

SOTERIOLOGY (70)

This is a key point—types will only be accurately understood as we accurately understand the Word of God. Those who are searching the Scriptures will be in the best position to discern what a true type is and what it isn't.

Dr. C. I. Scofield gave a couple of key warnings when it comes to the study of types: 1) If there is not explicit N.T. authority, it cannot be insisted that it is a type. 2) If it is not specifically called a type, it needs to be recognized as only having the authority of an analogy (C. I. Scofield, *The New Scofield Study Bible*, NASV, p. 7).

Dr. Scofield raises an important point—types need to be very carefully discerned or else the Bible can become nothing more than a series of allegories derived from men's fanciful speculations. The more one understands doctrine, and the more one pours through the pages of the Bible, the more one will be able to understand true biblical types.

Now as we have previously stated, there are many things that typify the sacrificial work of Jesus Christ:

1. The General Sacrifices of the O.T.

The first type that is found in the O.T. is one found in Genesis 3:21. It is a beautiful picture of God searching out a sinner and, through a blood sacrifice clothing him, making him fit for the presence of God. We learn from our study of the N.T. that God searches out sinners and through the blood sacrifice of His Son, clothes the sinner with Christ's righteousness, thus making him fit for the presence of God (Rev. 7:14; 19:8). Dr. Chafer, concerning this type, writes: "Few types are as complete as this. God undertakes for man, the imputation of sin to a substitute is implied, and the covering of the sinner is revealed" (Vol. 3, p. 124).

Another type is the offering of Abel in Genesis 4:4. This is a clear picture of the fact that God requires a blood sacrifice and that He determines the acceptability of the sacrifice. When seen in light of N.T. revelation, it is very clear that Christ provided the final blood sacrifice and His is the only sacrifice that is acceptable to God.

Another type is the altar and sacrifice of Noah in Genesis 8:20-22. This immediately demonstrates that the blood sacrifice is the only means of having a relationship with God after salvation. We learn from this passage that an altar was built on which the sacrifice was offered. Exodus 20:24-26 makes it clear that God requires that sacrifices be offered at a specific place in a specific way. Again, through N.T. revelation we learn that Jesus Christ's sacrifice is the only sacrifice that God finds acceptable. His is the only one that meets His standards (Heb. 13:10-16).

Dr. Walvoord said, "All sacrifices of the Old Testament which anticipate the death of Christ are types" (Vol. 2, p. 78). Certainly the general sacrifices of the O.T. picture the work of Jesus Christ.

SOTERIOLOGY (71)

2. The Prescribed Sacrifices of the O.T.

There were certain sacrifices that were demanded by God and specifically directed by Him. Each one clearly typifies the work of Jesus Christ:

1) The Lamb Offering.

It is quite evident from clear statements in the N.T. that Jesus Christ was God's Lamb (John 1:29). The Passover lamb which was offered the night of the Passover, when the children of Israel were in Egypt, is clearly a type of the work of Jesus Christ. The institution of this sacrifice is found in Exodus 12.

It was the blood of the lamb which thwarted the judgment of God (Ex. 12:12-13). Primarily, there were six features of this lamb: 1. It was to be without blemish; 2. It was to be tested; 3. It was to be slain; 4. Its blood was to be applied; 5. Its blood was a complete appeasement against divine judgment; 6. It was to be partaken of as food.

If each of these is analyzed, it may be readily seen that it is a clear type of the work of Jesus Christ: As God's lamb, Christ was without blemish; He was tested and proved; He was slain; His blood is to be applied; His blood is the appeasement against divine judgment; His life is to be partaken of—the partaking of the roasted lamb pictures divine fellowship.

Clearly when Christ came to this world He fulfilled all of the symbolic implications for being the sacrificial lamb.

2) The Levitical Offerings.

There are several offerings given in the book of Leviticus which typify the sacrificial work of Jesus Christ: The sweet savor offerings which consist of the burnt offering, the meal offering and the peace offering. These offerings speak of the fact that Christ offered Himself to God in perfect obedience in order to provide salvation for men. The non-sweet savor offerings which consist of the sin offering and trespass offering, which represent Christ as a substitute for sinners from whom God the Father must turn away His face. Each one of these offerings needs to be carefully studied in order to develop a deep theology of the sacrificial work of Jesus Christ.

The two birds are another representation of Jesus Christ (Lev. 14:1-7). These birds were to be sacrificed in connection to cleansing one from leprosy. The first bird slain speaks of Christ being delivered for our sins. The second bird released speaks of Christ raised again, particularly in the context of our justification (Rom. 4:25).

The Day of Atonement is another Levitical representation of Jesus Christ. Of particular typological significance are the two goats to be offered as a sin offering for Israel (Lev. 16:5, 7-10). The first goat that was killed is a picture of Christ shedding His blood for our sins. The second goat, which was set free, pictures Christ by His sacrifice setting us free from our sins.

SOTERIOLOGY (72)

When carefully analyzed, it will be discovered that much in Leviticus typifies the person and work of Jesus Christ. When theologians state that Christ is the theme of the Bible, Leviticus is an excellent proof of that reality.

The five offerings in Leviticus which typify the work of Jesus Christ are; the burnt offering (Lev. 1), the meal offering (Lev. 2), the peace offering (Lev. 3), the sin offering (Lev. 4), and the trespass offering (Lev. 5:6-7).

These offerings have been broken down and classified in several different ways:

Perhaps the most frequent breakdown of the offerings is to classify the first three the “sweet savor offerings” and the last two “the non-sweet savor offerings.” The reason for this classification is because the portion burned on the altar produced “an aroma pleasing to the LORD” (Lev. 1:9, 17; 2:2, 9; 3:5, 16). In other words, the first three offerings—burnt, meal and peace offerings—produced an aroma pleasing to the LORD. The last two, the sin offering and the trespass offering, are classified as the “non-sweet savor offerings” because they did not produce the same effect.

One problem with this breakdown is that a portion of the sin offering is said to be “an aroma pleasing to the LORD” (Lev. 4:31) or “a soothing aroma to the LORD.” However, Dr. Scofield points out that the only part of the sin offering that is the sweet aroma or soothing aroma is that which represents the perfections of Jesus Christ. Dr. Scofield writes: “The soothing aroma offerings are so called because they typify Christ in His own perfections and in His affectionate devotion to the Father’s will. The offerings which are not “soothing aroma” offerings typify Christ as bearing the whole demerit of the sinner. Both are substitutional. In our place Christ, in the burnt offering, makes good our lack of devotedness and, in the sin offering and trespass offering, suffers because of our disobedience” (*New Scofield Reference Bible*, ft. nt. 8, p. 156).

A second way to classify the offerings is to classify the first three as voluntary and the last two as nonvoluntary. This classification has its problems, too, since there were occasions specifically in regard to certain purification rituals (Lev. 14:12-20), and at the annual festivals (Num. 28-29) when the burnt, grain and fellowship offerings were required and were not voluntary (Num. 6:14, 17; Deut. 16:10-12, 16-17).

A third way to classify the offerings is to classify the burnt and grain offerings as dedicatory, the peace (fellowship) offering as communal and the sin and guilt offerings as expiatory (a sacrifice that makes provision for a sinner to have a relationship with God by satisfying the demands of God and by removing guilt by suffering punishment). This, too, has a problem because in a sense, in the covering of sin, the forgiveness comes through the sacrifice of someone else. This is true, in one way or another, in all of the offerings.

Many of the outstanding students of the Word of God accept the first method of classifying the offerings: sweet savor, non-sweet savor.

SOTERIOLOGY (73)

Although there are certain things that need to be carefully studied (i.e. Lev. 4:31), it still seems to be a very healthy, accurate way to view the Levitical offerings.

3) The Red Heifer Offering.

This prescribed sacrifice is found in Num. 19:1-22. This chapter is a beautiful picture of the cleansing of a believer. Its N.T. counterpart is found in I John 1:7-9.

J. N. Darby, a preacher, translator, theologian and hymn writer of the 1800's, writes concerning this passage:

“The heifer was completely burned without the camp, even its blood, except that which was sprinkled directly before the tabernacle of the congregation; that is where the people were to meet God. There the blood was sprinkled seven times (because it was there that God met with His people), a perfect testimony in the eyes of God to the atonement made for sin. They had access there according to the value of this blood. The priest threw into the fire cedar wood, hyssop, and scarlet (that is, all that was of man and his human glory in the world). ‘From the cedar down to the hyssop,’ is the expression of nature from her highest elevation to her lowest depth. Scarlet is external glory (the world, if you please). The whole was burned in the fire which consumed Christ, the sacrifice for sin. Then, if anybody contracted defilement, though it were merely through neglect, in whatever way it might be, God took account of the defilement. And this is a solemn and important fact: God provides for cleansing, but in no case can tolerate anything in His presence unsuited to it. It might seem hard in an inevitable case, as one dying suddenly in the tent. But it was to show that for His presence God judges of what is suited to His presence. The man was defiled and he could not go into God’s tabernacle. To cleanse the defiled person, they took some running water, into which they put the ashes of the heifer, and the man was sprinkled on the third and on the seventh days; then he was clean” (Cited from *Chafer*, Vol. 3, p. 123).

Clearly this is a type of cleansing that Christ offers to a defiled believer. He completely removes all defilement upon confession.

Dr. C. I. Scofield adds:

“The red heifer: a type of the sacrifice of Christ as the ground of the cleansing of the believer from the defilement contracted in his pilgrim walk through this world, and an illustration of the method of his cleansing. The order is: (1) the slaying of the sacrifice; (2) the sevenfold sprinkling of the blood, typical public testimony before the eyes of everyone of the complete and never-to-be repeated putting away of all of the believer’s sins before God (Heb. 9:12-14; 10:10-12); (3) the reduction of the sacrifice to ashes which are preserved and become a memorial of the sacrifice; and (4) the cleansing from defilement (sin has two aspects—guilt and uncleanness) by sprinkling with the ashes mixed water. Water is a type of both the Spirit and the Word (John 7:37-39; Eph. 5:26).

SOTERIOLOGY (74)

The operation typified in this: the Holy Spirit uses the Word to convict the believer of some evil allowed in his life that hinders his joy, growth and service. Thus convicted, he remembers that the guilt of his sin has been met by the sacrifice of Christ (I John 1:7). Therefore, instead of despairing, the convicted believer judges and confesses the defiling thing as unworthy of a Christian, and is forgiven and cleansed (John 13:3-10; I John 1:7-10) (Scofield, *NASV*, p. 234).

It is certainty that Christ's work on Calvary did include cleansing for the believer. This O.T. passage typifies how elaborate and extensive that sacrificial work truly was.

QUESTION #16 – What are the false theories concerning the value of Christ's death?

A. The Ransom Theory.

This theory was first developed by Origen (A.D. 185-254). It taught that Jesus Christ died in order to pay a ransom price to Satan. The concept was that Satan held people captive and Christ died to make the necessary payment to Satan in order to set the people free.

There is no doubt that Satan does have great power (II Cor. 4:3-4; Eph. 2:1-3; Col. 1:13; I John 5:19).

There are many reasons why this theory is false:

- 1) God's violated glory is what needs payment, not Satan. We need to be reconciled to God, not Satan (II Cor. 5:18-21).
- 2) Christ's death was clearly designed to appease God, not Satan.
- 3) It is not Satan who can free people; it is God who can free people.
- 4) Satan did not benefit from the death of Christ; he lost.
- 5) The cross pronounced a judgment against Satan; it was not a payment to Satan (John 12:31; 16:11; Col. 2:14-15).

B. The Recapitulation Theory.

This theory was first developed by Irenaeus (A.D. 130-200). It taught that Christ went through all phases of Adam's life and experiences, including the experience of sin. By doing this, Christ was able to succeed where Adam failed. Christ relived the life of Adam; He restated and recapitulated his life.

It is true that Christ is called the last Adam (I Cor. 15:45). It is also true that Christ is a type of Adam, but in the positive sense (Rom. 5:12-21). However, this theory proves to be false:

SOTERIOLOGY (75)

1) Christ had not personal contact with sin (I John 3:5; John 8:46).

2) It is Christ's death that saves, not His life (Rom. 5:9).

C. The Commercial Theory.

This theory, first developed by Anselm (A.D. 1033-1109), taught that God was robbed of His honor by our sin and Christ's death retrieved His honor and earned a reward for Christ, which was the ability to forgive sinners and give them everlasting life, which He passed on to sinners. Salvation primarily becomes nothing more than a commercial exchange—Christ's death for God's honor.

Although this theory seems to sound good, it is theologically weak for several reasons:

1) Although it does focus on God's honor, it totally neglects His holiness and justice. The death of Jesus Christ had to meet many requirements, not just God's honor.

2) This theory also lacks in that it totally neglects the biblical teachings that Christ died in our place and for our benefit. Although we would not deny the fact that God's honor has been violated, this theory denies the entire substitutionary side of the sacrificial work of Jesus Christ.

D. The Moral Influence Theory.

This theory is somewhat tricky because there seems to be two developmental stages to it. The first stage was developed by Abelard (A.D. 1079-1142), and it taught that Christ's death was nothing more than a demonstration of love for sinners. It was this demonstration of love that was designed to soften and melt the heart of a sinner, thus causing him to repent. The second stage was developed by Faustus Socinus (1539-1604), and it taught that Christ's death occurred in order to influence men to live good, moral lives. In other words, it was God's desire that this terrible death and the love behind it would morally influence people to change.

Certainly we would not deny that Christ's death is to make a profound difference on the lives of those who are saved (II Cor. 5:15). However, to simply make Christ's death nothing more than an expression of love or nothing more than an act designed to morally influence humanity is to totally reject the entire substitutionary nature of the death of Christ. Jesus Christ did not die just to influence men. He died in their place. He died taking their sin. He died receiving their judgment. God's love was a motive for Christ's death, but it was not the only motive. Christ's work was designed to make a sinner eternally right with the Holy God. It was not just to make some moral difference.

SOTERIOLOGY (76)

E. The Accident Theory.

This theory, first developed by Albert Schweitzer (1875-1965), taught that Christ became so caught up with being the Messiah and so caught up with the prospect of His coming kingdom that He totally overlooked the fact that man did not agree with Him and, as a result, He was “mistakenly crushed in the process.” To proponents of this theory, Christ’s death is nothing more than a mistake, an accident. It was not supposed to happen, but it did happen through Christ’s own neglect.

This theory is obviously false because both the O.T. and N.T. clearly reveal that the death of Christ is THE central issue of the entire program of God. Christ clearly predicted His own death (Matt. 20:17-19), and His death was clearly ordained by God (Acts 2:23). This theory also neglects the substitutionary nature of Christ’s sacrifice (Is. 53:4-6).

F. The Martyr Theory.

This theory, first developed by the Socinians in the 16th century, taught that Christ died as a martyr because of the truth He taught and the life He lived. It further taught that His willingness to die is proof of the validity of His teachings and that should inspire people to reform and live a life as Christ lived.

The weaknesses with this theory are obviously many:

- 1) This theory makes Christ’s death nothing more than a martyr, like any other martyr.
- 2) Christ’s death was substitutionary.
- 3) Christ’s death was carefully planned.
- 4) Christ’s death was for sin.

This theory totally neglects critical revealed data concerning the sacrifice and death of Jesus Christ.

G. The Governmental Theory.

This theory, first developed by Grotius (1583-1645), taught that God’s governmental program required Christ’s death to show God’s hatred of sin. This theory does recognize the fact that Christ’s death is connected to sin. However, it totally neglects the fact that Christ bore the penalty for sinners. This theory suggests that God can forgive sinners because His governmental principle of His hatred for sin has been clearly established by Christ’s death. But this theory rejects the fact that Christ died as a sinner’s substitute and took upon Him the wrath that man deserved.

SOTERIOLOGY (77)

Dr. Chafer has well stated regarding these theories:

“Strictly speaking, there could be no theory relative to the value of Christ’s death. Human speculation is ever active and reason has raised its objections to every divine revelation. The heart of man—however much it may be disciplined—can and should do no more than believe the record God has given concerning His Son. The careful study of all that is revealed to the end that its true message may be comprehended, is certainly enjoined (II Tim. 2:15); but rationalistic arguments which contradict revelation are foreign to a true theological method” (Vol. 3, p. 135).

A proper doctrinal view of the value of Christ’s death is that it was satisfactory. He died to satisfy all demands of God. It was substitutional—that is He died in our place and for our benefit in a sacrifice that was far above and beyond any other. It was willing—that is Christ willingly laid down His own life.

QUESTION #17 – How does the doctrine of election relate to soteriology?

Whenever one studies the doctrine of salvation, one will have to face the doctrine of election. There can be no doubt from the Word of God that a key doctrine connected to soteriology is the doctrine of election. The fact that God chooses some out of the many cannot be denied, nor can it be fully understood. The finite mind, trying to reconcile divine election with divine love, will always fall short. But as Dr. Chafer so adequately states: “Though the two revealed facts—divine election and the universality of divine love—cannot be reconciled within the sphere of human understanding, here, as elsewhere, God may be honored by believing and resting in Him” (Vol. 3, p. 165).

The fact that God makes certain choices among things cannot be denied:

- 1) It may be observed in the various classifications of angels.
- 2) It may be observed in the various classifications of stars.
- 3) It may be observed in the various classifications of race.
- 4) It may be observed in the various classifications of talents.
- 5) It may be observed in the various classifications of gifts.

It is clearly and obviously a reality that God does make elective choices.

The real difficulty comes when trying to wrestle with the concept of election as it relates to salvation. Before we can even begin to have a proper understanding (as proper as a finite mind can have) we must concede that the basis for our belief must not be our intellect, our emotions or our will. The basis for our belief must be the Bible, which is the revelation of God!