

OUR SACRIFICIAL LAMB

When the Lord Jesus Christ allowed himself to be taken, condemned, and crucified, he thereby accepted the guilt of every murderer, of all time (this included the humanly incomprehensible feat of accepting the guilt of his own murderers) and not only that of Barabbas. This sacrificial acceptance of the guilt which was so heavily laid upon him, was one factor which was required to make his spotless offering effective, we will call this the guilt factor. A second and vitally necessary factor we will call the innocence factor. It was not necessary for the Lord to ACCEPT this innocence for he had it inherent in himself from his immaculate conception on.

When man sinned and thereby fell, it was divinely decreed (apparently from the start) that only by the "shedding of blood" would there be remission. Seeing as it was man that had sinned, divine justice required the blood of man as a sin atonement. The problem which Rev.5:1-4 shows us, is that no man could be found who was worthy to shed mans blood as an atonement for mans sin, for it was revealed that everyone upon whom the spotlight shined had been spotted by sin and thereby rendered unfit for the Eternal Fathers acceptance. Although the Lord Jesus was made "to be sin" he was never marred by sin and therefore was found to be so very worthy. And so, a special sacrifice was "prepared" of God (for us) one who being a man could also be found worthy to shed the blood of man to take away the sin of man, "the sin of the world" see Jn.1:29.

It took however, the guilt factor of Num.35:33 to make the sacrifice effective. The Lord in his obedience to "the death of the cross" therein accepted the guilt of all the blood which had ever been shed upon the earth, in a manner that vicariously made him the murderer, see 11Cor.5:21. Therefore, as the "law of sin and death" so rigorously states, that "the land cannot be cleansed of the blood that is shed therein but by the blood of him that shed it" so we say that Jesus on the cross vicariously became "him that shed it" thus redeeming every murderer and going yet further he also became the guilt ego of every sinner and that in "all manner of sin and blasphemy" the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost excepted. Again we say, that without the Lords acceptance of the guilt factor, his sacrifice could not have been effective.

The fact that the Lord Jesus (vicariously) became bloodguilty for every murderer and thereby legally redeemed them (in accordance with the decrees of "the law of sin and death") will not divest these individuals of their own personal guilt burden if they fail to believe upon his name, (see Lk.11:50,51) they thereby render his immaculate sacrifice a waste on their own behalf and in doing so they create of themselves a vessel "of wrath fitted to destruction". There is a deeper dimension (of divine sovereignty) in which we view these individuals and their ultimate tragedy and we deal with this (according to the Scriptures) in other articles.

One scenario that could be used is that every person upon reaching a certain age would have been required to meet with a priest and be bled, which blood offering would then have been taken and offered as an atonement for the sin/sins of that particular individual. One reason that such a system could not have been effective is that "the law of sin and death" required the death of the sacrificial creature as one factor which made the offering acceptable and thus effectual. This grievous procedure could have been required once a year, but the Lord God accepted "the blood of bulls and of goats" instead. We should also recognize that the sacrificial animal is a sinless substitution, (which nevertheless is also under the sin curse, even as we) reminding us of the fact that our own blood could never have been accepted as an atonement for our sin. However, the blood of man only (shed by an individual who was completely innocent but at the same time bearing the totality of the guilt of all the sins of mankind, the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost excepted) was required by divine justice as a final atonement for sin.

While we do agree that the blood of the Lord Jesus is the most precious "substance" (see Heb.11:1) ever known to mankind, we nevertheless do deny the divine blood theory as entirely fallacious. The logical next step to this unprovable assertion would be for one to allege that the body of the Lords flesh was also divine in its nature. The concept of a natural human body being nourished by divine (supernatural) blood is confusion. Whenever the Scriptures speak of "the flesh" its always the adamic flesh that's intended unless otherwise conveyed from the particular context, for an example of this see Rev.19:18 fourth unit. Therefore the Scriptural warnings against denying "that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh" should settle the matter, especially when studied together with Heb.2:14-16 which undeniably relates Christ back to Abraham and thus to Adam. Heb.2:14 should be the end of the matter with its Apostolic assertion to the effect that the Lord Jesus partook of the same "flesh and blood" that "the children" do. The divine blood theory is nothing but fantasy. It confuses the plan of Salvation and the Apostolic counsel left to us in the inspired writing of the Sacred Scriptures.

We believe and really know that the blood of the Lord Jesus (also the atonemental water) was spiritualized (somewhere between the time that it flowed from his side and the moment of his resurrection) making it to be (in a certain sense) compatible with the spiritual element in man which needs (and also is) cleansed by it in the definite works of Saving and Sanctifying grace. P. S. This piece was shot down by the Faith & Truth editorial board awhile back even though it is so very needful. The divine blood theory is erroneous (it effectively voids the Salvation plan) but nevertheless has been advanced by well-meaning ministers. This (we say) is precisely the type of un-imputed sin which will be dealt with according to the order of 1Cor.3:15. R. Corn 08