

The Sanctuary Lesson 7 4Q 2013

Christ Our Sacrifice

Last week someone inquired about a quotation in the GC in which EGW said:

Day by day the repentant sinner brought his offering to the door of the tabernacle and, placing his hand upon the victim's head, **confessed his sins, thus in figure transferring them from himself to the innocent sacrifice**. The animal was then slain... **The blood, representing the forfeited life of the sinner**, whose guilt the victim bore, was carried by the priest into the holy place and sprinkled before the veil, behind which was the ark containing the law that the sinner had transgressed. **By this ceremony the sin was, through the blood, transferred in figure to the sanctuary**. {GC 418.1}

I got several emails this week from people questioning how we could come to our conclusions in light of this statement.

Truth is unfolding. One of the problems with many religious people and organizations, is that when they come to an idea, with truth in it, they lock down, and stop growing. 2000 years ago the Jews had much truth, they knew that the time for the Messiah was to come was at hand, they knew He would be born in Bethlehem, they knew many things, but they also had many misunderstandings about God and the meaning of their system that prevented them from accepting Jesus.

Likewise, many religious people have believes that are filled with truths, but can also have some misunderstanding. But, when they come to a belief they become afraid to change that belief. Fortunately, EGW didn't have this problem. The writer of the quote we just read grew in her perspectives, insights and understandings with time, meaning what she wrote at one point in time isn't necessarily the final word on any subject. For instance:

- The Lord loves those little children who try to do right, and he has promised that they shall be in his kingdom. **But wicked children God does not love**. He will not take them to the beautiful City, for he only admits the good, obedient, and patient children there. {Appeal to Youth 61.3} 1864
- Jesus would have the fathers and mothers teach their children this beauty of character. He would have them teach their children that God loves them, that their natures may be changed, and brought into harmony with God. Do not teach your children that God does not love them when they do wrong; teach them that he loves them so that it grieves his Spirit to see them in transgression, because he knows they are doing injury to their souls. Do not terrify your children by telling them of the wrath of God, but rather seek to impress them with his unspeakable love and goodness, and thus let the glory of the Lord be revealed before them. {BEcho, February 1, 1892 par. 9}

L



What should a spiritual, God filled church member have done with the quote in 1864? Should they have said, "well if EGW says it, who am I to question?" Or should the person have said, "I don't believe that is correct?"

When Peter the Apostle refused to interact with the uncircumcised, why didn't some of the local church members reject this idea, think for themselves, and tell him he was wrong? Could it be they were conditioned to believe if one has the gift of prophecy then their ideas are more right? That we are not to question those with the gift or prophecy but to just believe? Was Peter right? What is the lesson?

And what did Ellen White say about how we should understand and use her writings?

- I recommend to you, dear reader, the Word of God as the rule of your faith and practice. By that Word we are to be judged. A Sketch of the Christian Experience and Views of Ellen G. White, p. 64 (1851). (Reprinted in Early Writings, p. 78.) {3SM 29.1}
- The Spirit was not given--nor can it ever be bestowed--to supersede the Bible; for the Scriptures explicitly state that the Word of God is the standard by which all teaching and experience must be tested. . . (Isaiah 8:20).--The Great Controversy, Introduction, p. vii. {3SM 30.5} (1888).
- The testimonies of Sister White should not be carried to the front. God's Word is the unerring standard. The Testimonies are not to take the place of the Word... Let all prove their positions from the Scriptures and substantiate every point they claim as truth from the revealed Word of God.--Letter 12, 1890. {Ev 256.2}
- Our position and faith is in the Bible. And never do we want any soul to bring in the Testimonies ahead of the Bible. --Manuscript 7, 1894. {Ev 256.3}
- The Lord desires you to study your Bibles. He has not given any additional light to take the place of His Word. This light is to bring confused minds to His Word, which, if eaten and digested, is as the lifeblood of the soul. -- Letter 130, 1901. {3SM 29.2}
- We have many lessons to learn, and many, many to unlearn. God and Heaven alone are infallible. Those who think that they will never have to give up a cherished view, never have occasion to change an opinion, will be disappointed. As long as we hold to our own ideas and opinions with determined persistency, we cannot have the unity for which Christ prayed. {Christian Experience and Teaching 203.2}

The point of what we said last week is that if we don't find in the Scripture a certain point, then we must take the Scripture and interpret all other writings through the Scripture.

One other point on this idea that the blood of the animal contaminated the sanctuary. Consider this, if we believe the blood of the animal in the type (the model) contaminated, then are we to conclude, when Jesus moved the application to reality in John 6, when He said we must drink His blood, that



then, when we partake of Jesus, (symbolized by the blood) when we take Him in, we are being contaminated, sin is being transferred into the Spirit Temple?

We cannot have it both ways as some would like. Either the blood of the sacrificial animal contaminates or it cleanses. The Bible is 100% consistent in that the blood of the sacrificial always cleansed and made holy.

SABBATH

Memory verse: "He Himself bore our sins in His body on the cross, that we might die to sin and live to righteousness; for by His wounds you are healed." 1Pet 2:24 NASB

Thoughts?

Interesting verse, because this is frequently used by those who hold to penal substitution, yet those who take that view don't even apply what the text says. But, perhaps they are at a disadvantage because of the way one word was translated.

Do you notice how the translation says he bore our "sins" in His body but then says that we might die to "sin"?

In English, is there a different connotation, meaning, between "sins" and "sin"?

Would the text suggest something different if it read this way:

"He Himself bore our *sin* in His body on the cross, that we might die to sin and live to righteousness; for by His wounds you are healed."

What do you hear differently between bore our "sin" versus bore our "sins"?

The Greek is the exact same in both places, which means the translators must decide when to use the word "sins" and when to use the word "sin"? If they have an imposed law bias, then they falsely believe that each individual act of sin must be punished, thus they translate "sins" instead of "sin" in the first phrase.

When we hold the design law model, the healing model, we recognize Christ took our condition upon Himself and cured it, thus he took our iniquity, our fallen state, our sinfulness, or our "sin".

Which is more consistent with the very text itself. Notice how this text says nothing about penal payments, or legal requirements, but it does say that we are being healed by what Christ has done and that Christ died so we might live righteously, not so we could be declared righteous.

In other words, the context itself supports our view and refutes the penal view.



Read first two paragraphs, "Catholic priest..." thoughts?

What makes Christ's sacrificial death more significant than Kolbe's?

Multiple points:

- Christ overcame alone without the comfort of the Holy Spirit or His Father
- Christ's sacrificial death, by the exercise of His human brain destroyed the carnal nature, the desire to save self, by perfect sacrificial love.
- Christ died without the experience of hope. The martyrs died, with the presence of the Holy Spirit bringing comfort and encouragement, they didn't experience themselves as abandoned and cast off. They had hope for security in the resurrection. As such, they did not have the full weight of the carnal nature pulling on them and distressing them as Christ did.
- Christ could have delivered Himself from death and destroyed those killing Him, but He didn't. What does this reveal?

SUNDAY

Read first paragraph, "Isaiah..." thoughts?

The lesson suggests the passage provides "clear evidence that Jesus' death is atonement in the form of penal substitution..."

The lesson claims five points to prove this:

- He suffered for others
- His suffering brought benefit to others
- It was God's will for Christ to do this, and our iniquity was place upon Christ
- Jesus is righteous
- He was an atoning sacrifice

These five points are absolutely true – and yet, nowhere can you find penal substitution in it. Penal substitution is a manmade theory, based on believing Imperial Rome's idea of law. It is this distortion, above all others, that has infected Christianity, distorted the truth about God, and prevented the Christian church from completing the mission Jesus gave us to prepare the world for His return.

When we see God's law as the law of love, the design protocols for life, then we see that healing substitution is the correct view. Let's reexamine the five points, then the text itself.

Consider the analogy of someone in renal failure needing a kidney transplant:

The one who saves the dying by donating the kidney:

- Suffers for another
- His suffering brings benefit to the other



- It is the will of the loving Father to provide the healthy kidney to save the dying person and, the sickness and pain due the one dying, will be taken upon the person donating the kidney, i.e. the healthy person loses the kidney, and the sick person loses a dead kidney but gets a healthy one
- Jesus is righteous i.e. The one donating the kidney is perfectly healthy
- Jesus is an atoning or reuniting sacrifice. His sacrifice brings healing, reconciliation, oneness. Thus the one donating the kidney, by healing the dying patient reunites them with the living, brings them back into harmony with how life is built to operate.

Thoughts?

Let's look at Isaiah itself chapter 53 starting verse 2:

He grew up before him like a tender shoot, and like a root out of dry ground. He had no beauty or majesty to attract us to him, nothing in his appearance that we should desire him.

³ He was despised and rejected by men, a man of sorrows, and familiar with suffering. Like one from whom men hide their faces he was despised, and we esteemed him not.

⁴ Surely he took up our infirmities and carried our sorrows, yet we considered him stricken by God, smitten by him, and afflicted.

[notice that he took our infirmities, our sickness, our sinfulness, yet we would misunderstand and think God was striking him, punishing him]

⁵ But he was pierced for our transgressions, he was crushed for our iniquities; the punishment that brought us peace was upon him, and by his wounds we are healed. [But, it wasn't God doing this to Him, it was our transgressions, our evil that crushed Him. Our sinful condition caused Him grief, both within and from without. And the purpose He suffered was not to pay legal payment, but so that through his ordeal we could be healed, which meant He was procuring the Remedy to our condition]

⁶ We all, like sheep, have gone astray, each of us has turned to his own way; and the Lord has laid on him the iniquity of us all.

[Yes the sinfulness, the iniquity, with which we all are infected was laid upon Christ. He took our sinfulness and overcame, cured, eradicated it]

⁷ He was oppressed and afflicted, yet he did not open his mouth; he was led like a lamb to the slaughter, and as a sheep before her shearers is silent, so he did not open his mouth.

⁸ By oppression and judgment he was taken away. And who can speak of his descendants? For he was cut off from the land of the living; for the transgression of my people he was stricken.

⁹ He was assigned a grave with the wicked, and with the rich in his death, though he had done no violence, nor was any deceit in his mouth.

¹⁰ Yet it was the Lord's will to crush him and cause him to suffer, and though the Lord makes his life a guilt offering, he will see his offspring and prolong his days, and the will of the Lord will prosper in his hand.

[It was the Lord's will to provide the Remedy which would cure mankind. Christ's mission, to be the second Adam, to take up mankind broken off in Adam and carry it to completion, to cure the condition was absolutely, God's will. God was in the Son reconciling the world to



himself. It was only through this path that sin could be eradicated and man saved, and it was God's will to accomplish this.]

¹¹ After the suffering of his soul, he will see the light of life and be satisfied; by his knowledge my righteous servant will justify many, and he will bear their iniquities. [Justify means to set right. What was wrong that needed setting right? The actual sinful condition of mankind. Thus, mankind the species, was set right in heart, mind, character, motive, by Christ! And because of His accomplishments many additional individuals will also be set right.]

¹² Therefore I will give him a portion among the great, and he will divide the spoils with the strong, because he poured out his life unto death, and was numbered with the transgressors. For he bore the sin of many, and made intercession for the transgressors.

Thoughts?

Now I want to share with you a portion of a sermon delivered by George Fifield, SDA pastor, at the 1897 General Conference session:

"YOU will find the basis of our study this evening in the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah and the third verse: "He is despised and rejected of men; a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief: and we hid as it were our faces from him; he was despised, and we esteemed him not."

In connection with this I will read several other verses of the same chapter, and also a translation, which will enable us to obtain the thought more clearly:

"Surely he hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows; yet we did esteem him stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted. But he was wounded for our transgressions. He was bruised for our iniquities: the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed."

The other translation reads: "Surely he bore our griefs, yet we did esteem him stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted. But **he was pierced through by our sins; he was crushed by our misdeeds**. The chastisement of our peace lay upon him, and in his wounds there became healing for us. All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way; and the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all."

Another translation: "The Lord let all our misdeeds come upon him..."

Translation: "**It pleased the Lord to let him be crushed**; he hath made him sick; when his soul hath given a trespass offering, he shall see seed and live long." The thought is clearly enough expressed in the Authorized Version, but since we are liable sometimes to receive the wrong thought, the translation helps us to see it more clearly.

The third verse states and vividly contrasts the true and the false idea of Christ's mission, and of his work, and of the atonement. One is what was, and the other is what we thought was; one is truth, the other is falsehood; one is Christianity, the other is paganism. We



would do well to study every thought in that text. "Surely he hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows; he was pierced through by our misdeeds, and God permitted it because in his stripes there was healing for us. But we esteemed him stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted. Whose griefs? Whose sorrows? - Ours.

The grief and the sorrow that crushed the heart of Christ, and took him from among the living, so that he died of a broken heart, was no strange, new grief or sorrow. It was not something unlike what we have to bear; it was not God arbitrarily putting upon him our sins, and thus punishing our sins in him to deliver us.

He took no position arbitrarily that we do not have to suffer. It was our griefs and our sorrows that pierced him through. **He took our sinful natures**, and our sinful flesh, **at the point of weakness to which we had brought it**, submitting himself to all the conditions of the race, and placing himself where we are to fight the conflict that we have to fight, the fight of faith. And he did this by the same power to which we have access. By the Spirit of God he cast out devils; through the eternal Spirit he offered himself without spot; and the Spirit of God rested upon him, and made him of quick understanding in the things of God. It was our sins that he took; our temptations.

He took our sorrows, our griefs, all the conflicts of our lives upon him, and was tempted in all points as we are. He took the injustices of our lives upon him too. It is a fact that you and I have to suffer for many things for which we are not at fault. All my suffering is not the result of my sin. Some of it is; but just as long as sin exists, injustice exists. As long as men sin, men will be sinned against. Just so you and I will have to suffer for the sins of others; and so God, to show that he knew and realized all that, let him that was perfectly innocent, take the injustice and sin of us all. O brethren and sisters, he did not bear some other grief or some other sorrow, but he bore our griefs and our sorrows. He was pierced through by them, and the Lord permitted it, because there was healing in it for us; not that he might appease God, or reconcile him unto us.

Every passage of Scripture that refers to the reconciliation or atonement, or to the propitiation, always represents God as the one who makes this atonement, reconciliation, or propitiation, in Christ; we are always the ones atoned for, the ones to be reconciled. For us it was done, in order that, as Peter says, he might bring us to God.

The only way to do this is by destroying sin in us. He took our sins upon him in order that he might bring us to God. It was that he might break down the high middle wall of partition between human hearts and God, between Jew and Gentile, between God and man; that he might make us one with him, and one with one another, thus making the at-one-ment, or the atonement.

In Christ Jesus we who were sometimes afar off were made nigh by the blood of Christ, so that we are no longer strangers and foreigners, but fellow citizens with the saints, and of the household of God; and are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ



himself being the chief corner-stone; in whom all the building fitly framed together groweth into an holy temple in the Lord: in whom ye also are builded together for an habitation of God through the Spirit."

This is as near to the Lord as we can get. This is the at-one-ment; this is why he bore our griefs and carried our sorrows, that he might do that for us by breaking down all those things which separate hearts from hearts, both human and divine. Notwithstanding this, we did esteem him stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted. That was what we thought about it. We said, God is doing all this; God is killing him, punishing him, to satisfy his wrath, in order to let us off. That is the pagan conception of sacrifice. The Christian idea of sacrifice is this. Let us note the contrast. "God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." That is the Christian idea. Yes, sir. Indifference keeps, hatred keeps, selfishness keeps, or gives, if at all, but grudgingly, counting the cost, and figuring on some larger return at some future time. But love, and love only, sacrifices, gives freely, gives itself, gives without counting the cost; gives because it is love. That is sacrifice that is revealed throughout the entire Bible. But the pagan idea of sacrifice is just the opposite. It is that some god is always offended, always angry, and his wrath must be propitiated in some way.

Thoughts?

The battle between the truth about God's character of love and Satan's mischaracterization is the battle that has raged since the war broke out it heaven. This is not a new battle. It is THE battle and we are in the middle of it. Every Christian church is in the middle of this battle. Which version of God will you choose? On which side will you expend your resources, abilities, heart and soul? Who will you reveal in your life?

The last paragraph notes that in the New Testament they recognized Christ's fulfillment of this prophecy in Isaiah 53. Let's note how the New Testament writers used it:

Isa 53:4:

Surely our griefs He himself bore, and our sorrows He carried; yet we ourselves esteemed Him stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted.(NAS)

Matt 8:16-17:

And when evening had come, they brought to Him many who were demon-possessed; and He cast out the spirits with a word, and **healed all who were ill** 17 **in order that what was spoken through Isaiah the prophet might be fulfilled, saying, ''He Himself took our infirmities, and carried away our diseases.''** (NAS)

Bearing our griefs and carrying our sorrows does not mean that Christ "paid the penalty" for our sins, but instead means that he took away from us our griefs and



sorrows (ie took away our sicknesses). I'd like to think that the sickness he took away was not just physical, but also spiritual.

Isa 53:5

But He was pierced through for our transgressions, He was crushed for our iniquities; the chastening for our well-being {fell} upon Him, and **by His scourging we are healed**. (NAS)

1 Pet 2:24-25

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

For you were continually straying like sheep, but now you have returned to the Shepherd and Guardian of your souls. (NAS)

By His scourging we are healed does not represent a "legal" transaction in heaven where God's attitude toward us is "healed", but instead represents a change in our heart, where we die to sin and live to righteousness, returning to God instead of straying from Him.

Thoughts?

MONDAY

Read first paragraph, "Jesus died for..." thoughts?

Do you hear "sins" or "sin"? It can be translated either?

The lesson says in the second paragraph, "In simple terms, in order for humanity to be saved, Jesus had to die. There was no other way." This is absolutely correct. We want to affirm this truth.

But the great divergence has to do with WHY?

Penal view has the obstacle to our salvation being God's anger, God's wrath, God's law, God's justice, God's need, in other words something on God's side needed to be fixed so we could be saved. They couch it in words like "justice" or "holiness" etc. But in the end, it is a lie. It is pagan.

Our view has the barrier being sin, sinfulness of our hearts, lies about God we believe, our own carnal nature. The defect which separates us is in us and Christ came to fix sinful humanity to bring us back into unity with God. We believe there was no other way to accomplish this other than the life, death and resurrection of Jesus Christ.

TUESDAY

Read second paragraph, "Christ's blood..." thoughts?



First, when you hear "blood" do you think literal or symbolic? Is it literal red corpuscles or does the blood symbolize something else?

The lesson claims it does not represent Christ's life, but Christ's death. Why do they make this claim?

When they say the death – they are focusing on the "death penalty." In their penal view, they need the death payment to be made, so they claim the blood is about the death to ensure the legal payment is made.

But, what did Christ say, "This is my blood of the covenant, which is poured out for many," (Mt 14:24) What is being poured out? His life is being poured out, yes in death, but where is Christ focusing? On the sacrificed life, given for many.

Is Christ focusing on His death, "this is my death which is poured out" or "this is my life which is poured out"?

When He said in John 6, unless you drink my blood or eat my flesh, was He saying "unless you drink my death?" Or was He saying unless you internalize my life?

The death of Christ, in Bible symbolism is represented in Baptism, where we die to the old self, are buried with Christ and rise in newness of life.

Those who take the penal view focus on the death, because they believe that the law requires a death payment. But, not so, here is how our church viewed it over 100 years ago: (notice several points, who originates the legal model and the claim that sin must be punished? What does the law actually require?)

In the opening of the great controversy, Satan had declared that the law of God could not be obeyed, that justice was inconsistent with mercy, and that, should the law be broken, it would be impossible for the sinner to be pardoned. **Every sin must meet its punishment, urged Satan**; and if God should remit the punishment of sin, He would not be a God of truth and justice. When men broke the law of God, and defied His will, Satan exulted. It was proved, he declared, that the law could not be obeyed; man could not be forgiven. Because he, after his rebellion, had been banished from heaven, Satan claimed that the human race must be forever shut out from God's favor. God could not be just, he **urged, and yet show mercy to the sinner.** {DA 761.4}

But even as a sinner, man was in a different position from that of Satan. Lucifer in heaven had sinned in the light of God's glory. To him as to no other created being was given a revelation of God's love. Understanding the character of God, knowing His goodness, Satan chose to follow his own selfish, independent will. This choice was final. There was no more that God could do to save him. But man was deceived; his mind was darkened by Satan's sophistry. The height and depth of the love of God he did not know. For him there was hope in a knowledge of God's love. By beholding His character he might be drawn back to God. {DA 761.5}



Through Jesus, God's mercy was manifested to men; but mercy does not set aside justice. The law reveals the attributes of God's character, and **not a jot or tittle of it could be changed to meet man in his fallen condition. God did not change His law, but He sacrificed Himself, in Christ, for man's redemption. "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself."** 2 Corinthians 5:19. {DA 762.1}

[Why could the law not be changed? Because the law are the protocols upon which life is built. To change the law would be to destroy life. The law of respiration cannot be changed to meet the person who has tied a plastic bag over their head. What needs to change in the condition of the person. Thus, Christ was sacrificed for man's redemption, to reconcile man back to God, to restore man back to harmony with God. Actual transformation. Notice the very next words of what the law required. Satan alleged all sin must be punished. Penal substitution theology supports Satan's claim, stating all sin must be punished. Notice how our church thought over 100 years ago on what the law required...]

The law requires righteousness,--a righteous life, a perfect character; and this man has not to give. He cannot meet the claims of God's holy law. But Christ, coming to the earth as man, lived a holy life, and developed a perfect character. These He offers as a free gift to all who will receive them. His life stands for the life of men. Thus they have remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God. More than this, Christ imbues men with the attributes of God. He builds up the human character after the similitude of the divine character, a goodly fabric of spiritual strength and beauty. Thus the very righteousness of the law is fulfilled in the believer in Christ. God can "be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus." Romans 3:26. {DA 762.2}

What is happening? Christ is the means whereby the law is sustained and the sinner is restored to harmony with it. This is justice. This is doing right. This is healing. All this inflicted punishment for sin is pagan and based on Satan's false presentation of God's law as imposed.

WEDNESDAY

The lesson asks why it was crucial that Jesus be sinless?

Can you provide remedy for the disease if you are dying from the disease?

Read fourth paragraph, "Jesus, the.." thoughts? Is this clear to you? How would you explain it?

Read last paragraph, "Through Christ's death..." thoughts?

Are we presented to the Father, and then as the Father comes to see us, Jesus magically jumps in the way, and the Father sees His Son and says, "Why Son you are perfect. I won't look at the disgusting sinner hiding behind you but will pretend he is as perfect as you."

Or, is it something else? How about this, the way our church viewed it over 100 years ago:



This robe, woven in the loom of heaven, has in it not one thread of human devising. **Christ in His humanity wrought out a perfect character, and this character He offers to impart to us**... By His perfect obedience He has made it possible for every human being to obey God's commandments. When we submit ourselves to Christ, the heart is united with His heart, the will is merged in His will, the mind becomes one with His mind, the thoughts are brought into captivity to Him; we live His life. This is what it means to be clothed with the garment of His righteousness. Then as the Lord looks upon us He sees, not the figleaf garment, not the nakedness and deformity of sin, but His own robe of righteousness, which is perfect obedience to the law of Jehovah. {COL 311.4}

Is this Jesus standing in our place legally? Or is this Jesus healing, curing, restoring in US His perfection? This is the truth. The legal, penal substitution model has infected our church and obstructs our mission to lighten the world for Christ's return.

We cannot do our mission as a people until we throw off these distortions and come back to the truth about God's law, character and what Christ has accomplished for us and what He will do in us if we let Him!

THURSDAY

Read third paragraph, "Some of those..." thoughts?

What do you think of the idea, that those who deliberately reject God do not "have any efficacious sacrifice for their sins."

What does it sound like the problem with sin is, and the problem with rejecting God and His plan?

Does it sound like the problem is that they don't have the proper sacrificial payment to offer to God, in order to get God to forgive them? This is pagan, based on accepting the lie about God's law. It places the problem with sin upon God and God's attitude needing appeasement or the law needing payment.

Think of it this way, imagine someone dying of anthrax infection, and a doctor spends his life fortune, sacrificing all he has to develop Cipro (a remedy) and offers it freely to the dying patient, but the patient refuses it. What happens? Do we say, well without Cipro there isn't a sacrifice which will be efficacious? Or, would we realize there is no remedy? Yes the doctor sacrificed to develop the remedy, it was through the sacrifice that the remedy was achieved, but it is the remedy that cures.

Jesus, through His sacrificial death, provided Remedy for sin! If we reject it, we die in our trespass in sin, unhealed.

FRIDAY

Read first paragraph, "What Martin Luther..." do you notice how it is all about healing and transformation, not about legal payment? Read and discuss questions 1-3.