

## General Topics :: Did the Father, turn his face away from Christ, His own son?

### Did the Father, turn his face away from Christ, His own son?, on: 2014/6/13 15:02

Did the Father, turn his face away from Christ, His own son?

That's one of the biggest misunderstandings in the modern church. Jesus asked the question. What did God answer in that gospel, in the gospels? What was the answer God gave? He didn't, did He? He didn't give an answer. So people assume God the Father forsook his son Jesus.

The answer is he didn't forsake his son. That was the cry of Jesus when he became sin for us. If he had heard the answer right then and there God would have said, "I haven't forsaken you." You say, "how do you know?" I'll prove it.

Psalm 22 is the Messianic Psalm from which that verse, that cry of Jesus came. The first verse of Psalm 22, "My God, my God, why have you forsaken me?" You can go on down and read that Psalm and bit by bit you see it's talking about the cross right down to them casting lots for his garments - everything. Now if you go down to Verse 24 in Psalm 22, you get the answer to the question. It's not recorded in the gospel, but it is in Psalms. Psalm 22:1, "Why have you forsaken me?" Verse 24, "He has not despised nor abhorred the affliction of the afflicted nor has he hidden his face from him. But when he cried to him for help, he heard."

The Father never forsook His son. People say, well, they were separated. But it is impossible for the Deity to ever be separated or fragmented. The Godhead would have ceased to exist. The Father, Son, and Spirit have always been one. It's never wavered for one moment, even at the cross, which is encouraging to us because like Jesus, when we cry out "why have you forsaken me", we can know God says, "I haven't. I'm with you."

Do not forget that the bible says that God Himself was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself as Christ hung on the cross.

2 Cor. 5:19; "To wit, that God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them; and hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation."

### Re: Did the Father, turn his face away from Christ, His own son? - posted by Solomon101, on: 2014/6/13 15:34

Now from the sixth hour there was darkness over all the land until the ninth hour. 46 And about the ninth hour Jesus cried out with a loud voice, saying, "Eli, Eli, lema sabachthani?" that is, "My God, my God, why have you forsaken me?" Matthew 27:45-46 ESV

My God (Father), My God (Holy Spirit), WHY have you forsaken me? (emphasis mine)

In that verse Jesus states as an absolute fact that The Father and Holy Spirit had forsaken Him at that moment of being made sin. He then asks The Father and Holy Spirit why They had done so.

Are you then saying that Jesus was completely wrong and in total error about what was actually happening, and had to happen, to accomplish the plan of salvation?

### Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2014/6/13 16:06

How about this Solomon--

That we was quoting the opening lines of that very prophetic psalm for the benefit of the scribes and Pharisees who would have known the rest of the psalm?

I have always thought that was a distinct possibility although I am not overly sold on either interpretation.

I am not sure why it matters if God really forsook Jesus on the cross. He may have but I am not sure how necessary it is

**General Topics :: Did the Father, turn his face away from Christ, His own son?**

s to believe that.

**Re: , on: 2014/6/13 16:06**

It is true Jesus said it - that is what He felt at that time as a human man but that does not mean that God truly forsake Him.

How is it possible that God the Father was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them; and hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation and forsaking Him at the same time?

**Re: - posted by Solomon101, on: 2014/6/13 16:21**

Quote:  
-----TMK - I am not sure why it matters if God really forsook Jesus on the cross. He may have but I am not sure how necessary it is to believe that.  
-----

Agreed. It is not essential to salvation. It seems to me that a persons answer to that question will hinge largely upon their answers to the following two questions.

1. What is the actual price that must be paid for mans sin in order to purchase righteousness in its place.
2. A persons thoughts on the literal reading of 2 Cor 5:21

Quote:  
----- For our sake he made him to be sin who knew no sin, so that in him we might become the righteousness of God.  
-----

. In essence is that verse literally true. Did the Father and Holy Spirit make Christ TO BE sin .... not just BEAR SIN. What it literally says is quiet clear. However, that is to much for some people and alternative thoughts are abundant. The answer to that question has a great influence on a persons thoughts concerning the Father and Holy Spirit forsaking Jesus in the Matthew 27:46 scripture.

**Re: - posted by Solomon101, on: 2014/6/13 16:22**

Hi Tuc-

Just to clarify -

you stated

Quote:  
-----It is true Jesus said it - that is what He felt at that time as a human man but that does not mean that God truly forsake Him.  
-----

So you the ARE saying that Jesus was completely wrong and in total error about what was actually happening, and had to happen, to accomplish the plan of salvation? Correct? You believe that Jesus misunderstood what was happening to Him, and had to happen, for man to have sin paid for. Correct? Or am I somehow misunderstanding you?

**Re: - posted by havok20x, on: 2014/6/13 16:52**

There is a couple of quick things that I want to say about this subject. The atonement is wonderful to study and think about and just dig into the scriptures about.

Let's look at Isaiah 53, which is also a picture of the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus:

Quote:  
-----  
Who has believed our report?

And to whom has the arm of the Lord been revealed?  
For He shall grow up before Him as a tender plant,  
And as a root out of dry ground.  
He has no form or comeliness;  
And when we see Him,  
There is no beauty that we should desire Him.  
He is despised and rejected by men,  
A Man of sorrows and acquainted with grief.  
And we hid, as it were, our faces from Him;  
He was despised, and we did not esteem Him.

Surely He has borne our griefs  
And carried our sorrows;  
Yet we esteemed Him stricken,  
Smitten by God, and afflicted.  
But He was wounded for our transgressions,  
He was bruised for our iniquities;  
The chastisement for our peace was upon Him,  
And by His stripes we are healed.  
6 All we like sheep have gone astray;  
We have turned, every one, to his own way;  
And the Lord has laid on Him the iniquity of us all.

He was oppressed and He was afflicted,  
Yet He opened not His mouth;  
He was led as a lamb to the slaughter,  
And as a sheep before its shearers is silent,  
So He opened not His mouth.  
He was taken from prison and from judgment,  
And who will declare His generation?  
For He was cut off from the land of the living;  
For the transgressions of My people He was stricken.  
And they made His grave with the wickedâ€™  
But with the rich at His death,  
Because He had done no violence,  
Nor was any deceit in His mouth.

Yet it pleased the Lord to bruise Him;  
He has put Him to grief.  
When You make His soul an offering for sin,  
He shall see His seed, He shall prolong His days,  
And the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in His hand.  
He shall see the labor of His soul, and be satisfied.  
By His knowledge My righteous Servant shall justify many,  
For He shall bear their iniquities.  
Therefore I will divide Him a portion with the great,  
And He shall divide the spoil with the strong,  
Because He poured out His soul unto death,  
And He was numbered with the transgressors,  
And He bore the sin of many,  
And made intercession for the transgressors.

-----

The last paragraph is pretty important in regards to this. I have heard so many times people say that The Father turned away from the Son, because He could not look at sin or at the suffering Jesus was enduring. I really haven't ever seen that said in scriptures. Instead, what I find is that the Father was pouring out His wrath on the Son. Look at the last paragraph, "Yet it pleased the Lord to bruise Him; He has put Him to grief." Who did that? The Father. He did it. He poured out His wrath and Jesus willingly gave up His life.

That is precisely why we can be forgiven. All the wrath that we deserve, has already been paid for. Jesus Christ paid for it. By a much better sacrifice than anything we could provide, Jesus became our sacrifice and has brought us near to God.

So what about Matthew 27:46. Did the Father forsake the Son? Yes. But forsake doesn't mean that somehow God couldn't see Jesus. God sees everything. He is omniscient. Nothing in this tiny universe escapes his notice, because the entire thing is sustained by His will and every star is named and in its place.

Notice in Psalm 22 how there comes a point where the Lord does indeed answer Him. Jesus was forsaken, but not fore

**General Topics :: Did the Father, turn his face away from Christ, His own son?**

ver. He paid the penalty of our sin and died. But just before He died, He said, "It is finished!"

We can take confidence in that. Just like the song Amazing Love says, "I'm forgiven, because you were forsaken. I'm accepted. You were condemned. I'm alive and well. You're Spirit lives within me, because you died and rose again."

**Re: , on: 2014/6/13 16:54**

It is true Jesus said it - that is what He felt at that time as a human man but that does not mean that God truly forsake Him.

The fact is GOD never forsook Him!!

Now if you go down to Verse 24 in Psalm 22, you get the answer to the question. It's not recorded in the gospel, but it is in Psalms. Psalm 22:1, "Why have you forsaken me?" Verse 24, "He has not despised nor abhorred the affliction of the afflicted nor has he hidden his face from him. But when he cried to him for help, he heard."

How could God forsake Himself?

You are free to disagree.

**Re: - posted by Solomon101, on: 2014/6/13 17:29**

Hey Tuc-

As stated earlier in the thread - this is not necessarily essential to salvation to agree on every point so I don't wish to make it an issue larger than it is. However, you must also be honest and consistent if you are going to stake out a position as you have.

havok20x raised some very valid thoughts concerning the cost of atonement in his post.

Quote:  
-----Tuc stated - It is true Jesus said it - that is what He felt at that time as a human man but that does not mean that God truly forsake Him.

The fact is GOD never forsook Him!!  
-----

In response I also asked some very specific and exact questions about your positions. You have so far declined to answer them.

I will ask them again.

1. So you the ARE saying that Jesus was completely wrong and in total error about what was actually happening, and had to happen, to accomplish the plan of salvation? Correct?
2. You believe that Jesus misunderstood what was happening to Him, and had to happen, for man to have sin paid for. Correct?
3. You believe this because of your interpretation of the verse in Psalms 22?

If you would address or directly answer these questions from the stance you have taken it would be helpful.

A few more questions come to mind as well -

4. Do you hold to a position that Jesus The Christ is God? Do you hold to a position that the Holy Spirit is God? Do you use them interchangeably or note a difference in them?
5. What do you think was the full and total required price to pay for the sin of the human race and purchase the ability of man to be found righteous in the sight of God?

6. Do you believe that the Godhead portion of The Father and Holy Spirit extracted the vengeance, penalty, and full price of man's sin from the Son, Jesus The Christ? In essence did the Father and Holy Spirit strike the Son as a payment for mans sin. A payment that the Son paid of His own free will and volition.

7. When Jesus cried and sweat great drops of blood in the garden of Gethsemane, wishing the cup to pass from Him and another path for mans forgiveness to be found if possible, what do you believe Jesus was referring to? Was it merely a physical beating and crucifixion that caused Him to recoil in such despair? I personally find that a little difficult to believe. There were thousands of regular every day men being crucified that faced their deaths with little to none of the fear and anguish Jesus showed at Gethsemane. Was Jesus just a wimp in your estimation or was He actually facing something far greater than simply a physical crucifixion. Was He simply afraid of physical death .. or was He in anguish over the idea of being separated from the Father and Holy Spirit as He, and He alone, was actually made sin for our sin and paid the required price for the salvation of mankind? What say you?

If you would be willing to answer those 7 specific questions in a direct and straight forward manner it would be most appreciated.

**Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2014/6/13 17:36**

Well said havok.

One thing I would like to say about Is 53 and God being "pleased" to crush his Son..., I think the word "pleased" is used in the sense that he was willing to do it and that it was necessary to do it but not that he was "happy" about it.

Tuc- If God DID turn his back or forsake Jesus when he "became sin" it is something that is simply a mystery. We can either accept it as mystery or try to explain that away or accept it as something mystical which it certainly would be. I do tend to believe that the emotional violence Jesus suffered exceeded his physical pain and I think the fact that he was forsaken explains this. That anguish began in Gethsemane. It was not primarily physical pain He was dreading. It was something deeper that we with our pea sized brains cannot fully grasp. But that is ok because we don't have to fully grasp it. How could we?

**Re: - posted by brothagary, on: 2014/6/13 18:18**

remember this one cursed is everyone that hangs on a tree  
he became a curse for us

this is what it means to be forsaken ,,god forsakes all those who are cursed like this

this is no light thing that christ did for us ,,we were forsaken of god ,,and god took our rightful place ,,,,,,,dont down grade the gosple of the cross ,,and water it down to suit your theolighy ,,what christ went through is partly incomprehensible

**Re: - posted by brothagary, on: 2014/6/13 18:21**

precious brothers watch eric ludys the tree ,,on you tube and see the old testament shadow of the cross in action under the law of moses

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=kJ5wt72nWmA>

**General Topics :: Did the Father, turn his face away from Christ, His own son?**

**Re: , on: 2014/6/14 5:50**

Solomon101

Now if you go down to Verse 24 in Psalm 22, you get the answer to the question. It's not recorded in the gospel, but it is in Psalms. Psalm 22:1, "Why have you forsaken me?" Verse 24, "He has not despised nor abhorred the affliction of the afflicted nor has he hidden his face from him. But when he cried to him for help, he heard."

The fact is GOD never forsook Him!!

In this verse the Bible states as an absolute fact that the Father and Holy Spirit had NOT forsaken Him at that moment of being made sin.

So what do you do with this verse?

Or the fact that God the Father was IN CHRIST the whole time, reconciling the world unto himself?

**Re: - posted by brothagary, on: 2014/6/14 9:50**

the full context of that treasure of scripture

Why are You so far from helping Me, And from the words of My groaning? 2 O My God, I cry in the daytime, but You do not hear; And in the night season, and am not silent. 3 But You are holy, Enthroned in the praises of Israel. 4 Our fathers trusted in You; They trusted, and You delivered them. 5 They cried to You, and were delivered; They trusted in You, and were not ashamed. 6 But I am a worm, and no man; A reproach of men, and despised by the people

we see one who is forsaken

A reproach of men, and despised by the people. 7 All those who see Me ridicule Me; They shoot out the lip, they shake the head, saying, 8 "He trusted in the Lord, let Him rescue Him; Let Him deliver Him, since He delights in Him!" 9 But You are He who took Me out of the womb; You made Me trust while on My mother's breasts. 10 I was cast upon You from birth. From My mother's womb You have been My God. 11 Be not far from Me, For trouble is near; For there is none to help.

we see one who is forsaken

You have brought Me to the dust of death. 16 For dogs have surrounded Me; The congregation of the wicked has enclosed Me. They pierced My hands and My feet; 17 I can count all My bones. They look and stare at Me. 18 They divide My garments among them, And for My clothing they cast lots. 19 But You, O Lord, do not be far from Me; O My Strength, hasten to help Me! 20 Deliver Me from the sword, My precious life from the power of the dog. 21 Save Me from the lion's mouth And from the horns of the wild oxen! You have answered Me. 22

our father hears our cry THE CRY OF christ and does not leave the lord forsaken cursed on the tree but after the lord is buried out of sight of all, according to the old testament law of moises the lord turns his face back to his son

**I HAVE OVERCOME THE WORLD**

You have answered Me. 22 I will declare Your name to My brethren; In the midst of the assembly I will praise You. 23 You who fear the Lord, praise Him! All you descendants of Jacob, glorify Him, And fear Him, all you offspring of Israel! 24 For He has not despised nor abhorred the affliction of the afflicted; Nor has He hidden His face from Him; But when He cried to Him He heard.....

**THE GOSPEL OF JESUS CHRIST !!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!**

the lord was not far from him though he forsook him and turned from him as he was sin ,though he knew no sin ,a curse he became while he hung on the tree,,,tasted a sinners death but was the righteousness of god ,,,,,

laid his life down as a substitute to our cursed life of being a forsaken satan following, sinner

**Re: Did the Father, turn his face away from Christ, His own son? - posted by trxx (), on: 2014/6/15 18:29**

I am not responding to anyone in particular really as much as I am responding to all who have posted in this thread so far. There is much that can be said concerning this topic. I too believe that Jesus was not forsaken at any point when He was crucified. There was another purpose in repeating those words from Psalm 22.

Forgive me if this post should become lengthy. I have many thoughts that want to speak out at the same time. Where to begin?

For myself, this all began about 4-5 years ago. I was in prayer when a number of thoughts flooded into my head in rapid succession. It was not unlike the pieces of a jigsaw puzzle coming together by themselves to form a picture. I was not looking for any understanding concerning Jesus' words that He uttered from the cross, "My God, My God, why have You forsaken Me?" but I do recall not fully understanding why this should be yet not being overly troubled because there was an explanation "the Father turned away. Suddenly I understood why He said this. I was puzzled not by this revelation but by why it should be given me. I found out that I am not alone in this understanding though the majority of people may not agree. As we all ought to do, I have tested this according to the Scriptures and have found over the years that I cling even more to this truth that I realized that day. Truth must and will always stand up to the test of time and to the scrutiny of the Scriptures. Scripture will not contradict what God has revealed. You may not agree with the conclusion that Jesus was not forsaken, and while I agree that it is not essential to salvation I think it is important to know the truth and to know the character of God.

I have yet to find any Scriptural references that indicate that God the Father turned away from the Son or could not bear to look upon His beloved Son as He breathed His last upon the cross. It is the most common belief that I am aware of that as the sins were placed upon Jesus the Father could not look and in fact turned away from the Son and therefore Jesus felt the separation from the Father and the anguish being so great He cried out, "My God, My God, why have You forsaken Me?" Show me from Scripture the reason that I ought to have continued in this understanding. Remember that we ought always to test everything according to Scripture.

I understood that the Psalms were the hymnbook of the Jewish people. Psalm 22 was written as a song and was dedicated or written to the chief musician or choirmaster. I also knew that they had a mind (memorized) for Scripture that is simply unknown to most of us today. I knew that there was no place that God could not see (Psalm 139). I knew that Psalm 22 is a messianic psalm that began, "My God, My God, why have You forsaken Me?" and went on to describe in detail what would take place a thousand years later. It was even hundreds of years before crucifixion would be developed by the Romans as a means of the most severe punishment available. Actually Psalm 22 is the first of a trilogy of psalms that deal with the Messiah who was to come. I personally knew songs that were so popular that I was able to recite every word myself. I also knew that Israel cherished the hope that they had in the Messiah to come and would have had a special heart or love for passages that spoke of His coming. So the pieces suddenly fit together. If I were to begin with but a portion of a popular song or saying the person to whom I was speaking would likely continue the thought without much consideration, almost automatically. I could imagine, in more modern technological advances, a DJ on the radio of Jerusalem in David's time, introducing the number one hit of the day, Psalm 22 "To the choirmaster: according to The Doe of the Dawn. A Psalm of David." It would have been as ancient karaoke, the listeners would have begun to sing a long from the very start. If the song had stopped the listeners would have continued anyway. There is the key, I believe,

that explains why Jesus cried out, "My God, My God, why have You forsaken Me?" Jesus was leading the Jewish spectators to Psalm 22. It is, in my mind, no coincidence that Psalm 22 begins with these exact words. Neither was it coincidence that the scene described in Psalm 22 was being fulfilled before their very eyes. Even the ending of Psalm 22, verse 31, when translated may be rendered, "It is finished" the very last words of Jesus on the cross. Even a casual look at the ending of Psalm 22 in the different versions will verify this thought.

There was a teaching method that I later, a couple of years later, learned that a rabbi would use. The method is called "remez." To quote,

The great teachers (rabbis) during Jesus' day used a technique that was later called remez. In their teaching, they would use part of a Scripture passage in a discussion, assuming that their audience's knowledge of the Bible would allow them to deduce for themselves the fuller meaning of the teaching. Apparently, Jesus, who possessed a brilliant understanding of Scripture and strong teaching skills, used this method often.

For example, when the children shouted "Hosanna" to him in the temple and the chief priests and teachers of the law became indignant (Matt. 21:15), Jesus responded by quoting Psalm 8:2: "From the lips of children and infants, you have ordained praise." The religious leaders' anger at Jesus can be better understood when we realize that the next phrase in the Psalm reveals why children and infants offer praise, because the enemies of God would be silenced. The religious leaders realized that Jesus was implying that they were God's enemies.

Jesus used this teaching method again when speaking to Zacchaeus. "For the Son of Man came to seek and save the lost," Jesus said (Luke 19:10). The background to this statement is probably Ezekiel 34. God, angry with Israel's leaders for scattering and harming his flock, stated that he would become the shepherd and would seek the lost ones and save them. Based on this, the people of Jesus' day understood that the Messiah to come would "seek and save" the lost. By using this phrase, knowing that his listeners knew the Scripture, Jesus communicated several things. To the people, he communicated, "I am the Messiah and also God." To the religious leaders, whose influence kept Zacchaeus out of the crowd, he said, "You have scattered and harmed God's flock." To Zacchaeus, he said, "You are one of God's lost sheep and he still loves you."

Jesus best fit the type of rabbi believed to have s'mikhah, the authority to make new interpretations of the Torah. Whereas most teachers of the law could only teach accepted interpretations, teachers with authority could make new interpretations and pass legal judgments. Crowds were amazed because Jesus taught with authority (Matt. 7:28-29), and some people questioned his authority (Matt. 21:23-27).

<http://followtherabbi.com/world/encyclopedia/article/remez>

Jesus was the ultimate rabbi and likely would have taught in traditional ways. I could almost see the witnesses to the crucifixion mulling over in their minds the 22nd Psalm when Jesus gave the opening line. They would have concluded that the scene that they were witnessing was being fulfilled before their very eyes. This must be the Messiah!

I also learned that there was Scriptural evidence that the Father never turned away or hid His face from Jesus. It was one of those times where you can't believe that you have never seen something before but all of a sudden your eyes are opened to a verse. And it was in the very same psalm that I had learned to love. Psalm 22:24, says, "Nor has He hidden His face from Him." I couldn't believe it. Scripture denied God the Father ever turned away or hid His face from the Son. Where could the Father turn to anyway that He would not see. Nowhere.

Jesus never referred to the Father as His God but always spoke in a unique manner of His Father declaring a unique relationship to Him. Jesus was quoting the beginning of the psalm, "My God, My God" to lead the people into a revelation of the truth that He was the Messiah spoken of in Psalm 22.

We believe, according to the words of Hebrews 13 that God will never forsake or leave those that are His children. But are we expected to believe that the Father would forsake His beloved Son in whom He was well pleased. If He would forsake His only begotten Son in His hour of greatest need then what confidence can we have that He would not forsake us? No, the very character of the Father does not permit Him to forsake His own, those that are His children. He must be true to Himself. He does promise to forsake the wicked though. But He won't forsake us nor would He forsake His Son.

Jesus simply quoted Scripture to reveal the truth about Himself as His life ebbed there on the cross. The Father hid not His face from Him.

Another reason that I love Psalm 22 is found in verse 6, "But I am a worm and not a man." Do a little research into the Hebrew word used there for "worm." It is the crimson worm or "Tola'at"! Its full name is Tola'at Shani; or Crimson or Scarlet Worm (Coccus Ilicis.) and tells the story of the Gospel. <http://www.discovercreation.org/newsletters/TheCrimsonOrScarletWorm.htm> but that's a whole other story and yet part of the same. AMAZING!

**Re: - posted by Solomon101, on: 2014/6/16 10:28**

trxx -

I read your post. In my mind there are several scriptures that immediately jump out and appear to stand in contradiction to your interpretation on Psalm 22. I could just list them out. However, I am not sure that would be helpful at the moment. I first want to find out what your thoughts are on the atonement of Christ.

I asked most of these questions of you. Twice in fact. He has not chosen to answer them as of yet. I have only seen some various posts devoted to defending a very specific thought about Christ's atonement in response. It is a position on Christ's sacrifice based exclusively on a highly debatable interpretation of one solitary Old Testament verse.

I will ask those questions of you and see if you wish to respond. A person's answers to these questions will largely determine where their beliefs are on this topic. These questions are further key to having a solid understanding in this area.

1. So you the ARE saying that Jesus was completely wrong and in total error about what was actually happening to Him on the cross as He was made sin with our sin? Jesus was further wrong and in error as to what had to happen for the plan of salvation to be accomplished? Correct?
2. You believe that Jesus misunderstood what was happening to Him, and had to happen, for man to have sin paid for. Correct?
3. You believe this because of your interpretation of the verse in Psalms 22?
4. Do you hold to a position that Jesus The Christ is God? Do you hold to a position that the Holy Spirit is God? Do you use them interchangeably or note distinct differences in them?
5. What do you think was the full and total required price that had to be paid for the sin of the human race? What was the full and total price that had to be paid to give a man the ability to be found righteous in the sight of God?
6. Do you believe that the Godhead portion of The Father and Holy Spirit extracted the vengeance, penalty, and full price of man's sin from the Son, Jesus The Christ? In essence did the Father and Holy Spirit strike the Son as a payment for man's sin. A payment that the Son paid of His own free will and volition.
7. What would be your exact and specific definition of, "The Father turned His face away from Christ", as you have addressed it in this thread?
8. When Jesus cried and sweat great drops of blood in the garden of Gethsemane, wishing the cup to pass from Him and another path for man's forgiveness to be found if possible, what do you believe Jesus was referring to? Was it merely a physical beating and crucifixion that caused Him to recoil in such despair? I personally find that a little difficult to believe. There were thousands of regular every day men being crucified that faced their deaths with little to none of the fear and anguish Jesus showed at Gethsemane. Was Jesus just a wimp in your estimation or was He actually facing something far greater than simply a physical crucifixion. Was He simply afraid of physical death ... or was He in anguish over the idea of being separated from the Father and Holy Spirit as He, and He alone, was actually made sin for our sin and paid the required price for the salvation of mankind? What say you?

**Re: - posted by havok20x, on: 2014/6/16 12:16**

Brothers,

I think what we are lacking some common sense here.

I am NOT a proponent of the Lord writing scripture just so that he could reference it later.

He could have started that Psalm with ANYTHING, but He chose to start it with, "My God, My God, why have you forsaken Me."

**General Topics :: Did the Father, turn his face away from Christ, His own son?**

The author of all Scripture could have said anything else, if what you are saying is true--that it was for the sole purpose of bringing to remembrance a Psalm. Jesus was forsaken by the Father, not by presence, but by the relationship that they had being thrown aside and Jesus enduring the wrath of God. God hates sin. Jesus became sin for us.

Yes, they should have been reminded of Psalm 22, but there is a reason why He says, "My God, My God, Why have you forsaken me?"

I want to employ a little worldly logic here.

If a mother pays no attention to her child or treats the child with contempt. Then they get slapped with the charge of negligence.

I don't see any problem with believing that the Father forsook the son, because the Father was pouring out His wrath on the Son. He wasn't turning His face away. No. It was the outpouring of wrath.

**Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2014/6/16 14:05**

For the record I believe that God did turn away from Jesus.

That being said and if Jesus was not intending to point to Ps 22 for the sake of the Pharisees etc, why did He quote the opening lines? Why didn't He just say something else?

Also is it possible that Jesus felt forsaken but was not actually forsaken?

This has nothing to do with Jesus being "wrong" because Jesus emptied himself when he took on the form of a man. There are some things that Jesus did not know because the Father had not revealed them to him.

**Re: - posted by trxx (), on: 2014/6/16 17:48**

With all due respect I am afraid that I find some of your questioning irrelevant to the topic. The topic is, "Did the Father turn His face away from His Son?" Perhaps you might, as you have suggested, be able to show us the Scripture that supports this teaching. Keep in mind that Verse 24 of Psalm 22 says that He did not hide His face. Why you find it necessary to question whether someone, who holds to the belief that the Father did not turn away nor did He forsake His Son, holds to the deity of Jesus, or belief in the Person + deity of the Holy Spirit I cannot fathom. However, I'm sure that all of these questions would be better understood if you were to explain your reason behind them. It would take far too long to properly answer every one of your questions.

Let me be brief + answer at least some of your questions.

1. No
2. No
3. Not meaningful considering answers to 1 + 2
4. Yes
5. + 6. The atonement provided by the sacrifice of Jesus is not in question here. Nor does it change from orthodoxy because one believes what the Scripture reveals, that the Father did not hide His face.
7. Perhaps it would be better if you could explain your thoughts on the Father turning away from His Son as I don't hold to the belief that He did, nor that He would, or even that He could. Are you willing to suggest that there is somewhere that the Father could not see, if He were to "turn His back" or hide His face.
7. Too many questions here. Some not sure why you ask. Obviously, I would not believe that Jesus would be in agony because He feared separation from the Father. Remember that He "set His face" for Jerusalem. He knew what awaited Him. Nothing was hidden from Him.

Please understand that I held to the belief that the Father turned away from the Son, that He could not bear to look upon Him as the sins of the world were poured out upon the Son. That was until I was given to understand otherwise.

I have tested this to see if it is true + have yet to find anything, that holds but a drop of water, to contradict it.

If Jesus only quoted from Psalm 22, and the words are exactly as it is written, to point the witnesses of His crucifixion to the Psalm in order that they would realize its fulfillment + therefore confirming His claim of being the Messiah, according to common rabbinical teaching methods, then we do not need to believe that the Father hid His face or turned away + forsook His Son. Nor do we need to contradict Scripture's own testimony.

Please feel free to list out your Scriptural proof. I may discuss but I refuse to argue. I have put my understanding out there

e + its for you to test according to Scripture. As we are to test all things.

**Re: - posted by havok20x, on: 2014/6/16 17:51**

TRXX,

Psalm 22 is not about a single moment in time.

It is not until v. 21 that Jesus is answered.

**Re: - posted by trxx (), on: 2014/6/16 18:40**

"Psalm 22 is not about a single moment in time.

It is not until v. 21 that Jesus is answered."

I'm not sure what your point is. Could you expound a little

**Re: - posted by havok20x, on: 2014/6/16 19:44**

Jesus was forsaken, but for only for a little while. Until it was finished. Psalm 22 does express the crucifixion but just like Isaiah 53 does not linger there. It moves on.

**Re: - posted by trxx (), on: 2014/6/16 20:45**

"Jesus was forsaken" I understand that you believe that. I don't any more though I once did. Neither do I find it necessary to believe. I understand why people hold to the belief. I also believe that I have given a reasonable explanation for Him to be understood as not being forsaken. My only hope in responding to the original post is that others might see an alternative to the common and in my opinion false belief that the Father somehow forsook Jesus. Perhaps we should clarify how it is that He was forsaken. Forsaken is defined as abandoned. How was Jesus abandoned? We cannot say that the Father turned away from Jesus except that we deny verse 24.

"Psalm 22 does express the crucifixion but just like Isaiah 53 does not linger there. It moves on." What does this statement illustrate? Why do you make this point?

Please, I am not trying to be critical, only wanting to understand + to cause others to consider why they believe. Before I couldn't tell you why I believed as I did but now having considered + tested I know precisely why I believe.

**Re: - posted by Solomon101, on: 2014/6/16 20:56**

I could write these out myself but would not be able to say it any better. This post and the next one will be from respected ministers with numerous sermons on the SI site.

This first one is from the highly regarded A.W. Pink - It now follows

At the cross all our sins were laid upon Christ and therefore divine judgment fell upon Him. There was no way of transferring sin without also transferring its penalty. Both sin and its punishment were transferred to the Lord Jesus. On the cross Christ was making propitiation, and propitiation is solely Godwards. It was a question of meeting the claims of God's holiness; it was a matter of satisfying the demands of His justice. Not only was Christ's blood shed for us, but it was also shed for God: He "gave himself up for us, a fragrant offering and sacrifice to God." (Ephesians 5:2). Thus, it was foreshadowed on the memorable night of the Passover in Egypt: the lamb's blood must be where God's eye could see it - "When I see the blood, I will pass over you!"

The death of Christ on the cross was a death of curse: "Christ has redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us: for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangs on a tree" (Galatians 3:13). The "curse" is alienation from God. This is apparent from the words which Christ will yet speak to those that shall stand on His left hand in the day of His power - "Depart from me, you cursed," He will say (Matthew 25:41). The curse is exile from the presence and glory of God.

This explains the meaning of a number of Old Testament types. The bullock that was slain on the annual Day of Atonement, after its blood had been sprinkled upon and before the mercy-seat, was removed to a place outside the Camp" (Leviticus 16:27), and there its entire body was burned. It was in the center of the camp that God had his dwelling-place, and exclusion from the camp was banishment from the presence of God. Thus, it was, too, with the leper. "All the days that t

he plague shall be in him he shall be defiled; he is unclean: he shall dwell alone; without the camp shall his habitation be" (Leviticus 13:46) - this was because the leper was the embodied type of the sinner. Here also is the anti-type of the "brazen serpent." Why did God instruct Moses to set a "serpent" on a pole and bid the bitten Israelites look upon it? Imagine a serpent as a type of Christ the Holy One of God! It represented him as "made a curse for us," for the serpent was the reminder of the curse. On the cross then Christ was fulfilling these Old Testament foreshadowings. He was "outside the camp" (compare Hebrews 13:12) - separated from the presence of God. He was as the "leper" - made sin for us. He was as the "brazen serpent" - made a curse for us. Hence too, the deep meaning of the crown of thorns - the symbol of the curse! Lifted up, his brow encircled with thorns, to show he was bearing the curse for us.

Adapted from The Seven Sayings of the Saviour on the Cross, 4. The Word of Anguish, by A.W. Pink.

article can be seen in full at <http://www.jesus.org/death-and-resurrection/the-crucifixion/how-did-jesus-become-a-curse-on-the-cross.html>

**Re: - posted by Solomon101, on: 2014/6/16 20:59**

This is the second one. It is from R.C. Sproul who also has a listing of quotes here on SI. It now follows-

The key to understanding the cry of Jesus from the cross is found in Paul's letter to the Galatians: "Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law by becoming a curse for us, for it is written: "Cursed is everyone who is hung on a tree" (Galatians 3:13, NIV).

To be cursed is to be removed from the presence of God, to be set outside the camp, to be cut off from His benefits. On the cross, Jesus was cursed. That is, He represented the Jewish nation of covenant breakers who were exposed to the curse and took the full measure of the curse on Himself. As the Lamb of God, the Sin Bearer, He was cut off from the presence of God.

On the cross, Jesus entered into the experience of forsakenness on our behalf. God turned His back on Jesus and cut Him off from all blessing, from all keeping, from all grace, and from all peace.

God is too holy to even look at iniquity. God the Father turned His back on the Son, cursing Him to the pit of hell while He hung on the cross. Here was the Son's descent into hell. Here the fury of God raged against Him. His scream was the scream of the damned. For us.

Reflect on what Jesus did for you on Calvary. Give thanks for the Lamb of God who bore your sin.

Taken from "Treasuring Redemption's Price" by Ligonier Ministries

Article can be viewed at <http://www.jesus.org/death-and-resurrection/the-crucifixion/jesus-became-a-curse-for-us.html>

**Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2014/6/16 21:27**

Part of the problem is that there is no explicit scripture that says God forsook Jesus. There is only implication and surmising from various passages.

For example no where does scripture say that Jesus' cry was the "scream of the damned" like Sproul says. It is powerful rhetoric but scripture does not state this.

**Re: - posted by havok20x, on: 2014/6/16 23:46**

Quote:  
----- no explicit scripture that says God forsook Jesus.  
-----

What about the verse in question and all the verses where God says he is going to utterly forsake us because of our sin, which Jesus became on the cross and endured all the promises that God made concerning judgment for those who would believe?

**General Topics :: Did the Father, turn his face away from Christ, His own son?**

The issue here is that there is a great misunderstanding what happened on the cross. I agree it is not essential to believe that Jesus was forsaken in order to be saved; I can understand that The Father did not turn away; however, why do I have to know all of these extra Biblical facts in order to come to those conclusions that were suggested earlier in this thread. Would a man from Swaziland, having nothing but the Scriptures and the Holy Spirit come to that conclusion? Doubt fully.

A plain reading of the Scriptures is so important.

**Re: - posted by brothagary, on: 2014/6/17 2:57**

if we are willingly ignorant of what it means to be a curse, then that will be why we say Jesus was not forsaken of the father

any one like to give definitions of what being cursed means add to that what does it mean to become sin and to bare sins, and have the wrath of god poured out upon you

this is the opposite of being blessed of god, Jesus was cursed of god and forsaken punished by the absolute wrath of god

to say Jesus was forsaken doesn't even come close to describe what Jesus went through for our sakes

he went through what we all should go through because of rebellion against god we should be forsaken and cursed from the presence of god

he tasted death for all men, what does it mean to die

death is the beginnings of the eternal separation, ( TO BE ETERNALLY FORSAKEN )

AND brothers that is what our lord did for you and me,

don't water down what he did for us, let it cause a broken spirit and tears

look at the expiation that Jesus suffered, as the lamb of god he suffered outside the camp, just as the lamb of god of the old testament was forced to wander outside of the city till it died, this is the shadow of Christ himself, that lamb was forsaken to death, this was all apart of the old testament atonement for sin, which Jesus fulfilled in its reality in the new covenant atonement

it is so very clear if one looks at the old and new covenant atonements blessing

**Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2014/6/17 6:39**

This question now comes to mind:

1) In Gethsemane, Jesus prayed that the Father would "let this cup pass from me." In the OT the "cup" is a picture of God's wrath against the ungodly. Jeremiah, Isaiah and Psalms speak about the cup in this manner.

2) in Mt. 20, we see the following exchange: "22 But Jesus answered and said, 'You do not know what you ask. Are you able to drink the cup that I am about to drink, and be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with?'"

They said to Him, 'We are able.'

23 So He said to them, 'You will indeed drink My cup, and be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with;'

So, how can it be said that the disciples would drink the cup of God's fury against sin, if Jesus drank it for them?

**General Topics :: Did the Father, turn his face away from Christ, His own son?**

If the cup is referencing physical suffering, it seems that each disciple did physically suffer for Christ. If the cup represents physical suffering and the pouring out of God's wrath, it is not clear in what manner the disciples would drink this cup as Jesus did.

Again I am drawing no firm conclusions just adding to the discussion.

Maybe persons here do not realize that there are differing views on the atonement that true believers hold.

**Re: - posted by brothagary, on: 2014/6/17 6:59**

you need to remember we were in Christ when he died ,,paul said if one died then all died ,,,,,,,,we were in Christ when the wrath of God was poured upon upon him it was poured upon us ,,,,,,,,i was crucified with Christ

this is why Jesus was quick to say you will drink my cup ,,,,,,,,very clear if we understand the mystery of being in Christ ,, changes nothing of the atonement brother

**Re: - posted by brothagary, on: 2014/6/17 7:31**

some people don't realize the atonement fulfilled the shadows of the old covenant ,,which included propitiation ,and expiation ,,both actions included the death of the innocent animal spotless and sinless ,,one was the blood offering which satisfied justice and appeased wrath ,,the other a sin bearer ,,which bore sin as sin was transferred to the lamb or to Jesus ,,and was driven out side the gate and the camp to die out of sight ,,left to suffer .that was the same reason why the cross was out side the camp it exactly shadowed the old covenant forsaken of all and left to die ,,,,,,,,

i also believe that the burnt offering was a shadow of Christ's descent into Hades ,,i know many don't believe that but i read Calvin believed this so i'm in good company with that one

it is written cursed is everyone who hangs on a tree ,,,,,,,where is it written;,,,,; in the old testament law ,,it was a judicial punishment of the law of Moses for a cursed sinner ,,Christ fulfilled that as well ,,it was commanded in the old covenant to take the body of the tree and bury it in a tomb with a large stone ,,,,,,,,i wonder who fulfilled that as well Jesus did

he even fulfilled the tithe and grain offering to God ;;;he was the first fruits ,,,,,,,he was everything to God holy and acceptable and well pleasing a present aroma ,,he was a burnt offering

he bore every curse that was given under the law to the sinner ,,that we might receive every spiritual blessing in the heavenly places

Jesus fulfilled the whole law as the righteous one ,and as the damned and forsaken sinner USS

lets us not take away the role that our creator Jesus played in the renewal of the creation through the new covenant ,,its amazing

blessings

**Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2014/6/17 7:51**

Don't get too excited Gary. In my heart of hearts I agree with you. We are just having a discussion. I don't think anyone here is trying to lessen or cheapen what Jesus did for us. I certainly appreciate your passion for this subject and you make excellent points.

**Re: - posted by havok20x, on: 2014/6/17 10:40**

Amen, Gary.

TMK,

I will simply say that the cup of which Jesus drank included everything he endured, including the wrath of God. Jesus, as our sacrifice that appeased the wrath of God (propitiation), has paid the debt that we needed to pay.

Now, to tell the disciples that they would drink of that cup is not saying that they will have to pay that penalty that Jesus did, but that they would also endure similar things--the persecution, rejection, suffering, etc.

**Re: - posted by InTheLight (), on: 2014/6/17 18:43**

I apologize for jumping into the discussion at this late stage but as I read some of the posts a question came to mind for those who hold the position that God did not forsake Jesus as He was on the cross; my question is this;

What is the punishment for sin?

In Christ,

Ron

**Re: - posted by trxx (), on: 2014/6/17 21:49**

Solomon101

While I look up to these two theologians that you have quoted from I must admit that I need to disagree. As a side note why don't you try to put your beliefs in your own words rather than to quote someone else. You say that you could write these out for yourself. It would be more interesting to read why you believe, how you formed your own theology regarding the forsaking of Jesus. Surely you believe because you have carefully considered the Scriptures and concluded that Jesus was forsaken. Tell me that you have not simply accepted the status quo because it is the most popular. I accepted the status quo until it was revealed to me otherwise. I was not searching for a different answer. I realize that you probably think that I am a little "out there" because I suggested that God gave me to understand why Jesus cried out from the cross as He did. You would have to have been there to understand that part of it + you would need to know me to even begin to consider that I might have actually received a revelation. You will know them by their fruit. I say all of this not in a prideful way but humbly + hesitantly to explain the origin of my belief. Yes, I have tested His voice as we ought to + have found nothing that contradicts His Word, nor in any way takes away from what Jesus did or accomplished on the cross for us. Actually, I find it quite refreshing to know that Jesus was not forsaken by the Father.

I can see that it would be a great word study to look at "curse" + see how it applies. But I have not done so as of yet.

RC Sproul especially embodies the traditional view. "God turned His back on Jesus". "God is too holy to even look at iniquity". I equate "hiding His face" with "turning His back." Perhaps you or others don't. What's the difference then? Surely we don't agree with Sproul that God is too holy to look at sin. He didn't have a problem looking at mine or yours. There is nothing hidden from His sight + that would have to include sin. Even by turning His back, as if He could turn away + not see something, nothing is hidden from Him.

I agree wholeheartedly with TMK. We need to be careful not to add to the testimony of Scripture by teaching or suggesting something that is not there no matter how small it might seem. He obviously has a very high view of Scripture, as do I

**Re: havok20x - posted by trxx (), on: 2014/6/17 22:13**

"What about the verse in question and all the verses where God says he is going to utterly forsake us because of our sin".

Here I go sticking my neck on the chopping block for all to have a hack. I believe that this whole teaching, the Father turning away and not being able to bear to look stems from trying to explain away the "cry of the cross." Jesus said it therefore it must be according to the "plain reading." Thankfully most of what is written in Scripture is of that very nature or few would have enough comprehension to be saved, not neglecting the power of the Holy Spirit working in man's heart to bring one to repentance. We don't need to know "all of these extra Biblical facts" to understand all of Scripture. But you must admit that understanding the historical + cultural background has given us a greater understanding of Scripture than if we had no background information. The man from Swaziland, without divine intervention, would not conclude what I am

suggesting. Admitted. But this is one of those times that having knowledge of these things enhances our own understanding.

"A plain reading of the Scriptures is so important." We can understand enough of His Word with a plain reading but knowing the times in which they were written will surely enhance our knowledge. Must we though? Surely not I would agree. You don't have to know all of these extra Biblical facts but they are evidence that there might be something more than the plain reading. If these were Jesus own words rather than Him quoting Psalm 22 than why did He say, "My God" when He always called Him Father. Not once did He use that manner of addressing Him while ministering + teaching. For me its just another piece of evidence that must be considered.

**Re: - posted by trxx (), on: 2014/6/17 22:31**

I think we all ought to remember that the promise to forsake is God's promise to forsake those that forsake Him (2 Chron 15:2). Jesus never once forsook the Father. I'm sure that someone would suggest that Jesus suffered that in our place as part of what we deserve. I get that as an argument. I simply no longer accept that Jesus was forsaken because He quoted the words from Psalm 22. It does not mean that He had to experience being forsaken to have said what He said (quoted). He knew the Father too well for that - to think for a second that the Father would abandon Him in the time of His greatest need. If He wanted simply to convey an emotional abandonment He could have stated it or cried out in His own words so that we would know He was not quoting David's cry. How about, "Where are You Father?"

**Re: - posted by Sree (), on: 2014/6/18 5:58**

God did not turn away his face because he cannot see his son being physically punished for our sins. God the father could not have fellowship with Jesus and forsake that fellowship that existed from eternity because my sins were put on Jesus. God is light and he cannot have fellowship with anyone who has sins. Because that fellowship was broken Jesus referred to God his father as "GOD" not as father. He always called him father so far.

Also if the fellowship was never broken then what was the cup that Jesus was crying to be taken from him in Gethsemane? Jesus was clearly not crying for the fear of Physical punishment for my sins, there are many martyrs who were Crucified singing praises to God. This makes Jesus weaker than those martyrs. He was crying because the Cup had my sins that will separate his fellowship with Father. The fellowship that was never broken from eternity.

I also believe that it is essential for a Christian to know that the fellowship was broken when Jesus hung on the Cross. It is not a matter of unimportance. Because we need to know the magnitude of Jesus's sacrifice for us. It was not just Physical sacrifice that he did for us, but spiritual as well. If it was only Physical pain and agony on the Cross then Apostle Peter who was crucified upside down went through a better sacrifice.

**Re: - posted by Sree (), on: 2014/6/18 6:10**

Quote:

1) In Gethsemane, Jesus prayed that the Father would "let this cup pass from me." In the OT the "cup" is a picture of God's wrath against the ungodly. Jeremiah, Isaiah and Psalms speak about the cup in this manner.

2) in Mt. 20, we see the following exchange: "22 But Jesus answered and said, 'You do not know what you ask. Are you able to drink the cup that I am about to drink, and be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with?'"

I have had this question in the past and the only possible explanation is the Cup was filled with different things here. The cup that Jesus referred to was clearly filled with God's wrath, my sins, punishment for my sins and cutting of fellowship with father. The disciples drank from the same cup as well. Jesus said to his father 'As you have sent me, I send these into the world'. So the disciples had the same role as Jesus had on the earth to represent father and to suffer for his name. So the cup is same, but what was poured into the cup was not wrath of God or our sins, but only Physical sufferings for God's name. When Stephen was stoned, he saw the father, father did not forsake him, unlike how Jesus died.

**God Cannot Look Upon Sin (Habakkuk 1:13)?, on: 2014/6/18 6:29**

God Cannot Look Upon Sin (Habakkuk 1:13)?

This idea that God cannot look upon sin or see evil probably comes from Habakkuk 1:13. In one translation, for example, it says this:

Your eyes are too pure to look on evil; you cannot tolerate wrong (NIV).

Ironically, the text then goes on to say that God does in fact tolerate wickedness and evil. Habakkuk is a book where the prophet asks numerous questions to God such as this one. The prophet Habakkuk looks around him at what is going on in the world and has trouble reconciling it with what He knows about God, and so He asks a whole series of challenging questions about God's behavior and actions. Habakkuk 1:13 is one of those questions—the first one actually.

Habakkuk does not believe that God cannot actually see evil. No, Habakkuk knows that God sees everything that goes on in the world. From the very beginning, God saw that Adam had sinned, and He saw when Cain killed His brother Abel, and He saw when the people on the earth became so wicked that a flood was going to destroy them all. We could go on and on throughout the Bible to see that God both knows the evil that is going on in the world, and He sees it. God sees every bit of evil in this world.

So to say that God cannot look upon sin is not accurate biblically, and is not what Habakkuk 1:13 teaches. Instead, it seems that what Habakkuk is saying is that God, by not seeming to do anything about evil, appears to be looking upon evil with approval. But we know that God does look upon evil in approval; He disapproves it. So how then is it that the treacherous seem to be in God's favor, and the wicked seem to win at everything? This is what Habakkuk is asking.

And if we look around in the world, we often have the same question. Why do the wicked prosper? Why do the treacherous thrive? (Jeremiah 12:1). Job asked a similar question as well in Job 21:7.

**Re: God Cannot Look Upon Sin (Habakkuk 1:13)?, on: 2014/6/18 6:35**

Many scriptures tell us that God is all-seeing. Here are a few:

☞ For the eyes of the Lord run to and fro throughout the whole earth, to show Himself strong on behalf of those whose heart is loyal to Him. ☞ 2 Chr. 16:9

☞ For His eyes are on the ways of man, And He sees all his steps. ☞ Job 34:21

☞ The Lord looks from heaven; He sees all the sons of men. From the place of His dwelling He looks On all the inhabitants of the earth; He fashions their hearts individually; He considers all their works. ☞ Ps. 33:13-15

☞ For the ways of man are before the eyes of the Lord, And He ponders all his paths. ☞ Prov. 5:21

☞ The eyes of the Lord are in every place, Keeping watch on the evil and the good. ☞ Prov. 15:3

☞ For My eyes are on all their ways; they are not hidden from My face, nor is their iniquity hidden from My eyes. ☞ Jer. 16:17

☞ You are great in counsel and mighty in work, for your eyes are open to all the ways of the sons of men, to give everyone according to his ways and according to the fruit of his doings. ☞ Jer. 32:19

☞ And there is no creature hidden from His sight, but all things are naked and open to the eyes of Him to whom we must give account. ☞ Heb. 4:13

**Re: - posted by Sree (), on: 2014/6/18 7:53**

God turning his face away from Jesus is just a reference to the broken fellowship or sonship. It does not literally mean that God stopped looking at Jesus on the cross.

**Re: - posted by havok20x, on: 2014/6/18 10:48**

Let us consider the Day of Atonement found in Leviticus 16, especially verses 20-22. Now these are shadows of things to come, namely the day Jesus Christ atoned for our sins.

The scapegoat had sins placed on it and then was driven out into the wilderness. Sounds familiar, right?

Jesus Christ is the fulfillment of those shadows. He is our scapegoat, having our sins placed upon Him. Just as the goat was to be in a desolate wilderness, so we see that in Psalm 22 and when Jesus was on the cross.

I don't need to explain away Jesus' cry. There are plenty of other scriptures, which we have named, to show that this isn't a single verse taken out of context.

Quote:

-----TRXX said:

We can understand enough of His Word with a plain reading but knowing the times in which they were written will surely enhance our knowledge. Must we though? Surely not I would agree.

This statement is not correct. If we truly believe that the scriptures are sufficient in and of themselves as our guide, used of the Holy Spirit to direct his children, and authoritative above all other writings, thoughts, or ideas of men, then we must live that out.

That means that anything outside of the scriptures, be it some supposedly historical fact, some experience, or some other writing that alters a plain reading of Scriptures, under the power of the Spirit, is unneeded and potentially dangerous. And if our understanding is adjusted because of those things, then we have stepped outside the confines of truth.

I know that is hard and that it is strict, but if we are talking about truth and talking about what Scripture means, then it must be this way.

So, the man in Swaziland has everything he needs for life and godliness, as provided by the Lord. He does not need Jewish history or traditions or anything other than the Holy Spirit to aid him in his understanding of the Scriptures.

We cannot "interpret" (as if our interpretation bore any weight) scriptures except through the scriptures. They are self-contained.

**Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2014/6/18 12:02**

That's a tough one. I agree that the Bible is self contained but cultural context is incredibly important to a proper understanding of some passages.

Just ask every Christian woman who doesn't wear a hat to church.

**Re: - posted by havok20x, on: 2014/6/18 14:24**

Quote:

-----I agree that the Bible is self contained but cultural context is incredibly important to a proper understanding of some passages.

Just ask every Christian woman who doesn't wear a hat to church.

I am going to post a new thread regarding this subject so as not to venture off into la-la land from the OP.

**General Topics :: Did the Father, turn his face away from Christ, His own son?**

**Re: God Cannot Look Upon Sin (Habakkuk 1:13 - posted by trxx (), on: 2014/6/18 14:52**

Thankyou TUC for the nice bit of research that you did to come up with those verses. It seems to me to fulfill 2 Timothy 2 :15, "Be diligent to present yourself approved to God as a workman who does not need to be ashamed, accurately handling the word of truth."

re havok20x I appreciate your desire to start a new post so as not to hijack the original post. I am not convinced that it would be a hijack as the basic premise to this conversation is that beyond the "plain reading" of the text there is much historical, cultural context so as to give a better understanding of what is spoken. You cannot possibly deny the importance of cultural understanding. We cannot read plainly every text outside the writer's context or the interpreter's culture. There are cultures where Judas would become a hero because of the cultural norm that epitomizes betrayal. There most certainly times when we need to isolate our own cultural understandings or those of the writers in order to understand what is being said. Matthew 24:36, "But of that day and hour no one knows, not even the angels of heaven, nor the Son, but the Father alone" is best understood in light of the first century engagement/marriage customs. So the words of Jesus' cry, "My God, My God, why have You forsaken Me?" are better understood within the cultural/historical context. The whole reason we have a variance of understanding concerning this verse is because some have tried to explain by means of a plain reading, foregoing any other influence, and the other side allowing for the cultural/historical influence. I read an English Bible but when it comes down to defining something of any significance I insist not on the definition of the English word but of the original language whether it be Hebrew or Greek. Its imperative for us to determine, as best we can, what the writer meant and not what the reader hears. There are times when they are at a variance. I certainly agree though a plain reading will do just fine for the most part.

**Re: - posted by trxx (), on: 2014/6/18 15:01**

re havok20x  
I do want to thank you even though so far we disagree because you have helped to clarify, in my opinion, why it is that there is a variance. There is a plain reading or a historical/cultural reading. Each interpretation has a desire to stay true to its premise.

**Re: - posted by havok20x, on: 2014/6/18 16:54**

At what point does a reader need the historical context, then? What is the determining factor? Is it at the moment when the reader is confused? Is it at the moment when it references something spiritual? Is it at the moment a metaphor is used? Is it with every scripture?

What if the scripture is referencing a little-known-fact? How do we know?

Quote:  
-----There are cultures where Judas would become a hero because of the cultural norm that epitomizes betrayal. There most certainly times when we need to isolate our own cultural understandings or those of the writers in order to understand what is being said.  
-----

I definitely agree with this statement. It is improper exegesis to read my cultural understanding of anything into the scriptures.

Quote:  
-----So the words of Jesus' cry, "My God, My God, why have You forsaken Me?" are better understood within the cultural/historical context.  
-----

What tips you off to this? The response of those people on the ground certainly didn't seem to indicate that they were now mulling over Psalm 22.

Here is the inherent danger of interpreting things via some supposed cultural context:

1) Has the source of the extra-biblical information been verified? Is it historically accurate? Is it a source that can be trusted? What source did they use to determine this? Why did God forget to put that part in the Scriptures if it was so important?

important to know in order to understand what He meant.

- 2) What scriptural support shows that this single verse should be interpreted via the context of the culture, altering our understanding of the event?
- 3) Why do the verses immediately adjacent not need to be interpreted that way?
- 4) Why is the context of the Scripture and the historical events as portrayed in scripture not sufficient for interpreting the passage?

Listen, brothers, do we actually believe Sola Scriptura? Is Scripture sufficient in and of itself? Or do we have to bring every single history book and word-of-mouth story into the equation for us to gain a proper understanding of Scripture?

Is it the final word in all matters of life and doctrine? If so, why is a plain reading of the scriptures being rejected?

**Re: - posted by brothagary, on: 2014/6/19 3:13**

good points havoc ,,i allways say let scripture intreprate scrpiture ,,let the clear verses shead light on the not so clear ,  
,,rather then the other way round ,,

like jesus being forsaken say

- 1 we no he bacame sin
- 2 we know he bore sin in his body
- 3 we know he became a curse
- 4 we know god punished jesus with his full wrath ,that we should have recieved
- 5 we know he was a scapgoat
- 6 we know he even died andf went to hell
- and 7 we know he said to god whay have you fosaken me
- 8 we know jesus nevered lied  
and the last one that tops it of in my books
- 9 we knowjesus was never wrong ,,but allways wright  
he knew the hearts of men ,,and he knew the heart of god
- 10 we know he said no one noes the father but the son

it is verry clear what the bible is telling us with the clear verses

so we let the WHAT WE KNOW  
interpret the WHAT WE DONT KNOW

but realy it allready clear that jesus knew he was forsaken for a time ,,but when you add the rest of the clear statments in  
scripture ,,its undeniable to the unbaised mind ,what jesus went through

each of these ten points of scripture ,,can be expounded and made even clearer and the ones that may be doubtfull ca  
n be discused ,,

**General Topics :: Did the Father, turn his face away from Christ, His own son?**

any one want to start at nubmer 1 an expound the verse „and relate that back to why they feel or dont feel this is relate d to jesus being forsaken

i like expository preaching for the reason that one cant ignore certaint verses „and gloss over them and developpe an e nemic theoligy laking viatal truth

blessings

**Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2014/6/19 6:30**

Hi Gary-

I have a side question for you that is not 100% related to the topic at hand.

You said: "we know Jesus was never wrong but always right."

I know that probably 99.9% of people would accept your statement at face value as true. But being a tad weird I someti mes think about things a little more deeply than perhaps I should.

I agree that Jesus never sinned. That is a given, of course. But I am not willing to state that Jesus was not ever wrong about a certain fact. I think this because Jesus divested Himself of deity when He became a man. I don't believe Jesus, in His humanity, was omniscient. He was very closely in tune with the Father particularly after His baptism so I am even talking more about when he was younger. For example, did He have perfect memory for every person's name he ever met? Did he ever have to use an eraser when learning math or spelling? (Of course I know they didn't have erasers but you get the point).

It does not subtract from the deity of Jesus to suggest that he may have been mistaken about certain facts at least a few times in His life. I know that this may seem shocking to some but the Bible does say that He grew in wisdom and knowl edge.

**Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2014/6/19 7:53**

In my last post I mid-spoke. I said that when Jesus became a man he divested himself of deity. That probably made a l ot of people gasp. What I meant to say was that he divested himself of certain attributes of deity.

I did not mean to make any statement suggesting that Jesus is not God.

**Re: - posted by brothagary, on: 2014/6/19 15:58**

I knew that would be one that would be questioned

tmk

if jesus made mistakes that we can tell ,then it onens up the door for him being mistaken when he taught,,i wont say it w as possible that he made mistakes for that reason ,,it opens a can of homosexual worms so to speak

does the scripture show he made a mistake ,,I cant find one

but the bible does say he kwew the hearts of men „and was the only one who knew god „so when he said to god that h e forsook him , he knew the heart of god and was not mistaken ,jesus credabilty in perfect dersirment and judgment in every matter is biblical don't you think

see ya igota go to work

**Re: - posted by havok20x, on: 2014/6/19 16:48**

Quote:  
-----I said that when Jesus became a man he divested himself of deity. That probably made a lot of people gasp. What I meant to say was that he divested himself of certain attributes of deity.  
-----

Which attributes?

**Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2014/6/19 18:04**

Omniscience, omnipresence and omnipotence to name three. I don't think there is any doubt about this. Even the very conservative gotquestions.com website agrees with this.

Just put "kenosis" in the search field.

I believe that Jesus made an immature error in judgment when he stayed behind at the temple without telling his parents when he was 12. I am not saying he sinned. But he should have known his folks would be worried sick. But he did grow in wisdom and stature.

**Re: - posted by havok20x, on: 2014/6/19 18:54**

Depends on what you saying. Are you saying that Jesus was not any of those three or that at will he restricted his use thereof.

Divested is a strong word. Jesus was fully God and Fully man. That is what the hypostatic union is all about. Jesus was omniscient, omnipresent, and omnipotent and clearly proved that throughout His life. He chose not to display those things as part of His humbling of Himself and submission to the Father.

Don't forget that God is also immutable.

**Re: - posted by havok20x, on: 2014/6/19 19:01**

And just to be clear Jesus did not have to develop a relationship of submission with the Father. He always had it.

**Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2014/6/19 20:15**

"And Jesus increased in wisdom and in stature and in favor with God and man." Lk. 2:52

I think we may simply have to agree to disagree on what "kenosis" means.

Jesus emptied himself of divine attributes when he became flesh. He voluntarily surrendered them. He became a servant.

Since he learned he was not omniscient. Since he got hungry and tired he was not omnipotent. He was like us.

He did not do miracles by his own power. He did them by the Holy Spirit and only at the Father's leading. He no longer had authority to create or act on his own. He was always submissive to the Father. And in his flesh I believe he grew in this regard. He was more in tune with the Father at age 30 than age 3.

**Re: - posted by trxx (), on: 2014/6/19 21:17**

"So, the man in Swaziland has everything he needs for life and godliness, as provided by the Lord. He does not need Jewish history or traditions or anything other than the Holy Spirit to aid him in his understanding of the Scriptures.

We cannot "interpret" (as if our interpretation bore any weight) scriptures except through the scriptures. They are self-contained."

I must disagree. But first I would begin by suggesting that the Holy Spirit can indeed aid "the man from Swaziland" to understand enough of Scripture for salvation and sanctification apart from any historical/cultural understanding. Having said

id that any person's understanding of Scripture, though not absolutely necessary, will be enhanced through understanding the historical/cultural context that envelope the Scriptures. There are 2 extremes, one is to deny any context and the other is to exaggerate the historical/cultural context such as the liberal theologian would so as to conclude that Jesus was simply a product of His times and only believed and taught those things because they were contemporary to His time. They would also suggest that we are much more learned, not having the same superstitions, and therefore we filter out everything that does not fit our current understanding. An example would be to deny His miracles (therefore His deity) by reason that they could not have taken place and must have been performed as a magician might today.

I would only suggest a balanced viewpoint.

We cannot lift any Scripture, including the one in question, out of its greater context and expect a complete understanding. We would never consider looking at the New Testament without the context found in the Old Testament. A plain reading of the New Testament could lead to some errant doctrines if we did not have the Old Testament.

I personally think that all of this is demonstrated in what I call the problem of language or communication. Have you ever had a misunderstanding or argument when someone misinterpreted something you said or vice versa and only after further conversation did you realize that they interpreted something you said to mean something else?

Any form of communication whether verbal or nonverbal has the potential to be misunderstood. Ask any relationship counselor and I'm certain that they would tell you that most arguments can be repaired when everyone is clearly understood as to what they meant. Too often what we hear is not what the other meant. And that's not even cross-culturally. Cross-culturally I might offend someone through something as benign as body language which would be a nonverbal form of communication. I mean only to be comfortable but sticking my foot into the aisle might greatly offend another culture because that's how they interpret such a gesture. I am innocent of any wrongdoing only because I did not mean to offend even though an offense was interpreted.

Another form of nonverbal communication is the written word. The example that we wish to deal with is Scripture. There are different times when Scripture was written and it was written by many different people even of various cultural backgrounds.

Try talking to a Mormon or Jehovah's Witness. They have learned to use a lot of the same words that evangelicals use. They might even seem very Christian in their beliefs. But we need to understand how they encode the words that we speak and how we decode those same words that they have spoken. That's part of the problem of language. Each one of us, no matter the culture that we live in, encode our words with meaning that might differ from those that are hearers to our words. Each hearer decodes our words according to their own understanding. Multiply the potential for misunderstanding by communicating with a person of a different culture. That's what we are doing when we read the Bible. Can the average man, with the aid of the Holy Spirit, comprehend enough so as to be saved and to grow in faith. Undoubtedly yes.

But we do need to interpret and understand each part in its greater context.

For example, take the verse in question, "My God, My God, why have You forsaken Me?" Those who deny the deity of Jesus are quick to ask why would Jesus call the Father God if Jesus were God? Therefore Jesus must not be God. But we tell them that these words must be understood in the greater context of Scripture which has much to say about His deity. We cannot allow them a "plain reading" of this verse. It must be interpreted in its context. We differ somewhat on what the greater context of this verse is. I suggest that we do well to evaluate it according to its context, be it Scriptural, cultural and historical.

I've already gone on long enough but bear with me a moment longer. Look at verse 6 of Psalm 22, "But I am a worm, and no man." I used to interpret that to mean an earthworm. There is much that can be illustrated from such an understanding. But when you look at the Hebrew word, "TOLA'ATH", which means "Crimson worm" or "Scarlet worm". Sometimes the word is translated scarlet or crimson or, in this case worm. But it loses significant meaning by not being properly translated as scarlet worm. Take a peek at <http://www.discovercreation.org/newsletters/TheCrimsonOrScarletWorm.htm>

and you will understand. Here is a perfect example of better understanding because now we know why the writer (David), under the direction of the Holy Spirit, chose the word that he did. We would not get the significance if we read the plain meaning of "worm." If we did not dig into the greater context we would never know this nugget of truth.

So I reiterate that though it is not necessary for salvation or sanctification it most certainly edifies us to know the Scripture

**General Topics :: Did the Father, turn his face away from Christ, His own son?**

al + historical + cultural context of Scripture.

**Re: - posted by havok20x, on: 2014/6/19 21:22**

TMK, that is the essence of many of the dangerous teachings at Bethel--that Jesus was a man who simply had the right relationship with the Father....

It affects the atonement greatly and the understanding of who we are and how we become so in Christ. Very dangerous theology.

**Re: - posted by brothagary, on: 2014/6/20 4:52**

why I have a problem in that line of thinking „because the scripture doesn't in any clear statements support what you said about Jesus making mistakes

the only example you gave was what we can only call an assumption, it is not at all a clear verse saying Jesus made a mistake in judgment ,,,,,,,it could easily be said and rightly so that Jesus' parents made an error of judgment but Jesus was following God's will when he was at the temple ,,because the Bible says he did the will of the father

see that's what I was saying before we should use the clear verse like Jesus only does what he sees the father doing and says what the father tells him to say ,,use that to interpret the part about him being in the temple ,,rather than ignore the clear statements as you just did brother TMK

**Re: - posted by brothagary, on: 2014/6/20 4:59**

am just wondering TMK does the Bible say he emptied his self of his divine attributes or does it say something else ,, and you are adding the words divine attributes

**Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2014/6/20 6:45**

What the kenosis means had nothing to do with Bethel or any place else. Not sure where that came from. It is what it is.

Do you think Jesus was praying when he was in the manger. Jesus became a human being.

Like I said even the gotquestions.com agrees with this and that site is very conservative.

I think your reformed theology may be for some reason afraid to admit that Jesus really emptied himself. It's not a bad thing. He was still God. But it was part of God's plan.

**Re: - posted by brothagary, on: 2014/6/20 7:03**

who was that to ,,i just want the scripture that says what you said mmmi dont recall Paul saying what you said about Jesus separating himself from divine attributes ,,where does it say that

but i know he claimed to be the great I am full stop ,,no add msg ,,or he wasn't a cup of skim milk with the cream taken out ,,he was the full cream milk the best you can get

what were those verses again where it says he gave up his God attributes

brother who cares what got your answers dot com says ,,we have the bible dot com what does it say

**Re: - posted by brothagary, on: 2014/6/20 7:15**

it think whast the proplem is that god has devine atrabutes and a god that doesnt have thoses atrabutes is not god ,,s o if jesus was the great iam ,as he said and he was a man then he must have the atrabutes to both god and man ,,if a c hicken doesnt have the atrabutes of chicken then its not kfc ,,maby its macdonadls you would have to cheak the atrabut es

we have a bird in australia called a peacok ,,but it doesnt look so glorious becasue its glory is hiden but when it reliese st its glory wow [https://www.google.com.au/search?q=photos+of+a+peacock&tbm=isch&tbo=u&source=univ&sa=X&ei=aBekU6nqFofHkAWWhi4DgBg&sqi=2&ved=0CBsQsAQ&biw=1088&bih=515#facrc=\\_&imgdii=\\_&imgrc=IOHGKbvEq1f0-M%253A%3B9yykDIdD-u0vjM%3Bhttp%253A%252F%252Fupload.wikimedia.org%252Fwikipedia%252Fcommons%252F6%252F62%252FPeacock\\_Wooing\\_Peahen.jpg%3Bhttp%253A%252F%252Fcommons.wikimedia.org%252Fwiki%252FFile%253APeacock\\_Wooing\\_Peahen.jpg%3B1200%3B896](https://www.google.com.au/search?q=photos+of+a+peacock&tbm=isch&tbo=u&source=univ&sa=X&ei=aBekU6nqFofHkAWWhi4DgBg&sqi=2&ved=0CBsQsAQ&biw=1088&bih=515#facrc=_&imgdii=_&imgrc=IOHGKbvEq1f0-M%253A%3B9yykDIdD-u0vjM%3Bhttp%253A%252F%252Fupload.wikimedia.org%252Fwikipedia%252Fcommons%252F6%252F62%252FPeacock_Wooing_Peahen.jpg%3Bhttp%253A%252F%252Fcommons.wikimedia.org%252Fwiki%252FFile%253APeacock_Wooing_Peahen.jpg%3B1200%3B896)

**Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2014/6/20 9:10**

Gary-

Phil. 2:5-8

Have this mind among yourselves, which is yours in Christ Jesus, 6 who, though he was in the form of God, did not count equality with God a thing to be grasped, 7 but emptied himself, by taking the form of a servant, being born in the likeness of men. 8 And being found in human form, he humbled himself by becoming obedient to the point of death, even death on a cross.

**Re: - posted by dfella (), on: 2014/6/20 9:19**

Brothagary,

I have a question regarding Jesus going to hell. What is your understanding as to which hell the bible is referring to in the scriptures?

Was it the place of eternal torment (geenna used 12 times in the NT) or was it the place of departed spirits (hades used 11 times in the NT)?

Both of these places are referred to as hell in the New Testament.

This is a very important question because there are some that teach Jesus went to eternal torment (geenna) and not simply the place of departed spirits which is defined by the Greek word hades which the scriptures clearly teach was Abraham's Bosom, Paradise.

BD

**Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2014/6/20 9:27**

It is important for me to note that I believe this emptying was voluntary on the part of Jesus in that he \*chose\* not to exercise them.

I guess you could say that he veiled these attributes while he was in human form. He didn't lose them but did not exercise them.

Jesus did not know how many planets there were in the solar system when he was lying in the manger. All he did as a baby was poop cry and eat like all human babies. I know this may seem strange for some to consider but it is true.

**General Topics :: Did the Father, turn his face away from Christ, His own son?**

Gary the Bible does not explicitly state that Jesus never made a mistake in fact. The issue is whether he might have. When he learned the Hebrew alphabet did he never write a letter slightly the wrong way? When he learned carpentry did he never once measure wrong? We can't confuse sinless perfection with mistakes or errors. I am not talking about moral errors because I have repeatedly affirmed that Jesus was sinless.

**Re: - posted by havok20x, on: 2014/6/20 11:25**

Quote:  
-----I guess you could say that he veiled these attributes while he was in human form. He didn't lose them but did not exercise them.  
-----

This is entirely different than the word "divested". Divested means to shed off. Like clothes or armor or something like that. It is the language that many use to promulgate false teachings--Bethel is a good example, which is why I used it. They teach that Jesus was not God while on this earth. That is called kenoticism. There are also those who teach that Jesus was only partly God while on earth, and that is equally wrong.

I agree that Jesus veiled yet retained all His attributes. Such as his glory and holiness. His ministry would have been quite a bit different had He been displaying those all the time--everyone falling down trembling all the time. That is part of the great mystery of the Hypostatic Union--Jesus was and is now fully God and fully man. Jesus is submissive to the Father, and has been so for all eternity--although they are equally God (Doctrine of Eternal Generation). The Trinity is also a marvelous mystery! The only thing that was restraining Jesus from knowing certain things was His own will.

Do I believe that Jesus had to develop a relationship with the Father? No. But that is only because His coming in the flesh was a part of His will. He knew who He was. He did not have to discover it or figure it out. He knew. Even 12-year-old Jesus knew He had to be about His Father's business.

\*\*\*\*\*

In response to my "reformed theology". I am not a Calvinist. I am a Christian.

My theology changes and grows daily as I read the Scriptures and seek the Lord. I haven't figured all this out and I don't know almost anything. What I have, I cannot boast as if I discovered it myself, because I have not received it from myself, but the Lord.

Do the things that I believe line up with a lot of reformed teachings. Yes, in some instances. Was I raised that way. Not at all. I was raised (once I became a Christian) more Arminian than anything else. Do I sit under the banner of Calvinism and proudly display it? "God forbid that I should boast except in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom the world was crucified to me and I to the world."

\*\*\*\*\*

To wrap it up. I believe Jesus was forsaken by the Father, as a part of the will of God. I believe that the Scriptures clearly show that Jesus suffered under the wrath of God, whether you read a supposed cultural context into them or not. I believe Jesus did reference Psalm 22, not to remind them about the Psalm, but because the Psalm was being fulfilled, just as He did many other times with other Scriptures. I do not believe Jesus made mistakes.

I enjoyed this discussion.

**Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2014/6/20 15:14**

I didn't mean to sound as if I was disparaging reformed theology. Some of my favorite Bible teachers are reformed. I just disagree on some points (like Calvinism) which of course is a fairly big part.

So havok.. You sort of answered my question because you said you don't think Jesus ever made a mistake. Does this mean that you would affirmatively state that Jesus was the perfect student, carpenter, recaller of peoples' names etc? In other words would you affirm that not only did he exhibit sinless perfection but also everything-else-perfection?

I am sorry if it seems I am trying to pin you down but I am curious on what basis you say this because Heb 2:17 says that

**General Topics :: Did the Father, turn his face away from Christ, His own son?**

t he was like us in every way and a hallmark of humans is that they make errors.

In other words I am not sure what in your theology compels you to think that Jesus knew how to tie his sandals on the very first try or that he never tripped and skinned his knee because he didn't watch where he was walking. Scripture also says that he is able to sympathize with our weaknesses.

Seriously not trying to pick on you just trying to understand. Perhaps I am dead wrong in my thinking.

**Re: - posted by havok20x, on: 2014/6/20 17:17**

That's alright, TMK.

I really don't plan to discuss this anymore, at least at this time. The Scripture makes it clear that Jesus was perfect. It doesn't show that He made mistakes like the ones of which you are speaking. So how can I formulate a contrasting opinion. The best I can say is, "Scripture doesn't teach/show/discuss that." And the most negative I can say is simply, "I don't know." Either one is a valid answer from me.

I really feel like we are venturing into speculative theology now.

**Re: - posted by brothagary, on: 2014/6/21 0:56**

that was my point tmk scriptures does not actual say he seperated him self from devine atrbutes

**Re: - posted by brothagary, on: 2014/6/21 1:19**

yea veiling his atrabutes was bibical ,there was nothing stoping him from expressing them as he did when he trasfigure d him self

tmk ,,not having full revalation knowlage as we know jesus did not have becace he said he did not know when he was coming back ,,nor who was to sit at his right and left hand is what we are talking about ,,that is not the same as making mistakes

no brother i think the issue is what does the bible say, did he make a mistake any where that we can know for sure that he did ,,rather then look to hoptothecal questions and make asuptions based off that ,,thats not exageusa of scripture t hats isogesus ,,we dont need the bible to do that

when the bible says he was like us ,,that doesnt mean he made mistakes ,,,,what was the context of that verse ,,the thrust of that verse is conected to the surrounding verse ,,and no where is making mistakes even implied ,,that again is isogesus ,,read into to the tex for somthing that is not realy there ,,we dont creat a doctrine like jesus made mistakes from a verse we read into like that ,it is dishonest to the text and the thrust of what is being taught in thoses texts

context was temptation nothing more is being taught in thoses verses brother

we need to stik with the clear scripture about jesus and let that shed light on our questions and doubts ,,not take a verse out of context like that and say ,,,, see that says he made mistakes ,,jehovas witness do that with jesus and they dont have jesus as a result of there isogesus,,,,im not comparing you with a jw not at all ,,it just an example of not using clear scripture to give light to the not so clear

blessings