a. As already noted, the **sacrificial portion varied** depending on the type of sacrifice (See Appendix A: The Jewish Sacrifices)
 - b. What was **the significance** of the sacrifice?
 - 1) Some have argued that the burning of the sacrifice symbolized the **everlasting punishment of hell**
 - a) But how could such a burning be described as a “**sweet aroma to the Lord**”? (Lev. 1:9)
 - b) Furthermore, the **meal offering** was **also burned** on the altar, and the idea of punishment associated with the meal offering is untenable
 - 2) Most commentators believe that the burning of the sacrifice signified the **appropriation** of the gift to Jehovah¹⁴
 - 7. **Disposal or Dispersal Of The Leftovers:** Once again, this **varied** depending on the **type of sacrifice**
 - a. *Burnt Offering:*
 - 1) *Priest:* **Skin** (Lev. 7:8)
 - 2) *Offerer:* **Nothing**
 - b. *Grain Offering:* **Remainder** given to the priests to be eaten in the tabernacle court without leaven (Lev. 2:3, 10; 6:16-18)
 - 1) *Cooked Offerings:* Remainder given to **officiating priest** (Lev. 7:9)
 - 2) *Uncooked Offerings:* Remainder given to **all priests** (Lev. 7:10)
 - a) *Note:* All meal offerings offered by *the priests* themselves were **wholly burnt** (Lev. 6:19-23)
 - 3) *Offerer:* **Nothing**
 - c. *Peace Offering:*
 - 1) *Priests:* Wave **Breast** (Lev. 7:31)
-

-
- 2) *Priest*: Heave **Thigh** [Right Shoulder] (Lev. 7:32-34; 10:14-15; cf. Ex. 29:26-28)
 - a) *Note*: If the peace offering was made as a **thank offering**, the priest was also given **one of each oblation** of the unleavened cakes, wafers, etc. (Lev. 7:11-14)
 - 3) *Offerer*: **Remainder** eaten by the offerer, his family, his servants, and the Levites in a sacrificial meal eaten at the tabernacle (Lev. 7:15-21; Dt. 12:5-7)
 - d. *Sin Offering*:
 - 1) *Sacrifice for High priest or Congregation*: **Hide** and **carcass** burned outside the camp (Lev. 4:11-12, 21)
 - 2) *Sacrifice for Ruler or Commoner*: **Remainder** given to the officiating priest (Lev. 6:26, 29)
 - 3) *Offerer*: **Nothing**
 - e. *Trespass Offering*:
 - 1) *Priest*: Carcass eaten by **male priests** in a holy place (Lev. 7:6-7)
 - 2) *Offerer*: **Nothing**
- E. The **Scheduled** Animal Sacrifices:
1. **Daily**: (Ex. 29:38-42; Lev. 6:9-12; Num. 28:3-8)
 - a. *Burnt Offering*: **1 Lamb** [morning] + **1 Lamb** [evening]
 2. **Sabbath** [7th day of the week]: (Num. 28:9-10)
 - a. *Burnt Offering*: **2 Lambs** [in addition to the daily sacrifice]
 3. **Monthly** [1st day of the month]: (Num. 28:11-15)
 - a. *Burnt Offering*: **2 Bulls, 1 Ram, & 7 Lambs** (Num. 28:11)
 - b. *Sin Offering*: **1 Kid** (Num. 28:15)
 4. **Feast Of Unleavened Bread** [15th -21st day of the 1st month]: (Ex. 12:1-27; Lev. 23:5-8; Num. 28:16-25)
 - a. *Burnt Offering*: **2 Bulls, 1 Ram, & 7 Lambs** per day for 7 days (Num. 28:19, 24)
 - b. *Sin Offering*: **1 Kid** per day for 7 days (Num. 28:22, 24)
 5. **Pentecost** [50 days after the Sabbath of the Passover]: (Lev. 23:15-22; Num. 28:26-31)
 - a. *Burnt Offering*: **2 Bulls, 1 Ram, & 7 Lambs**
 - b. *Sin Offering*: **1 Kid**
 6. **Feast Of Trumpets** [1st day of the 7th month]: (Lev. 23:23-25; Num. 29:1-6)
 - a. *Burnt Offering*: **1 Bull, 1 Ram, & 7 Lambs**
 - b. *Sin Offering*: **1 Kid**
-

-
7. **Day of Atonement** [10th day of the 7th month]: (Lev. 16:3-, 29-34; 23:26-32; Num. 29:7-11)
- a. *Aaron's offering for himself*: (Lev. 16:6, 11, 24)
 - 1) *Sin Offering*: **1 Bull** (Lev. 16:3, 6)
 - 2) *Burnt Offering*: **1 Ram** (Lev. 16:3)
 - b. *Aaron's offering for Israel*: (Lev. 16:5, 15, 24)
 - 1) *Sin Offering*: **2 Kids** (Lev. 16:5)
 - a) **Lots** were cast for the two goats (Lev. 16:8)
 - b) One of these goats was **sacrificed as a sin offering** (Lev. 16:9)
 - c) The other goat became the **scapegoat** and was **released** (Lev. 16:10)
 - d) Each of these goats were for **atonement**: the **scapegoat** (Lev. 16:10) and the **sacrificed goat** (Lev. 16:18)
 - 2) *Burnt Offering*: **1 Ram** (Lev. 16:5)
 - c. *Note*: In Numbers, the sacrificial animals are **enumerated differently**
 - 1) *Burnt Offering*: **1 Bull, 1 Ram, & 7 Lambs** (Num. 29:8)
 - 2) *Sin Offering*: **1 Kid** (Num. 29:11)
 - 3) *Sin Offering For Atonement*: This may refer to **the scapegoat** (Lev. 16:10), or it may refer to **all the sacrifices** mentioned in Lev. 16
 - d. I can think of at least **three explanations**:
 - 1) The two accounts **contradict** each other (which I reject as a Bible believer)
 - 2) Each account is **incomplete** with some of the sacrifices in each account **equivalent** and others not
 - 3) Each account is **complete**, and the account in Numbers mentions **additional sacrifices** to those in Leviticus¹⁵
 - a) This appears to be the **best explanation**. The offerings mentioned in Num. 29:8, 11a are “**beside(s)**” (ASV; KJV; ESV; NASB; NKJV; RSV) or “**in addition to**” (LEB; NET; NAB; NIV) or “**apart from**” (YLT) the sin offering for atonement” [i.e. the various offerings mentioned in Lev. 16]
8. **Feast Of Tabernacles**: (Lev. 23:33-43; Num. 29:12-38)
- a. **Day 1**: (Num. 29:13)
 - 1) *Burnt Offering*: **13 Bulls, 2 Rams, & 14 Lambs**
 - 2) *Sin Offering*: **1 Kid**
 - b. **Day 2**: (Num. 29:17)
 - 1) *Burnt Offering*: **12 Bulls, 2 Rams, & 14 Lambs**
 - 2) *Sin Offering*: **1 Kid**
 - c. **Day 3**: (Num. 29:20)
-

-
- 1) *Burnt Offering*: **11 Bulls, 2 Rams, & 14 Lambs**
 - 2) *Sin Offering*: **1 Kid**
 - d. **Day 4:** (Num. 29:23)
 - 1) *Burnt Offering*: **10 Bulls, 2 Rams, & 14 Lambs**
 - 2) *Sin Offering*: **1 Kid**
 - e. **Day 5:** (Num. 29:26)
 - 1) *Burnt Offering*: **9 Bulls, 2 Rams, & 14 Lambs**
 - 2) *Sin Offering*: **1 Kid**
 - f. **Day 6:** (Num. 29:29)
 - 1) *Burnt Offering*: **8 Bulls, 2 Rams, & 14 Lambs**
 - 2) *Sin Offering*: **1 Kid**
 - g. **Day 7:** (Num. 29:32)
 - 1) *Burnt Offering*: **7 Bulls, 2 Rams, & 14 Lambs**
 - 2) *Sin Offering*: **1 Kid**
 - h. **Day 8:** (Num. 29:36)
 - 1) *Burnt Offering*: **1 Bull, 1 Ram, & 7 Lambs**
 - 2) *Sin Offering*: **1 Kid**
- F. The **Conditional** Animal Sacrifices:
- 1. Unintentional **sin** (Lev. 4; 5:17-19)
 - 2. Unintentional **contamination** with something unclean (Lev. 5:1-3)
 - 3. Failing to keep a **vow** (Lev. 5:4)
 - 4. Unintentional sins against the **“holy things”** (Lev. 5:15)
 - a. Only **priests** and their households were allowed to **eat the “holy things”** (Lev. 22:1-13)
 - b. If someone **ate** of the “holy things” **unintentionally**, he had to **restore the offering** and **add 20%** to it (Lev. 22:14)
 - 5. **Lying and swearing falsely** (Lev. 6:1-7)
 - 6. The consecration of **priests** (Lev. 8-9)
 - a. *First Day*:
 - 1) *Sin Offering*: **1 Bull** per day for 7 days (Ex. 29:1, 10-14, 36; Lev. 8:2, 14)
 - 2) *Burnt Offering*: **1 Ram** (Ex. 29:1, 15-18; Lev. 8:18, 21)
 - 3) *Consecration Offering*: **1 Ram** (Ex. 29:1, 19-28, 31-34; Lev. 8:22-23)
 - b. *Eighth Day*:
 - 1) Aaron’s Offering:
 - a) *Sin Offering*: **1 Bull** (Lev. 9:1-2, 8, 10)
-

-
- b) *Burnt Offering*: **1 Ram** (Lev. 9:1-2, 12-14)
 - 2) Israel's Offering:
 - a) *Sin Offering*: **1 Kid** (Lev. 9:3, 15)
 - b) *Burnt Offering*: **1 Calf & 1 Lamb** (Lev. 9:3, 16)
 - c) *Peace Offering*: **1 Bull & 1 Ram** (Lev. 9:4)
 - 7. The **purification** of women after childbirth (Lev. 12:1-8)
 - a. *Burnt Offering*: **1 Lamb** (Lev. 12:6)
 - b. *Sin Offering*: **1 Turtledove** or **1 Pigeon** (Lev. 12:6)
 - c. *Note*: If poor: **2 Turtledoves** or **2 Pigeons** (Lev. 12:8)
 - 8. The **cleansing** of a leper (Lev. 14:1-32)
 - a. *Cleansing Ritual*: **1 Bird** killed & **1 Bird** released (Lev. 14:4-7)
 - b. *Sin Offering*: **1 Ewe Lamb** (Lev. 14:10, 19)
 - c. *Trespass Offering*: **1 Male Lamb** (Lev. 14:10, 12)
 - d. *Burnt Offering*: **1 Male Lamb** (Lev. 14:10, 19-20)
 - e. *Note*: If poor: (Lev. 14:21-22)
 - 1) *Trespass Offering*: **1 Male Lamb**
 - 2) *Sin Offering*: **1 Turtledove** or **1 Pigeon**
 - 3) *Burnt Offering*: **1 Turtledove** or **1 Pigeon**
 - 9. A man's **bodily discharge** (Lev. 15:13-15)
 - a. *Sin Offering*: **1 Turtledove** or **1 Pigeon** (Lev. 15:14-15)
 - b. *Burnt Offering*: **1 Turtledove** or **1 Pigeon** (Lev. 15:14-15)
 - 10. A woman's **bodily discharge** (Lev. 15:29-30)
 - a. *Sin Offering*: **1 Turtledove** or **1 Pigeon** (Lev. 15: 29-30)
 - b. *Burnt Offering*: **1 Turtledove** or **1 Pigeon** (Lev. 15: 29-30)
 - 11. **Fornication** with a slave girl betrothed as a concubine (Lev. 19:20-22)
 - a. *Trespass Offering*: **1 Ram** (Lev. 19:21-22)
 - b. If the girl were **free**, both partners would have been **put to death** (Dt. 22:23-24)
 - c. Evidently since she was **a slave**, she was **not held responsible** for her action
 - 12. The **Nazirite vow** (Num. 6)
 - a. *If defiled*:
 - 1) *Sin Offering*: **1 Turtledove** or **1 Pigeon** (Num. 6:10-11)
 - 2) *Burnt Offering*: **1 Turtledove** or **1 Pigeon** (Num. 6:10-11)
 - 3) *Trespass Offering*: **1 Male Lamb** (Num. 6:12)
 - b. *When the vow is concluded*:
 - 1) *Burnt Offering*: **1 Male Lamb** (Num. 6:14)
-

-
- 2) *Sin Offering*: **1 Ewe Lamb** (Num. 6:14)
 - 3) *Peace Offering*: **1 Ram** (Num. 6:14)
 13. The dedication of **the altar** (Num. 7)
 - a. *Burnt Offerings*: **1 Bull, 1 Ram, & 1 Lamb** [male] per day for 12 days (Num. 7:15, 21, 27, 33, 39, 45, 51, 57, 63, 69, 75, 81)
 - 1) *Totals*: **12 Bulls, 12 Rams, & 12 Lambs** [male] (Num. 7:87)
 - b. *Sin Offering*: **1 Kid** per day for 12 days (Num. 7:16, 22, 28, 33, 40, 46, 52, 58, 64, 70, 76, 82)
 - 1) *Totals*: **12 Kids** (Num. 7:87)
 - c. *Peace Offerings*: **2 Oxen, 5 Rams, 5 Goats** [male], **5 Lambs** [male] per day for 12 days (Num. 7:17, 23, 29, 35, 41, 47, 53, 59, 65, 71, 77, 83)
 - 1) *Totals*: **24 Oxen, 60 Rams, 60 Goats** [male], & **60 Lambs** [male] (Num. 7:88)
 14. The consecration of **Levites** (Num. 8)
 - a. *Burnt Offering*: **1 Bull** (Num. 8:8, 12)
 - b. *Sin Offering*: **1 Bull** (Num. 8:8, 12)
 15. The atonement for **unintentional sin** (Num. 15:22-31)
 - a. The whole congregation:
 - 1) *Burnt Offering*: **1 Bull** (Num. 15:24)
 - b. An individual:
 - 1) *Sin Offering*: **1 Goat** [female] (Num. 15:27)
 16. The ritual of the **red heifer** (Num. 19)
 - a. *Purification*: **1 Red Heifer** (Num. 19:1-5, 9, 17) (ISBE, Rev. Ed., 4:268)
 17. The return of **the ark** (1 Sam. 6)
 - a. *Burnt Offerings*: **2 milk Cows** (1 Sam. 6:7, 14)
 18. Before battle at **Mizpah**
 - a. *Burnt Offering*: 1 suckling **Lamb** (1 Sam. 7:9)
 19. The coronation of **Solomon**
 - a. *Burnt Offerings*: **1,000 Bulls; 1,000 Rams; 1,000 Lambs** (1 Chr. 29:21)
 20. Solomon's sacrifices at **Gibeon**
 - a. *Burnt Offerings*: **1,000 animals** (1 Ki. 3:3-6)
 21. The dedication of **the temple** (1 Ki. 8)
 - a. *Burnt Offering*: Unknown quantity (1 Ki. 8:64; 2 Chr. 7:7)
 - b. *Peace Offerings*: **22,000 Bulls; 120,000 Sheep** (1 Ki. 8:63; 2 Chr. 7:5)
 22. There were many **unspecified animal sacrifices** on other occasions:
-

- a. Burnt offerings and peace offerings were offered when **Joshua built the altar at Mt. Ebal** (Josh. 8:30-31)
- b. Burnt offering and peace offerings were offered when Israel was **defeated by Benjamin** (Jdg. 20:26)
- c. Peace offerings were offered when **Saul was made king** (1 Sam. 11:15)
- d. Burnt offering and peace offerings when **David brought the ark of the covenant to Jerusalem** (2 Sam. 6:17-18)
- e. Burnt offering and peace offerings were **offered by David to halt the plague** (2 Sam. 24:25)
- f. Burnt offering and peace offerings were **offered by Solomon three times a year** (1 Ki. 9:25)
- g. Burnt offerings and peace offerings were offered by **Ahaz** on his new altar (2 Ki. 16:10-16)
- h. Peace offerings and thank offerings were **offered by Manasseh after repairing and restoring the altar** (2 Chr. 33:15-16) (NTT; ISBE, Rev. Ed., 4:269)

II. The Theology Of Blood

- A. Understanding the **theological significance** of blood is **absolutely essential** to:
 1. A proper *understanding* of the **OT sacrifices**
 2. A proper *appreciation* of the **death of Christ**
- B. **Blood** is explicitly mentioned for the first time in the OT following the murder of **Abel**, when God tells Cain that the blood of his dead brother “**cries out to Me from the ground**” (Gen. 4:10-11)
- C. The second reference to blood in the OT occurs immediately following **the flood**, when for the first time, God explicitly condemns **the shedding of blood** (Gen. 9:1-7)
 1. For the first time, God gives man **permission to eat animal flesh** as food (Gen. 9:3; cf. 1:29)
 2. And for the first time, God makes an **explicit connection** between “**blood**” and “**life**” (Gen. 9:4)
 - a. He prohibits the **eating of blood** (Gen. 9:4)
 - 1) It has been suggested that God prohibited this practice because it was a **prevalent religious rite** among the heathen nations (cf. Psa. 16:4)
 - 2) While this may have been the case and while it may have been a secondary factor, the context suggests that man was forbidden to consume blood because **blood was associated with life**, and **life is sacred** (Gen. 9:4-6; Lev. 17:11-14; Dt. 12:23)
 - b. He condemns the **shedding of man’s blood** (Gen. 9:5-6)
 - 1) The primary reason why murder is sinful is because **man is made in the image of God** (cf. Gen. 1:26-27)
 - 2) Thus **any animal** that killed a man was itself to be **destroyed** (Gen. 9:5; cf. Ex. 21:28)

-
- 3) And **any murderer** who shed innocent blood **forfeited his right to live** (Gen. 9:6; Lev. 24:17)
- D. Throughout the OT, a connection is repeatedly made between “**blood**” and “**life**” (cf. Gen. 9:4; Lev. 17:11, 14; Dt. 12:23; Psa. 72:14; 94:21; Ezek. 3:18; 33:5; Jon. 1:14)
- E. In the book of Leviticus, a connection is made between “**blood**,” “**life**,” and “**atonement**” (Lev. 17:11)
1. Some English translations indicate that **blood makes atonement for the soul** (NKJV; KJV; NIV; YLT)
 2. Other English translations indicate that **blood makes atonement because of the life it represents**
 - a. ASV: “...it is the blood that maketh atonement **by reason of the life**”
 - b. ESV: “...it is the blood that makes atonement **by the life**”
 - c. HCSB: “...since it is **the lifeblood that makes atonement**”
 - d. LEB: “...it is **the blood with the life** that makes atonement”
 - e. NET: “...the blood makes atonement **by means of the life**”
 - f. NAB: “...it is **the blood, as the seat of life**, that makes atonement”
 - g. NASB: “...it is the blood **by reason of the life** that makes atonement”
 - h. RSV: “...it is the blood that makes atonement, **by reason of the life**”
 3. *Leon Morris*: “This understanding of the Hebrew signifies that it is because of **the connection of life and blood** that blood makes atonement.” (Bold emphasis added, AMS, 53)
- F. In both the OT and the NT, blood is inextricably associated with **the forgiveness of sin** (Heb. 9:22), but what is the connection between “**blood**,” “**life**,” and “**atonement**”?
- G. There are **two prominent views** about the significance of blood in the OT sacrifices
1. “**Blood**” represents or signifies **life**, and the essence of sacrifice is the **offering up of life to God**¹⁶
 - a. *Leon Morris* summarizes this view with these words: “On this view the slaughter of the animal is necessary, but only because there is no other way of obtaining the blood, the life. **The death plays no real part in the sacrifice.**” (Bold emphasis added, APC, 114)
 2. “**Blood**” represents or signifies **death**, and the essence of sacrifice is the **death of the sacrificial victim**
 - a. *Note*: The **theological significance of blood** is a crucial question in discussions concerning **penal substitution**
 - 1) Those who **reject** the idea of penal substitution argue that “blood” signifies **life offered up to God**¹⁷
 - 2) Those who **accept** the idea of penal substitution argue that “blood” signifies **the death of a sacrificial victim**
- H. Why do some believe that sacrificial blood signifies the **offering up of life** to God?
1. There is an *explicit connection* between “**blood**” and “**life**” (cf. Gen. 9:4; Lev. 17:11, 14; Dt. 12:23)¹⁸
-

-
2. There are *implicit connections* between “**blood**” and “**life**”
 - a. The terms “**(life)blood**” and “**life/lives**” are used interchangeably in *Hebrew parallelism* (cf. Gen. 9:5; Psa. 72:14; 94:21; Jon. 1:14)
 - b. Eating **flesh** with its **blood** is repeatedly prohibited (cf. Lev. 3:17; 6:30; 7:26-27; 17:10, 12; 19:26; Dt. 12:16; 15:23; 1 Sam. 14:33-34)
 - c. David refused to “**drink the blood** of the men that went in jeopardy of their **lives**” (2 Sam. 23:14-17; 1 Chr. 11:16-19)
 - d. **Shed blood can cry out to God**, indicating that the blood is **still alive** after death (Gen. 4:10; Job 16:18)
 - e. Blood was associated with elementary ideas of **mysterious power** (Num. 23:24¹⁹; 1 Ki. 22:38²⁰)
 - I. Why do others believe that sacrificial blood signifies **death**?
 1. In the OT, the term “**blood**” [*dam*] is used most often to denote **death by violence**
 - a. “**Blood**” is associated with **death** in the concept of “**bloodshed**” (Gen. 37:26; Hos. 4:2; Rev. 16:6; cf. Isa. 26:21)
 - 1) *Kedar-Kopfstein*: “The expression *shaphakh dam* ‘**shed blood**,’ is synonymous with ‘**destroy life, kill, murder**’ (Gen. 9:6; Ezk. 18:10; etc.), and hence also with ‘**destroy nephesh**’ (Prov. 1:18; Gen. 37:21,22; Ezk. 22:27).” (Bold emphasis added, TDOT, 3:241-242)
 - 2) “Whoever **sheds man’s blood**, By man his **blood shall be shed....**” (Gen. 9:6)
 - a) *Leon Morris*: “‘**Blood**’ here [Gen. 9:5] means **death** rather than life. When Yahweh says He will **require the life or the blood of man**, He is not asking men to produce life or hand it back to Him: He is saying that **men will be held responsible for destroying life**.” (Bold emphasis added, APC, 115)
 - 3) When the psalmist says: “What profit is there in my **blood**?” (Psa. 30:9), he obviously means “What profit is there in my **death**?”
 - 4) When Jacob saw Joseph’s tunic covered with blood, he immediately assumed that “a wild beast has **devoured him**” (Gen. 37:31-33)
 - 5) “Cursed *is* the one who takes a bribe to slay an innocent person.” [lit. **the blood of the innocent**] (Dt. 27:25)
 - a) It would be ridiculous to limit the application of these words to murders where **blood actually flowed** as opposed to murders where **blood was not literally shed**
 - 6) **Parallel expressions** clearly indicate that “**shedding blood**” refers to **taking life**
 - a) “Let us **not kill him**” (Gen. 37:21) // “**Shed no blood**” (Gen. 37:22)
 - b) “What profit *is there* if we **kill our brother and conceal his blood**” (Gen. 37:26)

-
- c) When Saul wanted to take David's life, Jonathan asked him: "Why then will you **sin against innocent blood**, to **kill David** without a cause" (1 Sam. 19:5)
 - d) Jeremiah said: "But know for certain that if you **put me to death**, you will surely **bring innocent blood on yourselves**, on this city, and on its inhabitants; for truly the LORD has sent me to you to speak all these words in your hearing." (Jer. 26:15)
 - 7) **Shedding blood** refers to **taking life** or **inflicting death** even when very little if any **literal bleeding** actually occurs
 - a) Acts 22:20: ²⁰ And when **the blood** of Your martyr Stephen was shed, I also was standing by consenting to **his death**, and guarding the clothes of those who were killing him.'
 - b) Rev. 6:10: ¹⁰ And they cried with a loud voice, saying, "How long, O Lord, holy and true, until You judge and **avenge our blood** on those who dwell on the earth?"
 - 1] "**Avenge our blood**" means "**avenge our death**" regardless of the method of execution, whether it involved **literal bleeding** or not
 - b. "**Blood**" is also associated with death in the concept of "**blood guiltiness**"
 - 1) If a person deserved to be put to death or his death was the result of his own folly, his blood was said to be **on his own head** (Josh. 2:19; 2 Sam. 1:16; 1 Ki. 2:32-33, 37; Ezek. 18:10-13; 33:4)
 - 2) In fact, a person could be "**burdened**" (*'shaq*) **with bloodshed**" [lit. "**by blood of life**"] (Pr. 28:17)
 - 3) *Note*: Some sins brought "**blood guiltiness**," even though they did not actually involve "**bloodshed**," and were therefore punishable by death
 - a) **Cursing parents** (Lev. 20:9)
 - b) **Incest** (Lev. 20:11-12)
 - c) **Homosexuality** (Lev. 20:13)
 - d) **Bestiality** (Lev. 20:16)
 - e) **Sorcery** (Lev. 20:27)
 - 4) If a person was unjustly killed, **his blood** (i.e. his death) fell on his murderers (cf. Mt. 23:34-36; Lk. 11:50-51)
 - a) *A. M. Stibbs*: "What really rests upon them is not actual blood, nor some virtue or vengeance of 'life released', but the defilement and guilt of **blood shed**, that is, of **murder**." (Bold emphasis added, MWBS, 17)
 - c. "**Blood**" is associated with death in the concept of "**blood vengeance**"
 - 1) The one who inflicted the penalty for murder was called "**the avenger of blood**" (Num. 35:19, 26-27)
 - 2) When **blood vengeance** was executed, "**the guilt of innocent blood**" was put away (Dt. 19:13)
-

-
- a) This resulted in **avenging the blood, rendering vengeance**, and **providing atonement** for the land (Dt. 32:43)
 2. In the NT, the term “**blood**” [*haima*] is used, by my count, 74 times out of 100 occurrences in the NKJV to refer to “**death**”
 - a. “**Blood**” means “**death**”:
 - 1) “The **blood** of the prophets” (Mt. 23:30; Lk. 11:50)
 - 2) “All the **righteous blood** shed on the earth” (Mt. 23:35)
 - 3) “The **blood** of righteous Abel to the **blood** of Zechariah” (Mt. 23:35; Lk. 11:51)
 - 4) “I have sinned by betraying innocent **blood**” (Mt. 27:4)
 - 5) “...they [silver pieces returned by Judas] are the price of **blood**” (Mt. 27:6)
 - 6) “I am innocent of **the blood** of this just Person” (Mt. 27:24)
 - 7) “**His blood** be on us and on our children” (Mt. 27:25)
 - 8) “The Galileans whose **blood** Pilate had mingled with their sacrifices” (Lk. 13:1)
 - 9) “...intend to bring this Man’s **blood** on us” (Acts 5:28)
 - 10) “You have not yet resisted to **bloodshed**, striving against sin” (Heb. 12:4)
 - 11) “Judge and avenge our **blood**” (Rev. 6:10)
 - 12) “They shed **the blood** of saints and prophets” (Rev. 16:6)
 - 13) “The woman, drunk with **the blood** of the saints and with **the blood** of the martyrs of Jesus” (Rev. 17:6)
 - 14) “And in her was found **the blood** of prophets and saints, and of all who were slain on the earth.” (Rev. 18:24)
 - 15) “He has avenged on her **the blood** of His servants shed by her” (Rev. 19:2)
 - b. The **blood** of Jesus signifies His **death** (Rom. 5:9-10; Eph. 2:13, 16; Col. 1:20-22; Heb. 9:14-15; Rev. 1:5; 5:9)
 - 1) The “**blood of the new covenant**” refers to the blood Jesus shed in His **death** (Mt. 26:28 // Mk. 14:24 // Lk. 22:20; 1 Cor. 11:25, 27)
 - 2) Judas “**betraying innocent blood**” resulted in **Jesus’ death** (Mt. 27:4)
 - 3) The “**price of blood**” refers to the “**blood money**” that resulted in **Jesus’ death** (Mt. 27:6)
 - 4) Heb. 12:24: ²⁴ to Jesus the Mediator of the new covenant, and to the **blood of sprinkling** that speaks better things than that of Abel.
 - a) “**Sprinkling**” suggests **sacrifice**
 - b) The **blood of Abel** indicates **death**
 - c. Sometimes “blood” can even signify **spiritual death** rather than physical death (Acts 18:6; 20:26)
-

-
- d. *Leon Morris*: “As far as it goes, the statistical evidence indicates that the association most likely to be conjured up when the Hebrews heard the word **‘blood’** was that of **violent death**.” (Bold emphasis added, *APC*, 114)
 - e. *A. M. Stibbs*: “Blood is a visible token of **life violently ended**; it is a sign of life either **given** or **taken** in death.” (Bold emphasis added, *MWBS*, 30)
3. The passages that make an *explicit connection* between “**blood**” and “**life**” (cf. Gen. 9:4-5; Lev. 17:11, 14; Dt. 12:23) refer to the **infliction of death**, not the **offering up of life** to God
- a. “Eat[ing] flesh with its life, that is, its blood” (Gen. 9:4) presupposes **death**²¹
 - b. The references to “**lifeblood**” and “**life**” in Genesis 9:5 are talking about **murder**
 - 1) *Leon Morris*: “The passage is telling us that **anyone who kills another will be held responsible for the murder**. It is nonsense to claim that such a passage speaks to us of life released and not death.” (Bold emphasis added, *AMS*, 55)
 - c. There is good reason to believe that Leviticus 17:11 is talking about atonement by means of **the infliction of death** as opposed to **the offering up of life to God**
 - 1) The blood of atonement was given “**upon the altar**,” after the sacrificial animal had been killed (Lev. 17:11)
 - 2) The **blood** of the animal sacrifices was not the blood coursing through their veins but **blood shed**²²
 - a) The expression “...**the blood of the slain bird**” (Lev. 14:51) certainly suggests that **no life remained in the blood** after the animal was killed
 - 3) The Hebrew word *nephesh* (translated “**life**” in Lev. 17:11) does not always mean exactly what the English word “**life**” means
 - a) It can mean something very much like “**life yielded up in death**” (*Morris, JTS*, 31 [1952], 219)
 - 1] The sailors who were about to cast Jonah overboard prayed, “let us not perish for **this man’s nephesh**” (Jon. 1:14)
 - a] It is clearly his **death**, and *not* his **life**, that they have in mind
 - 2] The passages that talk about “**life for life**” as the **punishment for murder** require death – the execution of the murderer (Ex. 21:23; Lev. 24:18; Dt. 19:21; 2 Sam. 14:7; 1 Ki. 20:39, 42; 2 Ki. 10:24)
 - 3] The Suffering Servant’s **soul** (*nephesh*) is made **an offering** for sin (Isa. 53:10) when He **poured out His soul** (*nephesh*) **unto death** (Isa. 53:12)
 - b) The word *nephesh* occurs in passages that refer to:
 - 1] **Taking away life** (1 Ki. 19:4, 10, 14; Psa. 31:13; Pr. 1:19)
 - 2] **Losing life** (Jud. 18:25; Job 31:39)
 - 3] **Giving up life** (Ex. 21:23, 30; Esth. 7:3; Job 2:4; Jer. 45:5)
 - 4] **Putting one’s life in one’s hand** (Jud. 12:3; 1 Sam. 19:5; 28:21; Job 13:14)
-

-
- c) It is not uncommon for OT writers to refer to **murder** as:
 - 1] **“Smiting the *nephesh*”** (cf. Gen. 37:21; Num. 35:11; Jer. 40:14)
 - 2] **“Slaying the *nephesh*”** (Num. 31:19)
 - 3] **The *nephesh* “dying”** (Ezek. 13:19; 18:4)
 - d) Those who **desire to murder** someone are said to:
 - 1] **“Seek his *nephesh*”** [30x] (cf. Ex. 4:19; Psa. 35:4)
 - 2] **“Lie in wait for the *nephesh*”** (Pr. 1:18)
 - 3] **“Lay a snare for the *nephesh*”** (1 Sam. 28:9)
 - e) In fact, sometimes the Hebrew word *nephesh* refers to:
 - 1] **“The dead”** (Lev. 19:28; 21:1)
 - 2] A **“corpse”** (Lev. 22:4; Num. 5:2; 6:11; 9:6-7, 10)
 - 3] A **“dead body”** (Hag. 2:13)
 - f) *Leon Morris*: “From all this it is clear that the association of *nephesh* with *dam* in Leviticus 17:11, *etc.*, cannot be held to prove that **life is thought of as still existent after the blood has been poured forth**. This use of both *nephesh* and *dam* in other contexts makes it more probable that the meaning here is that of **life given up in death**. This is supported by the fact that **it is ‘the life of the flesh’ that is said to be in the blood, and it is precisely this life which ceases to exist when the blood is poured out.**” (Bold emphasis added, *APC*, 117)
 - 4) Other OT passages point to **atonement** achieved by the **infliction of death** rather than the **offering up of life** to God
 - a) **Phinehas** “made atonement for the children of Israel” by **killing** an Israelite man [Zimri] and a Midianite woman [Cozbi] with his javelin (Num. 25:6-15)
 - b) When **murder** was committed, atonement was to be made for the land by the blood of the murderer (Num. 35:30-34)
 - 1] Atonement was made, not by any **presentation of life** to God, but by the **death of the murderer**
 - 2] The blood that atoned was the **blood that flowed** when the **death penalty** was inflicted on the murderer
 - 3] It is true that this is **not a sacrifice** in the strictest sense of the term, but in both cases:
 - a] It is **expiation** of sin that is in question
 - b] The means is **blood**
 - c] The action is directed **towards God**
 - d] **Atonement** is said to be secured
 - c) **David** made atonement by delivering up seven descendants of King Saul to be hanged by the Gibeonites (2 Sam. 21:3-9)

-
- d) **A heifer's neck was to be broken** to "provide atonement" when murder had been committed by an unknown person (Dt. 21:1-9)
 - 1] *Leon Morris*: "In this passage the word 'blood' is mentioned four times in verses 7-9 and the verb *kipper*, 'to make atonement', twice, but atonement is not connected with blood in any of these instances. **It is the death of the heifer by means of a broken neck and not any life released in blood that brings atonement.**" (Bold emphasis added, AMS, 58-59)
 - e) *Leon Morris*: "In each of these passages there is atonement made or contemplated, and in none of them can it fairly be argued that what is meant is the presentation of life to God. **In each case it is the termination of life, the infliction of death, that atones....**" (Bold emphasis added, JTS, 31:222)
 - f) *Note*: Blood was not **literally shed** when:
 - 1] **Saul's descendants** were hanged
 - 2] **The heifer's neck** was broken
 - 5) Furthermore, there are times when **atonement** is connected with the **whole sacrifice**, not just the **blood rite**
 - a) Sometimes atonement is attached to a **point** in the ritual other than the blood rite
 - 1] The laying on of **hands** (Lev. 1:4)
 - 2] Burning the **fat** (Lev. 4:26, 31, 35)
 - b) Sometimes atonement is mentioned in connection with rites that **exclude the blood rite** (Lev. 10:17)
 - 4. Many of the passages concerning "blood" are obviously **figurative** and **metaphorical**, and they must not be pressed into a **literal mold**
 - a. The passages that speak of **shed blood crying out** to God (Gen. 4:10; Job 16:18) are **metaphorical statements** that must not be **interpreted literally**²³
 - b. In Balaam's oracle (Num. 23:24), **the Israelites are compared to a lion**, and their behavior is described in the terms of **a lion's behavior** to emphasize their **future strength and prowess**
 - c. David's refusal to "**drink the blood** of the men that went in jeopardy of their **lives**" (2 Sam. 23:14-17; 1 Chr. 11:16-19) is a **metaphorical statement** and must be understood as such
 - 1) He certainly did not mean that he would **literally drink** either their **blood** or their **lives**
 - d. The passage does not really say that **the harlot's washed themselves in Ahab's blood**; it says that "**the dogs licked up his blood while the harlot's bathed**" (1 Ki. 22:38)
 - 1) Did the dogs drink to **absorb power** from the dead king?
 - 2) The simplest explanation of this is that it represents **the dishonor** Ahab's body experienced in death
-

-
- e. There are many instances where **“blood” is used metaphorically** in the OT, and they must not be **interpreted literally**
 - 1) **“Arrows drunk with blood”** (Dt. 32:42)
 - 2) **“The moon [turned] into blood”** (Joel. 2:31)
 - 3) Joab is described as one who **“shed the blood of war in peace, and put the blood of war upon his girdle...and in his shoes”** (1 Ki. 2:5)
 - 4) The Psalmist speaks of the righteous as **bathing their feet in the blood of the wicked** (Psa. 58:10; cf. 68:23)
 - 5) Job exclaimed: **“O earth, do not cover my blood”** (Job 16:18)
 - 6) Through Isaiah’s pen, Jehovah declared: **“Your hands are full of blood”** (Isa. 1:15)
 - f. *Leon Morris*: “The Hebrews tended to use the term **‘blood’ in picturesque metaphors**, more particularly as **a vivid way of referring to death.**” (Bold emphasis added, AMS, 62)
 - 5. Finally, **death as the penalty for sin** would suggest that the **significance of the sacrifices** in the OT was the **infliction of death** rather than the **presentation of life**
 - a. God told Adam and Eve in the very beginning that if they **ate of the forbidden fruit** “in the day that you eat of it **you shall surely die**” (Gen. 2:17)
 - b. The apostle Paul explains that what was **true for Adam and Eve** (i.e. death as a consequence of sin) has also been **true for their descendants** (Rom. 5:12)
 - c. From that day till now, **(spiritual) death has been the penalty for sin** (cf. Ezek. 18:20; Rom. 6:23; Jas. 1:15)
 - d. It seems to me that there must be some connection between the **penalty for sin (death)** and the **sacrifice(s) offered for sin**
 - e. If that is true, the most reasonable explanation seems to be that **the animal sacrifices** offered under the Levitical system signified **the death of the animal on behalf of the sinner**, who by rights **should die for his sins**
 - J. Having said all of this, however, perhaps **a word of caution** is in order
 - 1. **James Moffatt**: “Semitic scholars warn us against finding in these words (Lv. 17¹¹) either the popular idea of **the substitution of the victim for the sinner**, or even the theory that the essential thing in sacrifice is **the offering of a life to God.**” (Quoted in Leon Morris, APC, 127)

III. “Forgiveness” Under The Old Covenant

- A. Was there **true and real forgiveness** under the old covenant?
 - B. To answer that question, **two apparently contradictory facts** must be reconciled and harmonized:
 - 1. There is clear evidence that **forgiveness was available** for God’s people under the old covenant
 - a. In the book of Leviticus, it is repeatedly said that the animal sacrifices brought about **“atonement”** and **“forgiveness”** (Lev. 4:20, 26, 31, 35; 5:10, 13, 16, 18; 6:7; 19:22)
-

-
- b. Jesus' promise that many would sit down with **Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob** in the kingdom of God (Mt. 8:11; Lk. 13:28) implies that they were **forgiven**
 - c. The very fact that **Moses** and **Elijah** appeared with Jesus on the mount of transfiguration (Mt. 17:1-13), **before His sacrifice on the cross**, implies that their sins had been **forgiven**
 - 2. On the other hand, there is also clear evidence that **animal sacrifices could not take away sin**
 - a. There may even be **hints** of this in the OT (Psa. 51:16-17; Mic. 6:6-8)
 - b. When Paul addressed the synagogue in Antioch of Pisidia, he told that Jewish audience that they "**could not be justified by the law of Moses**" (Acts 13:39)
 - c. The writer of Hebrews explicitly says that:
 - 1) "The law made **nothing perfect**" (Heb. 7:18-19)
 - 2) "Gifts and sacrifices are offered which cannot make him who performed the sacrifice **perfect** in regard to the conscience" (Heb. 9:9-10)
 - 3) "The law...can never with these same sacrifices...make those who approach **perfect**" (Heb. 10:1)
 - 4) On the Day of Atonement there was "a **reminder** of sins every year" (Heb. 10:3)
 - a) By contrast, when Jeremiah prophesied the coming of the new covenant, God said "their sin I will **remember no more**" (Jer. 31:34; Heb. 8:12; 10:17)
 - 5) "It is not possible that the blood of bulls and goats could **take away sins**" (Heb. 10:4)
 - 6) "...the same sacrifices which can never **take away sins**" (Heb. 10:11)
 - d. Why couldn't an animal sacrifice **take away sins**? Several inferences appear to be at least reasonable, if not necessary
 - 1) Animals are **not equivalent** to humans
 - 2) While the animals were **sinless** and **guiltless**, it was only because they **could not sin**
 - 3) The animal was **forced** to give its life; it did not give it **freely** and **voluntarily**
 - 4) **The death** which the animal suffered was not **equivalent** to the death that the sinner deserved
 - a) The **physical death** of an animal does not correspond to the **spiritual death** of a man
 - C. So how are these apparent contradictions to be explained? The writer of Hebrews solves this **theological "sticky wicket"** by declaring that:
 - 1. It is **Christ's offering of Himself** that brings about man's **sanctification** (Heb. 10:5-10)
 - 2. Christ's sacrifice provides **redemption** for those under the **first covenant** as well as all others (Heb. 9:15)
-

-
- a. Figuratively speaking, Christ's blood flows in **both directions**
 - 1) **Backwards** to cleanse those who lived and died before the cross
 - 2) **Forward** to cleanse those who would come afterwards
 - D. The apostle Paul explained to the Romans that it was **the sacrifice of Christ** that allowed God to be both **just** and the **justifier** (Rom. 3:24-26)
 - 1. Before the sacrifice of Christ, God had "**passed over the sins that were previously committed**" (i.e. He did not require the **payment of the penalty** that His justice demanded)
 - 2. But in the sacrifice of Christ, God was allowed to be **just** in requiring the **payment of the penalty** that His justice demanded and the **justifier** in providing a means to **save sinners**
 - 3. This is a very **common explanation** of this passage among the commentators²⁴
 - E. So God **provisionally forgave** the faithful believer under the old covenant on the basis of **Christ's sacrifice** on the cross (just as He forgives the faithful believer today)
 - 1. There was **a covering** of sins, but not the **actual removal** of sin until the sacrifice of Jesus (cf. Psalms 32:1; 85:2; Romans 4:7)
 - 2. He could describe their forgiveness as a **completed transaction** and treat them accordingly, because He can **see the future** and **bring His will to pass**
 - a. Romans 4:17: ¹⁷ (as it is written, "I have made you a father of many nations") in the presence of Him whom he believed—God, who gives life to the dead and **calls those things which do not exist as though they did**;
 - b. Isaiah 46:10: ¹⁰ **Declaring the end from the beginning**, And from ancient times things that are not yet done, Saying, 'My counsel shall stand, And I will do all My pleasure,'
 - 3. *Illustration*: The animal sacrifices under the old covenant were much like **renewing a bank loan by paying the interest on the principle** when the note comes due. The debt is not paid, but you are not "in the rears" with the bank if you pay the interest
 - 4. *Illustration*: The "**atonement**" and "**forgiveness**" provided by the animal sacrifices under the old covenant were much like **purchasing an item at the store with a check or a credit card**. You are sold the item, even though the store does not actually receive its money until a later time
 - 5. *Maurice Barnett*: "In effect, **God promised forgiveness based on the value of the blood of Christ. A 'promissory note' was 'issued' to those who were faithful to God, in whatever age they lived. The 'note' was 'paid off' with the blood of Christ.** In that way, the sacrifices for sin under the Law brought forgiveness, but only in view of the future. Under the Old Law, there was the forgiveness, pardon, that brought restoration to the service of God, the right to offer sacrifice, protection from immediate punishment, reconciliation with the community and the like. But, **there was no full and complete remission of sins until the sacrifice of Jesus.** There was just the promise of it for those who were penitent and faithful to God." (Bold emphasis added, *Reconciliation*, 234)

IV. The Typology Of The Old Testament Sacrifices

-
- A. Were the OT sacrifices **types** or **foreshadows** of Christ's sacrifice? There are **compelling reasons** to believe they were
1. The law was a "**shadow** of the good things to come" (Heb. 10:1; cf. Col. 2:16-17; Heb. 8:5; 9:23-24)
 2. The "Song of the Suffering Servant" describes the Servant as offering Himself as a "**guilt offering**" (Isa. 53:10, NASB)
 3. The NT is filled with "**sacrificial language**" referring to the death of Jesus
 - a. **Jesus** Himself is described as:
 - 1) "The **Lamb of God** who takes away the sin of the world" (Jn. 1:29, 36)
 - 2) "Our **Passover** [lamb]" (1 Cor. 5:7, ESV)
 - a) Jesus' bones were **not broken** during the crucifixion (Jn. 19:35-36) fulfilling the OT instructions concerning the Passover lamb (Ex. 12:46; Num. 9:12)
 - 3) A **Lamb** as though it had been slain (Rev. 5:6)
 - b. **Jesus' death** is described with "**sacrificial language**"
 - 1) Christ gave Himself as an **offering** and a **sacrifice** for a **sweet-smelling aroma** (Eph. 5:2)
 - 2) Jesus **offered** up Himself (Heb. 7:27)
 - 3) Jesus **offered** Himself **without spot** to God (Heb. 9:14)
 - 4) Jesus appeared to put away sin by the **sacrifice** of Himself (Heb. 9:26)
 - 5) Christ was **offered** once to **bear** the sins of many (Heb. 9:28; cf. Lev. 10:17; 16:22; Isa. 53:11-12)
 - 6) Jesus' **body** is contrasted with the **sacrifices** and **offerings** of the old covenant (Heb. 10:5)
 - 7) We have been sanctified through the **offering** of the body of Jesus (Heb. 10:10)
 - 8) Jesus offered **one sacrifice** for sin (Heb. 10:12)
 - 9) By **one offering**, Jesus perfected forever those who are being sanctified (Heb. 10:14)
 - 10) We can "**enter the Holiest** by the blood of Jesus" (Heb. 10:19-20)
 - 11) Jesus suffered **outside the gate** (Heb. 13:11-12; cf. Ex. 29:14; Lev. 4:11-12, 21; 8:17; 9:11; 16:27)
 - 12) Jesus was a **lamb** without **spot** or **blemish** (1 Pet. 1:18-19; cf. Ex. 12:5; Lev. 1:3, 10; 3:1, 6; 4:3, 23, 28, 32; 5:15, 18; 6:6; 9:2-3)
 - c. **Jesus' blood** is described in "**OT language**"
 - 1) It is the blood of the **new covenant** (Mt. 26:28; Mk. 14:24; cf. Ex. 24:8; Heb. 9:18-22)
 - 2) It was through His own blood that Jesus entered the **Most Holy Place** (Heb. 9:12, 25; cf. 10:19)
-

- 3) It is the blood of **sprinkling** that speaks better things than Abel's (Heb. 12:24; cf. 1 Pet. 1:2)
- 4) It is the blood of **the Lamb** (1 Pet. 1:18-19; Rev. 7:14; 12:11)

V. Penal Substitution

A. Were the OT sacrifices vicarious?

1. "Vicarious":

- a. *The American Heritage Dictionary*: "1. **Performed or endured by one person substituting for another**; fulfilled by the substitution of the actual offender with some other person or thing: *vicarious punishment*. 2. Acting in place of someone or something else; delegated; substituted. [Latin *vicarius*, substituting, from *vicis*, change, turn, office....]." (Bold emphasis added, 1427)
- b. *Merriam Webster's Collegiate Dictionary*: "1 a: serving instead of someone or something else b: that has been delegated <*vicarious* authority> 2: **performed or suffered by one person as a substitute for another** or to the benefit or advantage of another: SUBSTITUTIONARY <a *vicarious* sacrifice> " (Bold emphasis added)

2. Several OT passages point to the **vicarious (substitutionary) nature** of the animal sacrifices

- a. God provided **a ram** as a substitute for Isaac (Gen. 22:7-14)
 - 1) Gen. 22:13 [LXX]: ¹³ And looking up, Abraham saw with his eyes, and look, one ram being held in a bush, a thicket of the horns, and Abraham went and took the ram and offered it as a whole offering **instead** [*anti*] of Isaac, his son. (LES)
 - a) The Greek preposition *anti* usually means "in the place of"
 - 2) The **typology** in Abraham's offering of Isaac is not hard to detect:
 - a) Your son, your **only son** (Gen. 22:2; cf. Heb. 11:17; Jn. 3:16)
 - b) The land of **Moriah** (Gen. 22:2) became the sight of **Solomon's temple** (2 Chr. 3:1), and that was Jerusalem (Mt. 16:21; 20:17-19)
 - c) Offer him as a **burnt offering** (Gen. 22:2; cf. Isa. 53:10)
 - d) The **third day** (Gen. 22:4; Lk. 24:46)
 - e) We will **come back** to you (Gen. 22:5; cf. Heb. 11:19; Mt. 16:21)
 - f) Isaac carries **the wood** (Gen. 22:6; cf. Jn. 19:17)
 - g) God will provide **the lamb** (Gen. 22:8; cf. Jn. 1:29; 1 Pet. 1:19-20)
 - h) **Ram** offered instead (Gen. 22:13; cf. 2 Cor. 5:21)
 - 3) *Objection*: Isaac was supposed to be offered, and the ram became his substitute; but mankind was never supposed to be **offered on the cross** or any altar as a sacrifice (Barnett, *Reconciliation*, 123)
 - 4) *Response*: This is **pressing the typology** too far. Mankind was supposed to **die spiritually** (Ezek. 18:20; Rom. 6:23), and **Jesus died spiritually** (i.e. was separated from God) as mankind's substitute

-
- b. **The Passover lamb** was a substitute for the firstborn in Israel (Ex. 12:3-7, 12-13, 21-23)
- 1) The tenth plague was a judgment on **Egypt** (Ex. 4:22-23; 11:4-7; 12:12-13, 15, 21-23), but it was also evidently a judgment on **Israel** as well because she had adopted the idolatry of the Egyptians (Ezek. 20:4-10)
 - 2) The blood on the doorposts and the lintels was **a sign** (Ex. 12:13) to identify Israelite homes, but it was also an indication of **substitution**
 - a) The Passover lamb functioned as **a penal substitute**, dying in the place of the firstborn sons of the Israelites, in order that they might escape the wrath of God
 - b) “At the first Passover, the Jewish people were delivered not only from the **tyranny of Pharaoh**, but also from the **judgment of God** on their idolatry. It was through **the substitutionary death of a lamb**, whose blood marked out the Israelite households, that their firstborn sons were spared.” (Bold emphasis added, Jeffery, Ovey, & Sach, PFOT, 41)
 - c) *Leon Morris*: “It is **impossible** to understand from the splashing of blood on the lintel and doorposts that **a life is being presented to anyone**. The obvious symbolism is that **a death has taken place**, and **this death substitutes for the death of the firstborn**.” (Bold emphasis added, *APC*, 121)
 - d) *David McClister*: “It is not as if some of the people in Egypt were going to die and some were not, and the blood on the doorpost simply pointed out which were which. No, the picture instead is that every firstborn male in Egypt was going to die, whether they were native Egyptians or Israelites. The death sentence was on the whole land, and **the blood on the doorpost resulted in the saving of life in that home. The Passover, then, was a salvation from death**.” (PHSS, 108)
 - 1] *Note*: Bro. McClister argues that the blood of the Passover lamb signified a **commitment to God** rather than penal substitution (PHSS, 109)
 - 2] I personally think it is more likely that it signified **just the opposite**
 - 3) *Objection*: The blood that was placed on the door posts and the lintel saved the firstborn of both **man and beast** (Ex. 11:7; 12:13, 22-23). Was the blood of the Passover lamb **a substitute sacrifice for the “sins” of animals**? (Barnett, *Reconciliation*, 132)
 - a) *Response*: The **death** of the lamb (or goat) was a **substitute** for the **death of the firstborn** in each house, whether man or beast. It could not have been a substitute for the “sins” of animals, because **animals cannot sin**
- c. **Moses** offered his own life to atone for the sins of his people (Ex. 32:30-33)
- 1) Hofmann objects to this interpretation by saying: “All that Moses really asks is that **if Jehovah will not forgive the nation, He may blot out his name from the book of life**. He has no wish to live if his people are to forfeit their sacred calling, which they have received from God.” (Bold emphasis added, Quoted in J. H. Kurtz, *SWOT*, 107, n. 1)
-

-
- 2) Kurtz responds by saying: “But the answer given by God in ver. 33 requires our interpretation; for it presupposes that **Moses had asked to be blotted out of the book, for the purpose of preserving those who had deserved it** because of their sin.” (Bold emphasis added, SWOT, 107, n. 1)
 - 3) But I think that Hofmann’s objection is valid. **God is merely telling Moses that he will not take the life of an innocent man in the place of the guilty**
 - d. **The laying on of hands** in the sacrificial ritual suggests a **transfer of sins** from the sinner to the sacrificial animal as a substitute (Lev. 1:4)
 - 1) *Objection:* There is no indication that the laying on of hands signified a literal or symbolic **transfer of sins** to the victim
 - a) *Response:* The **confession of sins** associated with the laying on of hands on the Day of Atonement could certainly indicate such a transfer (Lev. 16:21)
 - 2) *Objection:* When a **mother** offered sacrifices after childbirth (Lev. 12:1-8) and when a **cleansed leper** offered sacrifices (Lev. 14:13-32) which required the laying on of hands (Lev. 3:4; 4:4) did that involve a transfer of sin?
 - a) *Response:* Childbirth and leprosy were **not sinful**, so there was **no transfer of sin** unless, I suppose, they had committed sin in some other way
 - b) *Response:* If the laying on of hands did not signify the transfer of sin in **some sacrifices**, that does not prove that it did not signify the transfer of sin in **any sacrifice**
 - e. The sending away of **the “scapegoat”** suggests penal substitution (Lev. 16:5-10, 20-22)²⁵
 - 1) *Objection:* The scapegoat appears in the atonement ritual **after the blood rite** in the Most Holy Place (Lev. 16:20)
 - a) *Response:* Both the sacrificed goat and the scapegoat were for **atonement** (Lev. 16:10, 18), and the atonement ritual was **not completed** until the scapegoat was released
 - 2) *Objection:* The scapegoat was **not slain**
 - a) *Response:* That does not disprove that it was a **type** of Christ’s **bearing** mankind’s sin (Isa. 53:11-12)
 - 3) *Objection:* If the scapegoat bearing Israel’s sins typifies Jesus bearing the sins of the world, then we must accept either **limited atonement** or **universal salvation**
 - a) *Response:* Not if sinners only receive the benefits of Jesus’ sacrifice if and when they **meet certain conditions**, and that is clearly what the NT teaches
 - f. **The sacrifice of an unworked heifer in the case of unsolved murder** suggests penal substitution (Dt. 21:1-9)²⁶
 - g. **Egypt and neighboring kingdoms** served as a substitutionary ransom price for Israel (Isa. 43:3-4)
-

3. *Leon Morris*: “When a sacrifice was offered we should see it as **a killing of the animal in place of the worshipper** and the manipulation of the blood as the ritual presentation to God of the evidence that a death has taken place to atone for sin. When the New Testament writers refer to **the death of Christ as a sacrifice**, we should not understand them to be making **some far-fetched identification of his blood with his life**. Rather they are solemnly referring to **the significance of his death**.” (Bold emphasis added, AMS, 62)

B. Was **Christ’s sacrifice vicarious**?²⁷ (Arguments For Penal Substitution)

1. The doctrine of **penal substitution** can be summarized as follows:
 - a. **Spiritual death** is the penalty for sin (Gen. 2:16-17; Ezek. 18:1-4, 20)
 - b. All men are **sinners** (Rom. 3:9, 23)
 - c. Therefore, all sinners **should die** (Rom. 6:23)
 - d. God’s **justice** demands the **punishment** of sin
 - e. God’s **mercy** wants to **save sinners**
 - f. God provided His Son as **a Substitute** to die in the place of sinners
2. If the OT animal sacrifices were **types** of Christ’s sacrifice and if they were **vicarious**, then they provide **presumptive evidence** that Christ’s sacrifice was **vicarious** as well
3. The **Song of the Suffering Servant** appears to describe **penal substitution** (Isa. 52:13-53:12)
 - a. There is **substitution**
 - 1) He suffered **“for”** transgressions and iniquities (Isa. 53:4)
 - a) Note the contrasts between the pronouns:
 - 1] **“He”** and **“we”** (Isa. 53:2, 3)
 - 2] **“Him”** and **“we”** (Isa. 53:3, 4)
 - 3] **“He”** and **“our”** (Isa. 53:4, 5)
 - 4] **“Him”** and **“our”** (Isa. 53:5)
 - 5] **“His”** and **“we”** (Isa. 53:5)
 - 6] **“Him”** and **“us all”** (Isa. 53:6)
 - b) Note the **emphatic position** of the pronoun **“He”** (Isa. 53:4, 5, 11, 12)
 - c) *Objection*: **“For”** [*min*] (Isa. 53:5, 8) means **“because of”** the sins of the people
 - 1] *Illust.*: The Jews who died in the Holocaust were wounded **because** of Hitler’s transgressions and crushed **as a result** of his iniquities; but this would not imply that they suffered **instead of** him (Jeffery, Ovey, & Sach, PFOT, 55)
 - d) *Response*: Yes, **“for”** [*min*] does mean **“because of,”** but “because of” and “instead of” are **not mutually exclusive**. The Servant suffers **“because of”** sinners’ transgressions and **“instead of”** those sinners so they won’t have to. This seems to be **clearly implied** throughout the context

-
- 2) He bore **our** griefs and carried **our** sorrows (Isa. 53:4)
 - 3) For the transgressions of **My people** He was stricken (Isa. 53:8c)
 - 4) He shall bear **their** iniquities (Isa. 53:11c)
 - 5) He bore the sin of **many** (Isa. 53:12e)
 - 6) “All of this serves to underline the simple fact that the Servant who is distinct from God’s people, **suffered in their place, as their substitute.**”
(Bold emphasis added, Jeffery, Ovey, & Sach, PFOT, 54)
- b. There is **punishment**
- 1) He was **wounded** for our transgressions (Isa. 53:5a)
 - 2) He was **bruised** for our iniquities (Isa. 53:5b)
 - 3) The **chastisement** for our peace was upon him (Isa. 53:5c)
 - a) “**Punishment**” (HCSB; NET; NCV; NIV)
 - 4) By His **stripes** we are healed (Isa. 53:5d)
 - 5) For He was **cut off** from the land of the living (Isa. 53:8c)
 - 6) For the transgressions of My people He was **stricken** (Isa. 53:8d)
- c. There is punishment **by God**
- 1) He was esteemed smitten by **God** (Isa. 53:4)
 - 2) **The Lord** has laid on Him the iniquity of us all (Isa. 53:6c)
 - 3) It pleased **the Lord** to bruise Him (Isa. 53:10a)
 - 4) **He** [God] has put Him to grief (Isa. 53:10b)
 - 5) **You** [God] make His soul an offering for sin (Isa. 53:10c)
- d. There is punishment while **innocent**
- 1) He had done **no violence** (Isa. 53:9b)
 - 2) Nor was any **deceit** in His mouth (Isa. 53:9c)
 - 3) He is “My **righteous** Servant” (Isa. 53:11b)
 - 4) “Thus the juxtaposition of the **Servant’s innocence** and **God’s determination that he should suffer** focuses our question: **for what sins might God justly visit this judicial sentence upon him?** Clearly not his own.” (Bold emphasis added, Jeffery, Ovey, & Sach, PFOT, 59)
- e. There is punishment for **the sins of others**
- 1) He was wounded for **our transgressions** (Isa. 53:5a)
 - 2) He was bruised for **our iniquities** (Isa. 53:5b)
 - 3) The Lord has laid on Him **the iniquity of us all** (Isa. 53:6c)
 - 4) For **the transgressions of My people** He was stricken (Isa. 53:8d)
 - 5) He was an “[guilt] offering for **sin**” (Isa. 53:10c, cf. ESV; HCSB, LEB, NASB; NIV; YLT)
 - a) ‘*asam* is translated “trespass/guilt offering” in Leviticus
-

-
- 6) He shall bear **their iniquities** (Isa. 53:11c)
 - 7) He bore **the sin of many** (Isa. 53:12d)
 - f. There is **great benefit** for others
 - 1) The chastisement for **our peace** was upon Him (Isa. 53:5c)
 - 2) By His stripes we are **healed** (Isa. 53d)
 - 3) He would **justify** many (Isa. 53:11a)
 - 4) “It is not just that the Servant shares in the people’s fate, and experiences their suffering alongside them. Rather, **he experiences the punishment due to them, and they do not**. Indeed, the sufferings experienced by the Servant are **not shared by Israel precisely because he experienced them in their place, as their substitute**.” (Jeffery, Ovey, & Sach, PFOT, 56)
 - g. There is **willing participation** by the Servant
 - 1) He has **borne** our griefs and **carried** our sorrows (Isa. 53:4a)
 - 2) He **carried** our sorrows (Isa. 53:4b)
 - 3) He **shall bear** their iniquities (Isa. 53:11c)
 - 4) He **poured out** His soul unto death (Isa. 53:12c)
 - 5) He **bore** the sin of many (Isa. 53:12e)
 - 6) He **made intercession** for the transgressors (Isa. 53:12f)
 - 7) “The Servant **consented to**, and **actively participated in**, this ministry of sin-bearing and substitutionary death, in accordance with the will of God to afflict him in the place of others. **Isaiah carefully guards against the false idea that God inflicted punishment against the Servant’s will**; indeed, ‘God’s responsibility for the Servant’s vicarious role is articulated explicitly only after the Servant’s acceptance of suffering has been established in 53:4a.’” (Bold emphasis added, Jeffery, Ovey, & Sach, PFOT, 59)
 - h. *Objection:* Jesus did not literally “**bear**” the sins of mankind (Isa. 53:4, 11-12) in the sense that they were **imputed** to Him; but He figuratively **took them away** or **removed them**
 - 1) The OT priests **bore the iniquity** of Israel by **making atonement** for them (Lev. 10:16-17)
 - a) If sin and guilt had been transferred from the people to the priests, then they would have become **unclean** and therefore **unfit** for making sacrifices
 - b) *Response:* This assumes that **bearing iniquity** *never* or *always* implies a **transfer** of sins. Sometime it does, and sometimes it doesn’t
 - 2) The **scapegoat** figuratively removed Israel’s sins (Lev. 16:22)
 - a) *Response:* The **laying on of hands** and the **confession of sins** (Lev. 16:21) strongly suggest a figurative or symbolic **transfer of sin** from the people to the scapegoat
 - 3) Jesus “**bore our griefs**” (Isa. 53:4) by casting out demons and healing the sick during His personal ministry (Mt. 8:16-17)
-

-
- a) *Maurice Barnett*: “[T]heir diseases were not **transferred to Jesus** so that He then became a leper. He didn’t become demon possessed in casting out the demons. He didn’t become blind in restoring their sight. Yet, He ‘bore’ their diseases in fulfillment of Isaiah 53:4. **Jesus took away their diseases!**” (Bold emphasis added, *Reconciliation*, 214)
 - b) *Response*: This assumes that “**bore**” *never* or *always* implies **transfer**. Sometime it does, and sometimes it doesn’t
 - 4) Jesus **bore our iniquities** (Isa. 53:11-12) by **removing them** (Jn. 1:29; 1 Pet. 2:24)
 - a) Heb. 9:26: ²⁶ He then would have had to suffer often since the foundation of the world; but now, once at the end of the ages, He has appeared to **put away** sin by the **sacrifice** of Himself.
 - b) Heb. 9:28: ²⁸ so Christ was **offered** once to **bear** the sins of many. To those who eagerly wait for Him He will appear a second time, apart from sin, for salvation.
 - 1] “**Put away**” (v. 26) = “**bear**” (v. 28)
 - 2] “**Sacrifice**” (v. 26) = “**offered**” (v. 28)
 - c) *Response*: This explanation does not **preclude penal substitution**. Jesus “**put away**” sins by **bearing them (imputation)** and being **punished** in the place of sinful mankind
 - 4. The **prophecy of Caiaphas** seems to indicate penal substitution (Jn. 11:47-52)
 - a. **Substitution** is clearly implied if one man **dies “for”** [*huper*] the people and those people **do not die**
 - 1) This may indicate that sometimes *huper* means “**instead of**” rather than “**on behalf of**” (cf. Jn. 6:51; 10:11; 13:37-38; 18:14)
 - 2) Even if *huper* means “**on behalf of**” here, **substitution** is still implied in this statement
 - b. Even though Caiaphas evidently **did not understand** the significance of his statement, John says “he **prophesied** that Jesus would die for the nation” (Jn. 11:51)
 - c. When Caiaphas “**prophesied**” that means that **God was speaking** through him (cf. Ex. 4:15-16; 7:1; Dt. 18:18; Acts 3:18, 21)
 - 5. The **release of Barabbas** and the **crucifixion of Jesus** seems to point to penal substitution (Mt. 27:15-26; Mk. 15:6-15; Lk. 23:13-25; Jn. 18:39-40)
 - a. This is mentioned in **all four of the Gospels**. Why? Isn’t it reasonable to believe that it must have **some kind of significance**?
 - b. Barabbas was a “**notorious prisoner**” (Mt. 27:16), a **rebel** (Mk. 15:7; Lk. 23:18-19), a **murderer** (Mk. 15:7; Lk. 23:18-19), and a **robber** (Jn. 18:40)
 - c. Jesus was a “**just Man**” according to Pilate’s wife (Mt. 27:19), and **His innocence** was proclaimed by Pilate at least five times
 - 1) After his **first conversation** with Jesus (Lk. 23:4; Jn. 18:38)
 - 2) After Jesus was **returned to Pilate** from Herod (Lk. 23:13-15)
-

-
- 3) When Pilate **brought Jesus out** to the Jews (Jn. 19:4)
 - 4) After offering to **punish Jesus** and **release Him** (Mt. 27:23; Mk. 15:14; Lk. 23:22; Jn. 19:6)
 - 5) When Pilate **washed his hands** (Mt. 27:24-25)
 - d. Barabbas, a guilty man, was **released**, and Jesus, an innocent man, was **punished instead** (in his place)
 - 1) Does Barabbas **represent sinners** like you and me?
 - e. This looks a lot like **penal substitution**
 - 1) *Note:* I wouldn't say that this is **conclusive**, but it is certainly **suggestive** and **consistent** with this concept of the atonement
 6. Christ's death is described in terms that appear to indicate **penal substitution**
 - a. Jesus died **for** [*hyper*] sinners
 - 1) Several passages teach this fact:
 - a) He gives His **flesh** (Jn. 6:51)
 - b) He gives His **life** (Jn. 10:11)
 - c) He lays down **His life** (Jn. 10:15; cf. 15:13)
 - d) He dies for the **people/nation** (Jn. 11:50-52; 18:14)
 - e) He died for the **ungodly** (Rom. 5:6)
 - f) He died for **sinners** (Rom. 5:8)
 - g) He died for the **weak brother** (Rom. 14:15)
 - h) His **body** was given (Lk. 22:19; cf. 1 Cor. 11:24)
 - i) His **blood** was shed (Lk. 22:20)
 - j) He died for **our sins** (1 Cor. 15:3)
 - k) He died for **all** (2 Cor. 5:14-15)
 - 1) He gave **Himself** (Gal. 1:4; 2:20; Eph. 5:2)
 - m) He gave Himself for **the church** (Eph. 5:25)
 - n) He died for **us** (1 Th. 5:10)
 - o) He gave Himself **a ransom for all** (1 Tim. 2:6)
 - p) He gave Himself for us that He might **redeem us** (Tit. 2:14)
 - q) He **tasted death** for everyone (Heb. 2:9)
 - r) He **entered the Presence** behind the veil for us (Heb. 6:19-20; 9:24)
 - s) He lives to make **intercession** for them (Heb. 7:25)
 - t) He offered **one sacrifice for sins** (Heb. 10:12)
 - u) He suffered for us **in the flesh** (1 Pet. 4:1)
 - v) He **laid down** His life (1 Jn. 3:16)
 - 2) A few passages deserve **careful consideration**:

a) He was **made to be sin** (2 Cor. 5:21)

1] *Objection*: “**Sin**” [*hamartia*] means “**sin offering**”

a] *Maurice Barnett*: “Jesus was **not made sin**, meaning that He became a sinner, but rather **He became a sin sacrifice on our behalf**. A sin sacrifice to God was the means of opening the way to God by which remission of sins could be accomplished, forgiveness could be given.” (Bold emphasis added, *Reconciliation*, 336)

b] The word for “**sin**” sometimes means “**sin offering**” (cf. Lev. 6:25; 4:21, 25; Heb. 10:6, 8)

1} 2 Cor. 5:21, (*The Jewish New Testament*): “God made this sinless man be a **sin offering** on our behalf, so that in union with him we might fully share in God’s righteousness.” (Quoted in Barnett, *Reconciliation*, 135)

c] If Jesus was **literally made sin**, then He could not have been the **perfect sacrifice** for sin (cf. 1 Pet. 1:18-19; Heb. 7:26-27)

2] *Response*: “**Sin**” [*hamartia*] means “**sin offering**” when the context **demands** that meaning. 2 Cor. 5:21 does not **require** that meaning

3] *Response*: There is a *contrast* between what Christ is made for us, namely, “**sin**” and what we are made in Him, namely, “**the righteousness of God**.” This contrast is obscured, if not destroyed, if *hamartia* is translated “**sin offering**” instead of “**sin**” (Crawford, quoted in Barnett, *Reconciliation*, 136)

a] *Maurice Barnett*: “There should be no difficulty in understanding that Jesus became a *sin-offering* on our behalf that we might, *as a result*, become the righteousness of God in Him. This is a simple instance of a **consequence following directly from a particular act**.” (Bold emphasis added, *Reconciliation*, 136-137)

4] *Objection*: Jesus was made to us wisdom from God, **righteousness, sanctification, and redemption** (1 Cor. 1:30). He was **holy, undefiled, and separated** from sinners (Heb. 7:26-27). Therefore, how could Jesus literally have been **made sin**?

5] *Response*: Paul does not mean that Jesus was literally made **sin** or a **sinner**. I believe he means that He was **treated** as a sinner and **punished** as a sinner in the place of sinners

a] *Note*: While Bullinger argues that “**sin**” is used by metonymy for a “**sin offering**” (*FSUBEI*, 292), it seems just as reasonable to believe that it is used by metonymy for “**guilt**”

b) He became **a curse** (Gal. 3:13; cf. Dt. 21:22-23)²⁸

1] *Leon Morris*: “It seems likely that **the preposition here conveys a substitutionary thought**. It is true that **the word usually**

signifies ‘on behalf of’, but this is not all the story. It can convey the idea of substitution.” (Bold emphasis added, APC, 62)

- 2] *Objection:* Christ was not literally cursed of God (Gal. 3:13-14); it only **appeared to others** that He was cursed of God, and they **treated** Him as though He were **guilty** (cf. Mt. 27:39-43; Psa. 22:6-8) (“The Vicarious Death Of Christ?? 3,” PM, Feb. 1999, 72)

- 3] *Response:* Dt. 21:22-23 refers to a “**cursing**” by God, not man

- c) He **suffered** for us (1 Pet. 2:21)

- 1] *Objection:* Christ died for [*huper*] sinners to show us **the kind of commitment** we must make to God²⁹

- a] Jesus “**bore our sins** in his body on the tree, so that we might **die to sin** and **live to righteousness**....” (1 Pet. 2:24, ESV)

- 1} *Note:* Here Peter strongly **echoes Isaiah 53** (cf. 1 Pet. 2:22 & Isa. 53:9, 11; 1 Pet. 2:23 & Isa. 53:7; 1 Pet. 2:24a & Isa. 53:4, 12; 1 Pet. 2:24b & Isa. 53:5; 1 Pet. 2:25 & Isa. 53:6)

- 2} *David McClister:* “[I]t is clear that Peter understood that text to be speaking about **Jesus dedication to God**. His bearing our sins in His body on the cross was for the purpose of instructing us that we should **die to sin** and **live to righteousness**.” (Bold emphasis added, PHSS, 117)

- b] *Response:* Is this the **only significance** of Jesus’ sacrifice?

- d) He suffered once for sins, **the just for the unjust** (1 Pet. 3:18)

- 1] “The juxtaposition of **Christ’s innocence** with **our guilt** and the fact that **his death benefits the guilty** (‘to bring you to God’) together point to a **substitutionary meaning** for the preposition *hyper*.” (Bold emphasis added, Jeffery, Ovey, & Sach, PFOT, 98)

- 3) *Objection:* The preposition *huper* never means “**in the place of**”³⁰

- a) Although *huper* normally means “**on behalf of**,” the lexicographers say that sometimes it can mean “**in the place of**” (See BDAG, 1030-1031; Thayer, 638-639; Trench, lxxxii, 310-313; EDNT, 3:396-397; TDNT, 8:507-513; Little Kittel, 1228-1229)

- b) In several passages, *huper* may mean “**in the place of**” (cf. Dt. 24:16; Jn. 10:11, 15; 11:50-52; 13:37-38 [?]; Rom. 9:3; 16:4 [?]; 1 Cor. 15:29 [?]; 2 Cor. 5:14-15, 20 [?]; Gal. 3:13; 1 Tim. 2:6 [?]; Phile. 13 [?])

- 1] *Objection:* Did Jesus **die** and **rise** again (2 Cor. 5:14-15) “**in the place of**” sinners? Do Christians live “**in the place of**” “Him who died for them and rose again”?³¹

- 2] *Response:* Must *huper* **mean the same thing** in every instance of its usage in 2 Cor. 5:14-15? Compare the meaning of “**spirit**” (*pneuma*) in Rom. 8:14-16

- c) A. T. Robertson: “It is sometimes said that ἀντί means literally ‘instead’ and ὑπέρ ‘in behalf of.’ But Winer sees more clearly when he says: ‘**In most cases one who acts in behalf of another takes his**

place.’ Whether he does or not depends on the nature of the action, not on ἀντί or ὑπέρ.” (Bold emphasis added, GGNT, 630)

b. Jesus died to **redeem** or **ransom** sinners

1) Jesus gave Himself **for** [*anti*] a **ransom** (Mt. 20:28; Mk. 10:45)

- a) *Leon Morris*: “The preposition ἀντί characteristically has the meaning ‘**in the place of**’, ‘**instead of**’....” (APC, 34)
- b) *Anti* certainly appears to have **this significance** in several Bible passages (cf. LXX Gen. 22:13; 44:33; Num. 3:12; Mt. 2:22; 5:38; Lk. 11:11; 1 Cor. 11:15; Heb. 12:2)
- c) *Objection*: The preposition *anti* can mean **different things** in different contexts:
 - 1] “**In the place of**” (Mt. 2:22; Mt. 5:38; Lk. 11:11; Heb. 12:16)
 - 2] “**Because**” (Lk. 1:20; 19:44; 2 Th. 2:10; Acts 12:23; Eph. 5:31)
 - 3] “**For**” (1 Cor. 11:15; Eph. 5:31; Heb. 12:2)
 - 4] “**On behalf of**” (Mt. 17:27; Mt. 20:28; Mk. 10:45)
 - 5] “**Equivalent to**” (Rom. 12:17; 1 Th. 5:15; 1 Pet. 3:9)
- d) *Response*: The fact that *anti* can mean different things in different contexts is **irrelevant**. That is true of many words. The issue is **what does anti mean in any particular context**, and **that meaning** must be determined by **that context**

2) The one Mediator between God and men gave Himself a **ransom** [*antilutron*] **for** [*huper*] all (1 Tim. 2:5-6)

- a) “**Ransom**”: *antilutron* = *anti* (“in the place of”) + *lutron* (ransom)
- b) “**For**”: *huper* = “on behalf of”
- c) Does this passage **combine both thoughts**: “in the place of” and “on behalf of”?
- d) Or is this **reading too much** into etymology?

1] *Illust.*: A “butterfly” is not a fly with butter smeared all over it

c. Jesus died to **reconcile** sinners to God

- 1) Sinners are **reconciled to God** through the death of His Son (Rom. 5:10-11)
- 2) God was in Christ **reconciling the world** to Himself (2 Cor. 5:19)
- 3) Enemies have been **reconciled “in the body of His flesh through death”** (Col. 1:19-22)

d. Jesus “**bore our sins in His own body** on the tree” (1 Pet. 2:24)

7. A vicarious sacrifice by Christ satisfies the requirements of “**propitiation**” [*hilasterion*] (Rom. 3:25; Heb. 2:17; 1 Jn. 2:1-2; 4:10)

a. “Propitiation” is the **turning away of anger**

- 1) God is **angry** when people sin (Psa. 7:11; Rom. 1:18; 2:5, 8; 3:5)

-
- a) He not only **hates sin** (Isa. 61:8; Jer. 44:4; Zech. 8:17), but He **hates sinners** (Psa. 5:5; 11:5-6; Hos. 9:15)
 - b) **Love** (Hos. 2:14-23; 11:1-4, 8-11) and **hate** (Hos. 9:15-17; 8:5, 14) are not **mutually exclusive**³²
- 2) If sinners are to be **forgiven**, something must be done to **appease God's anger**
- a) In the LXX, the Greek words translated "**propitiation**" in the NT involve the **appeasement of wrath** in several contexts (Morris, APC, 157-159)
 - 1] *Hilaskomai* (Lk. 18:13; Heb. 2:17)
 - a] Ex. 32:14 & Ex. 32:11-12
 - b] 2 Ki. 24:3-4 & 2 Ki. 23:26; 24:20
 - c] Lam. 3:42 & Lam. 3:43
 - d] Psa. 78:38 & Psa. 78:21, 31, 38, 49, 50, 58
 - e] Psa. 79:9 & Psa. 78:5-7
 - f] Dan. 9:19 [AT] & Dan. 9:16 [AT]
 - 2] *Hilamos* (1 Jn. 2:2; 4:10)
 - a] Dan. 9:8 (Th.) & Dan. 9:11-12, 16
 - b] 2 Macc. 3:33
 - 3] *Hilasterion* (Rom. 3:25)
 - a] 4 Macc. 17:22 & 4 Macc. 17:9-10, 20-21
 - b) **Extra-biblical evidence** for this understanding is also found in:
 - 1] Josephus, *Antiquities*, 6:6:(124)
 - 2] Philo (See TDNT, 3:315)
 - 3] *1 Clement* 7 (ANF, 1:7)
 - 4] *The Shepherd of Hermas*, Vision 1, 2.1 (AFET, 337)
 - c) This fundamental meaning of **propitiation** must not be **ignored** or **watered down**
- 3) Christ's death is the **means of removing God's wrath** from sinners (Rom. 5:9)
- a) God Himself **provided** the appeasing remedy for Israel in the blood of their animal sacrifices (Lev. 17:11)
 - b) God Himself **provided** the appeasing remedy for all men in the sacrifice of Christ (Rom. 3:24-26)
- b. How does **Christ's death remove God's wrath** from sinners?
- 1) All accountable people have **sinned** (Rom. 3:9, 23)
 - 2) The **penalty** for sin is **spiritual death** (Gen. 2:16-17; Ezek. 18:20)
 - 3) Spiritual death is **separation** from God (Isa. 59:1-2)
-

-
- 4) As sinners, we **earn** spiritual death (Rom. 5:12; 6:23)
 - 5) All unforgiven sinners are doomed to face **God's wrath** (Jn. 3:36; Rom. 1:18; 2:5, 8; Eph. 5:6; Col. 3:6)
 - 6) Jesus became our **substitute** (Isa. 53:1-12)
 - 7) God **punished Jesus** instead of us with spiritual death (Isa. 53:4-6, 8, 10-12; 1 Pet. 2:24)
 - a) Why must God **punish sin**? Because **He said He would**
 - 1] God's promise to Adam:
 - a] God told Adam that when he **ate** the forbidden fruit he would **die** (Gen. 2:17)
 - b] If God had **reneged** on His promise, then **Satan's lie** "you will not surely die" (Gen. 3:2) would have been **true**
 - 2] God's promise to all men:
 - a] The wages of sin is **death** (Rom. 6:23)
 - b] Therefore, **sinners must die** or a **Substitute must die** for them
 - 3] If God were to go back on His **promise to punish sin**, then His **promise of mercy** would be undermined as well
 - a] "Both **God's judgment** and **his mercy** are bound up with his character as a **truthful God**, faithful to his promises." (Bold emphasis added, Jeffery, Ovey, & Sach, PFOT, 125)
 - b) "Thus when we read in Romans 3:26 that God's wrath has been turned aside in a way that demonstrates *his justice*, we cannot conceivably imagine that the punishment for sin has been overlooked! **God must punish sin, and in the death of Christ he has done so.**" (Bold emphasis added, Jeffery, Ovey, & Sach, PFOT, 81)
 - c) *Leon Morris*: "The writers of the New Testament know nothing of a love which does not react in the very strongest fashion against every form of sin.
 "It is the combination of **God's deep love for the sinner** with **His uncompromising reaction against sin** which brings about what the Bible calls **propitiation**. Since God would not leave man to suffer all the consequences of his sin, Christ suffered...." (Bold emphasis added, APC, 210)
 - 8) Jesus' "**Cry of Dereliction**" suggests that He was **spiritually separated** from God at Calvary (Mt. 27:46; Mk. 15:34)
 - a) What is the significance of **the darkness** from the sixth to the ninth hour? (Mt. 27:45; Mk. 15:33; Lk. 23:44)
 - 1] **Darkness** is repeatedly associated with **God's wrath** (Isa. 13:9-11; Joel 2:31; Amos 5:18-20; Zeph. 1:14-15)
 - 2] **God's wrath** rests upon **unforgiven sinners** (Jn. 3:36; Rom. 1:18; 2:5, 8; Eph. 5:6; Col. 3:6)
-

-
- 3] If this darkness signifies God's wrath, **who is its object?** The **crucifiers?** The **crucified?** **Both?**
 - 4] The juxtaposition of **the darkness** with Jesus' **cry of abandonment** suggests that **God's judgment** was falling on His Son as **He died as a Substitute**, bearing the sins of the world (Jeffery, Ovey, & Sach, PFOT, 72)
 - b) Why would Jesus **ask this question** if He had **not been forsaken** by God?
 - 1] What does the "**plain sense**" of the question imply?
 - 2] Wouldn't we need **compelling evidence** to reject the "plain sense" of the question?
 - c) If Jesus **bore the sins** of the world (Isa. 53:11-12; 2 Cor. 5:21; Heb. 9:28; 1 Pet. 2:24) and **sin separates** one from God (Isa. 59:1-2), then how could Jesus **not have been forsaken** by God?
 - d) *Objections:*
 - 1] David wasn't **really forsaken** by God; he only felt that he was (Psa. 22:21-24)
 - 2] When Jesus quoted Psa. 22:1, He wants us to consider the message of the **entire psalm** which ends in triumph and vindication (Psa. 22:21-31)
 - 3] God **did not forsake** Jesus on the cross; it just **appeared that way** to the people around the cross
 - 4] Jesus denies **any separation** from His Father (Jn. 8:28-29; 16:32)
 - a] "**Is with Me**" is **present tense** indicating continuing action
 - b] "**Has not left** me alone" is **aorist tense** indicating that God had never left Jesus alone
 - e) *Response:*
 - 1] This objection is largely based on **inference**, and while it is **possible**, that doesn't mean that it is **probable**, much less **certain** (necessary)
 - 2] How do we **know** that Jesus wants us to consider the **entire psalm**?³³
 - a] If Jesus wanted us to **think of the vindication** in the last part of Psalm 22, **why didn't He quote from that section?** (cf. Psa. 22:21b, 24)
 - 3] Whenever a **passage** from the Psalms is quoted in the NT, should we **always consider the entire psalm**?³⁴
 - 4] Is this true of **all OT quotations** in the NT?
 - a] "Behold, **the virgin** shall be with child, and bear a Son...." (Isa. 7:14; Mt. 1:23)
 - b] "Out of **Egypt** I called My Son" (Hos. 11:1; Mt. 2:15)
-

-
- c] “A voice was heard in Ramah, Lamentation, weeping, and great mourning, **Rachel weeping for her children....**” (Jer. 31:5; Mt. 2:18)
 - d] **Thirty pieces** of silver (Jer. 32:6-9; Zech. 11:12-13; Mt. 27:9-10)
 - e] “You are **not my people....**” (Hos. 1:10; Rom. 9:24-26)
 - 5] Much of the language that was **figuratively fulfilled** in David was **literally fulfilled** in Jesus (Psa. 22:6-8, 12-18)
 - a] If this is the case for much of Psalm 22, **why not verse 1?**
 - b] If David **wasn’t really forsaken** by God, that doesn’t necessarily mean that Jesus **wasn’t forsaken** by God
 - 6] If we should **think of Psalm 22 in its entirety** when Jesus quoted the first verse, then the **victory** and **vindication** at the end of Psalm 22 was literally fulfilled in **Jesus’ resurrection**
 - 7] Jesus refers to **His Father’s presence with Him** throughout His life, **up to the cross**
 - 9) God’s wrath was **appeased** and **His justice upheld**
 - c. In what I have read from those who **question or reject the idea of penal substitution**, I do not believe that these writers **adequately address** the subject of **propitiation**
 - 1) Maurice Barnett **discusses “propitiation”**, but he argues that the terms refer to **mercy** or the **mercy seat** (*Reconciliation*, 314-325)
 - a) In the LXX, *hilasterion* refers to the **“mercy seat”** covering the ark of the covenant in several passages (Ex. 25:17-22; 31:7; 35:12; 38:5, 7-8; Lev. 16:2, 13-15; Num. 7:89; Ezek. 43:14, 17, 20)
 - b) In the book of Hebrews, *hilasterion* refers to the **“mercy seat”** (Heb. 9:5)
 - c) Atonement was completed only when Jesus **presented His blood** in the **true Holy of Holies** in heaven (Heb. 9:12-14, 23-28)³⁵
 - d) *Response*: Just because *hilasterion* refers to the **“mercy seat”** in some passages does not mean that it refers to it in all
 - e) *Response*: The writer of Hebrews does not say that Jesus **took His own blood** to the mercy seat in the heavenly Most Holy Place (Heb. 9:12)
 - 1] A. M. Stibbs: “He entered in not **with**, but **‘through his own blood’**, that is, **by means of**, or **because of**, His death as Man, when His human blood was shed.” (Bold emphasis added, MWBS, 18)
 - a] **“Through his own blood”** (ASV; NASB; YLT)
 - b] **“By means of his own blood”** (ESV)
 - 2] David McClister: “And yet I know of no one who would claim that when Jesus ascended to heaven, He literally had **a bowl of His blood** with Him.” (Bold emphasis added, PHSS, 112)
-

-
- a] Evidently Bro. McClister hasn't talked to Bro. Barnett or read his book
8. A vicarious sacrifice by Christ explains how God could be both **just** and the **justifier** (Rom. 3:26)
- a. While some might think that the ultimate question is "How could God be righteous if He **did not forgive**?", the question that Paul wrestles with is: "How could God be righteous if He **did forgive**?" (Morris, APC, 279)
 - b. **If Christ was not man's substitute, paying the penalty for sin** that man should have paid:
 - 1) How did His sacrifice **vindicate God** "because in His forbearance God had **passed over the sins** that were previously committed"? (Rom. 3:25)
 - 2) How did His sacrifice **demonstrate God's justice**? (Rom. 3:24-26)
 - c. *John Piper*: "There was only one hope for me – that the infinite **wisdom of God** might make a way for the **love of God** to satisfy the **wrath of God** so that I might become a **son of God**." (Bold emphasis added, "Forward," (Bold emphasis added, Jeffery, Ovey, & Sach, PFOT, 14)
- C. For a **response to the major objections** to penal substitution, see "Appendix B: Objections To Penal Substitution"
- D. While I believe that penal substitution is an important part of the biblical doctrine of the atonement, there is **much more** to the atonement than just **penal substitution**
1. The cross was the means by which **Jesus triumphed over evil powers** [*Christus Victor*] (Col. 2:15; Heb. 2:14-15; Rev. 12)
 2. The cross offers an **inspiring example** to those who suffer unjustly (1 Pet. 2:21-23)
 3. The cross brings about **a decisive end** to our old life of sin that we might live as new people (Rom. 6:6) (Jeffery, Ovey, & Sach, PFOT, 33, 36)
 4. Etc.
- E. Furthermore, penal substitution actually provides **the basis** of other dimensions of the atonement
1. For example, I believe that penal substitution explains **how Christ triumphed** over evil powers [*Christus Victor*]
- F. One of the things that **complicates our understanding** of the atonement provided by Christ's sacrifice is the fact that Bible writers use **figurative language** to describe it
1. *David McClister*: "[T]he language that the Bible uses to tell us about the atonement is obviously **figurative language**, and figurative language usually **describes** but **does not define**. That is, the Biblical language of atonement usually tells us **what it is like**, but rarely does it tell us **exactly what it is**." (Bold emphasis added, PHSS, 93)
 2. As a result, two different interpretative **mistakes** are often made:
 - a. Many **do not recognize** this figurative language and interpret it **literally**
 - b. Many **press the figures further** than they were intended
 3. *Illust.*: "**Redemption**" involves the **payment of a price** to secure freedom or deliverance. **To whom was the price paid** for our redemption from the bondage of sin? God? Satan? Anyone?
-

- a. *Leon Morris*: “[I]n the New Testament there is **never any hint of a recipient of the ransom**. In other words we must understand **redemption as a useful metaphor** which enables us to see some aspects of Christ’s great saving work with clarity but which is not an exact description of the whole process of salvation. **We must not press it beyond what the New Testament tells us about it**. To look for a recipient of the ransom is illegitimate. We have no reason for pressing every detail. We must use the metaphor in the way the New Testament writers did or we fall into error.” (Bold emphasis added, AMS, 129-130)
4. *David McClister*: “We do ourselves no good service when we **treat figurative language literally**, or when we **press figurative language too far**.” (Bold emphasis added, PHSS, 96)
 - a. Bro. McClister believes that the advocates of “penal substitution” often **make these mistakes**
- G. There are **difficulties** with virtually **every explanation** of the atonement that was made possible by Christ’s sacrifice at Calvary; but as we wrestle with these difficulties we need to be careful that **we don’t throw the baby out with the bath water**
 1. *Oliver Buswell*: “There is indeed **an inadequacy to any theory of the atonement** which our finite minds could understand. There are **incompletenesses** and even **inconsistencies** in nearly all the historical modes in which Bible-believing teachers have sought to present the doctrine.” (Bold emphasis added, *A Systematic Theology of the Christian Religion*, Vol. 2, p. 73, quoted in Barnett, *Reconciliation*, 329)
 2. Maurice Barnett suggests that we just **cannot know** why Jesus’ death provides atonement for sin, because that has **not been revealed**³⁶
 3. He simply suggests that Jesus is **man’s bridge to God**³⁷

VI. Practical Lessons For Us Today³⁸

A. “The wages of sin is death” (Rom. 6:23)

1. When God created man, he was **fit for fellowship** with God (he was **pure** in his morality, made in the **image and likeness** of God, a **companion** who had the right to be in the fellowship of Jehovah)
2. But God told Adam and Eve in the very beginning that if they **ate of the forbidden fruit** “in the day that you eat of it you shall **surely die**” (Gen. 2:16-17)
 - a. We all know **the rest of the story**. They **ate** of the forbidden fruit, and they **died**
 - 1) They **died spiritually**, because they were **separated** from God by their sin (cf. Isa. 59:1-2)
 - 2) They **began to die physically**, because they were driven out of the Garden of Eden and away from the **tree of life** (Gen. 3:22-24)
3. Sin brought **spiritual death** to Adam and Eve, and it has brought **spiritual death** to every other accountable human being Rom. 5:12-14
4. But why? **Why does sin bring death?** Because it could be no other way
 - a. Jesus once said: “I am the **resurrection** and the **life**.” (Jn. 11:25)
 - 1) *Note*: Jesus says not just that I **control life**, but that I **am life**
 - b. And God says that **sin separates** man from Him Isa. 59:1-2

- c. So if **God is life** and if **sin separates man from God**, then the natural consequence of sin is **death** – it is the way it had to be
5. From the very beginning of man's relationship with God, God emphasized that when **man sinned** he was **unfit for a relationship** with His Creator and **deserved to die**
 - a. This means that sin could not be **put aside** by a light-hearted wave of the hand. It required the **shedding of blood**
 - b. *Leon Morris*: "In a sacrifice **the blood must be manipulated** in prescribed ways and part or all of the animal must be **burnt on the altar**. All this speaks of the **necessity for death**, nothing less, if sin is to be put away. Sin is not some trifle, to be airily dismissed with no effort. **Sin means death** (Ezk. 18:4; Rom. 6:23) and **nothing less suffices to take it away**." (Bold emphasis added, AMS, 67)
6. The **sacrificial system** under the Mosaic law was intended to highlight the fact that **when sin occurred a life had to be given** to restore a relationship with God Lev. 17:11
 - a. In the Mosaic system, God offered the Israelites **a means** whereby they could **have fellowship** with Jehovah
 - 1) We understand, from our vantage point this side of the cross, that this was ultimately based on **the sacrifice of the Messiah** for the sins of the whole world throughout all time
 - 2) While they may not have understood what we now understand about that, they did understand that they could have **atonement** if they **did** what God **required** them to do
 - 3) And what God required them to do was to **sacrifice a life**

B. Sin is a personal matter

1. The offerer of animal sacrifices under the old covenant was **identified** with his sacrifice in several ways
 - a. He was the one who **brought** the animal to the door of the tabernacle
 - b. He **put his hands** on the head of the animal in the presence of the priest
 - c. He **killed** the animal with his own two hands
 - d. He stood there and **watched** that innocent victim bleed to death
 - 1) When we read about all of this, it probably does not have **the kind of impact** that it would have had upon those who **actually had to do** what this verse says
 - 2) This man had to **take a knife** and **slit the throat** of this animal and stand there with **his hands** upon the animal until the animal died
 - 3) *Leon Morris*: "In this way he gave symbolic expression to his recognition that **his sin merited the severest punishment**. He himself performed the act which set forth the truth that **he deserved death**." (Bold emphasis added, AMS, 48)
 - e. He stood and **watched** as the priest **offered a portion** of that animal on the altar
 - 1) And as he watched, **what would he have seen?**

-
- a) A man wearing **white linen garments** (Ex. 39:27-29)...**covered in blood**
 - 1] Hunters know that you **don't kill a deer** and slaughter it without **getting blood everywhere**
 - b) What the Israelites would have seen when the priests offered those animal sacrifices was **blood everywhere**
 - 2) The Israelites would have seen that **sin** caused that which was **beautiful** and **holy** to become **ugly** and **unholy**
 - 2. All this was done with the knowledge that **this animal was dying** because of the **offerer's sins**
 - a. This innocent lamb or bull was being **put to death**, because:
 - 1) He had **not honored** his father and mother
 - 2) He had **taken the life** of his fellow man
 - 3) He had **committed adultery** with his neighbor's wife
 - 4) He had **stolen** something that didn't belong to him
 - 5) He had **coveted** that which belonged to his neighbor
 - 6) He had **sinned in some way** against God
 - b. The sensitive Israelite understood that because **he had sinned** against God, **something had to die** in order for him to be **reconciled** to God
 - 3. As types of Christ's sacrifice, the animal sacrifices under the old covenant should serve to highlight **my personal responsibility** for the death of my Savior Isa. 53:4-6, 8b, 11b, 12b; Rom. 5:6-10
 - a. If we want to **really understand** what Jesus did for us, we need to **picture ourselves** in much the same position as the Jew with his hands upon the head of the animals that he sacrificed to God for his sins
 - 1) Maybe if we would picture ourselves with **our hands upon Jesus** as He died for us on the cross, then we would have a **better appreciation** for his sacrifice
 - b. *Ray Overholt*: "I'm the one who shouted 'crucify,' I'm the one who made His cross so high, I'm the one who stood and watched Him die; What have I done? I'm the one." ("I'm The One," HFW, #604)
 - c. If I were the **only person** in all the world to ever sin and I **only sinned once** in my entire life, **Jesus had to die to save me!!!**

C. Atonement for sin is costly

- 1. The **costliness** of atonement is depicted by:
 - a. The **quality** of the sacrifices demanded
 - 1) The sinner was required to offer **the very best** he had to atone for his sin (Lev. 22:17-25)
 - b. The **time** and **effort** and **expense** involved in bringing the animal to the tabernacle to make the sacrifice
-

- 1) The Israelites were to offer their sacrifices in **no other place** (Dt. 12:5-14)
- 2) They could not take care of their sin problem in the **comfort** and **convenience** of their **own back yard**
- c. The **sheer number** of the sacrifices that was required
 - 1) Can you imagine **the volume of blood** that was shed by the Israelites in the 1400 years that elapsed from the time of Moses to the time of Christ?
 - a) On just one occasion when **Solomon dedicated the temple**, he offered **22,000 bulls** and **120,000 sheep** (2 Chr. 7:5)
 - b) In fact on this occasion, there were so many offerings that Solomon **consecrated the middle of the court** of the temple, because the brazen altar was not able to receive all of the sacrifices (2 Chr. 7:7)
 - 2) *Robert E. Coleman*: “Official public sacrifices prescribed by law would number altogether **1,273 a year** (Numbers 28:1-29:39). If regularly observed, this would amount to almost **2,000,000 from Moses to Christ**, apart from the **countless millions** of unnumbered individual offerings and additional public sacrifices. Though the sacrifices were usually neglected during periods of religious indifference – which were frequent – still the number of animals slain in sacrifice is staggering to imagine.” (Bold emphasis added, WIB, 30-31, n. 12)
- d. The **attitude** with which the sacrifices were to be offered (Pr. 21:27; Hos. 6:6; Mic. 6:6-8)
 - 1) Rest assured that if a man came and **offered sacrifices** before God but he was not willing to **change his character**, his sacrifice was **not acceptable** to God
2. **David** understood something of the costliness of atonement when he, on one occasion, refused to offer sacrifices to the Lord which **cost him nothing** (2 Sam. 24:24)
3. The **costliness of the animal sacrifices** under the old covenant foreshadowed the **costliness of our redemption** (1 Pet. 1:18-19)
 - a. “Nor silver nor gold hath obtained my redemption,
Nor riches of earth could have saved my poor soul;
The blood of the cross is my only foundation,
The death of my Saviour now maketh me whole.
I am redeemed, but not with silver;
I am bought, but not with gold;
Bought with a price – the blood of Jesus,
Precious price of love untold.” (James M. Gray, quoted in Coleman, WIB, 114)
4. **Religion** in our day and age has largely **lost its significance**
 - a. It is not the **spiritual appeal** that people find in religion anymore. It is the **social** and **recreational** – the **moral** and **political** emphasis
 - b. The appeal is no longer **Jesus Christ and Him crucified**, but **food, fun, and frolic**
 - c. If we **forget** that Jesus Christ, the perfect God/Man, died on a cross because of our sins, we’ve just **missed** the very essence of Christianity

D. Christ's sacrifice is infinitely valuable

1. The Hebrew writer declares emphatically that the **blood of bulls and goats could not take away sins** (Heb. 10:4)
 - a. This means that **all the blood** shed from **all the animals** offered during **all the years** from Moses to Christ could not take away even **one sin** from **one sinner**
2. But the Hebrew writer also affirms in no uncertain terms that **the blood of the one man** Jesus Christ can take away **all the sins** of **all the men** who have lived throughout **all time** (Heb. 7:26-28; 9:11-15, 25-28; 10:5-10)
 - a. *Robert Lowry*: "What can wash away my sins? Nothing but the blood of Jesus; What can make me whole again? Nothing but the blood of Jesus. Oh! precious is the flow That makes me white as snow; No other fount I know, Nothing but the blood of Jesus." ("Nothing But The Blood," HFW, #269)
 - b. This should cause us to realize that Jesus Christ was **much better** than we will ever think of being. He was **much higher** than we will ever aspire to be. He was **much more faithful** to God than we might ever hope to be
 - c. He lived His life **completely and totally devoted** to the will of His Father
 - d. We have all known some **godly men** in our lives, but the **most godly man** who has ever walked on the face of the earth **pales** in comparison to Jesus Christ
 - e. And He died for **me** and for **you**
 - f. The **value of that death** was **so great** that His blood could **cleanse the sins of every man**
3. No wonder the Hebrew writer declares that those who **reject the sacrifice of Christ** can only look forward to "a certain **fearful expectation of judgment**, and **fiery indignation** which will devour the adversaries" (Heb. 10:26-31)
 - a. Would you walk up to Jesus Christ as He hung on that cross and **spit** on Him and **mock** and **ridicule** Him like some did on that fateful day? We would say **"Surely not"**
 - b. But realize that every time we **willfully ignore the word of God** in our lives and **sin** and **defy the will of our Father** that is precisely what we are doing

E. God cares about the details

1. Even the casual reader has to be impressed by **the intricacies** of the OT sacrificial system
 - a. When you read the book of Leviticus, you just can hardly help but wonder **how they kept all the details straight**
2. God **prescribed** His will concerning the OT sacrifices in **precise detail**
 - a. Note God's instructions concerning **the burnt offering** (Lev. 1:1-9)
 - b. Note God's instructions concerning **the sin offering**
 - 1) There was a certain procedure to follow if it was offered for **the anointed priest** (Lev. 4:1-12)
 - 2) There was a certain procedure to follow if it was offered for **the whole congregation** (Lev. 4:13-21)

-
- 3) There was a certain procedure to follow if it was offered for **a ruler** (Lev. 4:22-26)
 - 4) There was a certain procedure to follow if it was offered for one of the **common people** (Lev. 4:27-35)
3. Furthermore, God expected the Israelites to **follow His instructions exactly**, and when they did not, God **punished them severely** for their disobedience
 - a. Someone says: “Surely a God of **love** and **mercy** wouldn’t condemn someone who **left out one little detail**.” Well, He severely punished **Nadab** and **Abihu** (Lev. 10:1-3)
 - 1) Notice that the text does not say that they offered profane fire before the Lord which He had **condemned**. It says that they “offered profane fire before the Lord which He had **not commanded** them”
 - 2) In their presumption, they did not **regard God as holy**, and they did not **glorify God** (Lev. 10:3)
 - 3) And God viewed this as such a **serious transgression**, that he would not even allow **Aaron to mourn** the death of his sons (Lev. 10:6-7)
 - b. Have you noticed how many times the phrase “**as the Lord commanded**” (or its equivalent) is found in the previous two chapters? (Lev. 8:4-5, 9, 13, 17, 21, 29, 31, 34-36; 9:5-7, 10, 16, 21)
 4. God is **attentive to detail**
 - a. When God stipulates **certain conditions** that we must meet in order to **be saved**, those are not matters that are **left up to our own discretion** (Col. 1:21-23)
 - 1) If God tells us to **repent**, we’ve got to repent
 - 2) If God tells us to **be baptized**, we’ve got to be baptized
 - b. It’s God who **gets to decide** the conditions of salvation, not us
 - c. It does matter what we **believe**. It does matter what we **do**
 - 1) **Honesty** and **sincerity** are not the **sole conditions** of salvation
- F. **Sacrifice for sin is effectual only if it is accompanied by repentance and a conscientious effort to live a holy life** (cf. 1 Sam. 15:22-23; Psa. 51:16-17; Pr. 15:8; 21:27; Isa. 1:11-17; Jer. 7:20-23; Hos. 6:6; Amos 5:21-27; Micah 6:6-8; Rom. 6:1-23)
1. *David McClister*: “**God was not saying that He did not want sacrifices** from His people – He was the one who commanded them in the first place. No, God meant that **he did not want sacrifices that were not accompanied by a corresponding loyalty and dedication of heart. He did not want sacrifices all by themselves.** The ritual meant nothing if it was divorced from the proper disposition of heart on the part of the worshipper.” (Bold emphasis added, PHSS, 113)
- G. **God’s people can lose their appreciation for the sacrifice(s) that God has provided for their atonement**
1. Many of the Israelites eventually **lost their appreciation** of the sacrificial system which was intended by God to remind them of the **horror of sin** and the **value of atonement**
-

-
- a. The children of Israel **saw, day in and day out**, the sacrifices that occurred under the Mosaic covenant, and many of them became **so accustomed** to what went on that they could **go through all of that** and then **walk away without any real appreciation** of what they'd just done (Isa. 1:11-18; Amos 5:21-25)
 - b. God was telling them, "**Don't you understand** what all of this was intended to teach you about **your relationship with me?**"
 - c. Yet the **strange woman** who seduced the gullible young man in Proverbs 7 could **offer her sacrifices without any appreciation** of their significance (Pr. 7:13-20)
 2. This kind of thing happened to **some of the churches** that we can read about in the NT
 - a. The **church at Corinth** came together to observe the **Lord's Supper**, but not really (1 Cor. 11:20)
 - b. The **church in Ephesus** had **left her first love** (Rev. 2:4)
 - c. The **church in Sardis** had a **name** that they were alive but they were **really dead** (Rev. 3:1)
 - d. The **church in Laodicea** was **lukewarm** and it made **Christ sick** (Rev. 3:15-16)
 - 1) They were **going through the motions**, but they weren't really there
 - 2) There was **form** but **no substance**
 3. What happened to the Israelites of old, can **happen to you and me today** if we're not careful
 - a. God wants His people to present their bodies as **living sacrifices** (Rom. 12:1-2)
 - b. If we come to the church building, and **sit** in our pews, and **sing** our songs, and **eat** our little piece of bread, and **drink** our little cup of juice, and sit and **endure** a 30 or 40 minute sermon (and heaven forbid that it might last longer than that), and **sing** the invitation song, and then go back home and **live the way we want to**, how are we **any different** than the Israelites?
 - c. Christianity should be so much more that **sitting in a pew, singing a few, drinking the cup and dropping a buck**
 - d. *Russ Bowman*: "What that means is we can **come to worship services** day in and day out for the next hundred and fifty zillion years, but if **our character is not changed** because of our relationship with God, then all that we do in terms of religion is **worth nothing – WORTH NOTHING!** And if we think that **God will not punish our disobedience**, then we have **not read the scriptures.**"
 4. *Leon Morris*: "In every age people have found it easier to **perform outward actions** than to **live pure lives.**" (Bold emphasis added, AMS, 51)
 5. It's not enough to **hear** the word, it's not enough to **profess allegiance** to the word, you have to **do what God says** (Mt. 7:21-23)
 - a. We can spout all the **gospel clichés**, we can **go through all the services**, but if we do not **become godly** because we are Christians, our "**worship**" is **absolutely vain**
-

Conclusion:

- I. Heb. 10:1-10: ¹For the law, having **a shadow of the good things to come**, *and* not the very image of the things, can never with these same sacrifices, which they offer continually year by year, make those who approach perfect. ²For then would they not have ceased to be offered? For the worshipers, once purified, would have had no more consciousness of sins. ³But in those *sacrifices there is* a reminder of sins every year. ⁴For **it is not possible that the blood of bulls and goats could take away sins**. ⁵Therefore, when He came into the world, He said: "Sacrifice and offering You did not desire, But a body You have prepared for Me. ⁶In burnt offerings and *sacrifices* for sin You had no pleasure. ⁷Then I said, 'Behold, I have come - In the volume of the book it is written of Me - To do Your will, O God.' "⁸Previously saying, "Sacrifice and offering, burnt offerings, and *offerings* for sin You did not desire, nor had pleasure *in them*" (which are offered according to the law), ⁹then He said, "Behold, I have come to do Your will, O God." He takes away the first that He may establish the second. ¹⁰By that will **we have been sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all**.
- II. It is my hope and prayer that this **study in scarlet**, will help all of us have a **better understanding** of the **OT sacrificial system** and, above all, a **better appreciation** of the **sacrifice of our Saviour** and a greater determination to **live for the One who died for all** (2 Cor. 5:14-15)

Kevin Kay
1816 Weaver Branch Rd.
Piney Flats, TN 37601
kevinskay@gmail.com

Appendix A: The Jewish Sacrifices						
	Burnt	Grain	Peace	Sin	Trespass	Drink
References	Lev. 1:1-17; 6:8-13	Lev. 2:1-16; 6:14-23; 7:9-10	Lev. 3:1-17; 7:11-36	Lev. 4:1-35; 5:1-13; 6:24-30	Lev. 5:14-6:7; 7:1-10	Lev. 23:13; Num. 15:1-12
Other Terms	Burnt Sacrifice Holocaust Offering	Meal Meat Cereal	Fellowship Sacrifice Sacrifice of Fellowship Sacrifice of Well-Being	Purification Offering	Compensation Restitution Offering Guilt Offering Penalty for Guilt Reparation Offering	Libation
Occasions	With sin & trespass offerings	With burnt & peace offerings	Voluntary [T, F, V] Pentecost	Unintentional sin	Trespass involving restitution	With grain offerings
Offering	1 Cow [m] 1 Sheep [m] Doves/Pigeons	Flour, Oil & Frankincense Salt No honey or leaven	1 Cow [m or f] 1 Sheep/Goat [m or f]	HP: Bull C: Bull R: Kid [m] C: Kid/Lamb [f] P: Doves/Pigeons VP: Flour	1 Ram + Silver 1 Ram + Valuation Property + 20% 1 Ram + Valuation	Wine
Condition	Without blemish	Various forms & amounts	F: Slight blemishes (Lev. 22:23)	Without blemish	Without blemish	
Blood Rite	Sprinkled on altar		Sprinkled on altar	Sprinkled at veil Horns of AOI Base of ABO Horns of ABO Base of ABO	Sprinkled on altar	Poured out to the Lord
Sacrifice	Whole Animal	Token Handful	Fat, Kidneys, Lobe of Liver, Fat Tail [Sheep]	P/C: Fat, Kidneys, Lobe of Liver R/C/C: Fat	Fat, Fat Tail, Kidneys, Lobe of Liver	Lamb: 1/4 hin Ram: 1/3 hin Bull: 1/2 hin
Leftovers	Skin to Priest Crop beside altar	Given to priest(s)	Breast to Priests Thigh to Priest Remainder to Offerer	P/C: Hide & carcass burned R/C: Remainder to priest	Carcass to priests	Nothing
Purpose	Propitiation Consecration Atonement Obedience Thanksgiving	Dedication Consecration Thanksgiving Propitiation Remuneration	Celebration Communion Propitiation	Purification Propitiation Atonement	Restitution	Propitiation

Appendix B: Objections To Penal Substitution³⁹

I. Penal Substitution And History

A. “Penal substitution was invented around the time of the Reformation”

1. There is **no evidence of penal substitution** in the writings of the early “Church Fathers”
 - a. There were no “**fundamental principles**” of an atonement theory until **Anselm** (11th cen.)
 - b. Anselm only presented the “**fundamental beginnings**” of an atonement theory
 - c. The penal substitution theory was not fully developed until the **Protestant Reformation** (Barnett, *Reconciliation*, 9-10)
2. This is just not **historically accurate**
 - a. **Justin Martyr** (100-160), “Dialogue With Trypho,” Sec. 89, 94, 95, ANF, 1:244, 247
 - b. **Eusebius of Caesarea** (cf. 275-339): *Proof of the Gospel*, Vol. 2, 2:1:195
 - c. **Hilary of Poitiers** (c. 300-368): *Homily on Psalm 53(54)*, NPNF, Sec. II, Vol. 9; *Homily* Sect. 13, p. 246
 - d. **Athanasius** (c. 300-373): *Against the Arians*, NPNF, Sec. II, vol. 4, Sect. 60, p. 341; *On the Incarnation*, Sec. 1, p. 26; Sect. 4, pp. 29-30; Sect. 6-7, Sect. 7; Sect. 1; Sect. 8; Sect. 9; Sect. 21; Sect. 27-29; Sect. 5
 - e. **Gregory of Nazianzus** (c. 330-390): *The Fourth Theological Oration*, NPNF, Sec. II, vol. 7
 - f. **Ambrose of Milan** (339-397): *Flight from the World*, in *The Fathers of the Church*, Vol. 65, cf. 7, sect. 44, 314-315
 - g. **John Chrysostom** (c. 350-407): *Homilies on Second Corinthians*, NPNF, Sec. I, Vol. 12, Homily XI, sect. 6, p. 335
 - h. **Augustine of Hippo** (354-430): *Against Faustus*, NPNF, ser. 1, vol. 4, bk. 14, sect. 1, p. 207
 - i. Etc. (Jeffery, Ovey, & Sach, PFOT, 161ff)
3. While most of the early material does not come from **extended treatments of the doctrine of salvation**, this certainly does not make it **irrelevant**
 - a. “[I]f a writer makes a **passing**, but nonetheless **explicit, reference** to the doctrine of **penal substitution** in a work largely devoted to another subject, this probably indicates that penal substitution was both **widely understood** and **fairly uncontroversial** among his contemporaries. For it would have confused his readers if he had made a passing reference to an unknown doctrine, and it would have distracted attention from his point and undermined his argument if he had made a brief allusion to a subject of intense disagreement.” (Bold emphasis added, Jeffery, Ovey, & Sach, PFOT, 163)

II. Penal Substitution And The Bible

A. “Penal substitution is not the only model of the atonement”

-
1. True. A comprehensive doctrine of the atonement must include **other themes** besides penal substitution
 2. No one is claiming that penal substitution is **the only motif** connected with atonement in the Scriptures
 3. The fact that there are **other facets** to atonement does not address whether or not penal substitution should have **a central place** among them (Jeffery, Ovey, & Sach, PFOT, 210)
- B. **“Penal substitution is not central to the atonement”** (Other perspectives are more important)
1. Some biblical doctrines are **more important** than others (e.g. conversion vs. the covering)
 2. Some doctrines are **more central** than others because they are **more closely related** to a greater number of **other biblical doctrines**
 3. Some areas of Christian doctrine are **intimately related** to lots of **other important themes** (e.g. conversion, the Trinity, etc.)
 4. Many biblical doctrines would be **compromised** if we were to **remove penal substitution** from the picture
 - a. It safeguards the **justice** and **holiness** of God (Rom. 3:21-26)
 - b. It explains **how Christ was victorious** over evil powers
 - c. It explains the **renewal of the cosmos** (Jeffery, Ovey, & Sach, PFOT, 210-211)
- C. **“Penal substitution diminishes the significance of Jesus life and resurrection”**
1. Christ’s **entire life** on earth was **part of His atoning work**
 - a. He **lived a perfect life** to qualify as a **perfect sacrifice**
 - b. He **died for the sins** of the world
 - c. There were several purposes fulfilled in **the resurrection**
 - 1) It proved that He was the **Son of God** (Psa. 2:7; Acts 13:33; Rom. 1:4)
 - 2) It fulfilled **Scripture** (Lk. 24:45-46)
 - 3) It was essential to **forgiveness** of sins (1 Cor. 15:17)
 - 4) It was essential to **justification** (Rom. 4:25; 8:34) [ASV; KJV; ESV; HCSB; LEB; NET; NAB; NCV; NIV; NRSV; RSV]
 - 5) It supplies **hope** for our own resurrection (1 Cor. 15:19)
 - 6) It gives meaning to our **preaching** (1 Cor. 15:14)
 - 7) It provides substance for our **faith** (1 Cor. 15:14, 17)
 - 8) Jesus’ resurrection is the **first-fruits** of our resurrection (Acts 26:23; 1 Cor. 15:20, 23; 2 Cor. 4:14)
 - 9) It was necessary for **Jesus’ exaltation** (Acts 5:30-31; Phil. 2:9-11)
 - 10) It provides assurance of the **Judgment Day** (Acts 17:31)
 - d. Penal substitution does not in any way **diminish the importance** of Jesus’ life and resurrection
-

D. **“Penal substitution is not taught in the Bible”**

1. If penal substitution is **not biblical**, then it is **not true**
2. The **biblical case** for penal substitution is the **only response** that can be offered to this objection

E. **“Penal substitution is not important enough to be a source of division”**

1. All division is **painful**, and unnecessary division is **sinful**
2. However, the Bible teaches that there are **some issues** on which **division** is both **necessary** and **inevitable** (Gal. 1:8-9; 1 Cor. 5:11; 16:22; 2 Tim. 3:1-5; Tit. 3:9-10; 2 Jn. 9-11)
3. Penal substitution lies at **the heart of the gospel**; therefore we can no more **compromise** on this issue for the sake of **unity** than we can on **the deity of Jesus**
4. “But when **the gospel** itself is the thing being **debated**, there is nothing around which to **unite**.” (Bold emphasis added, Jeffery, Ovey, & Sach, PFOT, 216)
5. “It seems that **opponents** of penal substitution are **agreed on the magnitude** of the issue. They contend that penal substitution is an **unbiblical view of the cross without support in the historic church**. They claim that penal substitution **undermines the doctrine of the Trinity**, without which Christianity would not be Christianity at all. More than that, they insist that penal substitution **portrays God as an unjust tyrant, a vindictive child abuser, and a hypocrite** who pays no regard to Jesus’ foundational teaching about love. Finally, they have argued that penal substitution has **disastrous pastoral consequences**, that it has been used to **justify violence against women and children**, and that it is **stifling the mission of the church** in the world.” (Bold emphasis added, Jeffery, Ovey, & Sach, PFOT, 216-217)
6. **These charges are extremely serious**, and if any of them are **valid**, then the critics of penal substitution are not raising a **minor point** of dispute
7. “**Disagreements** over penal substitution are **fundamental**; they cannot be **ignored**.” (Bold emphasis added, Jeffery, Ovey, & Sach, PFOT, 217)
8. This doesn’t mean that we should **divide at the first sign of disagreement** on this issue
9. However, “differences over penal substitution ultimately lead us to **worship a different God** and to **believe a different gospel**.” (Bold emphasis added, Jeffery, Ovey, & Sach, PFOT, 217)

III. Penal Substitution And Culture

A. **“Penal substitution is the product of human culture, not biblical teaching”**

1. The claim that penal substitution is a relatively **late doctrinal development** is **unsustainable** in view of the **historical evidence** to the contrary
 - a. This concept just **did not originate** with **Anselm, Luther, or Calvin**
2. “The fact that penal substitution has been **taught in many different social and political settings** throughout the last two millennia also casts considerable doubt on the contention that the acceptance of the doctrine depends on a **particular set of cultural norms**.” (Bold emphasis added, Jeffery, Ovey, & Sach, PFOT, 220)
3. “The **key question**, however, is not whether ideas found in penal substitution are also **present within contemporary culture**, but whether they are **found in Scripture**.”

There is obviously a **danger of reading our cultural frameworks into the biblical text**, but in the end this can be avoided only by sensitive exegesis and careful theology. Nor should we underestimate the extent to which **Judaean-Christian assumptions** have influenced the culture of the Western world. It is wholly unsurprising that **some Western notions of justice overlap those found in the Bible**, for the simple reason that **the Bible informed those notions** in the first place. Nor is it surprising to find **this common ground shrinking** as biblical ideas become increasingly devalued in the Western mind.” (Bold emphasis added, Jeffery, Ovey, & Sach, PFOT, 220)

4. “[T]he **correspondence** or lack of it between a **given doctrine** and **human cultural ideas** is entirely **irrelevant** to the question of whether that doctrine is biblical. What counts is **whether it is taught in Scripture**.” (Jeffery, Ovey, & Sach, PFOT, 221)

B. “Penal substitution is unable to address the real needs of human culture”

1. The objection is that penal substitution fails because:
 - a. It does not address our **modern problems**
 - 1) *Steve Chalke & Alan Mann*: “People are desperate for a message that they can **buy into**, that they can see will **make a difference to them** and to the world in which they live. The truth is that you can’t engender **a sense of lostness or need** into people simply by pointing out that they are ‘**sinners**’. It just doesn’t work.” (Bold emphasis added, *The Lost Message of Jesus*, pp. 117-118, quoted in (Jeffery, Ovey, & Sach, PFOT, 221))
 - b. It is simply **incomprehensible** to us
2. The fact that penal substitution **does not fit** modern cultural presuppositions does not make it **incomprehensible**
 - a. It means the task of **explanation** will be **more difficult**
 - b. If **cultural differences** present an **insurmountable barrier** to understanding, then we should **never try to communicate anything** that our hearers do not already know
 - 1) We shouldn’t discuss **monotheism** with a **Hindu**
 - 2) First-century Christians should not have discussed **idolatry** with **pagans**
 - 3) “The **lack of common ground** with other people does not require that we **abandon distinctive ideas**; only that we **work harder to explain them**.” (Bold emphasis added, Jeffery, Ovey, & Sach, PFOT, 223)
 - c. Many people **reject the gospel** because:
 - 1) They **suppress the truth** (Rom. 1:18, 21; Eph. 4:17-18)
 - 2) They **love the darkness** rather than the light (Jn. 3:19)
 - 3) They want a **god** created in **their own image** [Idolatry]
 - 4) They have been **blinded by the god of this world** (2 Cor. 4:4)
 - d. The **perceived needs** of a sinful world will rarely coincide with its **real needs**
 - e. In the first century, the message of the cross was a **stumbling block to Jews** and **foolishness to Gentiles** (1 Cor. 1:23-24)

- f. “[T]he fundamental question is not whether penal substitution is **attractive**, or **easy to understand**, but whether it is **part of the gospel**. . . . Our **fallible notions** about what is **culturally acceptable** must never be allowed to **undermine word of God**. “ (Bold emphasis added, Jeffery, Ovey, & Sach, PFOT, 223)

C. **“Penal substitution relies on biblical words, metaphors and concepts that are outdated and misunderstood in our culture”**

1. It is true that **language never stands still, word meanings change** over time, and **sacrificial rituals are not a part** of our modern culture
2. However, this just means that we must **use our terms with care** and if necessary **take time to explain them**
3. None of this means that **the concepts** connected with penal substitution are **outdated and incomprehensible** to the modern mind, and therefore must be **abandoned**
4. “There may well be cultures where people are **unfamiliar with**, or even **hostile to**, important biblical concepts, and those concepts will therefore be **hard to explain**. But **the solution is not to change the concepts**: we must instead find **new ways**, and possibly **different words**, to express them.” (Bold emphasis added, Jeffery, Ovey, & Sach, PFOT, 225)

IV. **Penal Substitution And Violence**

A. **“Penal substitution rests on unbiblical ideas of sacrifice imported from paganism”**

1. Ancient paganism is **often blamed** for giving rise to the idea of penal substitution
 - a. **Placating** an angry god
 - b. **Human sacrifice**
2. **OT sacrificial rituals**, which foreshadow Christ’s sacrificial death, were **radically different** from many pagan practices
 - a. God explicitly **forbade** the Israelites from **imitating** many of the rituals of the pagan nations around them (Dt. 12:4, 31; 18:9; Lev. 18; 2 Ki. 17:15-17; 21:2; 2 Chr. 33:2), especially the appalling practice of **child sacrifice** (Dt. 12:31; 2 Ki. 17:17; 2 Chr. 28:3; 33:6; Jer. 7:31; 19:5; Ezek. 20:31)
 - b. “The mere fact that the other nations **also performed sacrifices** should therefore not be allowed to obscure **the huge differences** between those practices and the Old Testament sacrificial system.” (Jeffery, Ovey, & Sach, PFOT, 228)
 - c. The OT sacrificial system was **radically different** from pagan sacrificial systems in at least *three ways*:
 - 1) God’s anger is not the **volatile and erratic caprice** of pagan deities
 - a) *John Stott*: “It is never unpredictable, but always **predictable**, because it is provoked by evil and by evil alone. The wrath of God . . . is his **steady, unrelenting, unremitting, uncompromising antagonism to evil** in all its forms and manifestations.” (Bold emphasis added, *The Cross of Christ*, 173, quoted in Jeffery, Ovey, & Sach, PFOT, 228)
 - 2) The **propitiation** is not made by us, but **by God himself**, who took the **initiative**
 - 3) The propitiatory sacrifice was not an **animal**, a **vegetable**, or a **mineral** but a **Person** – the only begotten **Son of God**

- a) “[T]he **character of God’s wrath**, the **identity of the offerer** and the **nature of the offering** are so **utterly different** from paganism that it is simply **impossible to maintain** that the biblical doctrine of penal substitution **rests on pagan ideas of sacrifice.**” (Jeffery, Ovey, & Sach, PFOT, 228)

B. “The violence involved in penal substitution amounts to ‘cosmic child abuse’”

1. *Steve Chalke & Alan Mann*: “How...have we come to believe that at the cross this **God of love** suddenly decides to **vent his anger and wrath on his own Son**? The fact is that **the cross isn’t a form of cosmic child abuse** – a vengeful Father, punishing his Son for an offence he has not even committed.” (Bold emphasis added, *The Lost Message of Jesus*, 182, quoted in (Jeffery, Ovey, & Sach, PFOT, 229))
2. Jesus death was **not child abuse**
 - a. Jesus **willingly** went to his death, in the **full knowledge** of what it would entail
 - 1) He severely **rebuked Peter** when he refused to accept Jesus’ prophecy of His death (Mt. 16:21-23; Mk. 8:31-33)
 - 2) Jesus explicitly insisted that He would **die willingly** (Jn. 10:15, 17-18; cf. Mt. 20:28; Mk. 10:45; Gal. 1:3-4; 2:20; Eph. 5:25; 1 Tim. 2:6)
 - 3) “By contrast, **child abuse** involves **inflicting pain** upon an **unwilling victim**, or **exploiting** a person who is **unable to understand fully** what is happening.” (Jeffery, Ovey, & Sach, PFOT, 230)
 - b. Jesus died to **bring glory to Himself** (Jn. 17:1; Phil. 2:8-9; Heb. 2:9; Rev. 5:11), to **save His people** (Rom. 5:8; 1 Cor. 15:3; 1 Tim. 2:6; 1 Pet. 3:18), and to **glorify His Father** (Jn. 13:31-32; 17:1)
 - 1) “**Child abuse** is carried out **against the will of the victim** for the **sole gratification of the abuser**. Jesus **willingly** went to his death to **save** his people and **glorify** his name.” (Bold emphasis added, Jeffery, Ovey, & Sach, PFOT, 230)
 - c. Jesus was absolutely convinced of **His Father’s love** for Him (Jn. 3:35; 5:20; 15:9; 17:24), because He **willingly laid down His life** (Jn. 10:17)
 - d. Jesus **loved the Father** and **did His will** (Jn. 14:31)
 - e. Jesus **never worked independently** of His Father (Jn. 5:19, 30)
 - f. It was **God’s will** for Jesus to **lay down His life** (Jn. 10:7-18; Acts 2:23)
 - g. Jesus **understood** that the cross was **His Father’s will** for Him (Jn. 12:27-28); but He certainly did not perceive **any conflict** between this task and **His Father’s love** for Him
 - h. The cross was **the path** that led to **Jesus’ heavenly glory** (Phil. 2:6-11; Jn. 17:1; Lk. 24:26)
3. God **foresaw** and **foretold** Jesus death (Gen. 3:15; Psalms 22; 69; Isaiah 53:1-12; Zechariah 12:10; 13:7)
4. In some sense, God **caused** [?] or **allowed** Jesus’ death (Isa. 53:10; Acts 2:22-23; 3:13-18; 4:24-28)

C. “The retributive violence involved in penal substitution contradicts Jesus’ message of peace and love”

1. Penal substitution makes a **mockery** of Jesus' teaching to **love our enemies** and refuse to **repay evil with evil** (Mt. 5:38-39, 43-48; 18:21-22; cf. Lev. 19:18)
 - a. *Steve Chalke & Alan Mann*: "If the cross is a **personal act of violence** perpetrated by God towards humankind but borne by his Son, then it **makes a mockery** of Jesus' own teaching to **love your enemies** and to refuse to **repay evil with evil**." (Bold emphasis added, *The Lost Message Of Jesus*, pp. 182-183, quoted in (Jeffery, Ovey, & Sach, PFOT, 233))
 2. Penal substitution implies that God **requires punishment before offering forgiveness**, and therefore depicts him as a **hypocrite**, setting standards for us that He fails to follow Himself
 3. God and Jesus are certainly **examples** for us to follow (1 Pet. 1:16; cf. Lev. 11:44-45; 19:2; 20:7; Eph. 5:1; 1 Cor. 11:1; Mk. 8:34)
 4. But some things are **uniquely the prerogative of God**
 - a. Only God is to be **worshipped** (Ex. 20:1-6; Dt. 5:6-10; Isa. 45:18)
 - 1) **Herod Agrippa I** learned this lesson the hard way (Acts. 12:21-23)
 - b. **Vengeance** is God's right (Rom. 12:17-19) and any one He **delegates** this responsibility to (Rom. 13:1-7)
 - 1) *John Piper*: "...Paul said that **counting on the final wrath of God** against his enemies is one of the crucial warrants for **why we may not return evil for evil**. It is precisely *because* we may trust the wisdom of God to **apply his wrath justly** that we must **leave all vengeance to him** and **return good for evil**." (Jeffery, Ovey, & Sach, "Forward," PFOT, 15)
 - 2) "It is **wrong for us to punish sins** committed against us, but it is **not wrong for God to punish sins** committed against him." (Jeffery, Ovey, & Sach, PFOT, 235)
- D. "The violence inherent in penal substitution is an example of 'the myth of redemptive violence,' which can never overcome evil"
1. According to this objection, penal substitution amounts to an attempt to **overcome violence with violence**
 - a. "The central claim here is that **penal substitution simply cannot work**. It would constitute an attempt by God to **overcome the violence** inherent in human sin — our violence against each other, and our violent opposition to God — **by yet another act of violence**. Penal substitution, it is claimed, simply **adds one more act of brutality** to the appalling catalogue of bloodshed that extends through human history." (Jeffery, Ovey, & Sach, PFOT, 236)
 2. This objection is based on **faulty presuppositions** such as:
 - a. God is **not angered** by sin and therefore **does not require atonement**
 - b. God is required to **punish sin by a law outside Himself**, rather than by **His own holy and righteous character**
 - c. In the OT, **whenever God acts to punish**, He does so **through human beings** attacking each other
 - 1) What about:
 - a) The **flood** (Gen. 6-8)

- b) The **plagues** in Egypt (Exod. 8-12)
 - c) The punishment of **Nadab and Abihu** (Lev. 10:1-3)
 - d) The **plagues** against Israel (e.g. Num. 11:33-35; 25:1-9; 2 Sam. 24:15-25; 1 Chr. 21; Num. 16)
 - e) The destruction of the **Assyrian army** (Isa. 37:33-38; 2 Ki. 19:32-37)
 - f) The punishment of **Ananias & Sapphira** (Acts 5:1-11)
 - g) The punishment of **Herod Agrippa I** (Acts 12:21-23)
 - h) The blinding of **Elymas** (Acts 13:8-11)
3. Certainly, the death of Jesus did involve **horrible sinful acts** by other **wicked human beings** (Mk. 14:65; 15:1-20; Acts 7:52)
 4. However, God chose to **use those wicked deeds** to accomplish **His righteous purposes**
 5. Jesus was **fully aware** that a **violent death** awaited Him in Jerusalem and yet He deliberately **set Himself on that course** (Mk. 10:33-34; Lk. 9:51)
 - a. If this objection is valid, then Jesus should have **taken steps to avoid the violence** that awaited Him in Jerusalem
 6. The entire **OT sacrificial system was violent**; but nonetheless it had **redemptive value**
 7. There are **significant differences** between the death of Jesus and other acts of violence perpetrated by sinful people against one another and God
 - a. Jesus **willingly laid down** His life (Jn. 10:17)
 - b. It was a **selfless act** of the Father to **give His Son** motivated by **His love** for the world (Jn. 3:16)
 - c. Because of these differences, penal substitution is not simply a case of **adding one more act of violence** to the list
 8. Although Jesus' death by crucifixion was **extremely violent**, it was also at least in some sense **"redemptive"**
 - a. "The so-called '**myth of redemptive violence**' is, in the case of Jesus' death, **no myth at all.**" (Jeffery, Ovey, & Sach, PFOT, 239)

V. Penal Substitution And Justice

A. "It is unjust to punish an innocent person, even if he is willing to be punished"

1. **Justice** requires that:
 - a. Only **guilty people** should be **punished** (Pr. 17:15; Ex. 23:7; Dt. 25:1; 1 Ki. 8:31-32; Psa. 15:5; Isa. 5:22-23)
 - 1) *Colin Greene*: "Is it not the case that **sins are so identified with their perpetrators that they cannot simply be transferred from one person to another** as if by legal fiat?" (Bold emphasis added, "Is The Message of the Cross Good News for the Twentieth Century?," *Atonement Today*, pp. 231, quoted in (Jeffery, Ovey, & Sach, PFOT, 241)
 - b. Guilt cannot be **transferred** (2 Ki. 14:6; Jer. 31:29-30; Ezek. 18:1-4, 19-20) (McClister, PHSS, 98)

2. “[T]he objection is that **guilt and punishment** simply cannot **be incurred by one person and transferred to another**. People who sin, and only people who sin, are guilty, and only they should be punished.” (Jeffery, Ovey, & Sach, PFOT, 242)
 3. Evidently, God does not **think this way**
 - a. Peter declares that **God “judges righteously”** (1 Pet. 2:23) and that **Jesus “bore our sins** in His own body on the tree” (1 Pet. 2:24)
 - b. Paul declares that putting forth **Christ as a propitiation** for our sins was a **demonstration of God’s justice**, not a violation of it (Rom. 3:24-26)
 4. We must never forget that **we do not think like God** (Isa. 55:8-9)
 5. Ezekiel symbolically **bore the iniquity** of Israel and Judah (Ezek. 4:1-6)
 - a. “It is notable that **Ezekiel himself**, from the southern tribe of Judah, **symbolically bears the guilt** of the northern tribes of Israel in Ezekiel 4:4-5. That is, he **symbolically suffers for the guilt of others**. Thus there is a **notion of shared guilt** in the same biblical book as we find an emphasis on **individual responsibility**.” (Jeffery, Ovey, & Sach, PFOT, 248)
 6. Most of the verses cited by those who raise this objection refer to **man’s dealings with his fellowman**; they do not refer to **God’s dealings with sinners**
 - a. These verses refer to the transfer of guilt from **one human to another**. They do not rule out the **punishment of Christ**, the God-Man, as mankind’s Substitute (cf. Isa. 53:4-6, 8, 11-12; 2 Cor. 5:21; Gal. 3:13; 1 Pet. 2:24)
 7. God’s **justice** and **mercy** are in harmony (Hab. 3:2)⁴⁰
- B. **“Biblical justice is about restoring relationships, not exacting retribution”**
1. Men have basically accepted one of **four theories** of punishment:
 - a. **The Restitution Theory:** The purpose of punishment is only to make restitution or compensation, i.e. to repay what has been illegally taken or to make good damage that has been done
 - 1) “But **if restitution is limited merely to restoring the situation as it was before the offence, then it is not actually a punishment at all**, for the criminal is no worse off than if he had never offended in the first place (Fagothey, *Right and Reason*, p. 419). **Robbing a bank and then returning the money a few weeks later becomes indistinguishable from a legitimate bank loan! If restitution seeks to go beyond this** (e.g. by imposing a fine considerably greater than the sum of money stolen), **then it ceases to be restitution: it has actually become a punishment....**” (Jeffery, Ovey, & Sach, PFOT, 251-252, n. 27)
 - b. **The Deterrent Theory:** The purpose of punishment is to discourage other people from offending. It seeks to persuade people not to commit crimes by showing what will happen to them if they do
 - c. **The Corrective Theory:** The purpose of punishment is to change the behavior of the criminal for the benefit of both the criminal himself and the rest of society (Jeffery, Ovey, & Sach, PFOT, 252-253)
 - d. **The Retributive Theory:** The purpose of punishment is to give a criminal what he deserves. People must not be allowed to do morally wrong things with impunity, and it is right that offenders suffer a certain penalty

2. “Some have claimed that **the principle of retribution** upon which penal substitution depends is **immoral**. Punishment, they say, should aim to achieve other objectives, such as **reforming** the offender or **detering** others; it should not be to **exact retribution**.” (Jeffery, Ovey, & Sach, PFOT, 249)
 3. Some argue that **retribution is not a biblical idea**
 4. However, **men’s views** of the purpose of punishment are completely **irrelevant** and **immaterial**. What really matters is **what God says** about punishment in His word
 5. And the Bible teaches **three purposes** of punishment:
 - a. **Deterrence** (cf. Dt. 13:9-11; 17:12-13; 19:18-21; 21:18-21; Isa. 26:9)
 - b. **Correction** (cf. Amos 4:6-12; Heb. 12:4-11; Rev. 3:19)
 - c. **Retribution** (cf. Dt. 7:9-11; 32:39-42; Isa. 59:18; Jer. 32:18; 50:29; 51:24, 56; Rom. 12:19)
 - 1) *Note:* **Retribution** is necessary because of the **righteous character** of God (2 Th. 1:6)
 - 2) If there is a **final Day of Judgment**, where **eternal punishment** will be pronounced on the wicked (Mt. 25:31-46), then that punishment cannot be to **deter** or **correct** man’s wicked ways
 6. Furthermore, **retribution** is not equivalent to **revenge**
 - a. **Retribution** is carried out only by a **properly constituted authority**, whereas **revenge** is exacted by **anyone** who has both the inclination and the opportunity
 - b. **Retribution** will always be **fair**; **revenge** is likely to be **disproportionate**
 - c. **Retribution** is motivated by the solemn demands of **justice**; **revenge** derives a macabre delight in **the pain of an enemy**
 - 1) “**Revenge** aims at the **emotional pleasure** one gets from hurting an enemy, **retributive punishment** at securing **justice** simply” (Fagothey, *Right and Reason*, p. 421).” (Jeffery, Ovey, & Sach, PFOT, 252, n. 28)
 - 2) God **takes no pleasure** in the death of the wicked (Ezek. 18:23), even though He **punishes** them (Ezek. 18:24)
 - d. “**Human revenge** may be considered **selfish**, for it seeks only its own satisfaction. **Divine retribution**, even if motivated by God’s desire to satisfy his own sense of justice, **cannot be ‘selfish’** in any negative sense, because it is right for God to put himself and his will at **the centre of the universe** in a way that would be wrong for anyone else to do.” (Bold emphasis added, Jeffery, Ovey, & Sach, PFOT, 2452)
 - e. Retribution is the **prerogative** of God; revenge is the **presumption** by man
 - 1) Paul **forbids** us from **taking vengeance** precisely because God can be trusted to **bring just retribution** (Rom. 12:17, 19-21)
- C. “Penal substitution implicitly denies that God forgives sin”
1. *Eleonor Stump*: “To **forgive** a debtor is to **fail to exact all** that is in justice due. But, according to [penal substitution], **God does exact every bit of the debt owed him** by humans; he allows none of it to go unpaid.” (Bold emphasis added, “Atonement According to Aquinas,” *Philosophy and the Christian Faith*, p. 62, quoted in Jeffery, Ovey, & Sach, PFOT, 263)

-
- a. *Eleonor Stump*: “Suppose that Daniel **owes Susan \$1000** and **cannot pay it**, but Susan’s daughter Maggie, who is Daniel’s good friend, **does pay Susan the whole \$1000** on Daniel’s behalf. **Is there any sense in which Susan can be said to forgive the debt?**” (Bold emphasis added, “Atonement According to Aquinas,” *Philosophy and the Christian Faith*, p. 62, quoted in Jeffery, Ovey, & Sach, PFOT, 263)
 2. “In summary, this objection claims that the emphasis in penal substitution on Christ’s paying the debt we owe means that **God does not actually forgive sinners**, because in the end there is **nothing to forgive.**” (Bold emphasis added, Jeffery, Ovey, & Sach, PFOT, 264)
 3. Penal substitution does not deny that **God forgives sin** because:
 - a. God Himself **pays the debt** that sinners owe by **providing payment** in the sacrifice of His Son
 - b. Is there a sense in which **providing a Substitute** and **not requiring sinners to pay their debt** constitutes **forgiveness**?
 - c. Passages that mention **forgiveness without any repayment** (cf. Lk. 7:36-50; 15:11-32) **do not tell the whole story** of redemption
 - d. Furthermore, in the OT **forgiveness** and **atonement by sacrifice** go hand in hand (Lev. 4:20, 26, 31, 35; 5:10, 13, 16, 18; 6:7; 19:22; Num. 15:25, 28)
 - e. **Pardon** is offered because **a price is paid** (Psa. 130:4, 8)
 - D. “**Penal substitution does not work, for the penalty Christ suffered was not equivalent to that due to us**”
 1. In other words, the so-called “**punishment**” that Jesus suffered on Calvary was **not equivalent in quantity or quality** to the punishment that is reserved for impenitent sinners
 - a. How can the punishment (physical death and/or spiritual death) of **one man** atone for the sins of **all mankind**?
 - b. How can a few hours of **physical torture** and/or a few days of **spiritual separation** be equivalent to **eternal separation** from God in the **torments** of hell?⁴¹
 2. *Note*: I believe that this is by far **the strongest objection** to “penal substitution” that I have encountered
 3. *Response*: It wasn’t **just a man** who died on Calvary, but the **God-Man** (Acts 20:28; Tit. 2:13-14, ESV). If the One who died is **infinite** in His attributes, quality, and value, He could die for a **finite number of finite beings**
 - a. *Illust.*: One **diamond** can be worth more than tons and tons of coal
 4. *Response*: Christ’s suffering, although it lasted only a **finite time**, was **infinite in value** because he is **infinitely worthy** (Jeffery, Ovey, & Sach, PFOT, 267)
 - a. “...How could Christ’s suffering, which lasted only a few hours, pay an infinite price? How could an **infinite punishment, infinite pain** be borne in a **finite time**? The answer is that just as the heinousness of a sin is determined in part by the dignity of the person sinned against, so also **the severity of a punishment is determined in part by the dignity of the one punished**. Christ is the one in whom ‘all the fulness of the Deity lives in bodily ‘ (Col. 2:9). His **incarnation was an act of infinite condescension, and his blood is of infinite worth....As**
-

Turretin puts it, ‘Christ alone ought to be estimated at a **higher value than all men together. The dignity of an infinite person swallows up...all the infinities of punishment due to us.**’” (Bold emphasis added, Jeffery, Ovey, & Sach, PFOT, 266-267)

- b. “The **great value** of Christ’s sacrificial death is implicit in I Peter 1:18-19, where ‘the **precious blood of Christ**, a lamb without blemish or defect’ is contrasted with ‘**perishable things** such as silver or gold’. The **eternal effects** of an act of **finite duration** are attested in Hebrews 10:14, which proclaims that ‘by **one sacrifice** he has **made perfect for ever** those who are being made holy’ (italics added). The perpetuity of Christ’s priesthood and the **eternal efficacy** of his work are major themes in Hebrews (e.g. 7:23-28; 9:11-15)!” (Bold emphasis added, Jeffery, Ovey, & Sach, PFOT, 267)
5. *Response:* This objection takes for granted that **there must be equivalent punishment**; but must there be an **equivalent punishment** for sin for there to be an **actual punishment** for sin?
- a. The principle of *lex talionis* decreed that the **punishment be equivalent to the crime** (Ex. 21:22-27; Lev. 24:19-22; Dt. 19:21)
 - 1) Did that mean that there had to be **100% equivalence** between a **crime** and its **punishment** for there to be **actual punishment**?
 - 2) If a Jew put out the eye of a fellow Jew with **20/20 eyesight**, did his eyesight have to be **20/20** for there to be **equivalent satisfaction** and **actual punishment**?
 - b. **David** made atonement by delivering up **seven descendants of King Saul** to be hanged by the Gibeonites (2 Sam. 21:3-9)
 - 1) Unless we assume that **Saul killed only seven Gibeonites**, this atonement was made **without equivalence**⁴²
 - c. When Israel murmured against Moses and Aaron, **Aaron appeased God’s wrath** and stopped the plague that God sent among the people by **offering incense** (Num. 16:41-50). Was there **equivalence** between Israel’s sin and Aaron’s offering?
 - 1) *Leon Morris*: “If it be objected that there was no great money value in the offering of a small quantity of incense, so that the atonement obtained is out of all proportion to the price paid, the answer must be that **the atonement obtained is always out of all proportion to the price paid....There is always an element of grace in atonement.**” (Bold emphasis added, APC, 167)
 - 2) There is **grace in atonement** (cf. Hab. 3:2; Jas. 2:13)
 - d. Is **life in prison without parole** an **equivalent punishment** for murder? If not, is it still **punishment** even though there is not equivalence?
 - e. Is **execution** an **equivalent punishment** for mass murder? If not, is it still **punishment** even though there is not equivalence?
 - f. Would the **execution** of a mass murderer by **torture** be an **equivalent punishment** for mass murder by torture? If not, is it still **punishment** even though there is not equivalence?
 - 1) *Objection:* Equivalence is **impossible** in these cases, but equivalence would not have been impossible in Jesus’ case

- 2) *Response:* Even if Jesus did not experience an **equivalent punishment**, did He experience **actual and sufficient punishment** for the sins of mankind?
6. *Response:* Sinners do not have **the right** to insist on anything (See Endnote #41)
7. *Response:* It was not Jesus' physical death but His **spiritual death** that made **sufficient payment** for mankind's sin
 - a. Others before and after Jesus have experienced **equal or greater torture and execution** (cf. Heb. 11:32-38)
 - 1) Jesus promised James and John that they would **drink His cup** and **be baptized** with His baptism (Mt. 20:22-23)
 - 2) **Two other men** were crucified with Jesus on that dreadful day (Mt. 27:38)
8. *Response:* Would **rejecting** Jesus' sacrifice "**justify**" **eternal torment** in hell? The writer of Hebrews implies that those who do that will and should experience "**worse punishment**" than physical death (Heb. 10:26-31)
 - a. *Note:* While this passage may explain why many should experience eternal torment in hell, it doesn't explain why those who **die** without the opportunity to **hear the gospel** and either **accept or reject Christ** will experience "**fiery indignation**"

E. "**Penal substitution implies universal salvation, which is unbiblical**"⁴³

1. If Christ **paid the penalty for sin completely**, how is God just in demanding that **some people pay the penalty again**?
 - a. Jesus' death **fully paid the debt** of those for whom He died
 - b. Jesus died for **all people**
 - c. Therefore, Jesus' death **fully pays the debt for all people**
 - d. Yet some people will **pay their own debt** in hell
 - e. Therefore, **God is unjust**, because He **demand payment** from those who will go to hell for **a debt already paid in full** by Christ
 - 1) In other words, **God punishes the same sins twice**
2. Calvinists who believe in "**limited atonement**" respond to this objection by arguing that **Jesus did not die for everyone**, only for the elect⁴⁴
 - a. However, the Bible clearly teaches "**unlimited atonement**" – that **Jesus died for all men**
 - 1) Savior of **world** (Jn. 4:42; 1 Jn. 4:14)
 - 2) Takes away sin of **the world** (Jn. 1:29)
 - 3) Gives flesh for the life of **the world** (Jn. 6:51)
 - 4) Died for **all** (2 Cor. 5:14-15)
 - 5) Savior of **all men** (1 Tim. 4:10)
 - 6) Ransom for **all** (1 Tim. 2:5-6)
 - 7) Tasted death for **everyone** (Heb. 2:9)
 - 8) Propitiation for **the whole world** (1 Jn. 2:2)

- b. Passages that say that Jesus died for **His sheep** (Jn. 10:11, 15), **His friends** (Jn. 15:13), and **His church** (Acts 20:28; Eph. 5:25), etc. do not *exclude* others; they merely *include* those mentioned
- c. *Objection:* If Jesus **died for all men**, then how is it that **many will be lost** (Mt. 7:13-14)?
 - 1) Although Jesus died for all men (**universal provision**), only those who respond in faith (**individual appropriation**) actually benefit from His death (Rom. 3:25)
 - 2) Jesus died for some who **may be lost** (Rom. 14:15; 1 Cor. 8:11; 2 Pet. 2:1)
- 3. Penal Substitution does not imply “**universal salvation**” because Jesus does not **become our Substitute** until we **meet all of the conditions** that He stipulates in His will for salvation
 - b. “**Be saved** from this perverse generation”^{cc} (Acts 2:40, NKJV; cf. HCSB; ISV; LEB; NASB; YLT)
 - 1) “**Save yourselves....**” (ASV; KJV; ESV; NET; NAB; NIV; NRSV; RSV)
 - c. “**...be reconciled to God**” (2 Cor. 5:20)
 - d. “**...a propitiation in His blood through faith**” (Rom. 3:25, NASB)
 - e. **Redemption through faith** (Gal. 3:13)
 - f. “**...a man is justified by works, and not by faith only.**” (Jas. 2:24)
- 6. While Jesus died to appease God’s wrath (Rom. 3:25-26), God’s wrath **abides** on the one who **does not believe** in Jesus (Jn. 3:36; cf. Eph. 2:3; 5:6; 2 Th. 1:8-9)

VI. Penal Substitution And Our Understanding Of God

A. “Penal substitution implies a division between the persons of the Trinity”

- 1. Penal substitution implies **a division** between Father and Son, setting them **at odds** with each other. This is unacceptable since the Father, the Son, and the Spirit are **one God**
 - a. Penal substitution **pits Jesus and God against each other**, with **God** on the side of **justice** and **Jesus** on the side of **man** (McClister, PHSS, 98)
- 2. The Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit are **three distinct divine Persons** (cf. Mt. 3:16-17) making up **one Godhead**
 - a. Although they possess **an essential unity** (cf. Jn. 10:30; 14:10), they can and do **act independently** of one another
 - b. It is perfectly biblical for one person of the Godhead to **perform an action** upon another
 - 1) The **Son loves** the Father (Jn. 14:31) and the **Father loves** the Son (Jn. 3:35; 5:20; 10:17; 17:24)
 - 2) The Father and the Son **send the Spirit** (Jn. 14:26; 15:26)
 - c. “[W]hile the persons of the Trinity do not perform the **same action** in the **same way**, they nonetheless **never act independently** of each other – their respective contributions to any given activity are **inseparable**.” (Bold emphasis added, Jeffery, Ovey, & Sach, PFOT, 285)

3. “[I]t is not meaningless to say that **God the Son propitiated God the Father**. It is not the **same person** who is the subject and object of the verb. For the Father and the Son are **distinct**.” (Bold emphasis added, Jeffery, Ovey, & Sach, PFOT, 285)
4. The fact that **the Father exacts a punishment borne by the Son** does not mean that the members of the Godhead are **divided** or **act independently**
 - a. Both the Father and the Son were in **perfect agreement about Calvary** (Jn. 10:15, 17-18)

B. “Penal substitution relies on an unbiblical view of an angry God that is incompatible with his love”

1. This objection assumes that God cannot be **angry and loving** towards the **same people** at the **same time**, because love and anger are **contradictory** and **conflicting**
2. **God loves sinners**, and **the cross** is the **supreme manifestation** of this love (Jn. 3:16; Rom. 5:8; 1 Jn. 4:10)
3. However, **God’s love** and **His wrath** are **not mutually exclusive** (Psa. 7:11; Jn. 3:16, 36; Eph. 2:3-4; Rom. 11:22)
 - a. *Illust.*: **Parents** can certainly experience both **love** and **anger** at the same time for a disobedient child
 - b. “**God’s attributes cannot be pitted against one another**, neither ought one to be **elevated above** the others to a ‘primary’ position. **All of God’s attributes have equal significance** in determining his actions. He always acts in conformity with **the whole of his character**.” (Bold emphasis added, Jeffery, Ovey, & Sach, PFOT, 293)

C. “Penal substitution misunderstands the relationship between God’s wrath and human sin”

1. “Some argue it is incorrect to say that **sin arouses God’s wrath and provokes his judgment**. Rather, **our acts of wickedness, together with the negative consequences intrinsic to them...are themselves God’s judgment** on sinful humanity, a manifestation of his wrath.” (Bold emphasis added, Jeffery, Ovey, & Sach, PFOT, 294)
 - a. The Gentiles **refused to honor** God (Rom. 1:18-23)
 - b. God **gave the Gentiles up** to follow their own desires (Rom. 1:24, 26, 28)
 - c. The Gentiles’ **wickedness** and the **attendant consequences** constituted **God’s wrath** (Rom. 1:18, 27, 32)
 - 1) *Joel Green & Mark Baker*: “**Sinful activity** is the result of **God’s letting us go our own way** – and this ‘**letting us go our own way**’ constitutes **God’s wrath**. In Paul’s own words, the wrath of God is revealed in God’s giving humanity over to their lusts, over to their degrading passions and over to their debasement of mind (Rom. 1:18, 24, 26, 28)...**Our sinful acts do not invite God’s wrath but prove that God’s wrath is already active**.” (Bold emphasis added, *Recovering the Scandal of the Cross: Atonement in New Testament and Contemporary Contexts*, 55, quoted in Jeffery, Ovey, & Sach, PFOT, 294-295)
 - 2) *Stephen Travis*: “**God does not impose punishment retributively from outside**, but allows men to **experience the consequences** of their refusal to live in relation to him.” (Bold emphasis added, *Christ and the Judgment of God: Divine Retribution in the New Testament*, 3, quoted in (Bold emphasis added, Jeffery, Ovey, & Sach, PFOT, 293)

-
- d. According to this view, **Christ died under the “wrath” of God**, but only in the sense that he entered into and **shared the human experience of suffering the natural consequences of sin** in human life. **No penalty was transferred to Christ**, paid by him in our place (Jeffery, Ovey, & Sach, PFOT, 296)
 - 2. It is certainly true that God sometimes uses **the natural processes** of human life to **judge human sin** in this life (cf. Rom. 1:18-32)
 - 3. But this is not the whole story. There is **a coming day of wrath** (cf. Rom. 2:5, 8-9; 5:9; Col. 3:5-6; Eph. 5:5-6; 1 Th. 5:1-3)
 - a. The sins that sometimes bring **a judgment from God in time** (Rom. 1:18-32) are **the same sins** that will bring **His future judgment throughout eternity**
 - 4. So while **God manifests His wrath** against sin and sinners **presently in this life** (Rom. 1:18-32), **He will manifest His wrath** against sin and sinners **in the future** (1 Th. 1:10)
 - 5. Furthermore, **God actively judges sin** in time even if sometimes He works through **secondary agencies** or **“natural causes”**
 - a. The **ten plagues** (Ex. 8:1-4, 19-21; 9:1-3, 13-18; 11:4-6; 12:29-30; cf. Gen. 15:13-14)
 - b. The **wilderness wandering** (Psa. 95:7-11)
 - c. Israel’s **defeat** by the army of Ai (Josh. 7:1ff, 11-12)
 - d. The **foreign oppressions** during the time of the judges (Jdg. 2:19-21; 3:7-8)
 - e. The **disasters** during the divided kingdom period (1 Ki. 16:1-4; 2 Ki. 13:1-3)
 - f. The **Assyrian captivity** (2 Ki. 17:1ff, 2, 7, 18)
 - g. The **Babylonian captivity** (Jer. 30:14; 32:26ff, 30-31; Ezra 5:12)
 - 1) Although this was **not recognized as God’s judgment by everyone**, it was nonetheless (Isa. 42:23-25)
 - h. The punishments of **civil government** (Rom. 13:1, 3-4; 1 Pet. 2:13-14)
 - D. **“Penal substitution generates an unbiblical view of a God constrained by a law external to himself”**
 - 1. “Some think that penal substitution depicts **God in a quandary**: he **longs to have fellowship with sinful people**, and would be **perfectly happy to forgive us freely and completely**, but is **forced to punish our sins by a ‘law’ or ‘standard of justice’ outside himself**, over which he has no control.” (Bold emphasis added, Jeffery, Ovey, & Sach, PFOT, 300)
 - a. Penal substitution makes God out to be like **the elder brother**, in the Parable of the Prodigal Son, rather than **the loving father** who refuses to accept that there is any debt outstanding against him (Lk. 15:11-32)
 - 2. God is **not constrained by any authority** outside Himself
 - 3. **God’s commandments**, are a reflection of **His character** (Lev. 11:44-45; cf. 19:2; 20:26; 20:7-8; 21:8, 15, 23; 22:2, 9, 16, 32; 1 Pet. 1:14-16)
 - a. “The **standard of justice** on which basis Christ was punished in our place is not **external** to God, but **intrinsic** to him; it is **a reflection of his own righteous, holy character**.” (Bold emphasis added, Jeffery, Ovey, & Sach, PFOT, 301)
-

- b. “God’s law, then, is not external to him, but intrinsic, reflecting his own perfect righteousness and holiness. To **obey God’s law** is to **obey God**.” (Bold emphasis added, Jeffery, Ovey, & Sach, PFOT, 302)
- c. “The converse is also true. **Disobedience to the law** is **disobedience to God himself**. **Sin is not a transgression of an abstract moral code: it is an affront to God’s holy character**. Moreover, **when God punishes sin**, he is not reluctantly conforming to the dictates of an arbitrary set of regulations that he would rather ignore: **he is acting in conformity with his own justice and righteousness**.” (Bold emphasis added, Jeffery, Ovey, & Sach, PFOT, 302)
- 4. Jesus did not die in order to **satisfy an external standard of justice**, but rather to **demonstrate God’s justice** (Rom. 3:24-26)
 - a. “[I]t is right for God to be **intimately and personally involved** in the administration of his justice, precisely because it is **his justice**, and he is the **ultimate standard** of right and wrong.” (Bold emphasis added, Jeffery, Ovey, & Sach, PFOT, 303, n. 73)

E. **“Penal substitution is an impersonal, mechanistic account of the atonement”**

- 1. “[T]his objection claims that penal substitution is **impersonal** and **mechanistic**, whereas the Bible depicts sin and atonement in **personal, relational terms**.” (Bold emphasis added, Jeffery, Ovey, & Sach, PFOT, 304)
- 2. Penal substitution does not construe law and sin as **impersonal “objects or things** that somehow had to be dealt with”
 - a. God’s law is **no abstract legal code**; it is a reflection of **God’s perfect justice**
 - b. Human sin is no mere **transgression** of a set of **impersonal moral dictates**; it is an **affront to God’s holiness**
 - c. Jesus death was not “**a factor in an equation** ... needed to balance the cosmic sum,” but the **loving and costly action** of God in human history (Jeffery, Ovey, & Sach, PFOT, 305)
- 3. The Bible consistently depicts **God’s anger at sin** and **His judicial response** in unmistakably **personal terms** (cf. Isa. 2:10, 19-21; Jer. 4:26; Rev. 6:12-17; 14:9-10)
 - a. **What could be more impersonal** than the view that God’s wrath is nothing more than “**letting us go our own way**” to reap the “**natural consequences**” of our actions

VII. **Penal Substitution And The Christian Life**

A. **“Penal substitution fails to address the issues of political and social sin and cosmic evil”**

- 1. “[T]he objection is that penal substitution does not provide **a sufficiently comprehensive answer to the problem of human sin**, for it fails to address **its effects on human society** and the wider created order.” (Bold emphasis added, Jeffery, Ovey, & Sach, PFOT, 309)
 - a. Penal substitution says little about the need for, or the path to, **reconciliation** between **nations** and **peoples** divided by **political, ethnic, economic and social barriers**
 - b. Penal substitution does not provide for **the redemption of the whole cosmos** from its fallen state

-
- c. Penal substitution is fixated with **penalties** but cares nothing for **the cosmic consequences** of sin
 2. “Penal substitution correctly recognizes that **all sin begins with human beings**, and it is this **root problem** that it treats.” (Bold emphasis added, Jeffery, Ovey, & Sach, PFOT, 311)
 - a. “It was **Nazis, not ‘Nazism’**, that conceived, propagated and implemented the sickening plans to murder millions of Jews in the Second World War.” (Bold emphasis added, Jeffery, Ovey, & Sach, PFOT, 311)
 3. Furthermore, as **a by-product** of initial salvation and/or **a condition** of final salvation, Christ calls upon saved people (Christians) to:
 - a. **No longer live in sin** (Rom. 6:1-4)
 - b. Be **salt and light** in this sinful world (Mt. 5:13-16)
 - c. **Spread the gospel and bring others to salvation** (Mt. 28:18-20; Mk. 16:15-16)
 - d. Etc.
 4. If everyone **followed the ethical teaching of Jesus**, most, if not all, of society’s **problems would be solved**
 5. Finally, **the cursed cosmos** will be “**delivered from the bondage of corruption**” in some way at the Second Coming when the bodies of the children of God are redeemed (Rom. 8:19-23)
- B. “Penal substitution is an entirely objective account of the atonement, and fails to address our side of the Creator-creature relationship”**
1. “[T]his objection argues that penal substitution does not explain how the relationship between us and God can be **restored from our side**” (Bold emphasis added, Jeffery, Ovey, & Sach, PFOT, 315)
 2. Penal substitution is **not the whole story**. It is **one puzzle piece** in the “jigsaw” puzzle of atonement
 - a. “An individual piece can hardly be **criticized for not containing the whole picture**: that is simply not its job.” (Bold emphasis added, Jeffery, Ovey, & Sach, PFOT, 315)
 3. Furthermore, **the benefits** of penal substitution are only for **those who are “in Christ”** where **all spiritual blessings** are found (Eph. 1:3); and **certain conditions must be met** to get into Christ [e.g. baptism] (Rom. 6:3-4; Gal. 3:26-27)
 4. So, **the sinner has a part to play** in conversion, initial salvation, becoming a Christian, etc. by **meeting Christ’s conditions of pardon**
 5. Also Christ expects saved people to **live holy lives** as **a by-product** of their initial salvation and/or **a condition** of their final salvation (Rom. 6:1-2, 11-12; 1 Cor. 6:20; 2 Cor. 5:14-15; Tit. 2:14; 1 Pet. 1:17-19)
- C. “Penal substitution causes people to live in fear of God”**
1. All throughout the Bible, God’s people are instructed to **fear God**
 - a. **David** (Psa. 34:7, 9)
 - b. **The wise man** (Pr. 1:7)
 - c. **Jesus** (Mt. 10:28; Lk. 12:4-5)
 - d. **Peter** (1 Pet. 1:17)
-

-
- e. **Writer of Hebrews** (Heb. 10:31)
 - 2. The depiction of a **loving Jesus placating the wrath of an irascible Father** is a **grotesque caricature** of penal substitution
 - a. Jesus was **not acting against the will of the Father** in His self-offering on the cross
 - b. The will of the Father and the Son were in perfect agreement. The Father **gave the Son**, and the Son **gave Himself** (2 Cor. 5:19)
 - c. **God's love** was **demonstrated** in the death of His Son (Rom. 5:6-8)
 - D. **"Penal substitution legitimates violence and encourages the passive acceptance of unjust suffering"**
 - 1. "[T]his objection claims that penal substitution **justifies the perpetration and passive acceptance of violent abuse**, by setting forth as an example the image of a Father inflicting suffering upon his Son." (Bold emphasis added, Jeffery, Ovey, & Sach, PFOT, 322)
 - 2. This objection is based on the presupposition that we should **imitate God's example at Calvary**; however, this is precisely what the apostle Paul says **we should not do**
 - a. Because God will **exact punishment**, we must not **seek revenge** (Rom. 12:17-21)
 - 3. This objection erroneously **makes no distinction** between **God's holy and righteous punishment of mankind's sin** in Christ at Calvary and the **vindictive and godless atrocities of "man's inhumanity to man"**
 - a. It is certainly true that **those who put Jesus to death** were guilty of **appalling brutality**, and they were **rightfully condemned** for their actions (Acts 2:22-23, 36; 3:13-15; 4:10; 5:30; 7:51-53)
 - b. It is also true that **God justly worked through those same actions** for His good purposes (Acts 2:23; 4:27-28; Isa. 53:10)
 - c. This was not **vindictive** or **capricious**, but a perfectly holy demonstration of **justice** (Rom. 3:24-26)
 - 4. The second charge that penal substitution encourages victims to **passively accept abuse** pertains not to penal substitution but to the **"exemplary theory" of atonement**
 - a. Peter does teach that Christ's death is **an example** that we should follow when we are **mistreated** (1 Pet. 2:18-25)
 - b. But there are some things that **Peter does not teach**:
 - 1) He does not **commend unjust suffering** as a good thing in itself
 - 2) He does not **commend the perpetrators of injustice**
 - c. Peter **does teach**:
 - 1) Christians **how they should respond to unjust treatment**, especially when they cannot escape injustice
 - 2) **Government** has the God-given responsibility to **protect the good and punish the evil** (1 Pet. 2:13-14)

VIII. Penal Substitution And Miscellaneous Objections⁴⁵

A. The Emotional Objection

1. “The use of **emotive language** is **legitimate** when used to communicate the force of a **reasoned argument**—Jesus used it in this way (e.g. Matt. 5:29-30), as did the apostle Paul, who spoke of the fate of those without Christ ‘with tears’ (Phil. 3: 1 8). But The Emotional Objection is different. **The Emotional Objection deploys forceful language in the absence of a reasoned argument**, rather than as a climax to it. Its effect is to **overwhelm the hearer**, and to make calm, level-headed evaluation of the ideas on the table almost impossible. We find ourselves **agreeing**, not because we have been **persuaded**, but because we have been **swept along by the emotional tide**. At worst, we have simply been **manipulated**. Those who indulge in this kind of argument do not merely **put the rhetorical cart before the logical horse**; they **unhitch the cart completely, take it to the top of a steep hill, give it a firm shove, and watch with satisfaction as the pedestrians are scattered into the hedgerows.**”
(Bold emphasis added, Jeffery, Ovey, & Sach, PFOT, 36-327)

B. “While Jesus suffered for our sins, He was not punished for our sins”

1. *Maurice Barnett*: “THE BIBLE NEVER SAYS THAT JESUS WAS PUNISHED FOR OUR SINS – IT DOES SAY **HE SUFFERED FOR OUR SINS!**” (Bold emphasis added, *Reconciliation*, 170)⁴⁶
2. It is certainly true that sometimes **when wicked people are punished, innocent people may suffer** as a consequence
 - a. When God punished the northern kingdom of **Israel** with **drought** and **famine** (Amos 4:6-13), no doubt **innocent little babies** and **righteous adults** suffered, although they were not being punished by God
 - b. When God used the Babylonians to punish the southern kingdom of **Judah**, the **wicked were punished** and **righteous people suffered**, without being punished (Ezek. 21:1-5)
 - c. *Jim McGuigan*: “An honorable judge knowingly **subjects innocent little children to suffering** when he sends their parents to jail for serious crimes. We say he is **punishing the parents** and not the children precisely because **the parents are guilty** and **the children are guiltless**. It is tragic that the children are subjected to suffering, which results (in part) because they are closely related to the transgressors, and the judge would feel their pain. But it wouldn’t enter our minds to say he was punishing the children.” (“Penal Substitution (1)”)
 3. *Response*: Assertion is **not proof**
 4. *Response*: Citing examples of righteous people suffering when wicked people are punished **does not prove** that this is merely what happened in Jesus’ death
 5. *Response*: The language of Isaiah 53 certainly sounds like **punishment**, and **punishment from God**, to me (See the material above on Isaiah 53)

C. “If our sins are imputed to Christ, then logically we must accept the Calvinistic doctrines of imputation”⁴⁷

1. Why should we object to the Calvinistic doctrine of **imputed sin** (i.e. Adam’s sin was transferred to all mankind) and **imputed righteousness** (i.e. Christ’s righteousness is transferred to believers) if we are willing to accept the idea that **our sin was imputed to Christ**?

-
2. *Response:* It is not a forgone conclusion that the **imputation of our sin** to Jesus (1 Pet. 2:24) demands the **imputation of His righteousness** to us
 3. *Response:* The Calvinistic doctrines of **imputed sin** and **imputed righteousness** should be **rejected**, because the Bible **doesn't teach** those doctrines
 - a. Paul does not say that **Adam's sin (guilt) was imputed** to all mankind
 - 1) Paul says that:
 - a) Adam **introduced sin** into the world (Rom. 5:12a)
 - b) **Death**, not sin, spread to all men, **because all sinned**, not because Adam sinned (Rom. 5:12b)
 - 2) He **does not say** what Calvinists' claim he says
 - b. While the NT certainly teaches the **imputation of righteousness** (Rom. 4:3, 5-6, 9, 11, 22-23; Gal. 3:6), it does not explicitly teach the **imputation of Christ's personal righteousness** to sinners
 - 1) *Leon Morris:* "In view of plain statements like these [Rom. 4:3, 5] it seems impossible to hold that Paul found no place for the imputation of righteousness to believers. On the other hand **he never says in so many words that the righteousness of Christ was imputed to believers**, and it may fairly be doubted whether he had this in mind in his treatment of justification...." (Bold emphasis added, APC, 282)
 4. *Response:* Penal substitution and Calvinism do not **stand or fall together**
- D. **"Penal substitution inevitably leads to the Calvinistic doctrine of eternal security"** (i.e. "once saved always saved")
1. *Maurice Barnett:* "If Jesus took all of our punishment on Himself, there is **no punishment left for us to endure**. Seeing He did this for all men, not a single human can be charged with sin, guilt or punishment and **not one can ever be lost**." (Bold emphasis added, *Reconciliation*, 175)
 2. *Response:* This is not the case if continuing to receive the benefits of Jesus' vicarious sacrifice is conditioned upon **faithfulness to Christ** after conversion (Col. 1:19-23)
 - a. *Note:* Bro. Barnett certainly understands that **salvation is conditional**, because he repeatedly refers to such; but he doesn't seem to see or believe that **penal substitution can be conditional** (See "The Vicarious Death Of Christ?? 5," PM, May 1999, 132-137)⁴⁸
- E. **"If Jesus is our substitute, then He has already done everything that must be done, and there is nothing for us to do"**⁴⁹
1. This objection sounds much like the denominationalist's objection against baptism: "We're **saved by grace**, but if we have to **do anything** (e.g. be baptized), our **salvation cannot be by grace**"
 - a. The denominationalist ignores the fact that **grace can be conditional** and still be grace
 2. Bro. Barnett argues that if Christ was our **substitute**, then He **did everything** that had to be done, and there's **nothing for us to do**. But since there are **things for us to do to be saved**, Christ could not have been our **substitute**
-

-
- a. Can **substitution** be **conditional** and still be **substitution**?
 - b. In the **Civil War**, one could **send a substitute** in his place, if he **paid \$300**, but what if he **didn't pay**?
 - c. Are the **conditions** we must meet for salvation any different than **paying \$300**?
3. This objection seems to assume that **Jesus automatically becomes our Substitute** merely by dying on the cross
- F. **“Penal substitution does not supply any good reason for why anyone actually needs to become a follower of Jesus”** (McClister, PHSS, 100)
1. *Response:* Sinners must become **faithful followers** of Jesus because it is a **condition** for receiving the benefits of Jesus' vicarious sacrifice (cf. Mk. 8:34-38; Jn. 10:27-29; 12:26; 1 Jn. 1:7; 2:3-6)
 2. *Note:* This seems so obvious to me that I am **truly amazed** that anyone would raise this objection
- G. **“Penal substitution negates the grace of God in forgiveness”**
1. *Barton W. Stone:* “This scheme **destroys the ideas of grace and forgiveness**. For if my surety or substitute has **fully discharged my debt**, having paid the *real, proper* and *full* demand for me, **can it be grace in my creditor to forgive me.**” (Bold emphasis added, *Works of Elder B. W. Stone*, 121, quoted in Barnett, *Reconciliation*, 172)
 2. *Response:* Grace is manifested in **allowing a Substitute** in the first place!!!

Abbreviations

AFET:	<i>The Apostolic Fathers: English Translations</i>
AMS:	<i>The Atonement: Its Meaning And Significance</i>
APC:	<i>The Apostolic Preaching Of The Cross</i>
BDAG:	<i>A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature</i>
BEC:	<i>The Bible Exposition Commentary</i>
CNTUOT:	<i>Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament</i>
EBC:	<i>The Expositor's Bible Commentary</i>
EDNT:	<i>The Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament</i>
FBR:	<i>Faith In The Book Of Romans</i>
FSUBEI:	<i>Figures Of Speech Used in the Bible: Explained and Illustrated</i>
GGNT:	<i>A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research</i>
GHCLOT:	<i>Gesenius' Hebrew-Chaldee Lexicon of the Old Testament</i>
HFW:	<i>Hymns For Worship</i>
ISBE:	<i>The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia (Revised Edition)</i>
LES:	<i>The Lexham English Septuagint</i>
JFB:	<i>Jamieson, Fausset, & Brown, Commentary Critical and Explanatory on the Whole Bible</i>
JTS:	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
MWBS:	<i>The Meaning Of The Word "Blood" In Scripture</i>
NBCR:	<i>The New Bible Commentary: Revised</i>
NIBC:	<i>New International Bible Commentary</i>
NLBC:	<i>The New Layman's Bible Commentary</i>
NTT:	<i>New Topical Textbook</i>
PFOT:	<i>Pierced For Our Transgressions</i>
PHSS:	<i>Psalms, Hymns and Spiritual Songs</i>
PLSR:	<i>The New Commentary On Paul's Letter To The Saints At Rome</i>
PM:	<i>The Preceptor Magazine</i>
SWOT:	<i>Sacrificial Worship Of The Old Testament</i>
TDOT:	<i>The Theological Dictionary Of The Old Testament</i>
TWOT:	<i>Theological Word Book Of The Old Testament</i>
WIB:	<i>Written In Blood: A Devotional Bible Study Of The Blood Of Christ</i>
YLT:	<i>Young's Literal Translation</i>
ZPBD:	<i>The Zondervan Pictorial Bible Dictionary</i>

End Notes

¹ *Gordon Wenham*: “The animal given in its totality to God pictures at once the **total annihilation** the sinner deserves and the **total consecration** God expects from his followers.” (Bold emphasis added, “Numbers, TOTC, 4:228)

Gordon Wenham: “Sacrifice is the appointed means whereby **peaceful coexistence** between a **holy God** and **sinful man** becomes a possibility.” (Bold emphasis added, “Leviticus,” NICOT, 56)

Gordon Wenham: “The burnt offering was **the commonest** of all the OT sacrifices. Its main function was to **atone for man’s sin by propitiating God’s wrath**. In the immolation of the animal, most commonly a lamb, **God’s judgment against human sin was symbolized** and **the animal suffered in man’s place**. The worshipper acknowledged his guilt and responsibility for his sins by pressing his hand on the animal’s head and confessing his sin. The lamb was accepted as **the ransom price** for the guilty man....In bringing a sacrifice a man **acknowledged his sinfulness and guilt**. He also **publicly confessed his faith** in the Lord, his **thankfulness** for past blessing, and **his resolve to live according to God’s holy will** all the days of his life.” (Bold emphasis added, “Leviticus,” NICOT, 63)

² *Gordon Wenham*: “Most probably *the salt of your God’s covenant* ([Lev. 2] v. 13) gives the clue to the symbolism. It suggests that the **salt symbolized the covenant**. Greeks and Arabs are known to have eaten salt together when they concluded covenants. In the OT salt is connected with covenants on two occasions, and in both a **covenant of salt means an eternal covenant** (Num. 18:19; 2 Chr. 13:5). **Salt was something that could not be destroyed** by fire or time or any other means in antiquity. To add salt to the offering was a reminder that **the worshipper was in an eternal covenant relationship with his God**. This meant that **God would never forsake him**, and also that **the worshipper had a perpetual duty to uphold and keep the covenant law**.” (Bold emphasis added, “Leviticus,” NICOT, 71)

³ *Gordon Wenham*: “The cereal offering is **a kind of tribute** from the faithful worshipper to his divine overlord. When a treaty was made, the conquered nations were expected to bring their tribute to the great king. Israel too was bound by a covenant with God, and therefore had a responsibility to **express her fidelity** by bringing her cereal offerings.” (Bold emphasis added, “Leviticus,” NICOT, 69)

Gordon Wenham: “The cereal offering then was **a gift by the worshipper to God**. It normally **followed the burnt offering**. God having granted forgiveness of sins through the burnt offering, the worshipper responded by giving to God some of the produce of his hands in cereal offering. It was **an act of dedication and consecration to God** as Savior and covenant King. It expressed not only **thankfulness** but **obedience** and a **willingness** to keep the law.” (Bold emphasis added, “Leviticus,” NICOT, 71)

Gordon Wenham: “In offering these other fruits of the earth to God, the worshipper pictured **the offering of his entire life** to his creator.” (Bold emphasis added, “Numbers,” TOTC, 4:229)

⁴ *Gordon Wenham*: “The **kidneys and entrails** are referred to in the OT as the **seat of the emotions** (Job 19:27; Ps. 16:7; Jer. 4:14; 12:2), just as in English we talk of the heart.” (Bold emphasis added, “Leviticus,” NICOT, 80)

⁵ *Gordon Wenham*: “The peace offering (*šəlamîm*) was offered when an individual was **seeking, or already enjoying, peace** (*šālôm*) with God.” (Bold emphasis added, “Numbers,” TOTC, 4:227)

Gordon Wenham: “Since peace offerings were the only type of sacrifice in which the layman had a share of the meat, it made these occasions **very festive and joyful**.” (“Numbers,” TOTC, 4:227)

Gordon Wenham: “Though **confession of sin** and **pleas for deliverance** are associated with these sacrifices, more typically they are seen as **joyous occasions**. These sacred meals were **opportunities for rejoicing before the Lord** (Deut. 12:12, 18; 27:7; 1 K. 8:66). When God has saved and blessed his people, they can and should enjoy worshipping him.” (Bold emphasis added, “Leviticus,” NICOT, 79)

⁶ *Gordon Wenham*: “*Ḥaṭṭā’t* can be translated ‘**sin**’ or ‘**purification**’, and it is probably the latter sense that is central in references to this sacrifice, which would, therefore, be better termed the ‘**purification offering**’.” (Bold emphasis added, “Numbers,” TOTC, 4:228)

⁷ *Gordon Wenham*: “**Male and female animals** could be used in the purification [a.k.a. sin, ksk] offering, but **only male animals** in the burnt offering. This points to the fact that while both types of offering were regarded as essential in worship, **the burnt offering played the major role**. This is confirmed by the list of animals prescribed for festal sacrifices in Num. 28-29. The **burnt offerings** required **more animals** of **greater value** than the purification offerings.” (“Leviticus,” NICOT, 90)

⁸ *Gordon Wenham*: “The sin offering (*ḥaṭṭā’i*) pictures another aspect of atonement. **Sin causes uncleanness**, polluting both the individual concerned and the tabernacle. By smearing the blood of the sin offering on parts of the altar and tabernacle **the sanctuary is cleansed** so that God can continue to dwell among his people.” (Bold emphasis added, “Numbers,” TOTC, 4:228)

Gordon Wenham: “[T]he purification offering deals with only one aspect of the process of atonement. **It purifies the tabernacle or temple**, so that God may be present with the worshipper. **The burnt offering may then be offered** to bring reconciliation between man and God and give the worshipper an opportunity to rededicate himself to God’s service.” (Bold emphasis added, “Leviticus,” NICOT, 101)

⁹ *Gordon Wenham*: “Another notable feature of this law is the **low level of restitution** made to the man who had lost his property, in comparison with the law in Exod. 22:6ff. There, for similar offenses, **double restitution** was the norm (200 percent), whereas here it is only **one and one fifth** (120 percent) restitution plus **a ram**. Traditionally this discrepancy has been accounted for as follows: **Exodus** envisages a situation where the offender is convicted on the **evidence presented by the plaintiff**, but in **Leviticus** the culprit **confesses his guilt**. Making the penalty a low one should have encouraged voluntary surrender.” (Bold emphasis added, “Leviticus,” NICOT, 109)

¹⁰ *Gordon Wenham*: “The guilt offering (*’āšām*) introduces another analogy for sin: it is **a debt that has to be repaid**. Elsewhere *’āšām* may be translated **‘reparation’**, and the significance of this sacrifice is better brought out by the translation **‘reparation offering’**.” (“Numbers,” TOTC, 4:228)

Gordon Wenham: “The reparation offering thus demonstrates that there is another aspect of sin that is not covered by the other sacrifices. It is that of **satisfaction or compensation**. If the **burnt offering** brings **reconciliation** between God and man, the purification or **sin offering** brings **purification**, while the **reparation offering** brings **satisfaction** through paying for the sin.” (Bold emphasis added, “Leviticus,” NICOT, 111)

Gordon Wenham: “The sacrificial system therefore presents **different models or analogies** to describe **the effects of sin and the way of remedying them**. The **burnt offering** uses a personal picture: of man the guilty sinner who deserves to die for his sin and of **the animal dying in his place**. God accepts the animal as **a ransom** for man. The **sin offering** uses a medical model: sin makes the world so dirty that God can no longer dwell there. The blood of the animal **disinfects the sanctuary** in order that God may continue to be present with his people. The **reparation offering** presents a commercial picture of sin. Sin is **a debt** which man incurs against God. The **debt is paid** through the offered animal.” (Bold emphasis added, “Leviticus,” NICOT, 111)

¹¹ *David McClister*: “The point of the ritual was **the identification of the offerer with the victim** (the animal). Think about the psychological impact this part of the ritual was designed to have. You bring an animal to the doorway of God’s tent, you place your hands on its head, and then the animal is killed. **The ritual was a public expression that the animal represented you**, and consequently **its death represented you as well**. And here is the most important part about this: by placing his hands on the animal’s head, **the offerer was not identifying himself [sic] the victim’s body, but with its death**. There is absolutely **no indication that this ritual was designed to effect some transfer of sin from the person to the animal** (even symbolically), nor was the point of the ritual the substitution of an animal’s body for the offerer’s body. No, it is much deeper than that. The laying of hands on the animal’s head was designed to **create an awareness of the need of a death in order to be right with God**, and the death that was needed was not just the death of an animal’s body. **What had to die was the sinner’s sinfulness**, that part of the offerer that wanted to sin, the sinful desire that had come to rule what Paul would later call the ‘inner man.’ It is this desire to sin, this desire to rebel against God and to live according to one’s own desires, this part of me that does not want to obey God, that had to die.” (Bold emphasis added, PHSS, 103-104)

¹² *Leon Morris*: “In this way he gave symbolic expression to his recognition that **his sin merited the severest punishment**. He himself performed the act which set forth the truth that **he deserved death**.” (Bold emphasis added, AMS, 48)

¹³ *David McClister*: “The animal is flesh and the ritual was designed to emphasize **the death of the sinner’s flesh.**” (Bold emphasis added, PHSS, 104)

David McClister: “The death of a fleshly animal represented **the sinner’s death to his flesh and its desires**, a dying to that way of life that is dominated by the flesh.” (Bold emphasis added, PHSS, 105)

¹⁴ *J. H. Kurtz*: “We regard **the appropriation of the gift to Jehovah**, therefore, as the real and only design of the burning. Through the burning the gift was resolved into vapour and odour: its earthly elements still remained, but its real essence ascended in the most refined and transfigured corporeality towards heaven, where Jehovah was enthroned – a sweet odour of delight to Him...” (Bold emphasis added, SWOT, 154)

¹⁵ “The burnt offerings of v. 8 appear to be in addition to the two rams of Lev. 16:3, 5, just as the sin offerings of v. 11 are an addition to the sin offering of atonement of Lev. 16 and the daily offerings (cf. 28:3). These offerings are the same as for the Feast of Trumpets (vv. 1-6).” (NIBC, 250)

“The prescriptions in this passage appear supplementary to the former statement in Leviticus.” (JFB)

¹⁶ *E. O. James*: “In the ritual shedding of blood it is **not the taking of life but the giving of life** that really is fundamental, for **blood is not death but life.**” (Bold emphasis added, *Origins Of Sacrifice*, 33, quoted in Leon Morris, “The Biblical Use Of The Term ‘Blood,’ JTS, 6:77)

P. T. Forsyth: “...The **pleasing thing** to God and the **effective element** in the matter is **not death but life.** The blood shed with the direct object not of killing the animal, but of **detaching and releasing the life**, isolating it, as it were, from the material base of body and flesh, and **presenting it in this refined state to God.**” (Bold emphasis added, *The Cruciality of the Cross*, 186, quoted in A.M. Stibbs, MWBS, 6)

F.C.N. Hicks: “**The blood, in fact, needs to be dissociated from the idea of death.** To us, with our modern associations, it is merely the evidence, the revolting evidence, of slaughter and destruction. To the men of the ancient world it was not revolting, but precious. **It was life, once prisoned and misused, now released.**” (Bold emphasis added, *The Fullness Of Sacrifice*, 242, quoted in Leon Morris, AMS, 54)

Vincent Taylor: “**The victim is slain in order that its life, in the form of blood, may be released**, and its flesh burnt in order that it may be transformed or etherealized; and in both cases the aim is to make it possible for **life to be presented as an offering to the Deity.** More and more students of comparative religion, and of the Old Testament worship in particular, are insisting that **the bestowal of life is the fundamental idea in sacrificial worship.**” (Bold emphasis added, *Jesus and His Sacrifice*, 54-55, quoted in A.M. Stibbs, MWBS, 4)

E. L. Mascall: “The slaying was merely an indispensable preliminary by which **the life was set free to be offered.**” (Bold emphasis added, *Corpus Christi*, 89, quoted in Leon Morris, APC, 114)

¹⁷ *David McClister*: “Atonement, then, is not a simple matter of a death. Atonement is also a matter of **a life** (symbolized by blood) **given to God** (at the symbolic location of the altar).” (Bold emphasis added, PHSS, 106)

David McClister: “The point of the sacrificial ritual’s manipulation of the animal’s blood, whether it was done at the altar or at the mercy seat, was that **the sinner’s life was symbolically being given to God.** The fact that it was given to God at the ark of the covenant on the Day of Atonement is especially significant, for it symbolizes **the sinner’s life being placed at God’s feet in complete humility and submission.** Atonement therefore also inherently involves the idea of the sinner’s humility before God.” (Bold emphasis added, 107)

David McClister: “In short, the sacrificial ritual associated with atonement involves nothing less than **a symbolic death and resurrection of the sinner.** The sinner identifies himself with the death of a fleshly animal, thus signifying **the death of his own flesh and its desires.** But the sinner himself does not physically die in the process. Instead **the blood of the animal, which represents the sinner’s life, is given to God for his possession.** That is, after the death of the flesh (symbolized in the death of the animal), **the sinner goes on to live the rest of his life for God, committed to God, dedicated to God, and sanctified for God’s use alone** (symbolized by giving the animal’s life-blood on the altar or at the mercy seat). Coming to the tabernacle with a sacrifice was the sinner’s expression that he did not intend to continue in sin. It was an outward expression of his repentance, and **he came with an animal that would die as a representation of the death of his own desire to sin.** That is, he would live

his life from that point onward in dedication to God, humbly submitting to God's demands. So part of the sinner died, but another part of him lives anew." (Bold emphasis added, PHSS, 107-108)

David McClister: "The sacrifices themselves were useless unless they were offered with the understanding and intention that they represented **the death of the sinner's sinful self** and the giving of oneself anew in utter humility to God in complete and total commitment and dedication...." (Bold emphasis added, PHSS, 113)

¹⁸ *S. C. Gayford*: "The offering of the blood still within the body of the victim would represent **a life unsundered**; to offer some only of the blood drawn from its body would typify the **surrender of but a part of the life**. **The entire surrender of the whole life is essential** before it can be given over to God, and therefore **nothing less than the death of the victim is required**, though but a little of its blood was needed to 'put' on the Horns of the A

Itar." (Bold emphasis added, 116, quoted in Dewar, JTS, 4 (1953), 207)

¹⁹ *Lindsay Dewar*: "It was believed that by thus **drinking of the blood of the slain their powers could be appropriated**. The rabbis may have read back the prohibition against eating the flesh with the blood into the Noachian covenant, but this is a patent fiction." (Bold emphasis added, "The Biblical Use Of The Term Blood," JTS, p. 205)

²⁰ *Lindsay Dewar*: "[T]he prostitutes washed themselves in the pool into which King Ahab's blood had drained, obviously expecting in some way to become **possessed of his kingly powers**." (Bold emphasis added, "The Biblical Use Of The Term Blood," JTS, p. 205)

²¹ *Leon Morris*: "The prohibition seems to be because **blood yet in the flesh is closely connected with life**, is the seat of life, may even be said to be life, and thus **blood shed is a sign that life has been violated**, and abruptly terminated. The close association of the blood with the life while the organism lives on the one hand makes it a suitable symbol of **the infliction of death when separated from the flesh**, and on the other explains why participation in the blood should be prohibited. Reverence must be exercised towards the principle of life." (Bold emphasis added, JTS, 6:81)

²² *A.M. Stibbs*: "So **blood directly suggested death**, particularly a **violent death**. For, **when blood becomes visible** and begins to flow, it means that **damage has been done to someone's life**; and when the **blood is poured out in quantity**, and, so to speak, thought of in isolation as now separated from the body in which it flowed, it means that a **life has been taken**. So '**blood**' became a word-symbol for '**death**'." (Bold emphasis added, MWBS, 9)

A.M. Stibbs: "[T]hese statements [Gen. 9:4; Lev. 17:11; Dt. 12:23] say not that 'blood' is 'life' in isolation, but that **the blood is the life of the flesh**. This means that **if the blood is separated from the flesh**, whether in man or beast, **the present physical life in the flesh will come to an end**. **Blood shed stands**, therefore, not for the release of life from the burden of the flesh, but for the bringing to **an end of life in the flesh**. It is a witness to **physical death**, not an evidence of spiritual survival." (Bold emphasis added, MWBS, 11)

J. Armitage Robinson: "To the Jewish mind '**blood**' was not merely – nor even chiefly – the life-current flowing in the veins of the living; it was especially **the life poured out in death**; and yet more particularly in its religious aspect it was **the symbol of sacrificial death**." (Bold emphasis added, *St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians*, 1904, p. 29, quoted in Leon Morris, *APC*, 127-128)

²³ *A. M. Stibbs*: "True, according to Scripture, the 'blood' of a man after he is dead may cause things to happen. But that is not because the blood itself is still alive. The compelling cause is not the literal blood, not some persistent activity of the life that was in the blood, but the fact of **the death or the life taken which the blood represents in the sight both of God and of men**." (Bold emphasis added, MWBS, 12)

²⁴ *Leslie C. Allen*: "In seeming complacency God had leniently **passed over the former sins** of Jew (2:4) and Gentile (1:24 n.; Ac. 17:30), but He had only done so because **His eye was on the Cross**. Now He had acted according to character and rent the heavens (1:18) in a display of His **abhorrence** to, and **punishment** of, sin." (Bold emphasis added, NLBC, 1394)

Warren Wiersbe: "**A God of love wants to forgive sinners**, but a **God of holiness must punish sin** and uphold His righteous Law. **How can God be both 'just and the justifier'** The answer is in Jesus Christ. **When Jesus suffered the wrath of God on the cross for the sins of the world, He fully met the demands of God's Law, and**

also fully expressed the love of God's heart. The animal sacrifices in the Old Testament never took away sin; but when Jesus died, he reached all the way back to Adam and took care of those sins. No one (including Satan) could accuse God of being unjust or unfair because of His seeming passing over of sins in the Old Testament time.” (Bold emphasis added, BEC, 1:524)

R. L. Whiteside: “God’s law had been violated again and again; and yet in this present dispensation he was justifying sinners; and he had **passed over the sins done aforetime** – that is, sins committed under the former dispensation. How could he show that he was just in so doing? To ignore sins, or to treat them with indifference, would wreck his moral government. He must be just and the majesty of his law upheld. **Justice demands that the guilty be punished**, and the majesty of the law requires that the penalties of the law be inflicted on the guilty. How, then, could God be just in passing over the sins of the former dispensation and in justifying sinners in the present time. Only because **Jesus died for us. He suffered the penalties of the violated law.**” (Bold emphasis added, PLSR, 81-82)

L. A. Mott, Jr.: “But Paul is talking about men of faith, penitent sinners, men like Abraham and David....These men were sinners. Yet in consideration of their faith and penitent hearts God did not reckon their sins to them. **He did not give them the punishment their sins deserved. He forgave them.**

“But **how could he do that when the ransom price had not been paid** and no adequate basis for forgiveness had been laid? Paul’s answer is, **God forgave sins in view of what was going to happen at the cross. In Christ at last judgment was brought against sin as the sinless son of God died for sinners....**

“God’s righteousness was then manifested, for it became clear at last that God was **not just winking at sin**; that he was **not just looking the other way**; but that he was forgiving sin only because there was to be **an adequate basis for forgiveness in the death of Christ.** (Bold emphasis added, FBR, 16-17)

²⁵ *R. Laird Harris:* “This goat [the scapegoat], like the sin offering (Lev. 4:24), was presented before the Lord, and hands were laid on its head. This was a usual part of the sacrificial ritual (Lev. 1:4 et al.), but in Leviticus 16:21 it is explained: the priest is to **confess over the animal the sins of the people and put them on the goat’s head.** There could hardly be a clearer expression of **the transfer of sins to the sacrifice.** In the sin offering **the sins are symbolically judged and the penalty paid.** In the ritual of the escape goat, **the sins are in the symbol removed far away, and the work of atonement is complete.**” (Bold emphasis added, “Leviticus: Introduction,” EBC, 2:523)

R. K. Harrison: “But whatever the precise meaning of the term [*aza'zel*, translated “scapegoat”], the purpose of this very dramatic portion of the day of atonement ritual was to place before the eyes of the Israelites an unmistakable token that **their sins of inadvertence had been removed from their midst.** It was a symbol of the fact that **both people and land had been purged from their guilt**, since a confession of communal sin would be made over the goat’s head by the high priest before it was driven out into the wilderness....Both animals preserve the Old Testament concept of **sin being taken away by an agent other than the sinner.** This principle of vicarious atonement finds its fullest expression in Christ, the divine Lamb, who takes away human sin by His death (*cf.* Jn. 1:29).” (Bold emphasis added, TOTC, p. 171)

²⁶ *J. H. Kurtz:* “**The blood of a murdered person demanded the blood of the murderer as an expiation** (Num. xxxv. 33). But **if the murderer could not be discovered, a heifer was to be killed**, and the elders of the nearest town were to pray to God, that He would regard its death as representing the execution of the murderer who could not be found; that the innocent blood which had been shed might no longer lie uncovered, *i.e.*, unexpiated (ver. 8), in the land (because, according to Gen. iv. 10, so long as that was the case, it cried to heaven for vengeance); and that the city might not remain under the ban, which the murder committed in the neighbourhood had brought upon it. It is true, **the object in this instance was not to cover or atone for the sin of the murderer**, and therefore not to obtain blood as a means of expiation for that sin....But **the idea of a poena vicaria, suffered by an animal instead of a man, is as evident here** as in the sacrificial worship; the only difference being, that in the one case the punishment *could not* be inflicted upon the person who deserved it, because he was not to be found; and in the other case, it *was not* to be inflicted upon him, because the mercy of God had provided a means of expiation for his sin in the blood of the animal offered *by him and dying for him.*” (Bold emphasis added, SWOT, p. 106)

²⁷ *Maurice Barnett:* “**Vicarious** thus refers to the theory that Jesus **took our place** on the cross, **died in our stead, suffered the guilt and punishment** that rightly belongs to us, **became a curse** in our place.” (Bold emphasis added, *Reconciliation*, 7)

Maurice Barnett: “The *substitution theory* says that **our sins were literally transferred to Jesus**, that He **took our place in guilt and punishment**, in our place **became a curse** and in our stead **took the sufferings** due us for our sins.” (Bold emphasis added, *Reconciliation*, 112)

David McClister: “This theory says that the problem with our sin was primarily legal in nature: **our sin was a violation of divine law**, and **divine justice demanded that sin must be punished with death**. However, God loves us so much that He did not want us all to die, so Christ took on human form and as a man **died in the place of all men**, thus **satisfying the divine demand for justice**.” (Bold emphasis added, PHSS, 90)

²⁸ J. Gresham Machen: “The curse which Christ bore upon the cross was not a curse that *wrongly rested upon Him*....it was a curse which *rightly rested upon Him*. But if that be so, there can be no doubt but that the substitutionary atonement is taught in Scripture. **The only way in which a curse could rightly rest upon a sinless One is that he was the substitute**, in bearing the curse, for those upon whom it did rightly rest.” (Bold emphasis added, *Notes on Galatians*, 181, quoted in Barnett, *Reconciliation*, 138)

Leon Morris: “Paul is saying that Christ’s death on the cross meant that he **bore the curse** that would otherwise have rested on us. He **suffered in our stead**. He **took what was coming to us**. He **bore the curse that sinners incurred** and this is viewed as a **paying of the price**, an act of redemption.” (Bold emphasis added, AMS, 121)

²⁹ David McClister: “...Jesus died for us. He Himself did not need to die unto sin, because he had not sinned. Instead **He went to the cross to teach me what was required on my part if I wanted to enter into a relationship with God**. He took on the form of a servant (Phil. 2:7) and substituted Himself in the place of men. In that substitution His death provided the example, and did so in a way that describing it with words or symbols (such as the OT sacrifices) could never have conveyed. He did this to show me the way out of sin, even though it would cost Him His own life in the process....Furthermore, just because He died did not mean that my sins were now taken care of and I had nothing to do in the matter. No, **my sins would be atoned only when I followed His example and died myself with respect to my sins and my flesh**. **Only when I took the example of Jesus into myself and made it my own was atonement possible**.” (Bold emphasis added, PHSS, 115-116)

David McClister: “The death of Jesus, then, was the fullest possible demonstration of dedication to the will of the Father – and what our own commitment must look like....In short, when Jesus went to the cross and died, **He was showing us how to dedicate ourselves to God**, He was showing us what true and acceptable commitment really looks like.” (Bold emphasis added, PHSS, 116)

³⁰ Harold K. Moulton: “The word *huper* never means ‘instead of.’ It is always used in the sense of ‘**on behalf of**.’” (Bold emphasis added, *The Challenge Of The Concordance*, 143, quoted in Barnett, *Reconciliation*, 177)

Winer: “Still in doctrinal passages relating to Christ’s death (Gal. iii. 13; Rom. V. 6, 8; xiv. 15; I Pet. iii. 18, etc.) **it is not justifiable to render *huper* *hemon* and the like rigorously by *instead of***....” (Bold emphasis added, Winer’s Grammar, 383, footnote, quoted in Barnett, *Reconciliation*, 177-178)

Handley C.G. Moule: “*huper* is literally ‘**over**,’ and in itself imports simply ‘**concern with**’; as when we say that a man is busy ‘over’ an important matter; as it were stooping over it, attending to it. Its special references depend altogether upon context and usage: ***In itself* it neither teaches nor denies the doctrine of a vicarious and substitutionary work**; *anti* is the preposition which guarantees as true that great aspect of the Lord’s death. But ***huper* of course amply allows for such an application of its meaning, where the context suggests the idea**.” (Bold emphasis added, *Epistle to the Romans*, 135, footnote, quoted in Barnett, *Reconciliation*, 178)

W. Robertson Nicol: “The preposition *huper*, ‘**on behalf of**’ (cf. chap. xii. 10), employed in these verses is the one usually employed in the N.T. to express the relation between Christ’s Atoning Death and our benefit: it was ‘**for our sake**,’ and ‘**on our behalf**’ ... **It is not equivalent to *anti*, ‘instead of’** (although in Philemon 13 its meaning approximates thereto), and ought not to be so translated; although the preposition *anti* is used of our Lord’s Atoning Work in three places (Matt. xx. 28, Mark x. 45, I Tim. ii. 6), and the implied metaphor must have a place in any complete theory of the Atonement. But here [2 Cor. 5:15] *huper* is (as usual) used, and the rendering ‘instead of,’ even if linguistically possible (which it is not), is excluded by the fact that in the phrase ... is governed by both

participles.” (Bold emphasis added, *Expositor's Greek Testament*, 3:70, quoted in Barnett, *Reconciliation*, 179)

William Douglas Chamberlain: “The most common usage is to express the general notion of **‘in behalf of,’ ‘for one’s benefit.’** ‘This grows easily out of the root idea of “over” in the sense of protection or defence.’ As to the bearing of this meaning on the doctrine of substitutionary atonement, it should be said that **it is the nature of the act related, rather than the meaning of the preposition, that determines whether or not the deed was substitutionary.**” (Bold emphasis added, *An Exegetical Grammar of the Greek New Testament*, 130-131, quoted in Barnett, *Reconciliation*, 179)

³¹ *Maurice Barnett*: “In verse 15, Jesus *died and rose again for (huper) us*; *huper* no more means He DIED in our place than that

³² *Leon Morris*: “[T]hat **divine love** and the **divine wrath** are compatible aspects of the **divine nature**. There is a divine wrath, but if we may put it this way, it is always exercised with a certain tenderness. Even when He is angry with man’s sin God loves man and is concerned for his well-being in the fullest sense. **There is a divine love, but it is not a careless sentimentality indifferent to the moral integrity of the loved ones.** Rather it is a love which is a purifying fire, blazing against everything that hinders the loved ones from being the very best that they can be.” (Bold emphasis added, APC, 176)

³³ *R. T. France*: “But **it is illegitimate to interpret Jesus’ words as referring to the part of the psalm which he did not echo.** As throughout the crucifixion scene, it is the suffering of the righteous man in Psalm 22, not his subsequent vindication, which is alluded to.” (“Matthew,” TNTC, 1:403)

Leon Morris: “But in any case **it is perilous to argue from the use of one verse that Jesus was quoting the whole psalm**; indeed, he may not have been quoting at all. Many religious people express their thoughts in the language of Scripture, and it is possible that Jesus was doing just that.” (“Matthew,” PNTC, 720)

³⁴ *Craig L. Blomberg*: “What is more controversial is the question of whether Jesus, in uttering this cry of dereliction (or Matthew in recording it), was thereby alluding to the entire psalm, following the **common rabbinic practice of citing just the beginning of a given text when a larger, entire passage was in view.** This would enable one to interpret Jesus’ words as anticipating the same victory described in 27:19-31 even as he uttered his cry of abandonment (so, cautiously, Hill 1972: 355; Keener 1999: 685). However, **neither Jesus nor Matthew seems to have employed this technique elsewhere, and nothing in the immediate context of Matt. 27 suggests it** (though of course Jesus elsewhere repeatedly predicted his resurrection, which in fact does occur). So **it is probably safer not to assume that Jesus’ cry of abandonment was simultaneously a cry of faith.** Jesus really did sense the absence of his Father, and this is precisely the moment when we should expect him, in his humanity, to be *least* confident of his future (see Davies and Allison 1988-1997: 3:624-25).” (CNTUOT, 99-100)

³⁵ *Maurice Barnett*: “There were two parts to the offering for sin. First, **the animal had to be slain and it’s blood taken. Second, the high priest then took the blood into the Most Holy Place and offered it there before the mercy seat,** the seat of God located on the Ark of the Covenant. If the high priest in the Old Testament had just killed the goat for the sacrifice and stopped at that point, there could not have been any offering for atonement. **The blood of the goat had to be offered in the Most Holy Place.** As we before stated, **if Jesus had just died on the cross and nothing more, then there could not have been a sacrifice for us.** The shedding of the blood was only part of the sacrifice. So, **Jesus shed His blood on the cross,** which corresponded to the slaying of the sacrificial animal in the Old Testament. After shedding His blood, and now functioning as High Priest, **Jesus entered into the heavenly Holy of Holies to complete the offering for sins with His own blood** [Heb. 9:22-26].” (Bold emphasis added, *Reconciliation*, 99-100)

Maurice Barnett: “**Jesus took His own blood into the heavenly Holy of Holies** to offer it before the heavenly mercy-seat. The *hilasterion* in Leviticus 16 is the shadow of the real *hilasterion* in heaven. It also may be, as some authors have proposed, that Jesus is Himself presented as the mercy-seat in Romans 3:25. By means of faith, in His blood, we meet the mercy of God in Jesus the seat of mercy.” (*Reconciliation*, 319)

Maurice Barnett: “As there was no atonement in Leviticus 16 without the sprinkling of the blood of sacrifice on the mercy-seat by the High Priest, just so there could be no propitiation without the offering of the blood of Christ by our High Priest in Heaven.” (*Reconciliation*, 319)

Maurice Barnett: “[L]et’s keep in mind that **just the death of Jesus on the cross was not enough to take away sins**, I Corinthians 15:16-17. We are looking at very figurative language where **the ‘cross’ represents all that Jesus did to take away sin** which was much more than just the moment of His death on the tree —His burial, resurrection, offering of His own blood as High Priest in heaven following His ascension, were all as essential to redemption as His suffering and literal death. **Purification of sins did not become reality until Jesus ascended to heaven**, Hebrews 1:3, 9:22-28. His death was only taking the life of the sacrifice, shedding of blood, by which reconciliation could be accomplished.” (Bold emphasis added, *Reconciliation*, 221)

Maurice Barnett: [T]here was more to what Jesus did to redeem us than just die on the cross. ...**His physical death was only the slaying of the sacrifice**. Jesus then functioned as High Priest, **offering His own blood in the heavenly Holy of Holies** before the face of God for us. When He had *then* made purification for sins, he sat down at the right hand of God, Hebrews 1:1-3.” (Bold emphasis added, *Reconciliation*, 373-374)

³⁶ *Maurice Barnett:* “Man does not like unanswered questions. If truthful and reasonable answers are not clearly evident, then philosophical theories must be invented to explain the unexplainable. **Can we know all of the bases and reasons for the death of Jesus? The answer to that is decidedly, no!** Isaiah 55:8-9 says that God’s thoughts are higher than ours. All of His motives and reasons are not open to us; we know only that part of the mind of God that He reveals to us, I Corinthians 2:10-13. **Theology has struck out into the void of philosophy, attempting to construct answers that are not revealed to us in Scripture.**” (Bold emphasis added, “The Vicarious Death Of Christ?? 5,” PM, May 1999, 132)

³⁷ *Maurice Barnett:* “The facts are, **Jesus provided the bridge between man and God**, Hebrews 4:14-16, 1 Timothy 2:5-6; He **opened the door to reunion** with God, Hebrews 6:18-20. We must return to God for pardon and Jesus is the way by which we make that return, John 14:6. **Jesus provided the means but was not our substitute.**” (Bold emphasis added, “The Vicarious Death Of Christ?? 1,” PM, Jan. 1999, 7)

³⁸ I am indebted to a sermon by Russ Bowman for much of the material in this section.

³⁹ In their book *Pierced For Our Transgressions: Rediscovering the Glory of Penal Substitution*, Steve Jeffery, Michael Ovey, and Andrew Sach respond to “all of the major objections to the doctrine of penal substitution [they] have encountered” (p. 206). Appendix A is basically a digest of this material (pp. 161-328) in outline form. While I have used their major headings and their wording of the various objections (with a few exceptions), each response is a condensation of their material. I certainly do not agree with everything they say or every counter-argument they make. For example, they are Calvinists; therefore they argue at times for “original sin,” “limited atonement,” “the imputation of Christ’s righteousness,” and “eternal security,” and I could not disagree more with those doctrines. Many of the objections to penal substitution are based more on culture than the Bible, and therefore they are of no weight whatsoever. Many of the objections will seem downright absurd to anyone who has any respect for the Bible as the word of God. Hopefully, however, this material will give “a bird’s eye view” of what is being discussed in the on-going debate about penal substitution.

⁴⁰ *Leon Morris:* “There is some force in this objection, and there would be more if we were dealing with a human law. But the fact is that we are not. **The law in question is the law of God’s holy nature**, and that nature is **merciful** as well as **just**. Thus God’s justice, while it is not capricious but works by the method of law, is a justice which finds **a large place for mercy** and is not hard, bare, and legalistic. At any rate, whether our legal categories can find a place for mercy or not, those of the Bible can and do.” (Bold emphasis added, APC, 280)

J. H. Kurtz: “Substitution under any circumstances is of course a problematical thing, and its acceptance and acknowledgment are dependent upon **the mercy of God** (Ex. xxxii. 33). But the substitution referred to here, is in all respects so obviously insufficient, that **we cannot speak of its possessing validity according to natural law, but only according to the law of mercy** laid down by the divine plan of salvation.” (Bold emphasis added, SWOT, 118)

⁴¹ *Maurice Barnett:* “Jesus did not take our place in punishment for sins, endure our penalty, because the penalty and punishment for sins is **eternal death, eternal separation** from God, **eternal torment**, something **He didn’t experience.**” (Bold emphasis added, *Reconciliation*, 170-171)

Maurice Barnett: “Thus, we are told that **the torture of Jesus’ death was sufficient exchange for the eternal**

torment in Hell for all of the sins of all men of all time; it was sufficient to satisfy Divine justice! But, if our penalty for sin is eternal torment in Hell and Jesus received only **a slap on the wrist** by comparison, **it cannot be said that he stood in our place as a substitute in suffering the penalty for sin.**" (Bold emphasis added, *Reconciliation*, 162)

Maurice Barnett: "Note: (1) **All of the suffering and punishment for sin was transferred to Jesus on the cross;** He took our place.... (2) But **what He actually took was far, far less in quantity and quality than the actual suffering and punishment for sin,** a slap on the wrist by comparison. (3) But, **if what Jesus endured was sufficient suffering and punishment for sin, those who are condemned should be able to insist on the same suffering and punishment for their sin.** No more than what Jesus endured *was sufficient punishment for God to accept as a penalty for sin, it satisfied Divine justice, it fully satisfied the claims of the law.* **Why then will God inflict far worse punishment on sinners than what Jesus endured on the cross, a punishment worse than physical death, Hebrews 10:28-29? Why would it not be unjust of God to inflict eternal punishment on the lost when just a few hours [sic] torture and physical death is sufficient payment for their sins? Why does not equivalence work both ways? The punishment of sinners should be equivalent to the suffering of Jesus on the cross.**" (Bold emphasis added, *Reconciliation*, 174)

⁴² I am indebted to Jeff Smelser for this point.

⁴³ *Maurice Barnett:* "**If Jesus paid everything at once,** satisfied Divine Justice by His life and sacrifice, **then no one can ever be held guilty of anything** and hence is no longer subject to punishment for sins. That is **universal salvation.**" (Bold emphasis added, *Reconciliation*, 166)

Maurice Barnett: If Jesus, on the cross, **completely 'paid the debt,'** endured our punishment, experienced our penalty for sin, then it must lead directly to **universal salvation,** seeing **He did all of this for all men.**" (Bold emphasis added, *Reconciliation*, 168)

Wiley & Culbertson: "(1) **If Christ bore the sinner's punishment as a Substitute, then the sinner is unconditionally free** from it, for both the sinner and the Substitute cannot be justly punished for the same offence. The theory, therefore, leads necessarily, either to **universalism** on the one hand, or **unconditional election** on the other." (Bold emphasis added, *Introduction to Christian Theology*, 229, quoted in Barnett, *Reconciliation*, 167)

Maurice Barnett: "In the sense of the substitution theory, if Jesus, *when He died on the cross,* removed God's wrath against sin, satisfied divine justice, paid all our debt in our place, took our punishment for sin upon Himself, became guilty with our guilt, was cursed in our stead, then **Jesus has already done it all in our place.** **Why then should we be charged with anything if Jesus has already done it all?** He removed our responsibility and accountability, and He did it nineteen centuries ago. **If Jesus has already taken my punishment for my sins upon himself, then I don't have to worry** because my punishment was removed nineteen centuries ago. I cannot be held accountable to God for what I have done because my substitute has *already* taken that on Himself and removed any responsibility from me! *The only conclusion that can be reached from the substitution position is universal salvation or Calvinist limited atonement!*" (Bold emphasis added, "The Vicarious Death Of Christ?? 1," PM, Jan. 1999, 6)

⁴⁴ *Wiley & Culbertson:* "(2) Since the penal substitutionary theory denies that all men are **unconditionally saved,** as universalism maintains, it follows immediately that **the atonement must be limited to the elect,** whereas the Scriptures declare that **Christ died provisionally for all men.**" (Bold emphasis added, *Introduction to Christian Theology*, 229, quoted in Barnett, *Reconciliation*, 168-169)

⁴⁵ This section deals with various objections to penal substitution that were not covered in the preceding sections, primarily from Maurice Barnett's book *Reconciliation: The Scheme of Redemption – Volume II* and David McClister's lecture "There Is A Fountain Filled With Blood: The Doctrine of the Atonement," *Psalms, Hymns and Spiritual Songs*.

⁴⁶ *Maurice Barnett:* "The position that will be taken and argued in this book is that **Jesus died for all men, 'on our behalf,' not 'in our place;'** there was no **'penal substitution'** of Jesus for our sins, guilt and punishment; a ransom price was not paid to anyone or anything." (Bold emphasis added, *Reconciliation*, 17)

Maurice Barnett: "Jesus was not our **substitute** in sin and guilt; He did not **take our place** to receive the

punishment for sin; the intense wrath of God was not poured out on Him on the cross.” (Bold emphasis added, *Reconciliation*, 361)

⁴⁷ *Maurice Barnett*: “**Substitution is essential to Calvinism**. Predestination, limited atonement, irresistible grace and the impossibility of apostasy all depend on substitution as their solid foundation. And, **substitution** is bound together with the **imputation of sin to Christ** and **imputation of His righteousness to the elect**.” (Bold emphasis added, *Reconciliation*, 166-167)

⁴⁸ *Maurice Barnett*: “No one is redeemed, saved or justified, however it is expressed, automatically, *solely and only on the basis that Christ died on the cross*. **There must be the proper response on our part in order to have those blessings**. We must listen to the word of reconciliation, hear the gospel message and then properly respond to it in order to be reconciled, redeemed from sin, have salvation, be justified. This is all so much a part of New Testament teaching that it cannot be successfully denied.” (Bold emphasis added, *Reconciliation*, 283)

Maurice Barnett: “Jesus *provided* for our redemption centuries ago, but we are not personally redeemed, bought with a price, purchased by God, until we personally act. He provided for our reconciliation, justification and propitiation *through* His sacrifice. Yet, we have no peace with God, are not justified, do not receive the mercy of God until we respond to His will.” (*Reconciliation*, 359)

Maurice Barnett: “He gave Himself **provisionally** for all men, but only those who **properly respond** to the gospel message of reconciliation have that reconciliation.” (*Reconciliation*, 361)

⁴⁹ *Maurice Barnett*: “**If there is anything, and there is, that we have to do today**, any commands of God that we must obey in order to obtain forgiveness of our sins and escape the punishment for our sins, have justification, redemption and propitiation, **then Substitution is not true** for these are contradictory positions. **If Substitution is true, then there is nothing we must do, or can do**, to stand justified before God; **everything has already been done in our place by our substitute!** We cannot hold on to both the gospel and Substitution.” (Bold emphasis added, “The Vicarious Death Of Christ?? 4,” PM, April 1999, 100)

Maurice Barnett: “The Bible teaches that **we must do something to have our sins removed**, Mark 16:15-16, Acts 2:38. We are righteous even as He is righteous *if we do righteousness*, I John 3:7, and are acceptable with God *if we work righteousness*, Acts 10:34-35. We can escape the punishment of hell but must obey God to do so, Matthew 25:32-46. We must obey God in order to enter Heaven, Matthew 7:21-27. The very fact that we must do all these things in order to have our sins removed, be righteous and escape punishment for sin *demonstrates that the substitution theory is human error and not truth*.” (Bold emphasis added, “The Vicarious Death Of Christ?? 1,” PM, April 1999, 6)

Maurice Barnett: “As we have seen, according to the substitution theory, **every sin must be punished without exception**; this punishment must either be placed on **the sinner** or **his substitute**. If our punishment has been transferred to Jesus, then we should **not be held accountable**; our substitute has taken it in our place. The debt was paid before we were born. It was thus paid for all men for all time—**universal salvation**.

“So, **God owes the sinner salvation because his ‘debt was paid’ by his substitute!** Nothing can be exacted from the sinner. **The ‘debt’ cannot be required of both the substitute and the sinner** as well, collecting twice to satisfy law and justice.” (Bold emphasis added, *Reconciliation*, 173)

Selected Bibliography

- Barnett, Maurice. *Reconciliation: The Scheme Of Redemption*. Vol. 2. Beaumont: The Preceptor Co., 1998.
- . *The Person of Christ: The Scheme of Redemption*. Vol. 1. Beaumont: The Preceptor Co., 1996.
- . "The Vicarious Death of Christ?? - 1." *The Preceptor Magazine* 48 (1999): 4-9.
- . "The Vicarious Death Of Christ?? - 2." *The Preceptor Magazine* 48 (1999): 36-39.
- . "The Vicarious Death Of Christ?? - 3." *The Preceptor Magazine* 48 (1999): 68-73.
- . "The Vicarious Death Of Christ?? - 4." *The Preceptor Magazine* (1999): 100-103.
- . "The Vicarious Death Of Christ?? - 5." *The Preceptor Magazine* 48 (1999): 132-137.
- Blomberg, Craig . *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*. Ed. G. K. Beale & D. A. Carson. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007.
- Bowman, Russ. "*The Role Of Sacrifices In Restoring Men To God*. 4 March 1996. Cassette Tape.
- Bullinger, E. W. *Figures Of Speech Used In The Bible: Explained And Illustrated*. n.d.
- Carson, T. *New International Bible Commentary*. Ed. F. F. Bruce. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1979.
- Clippinger, W. G. "'Bood'." *The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*. Ed. Geoffrey W. Bromily. Rev. ed. Vol. 1. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1979. 4 vols.
- Coleman, Robert E. "Written in Blood: A Devotional Bible Study of the Blood of Christ." Old Tappan: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1972.
- Danker, Frederick William, ed. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2000.
- Dewar, Lindsay. "'The Biblical Use of the Term 'Blood''." *Journal of Theological Studies* 4 (1953): 204-208.
- France, R. T. *Tyndale New Testament Commentaries: Matthew*. Ed. Leon Morris. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1985.
- G. Johannes Botterwick and Helmer Ringgren. *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*. Vol. 3. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1978. 4 vols.
- G.C.D. Howley, F.F. Bruce, and H.L. Ellison, ed. *The New Layman's Bible Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1979.
- Gesenius, William. *Gesenius' Hebrew-Chaldee Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Trans. LL.D. Samuel Prideaux Tregelles. n.d.
- Harris, R. Laird. "Leviticus." *The Expositor's Bible Commentary*. Ed. Frank E. Gæbelein. Vol. 2. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1990. 12 vols.
- . *Theological Word Book of the Old Testament*. Ed. R. Laird Harris. Chicago: Moody Press, 1980.
- Harrison, R. K. *Leviticus: An Introduction And Commentary, Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries*. Ed. Donald J. Wiseman. Vol. 3. Downers Grove: Inter-Varsity Press, 1980. 28 vols.
- Hess, Richard S. *The Expositor's Bible Commentary: Revised Edition*. Ed. Tremper Longman and David E. Garland. Vol. 1. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, n.d. 13 vols.
- Holmes, Michael W., ed. *Apostolic Fathers: English Translations*. Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1999.
- Jenkins, Ferrell. *The Theme Of The Bible*. Temple Terrace: Florida College Bookstore, 1990.
- John E. Steinmueller. "'Sacrificial Blood In The Bible'." *Biblica* 40 (n.d.): 556-567.
- Kurtz, Johann Heinrich. *Sacrificial Worship Of The Old Testament*. Minneapolis: Klock & Klock Christian Publishers, 1980.
- L. A. Mott, Jr. *Faith in the Book of Romans*. Gainesville: Moot Books, 1977.
-

-
- McCarthy, Dennis J. "'The Symbolism of Blood and Sacrifice'." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 88 (1969): 166-176.
- . "Further Notes on the Symbolism of Blood and Sacrifice." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 92 (1973): 205-210.
- McClister, David. "There is a Fountain Filled With Blood: The Doctrine of the Atonement." *Psalms, Hymns and Spiritual Songs*. Ed. Mike Willis. Athens: Guardian of Truth Foundation, 2012. 86-129.
- McGuiggan, Jim. *Spending Time With Jim McGuiggan*. 23 January 2014. 23 January 2014.
<<http://www.jimmcguiggan.com/index.asp>>.
- Morris, Leon. *The Apostolic Preaching Of The Cross*. Third Revised Edition. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1965.
- . *The Atonement: Its Meaning and Significance*. Downers Grove: Inter Varsity Press, 1983.
- . "The Biblical Use of the Term 'Blood'." *Journal of Theological Studies* 6 (1955): 77-82.
- . "The Biblical Use of the Term 'Blood'." *Journal of Theological Studies* 3 (1952): 216-227.
- Motyer, D. Guthrie and J. A., ed. *The New Bible Commentary: Revised*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1970.
- Rick Brannan, Ken M. Penner, Israel Loken, Michael Aubrey, and Isaiah Hoogendyk, ed. *The Lexham English Septuagint*. Bellingham: Lexham Press, 2013.
- Robert Jamieson, A. R. Fausset, and David Brown. *Commentary Critical and Explanatory on the Whole Bible*. 1871.
- Robertson, A. T. "A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research." 1919.
- Schneider, Hortst Balz and Gerhard, ed. *The Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1990.
- Shepard, R. J. Stevens and Dane Kl, ed. *Hymns For Worship*. Shepard-Stevens Music, Inc., 1987.
- Steve Jeffery, Michael Ovey, Andrew Sach. *Pierced For Our Transgressions: Rediscovering the Glory of Penal Substitution*. Wheaton: Crossway Books, 2007.
- Stibbs, A. M. "The Meaning of the Word 'Blood' in Scripture." *The Tyndale New Testament Lecture*. 2d ed. Rushden: Stanley L. Hunt (Printers) Ltd., 1954.
- Tenney, Merrill C., ed. *The Zondervan Pictorial Bible Dictionary*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1967.
- Torrey, R. A. *New Topical Textbook*. n.d.
- Wenham, Gordon J. *The Book of Leviticus*. Vol. 3. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1979. 44 vols.
- Whiteside, Robertson L. *A New Commentary On Paul's Letter To The Saints At Rome*. Fort Worth: The Manney Company, 1945.
- Wiersbe, Warren W. *The Bible Exposition Commentary*. Wheaton: Victor Books, 1989.
- Young, Robert. *Young's Literal Translation*. n.d.
-