

PLAIN SPEECH

Volume 3 – Issue 6 – 22 November 2009

“Seeing then that we have such hope, we use great plainness of speech” (2 Cor. 3:12)

BY SCOTT PARKER

THE SUBSTITUTION THEORY IS A FALSE DOCTRINE

Many people in the denominational world advocate the substitution theory. Here's the idea behind such: Christ died on the cross as a substitute for man. God transferred our sins to Christ, and He, in our place, bore the punishment that we deserve. RUBBISH!! (as we will soon see).

Sadly, some members of the church have also bought into the erroneous substitution theory. For instance, many blindly sing songs like “**In the Glory of His Cross**” and “**Hallelujah, What a Savior**” which clearly advocate that Christ was our substitute. Moreover, some who've rendered initial obedience also promote the theory from pulpits and in writing. Consider the following words of a favorite “sound” preacher in the eyes of many: “*Jesus on the cross, was burdened by all the sins of the world; thus the pure eyes of God could not look upon the scene. For a period of time he turned away from it. God's law had been broken and someone had to pay the penalty. Jesus was qualified to do this because he had no sin. As we sing, 'He bore it all.' All the sins of the world were on Jesus – murder, adultery, dishonesty, jealousy, and the list is ad infinitum. As we also sing, 'He carried my sins with Him there'” (“Have Ye Not Read” – Guardian of Truth – 2 March 1989).*

Having briefly described the damnable (2 Jn. 9) substitution theory, and having noted that it is not just an error unique to denominationalists, let's now see some of the reasons why the substitution theory is a false doctrine.

REASON #1 – THE BIBLE DOES NOT SAY THAT JESUS WAS OUR SUBSTITUTE

We can read about Jesus being our substitute in denominational creeds and “brotherhood” papers, but does the Bible ever state such? Think about it, is there a passage of scripture which states that Jesus was our substitute? No. Is the word “substitute” even in the New Testament? No. Is there a passage that states “*Christ died in our stead?*” No. Does it not seem strange that if Jesus was our substitute that the scriptures do not specifically state such? Now listen, I know there are some who twist the Word of God (2 Pet. 3:16) to fit their precious substitution theory. I will deal with some of their violent acts momentarily.

REASON #2 – THE DOCTRINE MAKES MEN INTO GOD

How so, you ask? Common sense answers the query. If Jesus was our substitute, that means each of us was predetermined to die as the sinless sacrifice for sins. It was supposed to be us, but Jesus was our substitute per the doctrine. Thus, understanding deity was to be the perfect sin sacrifice (Jn. 1:1, 14, 29) and understanding that only deity could be a proper sacrifice (Heb. 9:11-14), then it must follow that men be counted divine since Christ was a substitute. A substitute is of the same kind and class as the real thing! For instance, if a teacher needs a substitute; who does he call? Another teacher. Both are teachers. Per the substitution theory both men and Christ are divine. Give me a break. How stupid! Yes, stupid.

REASON #3 – THE DOCTRINE LEADS TO UNIVERSAL SALVATION

Per the substitution theory everyone winds up in heaven. If Christ already did it all, if He already removed the curse of sin, and if He has already dealt with the sin problem by assuming the sins of mankind (past, present and future), then there is nothing that will keep any from heaven (cf. Isa. 59:1-2). A famous Baptist named Charles Spurgeon said it this way, “*Where was the use of a Substitute if I am to bear it also? Should Satan come before God to lay an accusation against me, the answer is, 'This man is dead. He has borne the penalty, and is dead to sins, for the sentence against him has been executed upon another.' What a wonderful deliverance for us!*” (<http://www.asermon.com/books/spurgeon-tilhecome-sin-bearer.html>). The Bible does not teach universal salvation (Mt. 7:13-14, 21-23).

REASON #4 – THE DOCTRINE IS A DOCTRINE OF FAILURE

In what way did Jesus take our place? Was he our substitute for physical death? No (Heb. 9:27). Was Jesus a substitute for our spiritual death? No (Lk. 23:43). Jesus did not end up our substitute physically or spiritually, thus one must conclude that Jesus, if He really was to be our substitute, failed to accomplish His job. Good luck getting into heaven calling God a failure.

REASON #5 – THE DOCTRINE TWISTS SCRIPTURE

We'll note two of the favorite passages of the substitution advocates. They love 2 Cor. 5:21; yet, fail to recognize the passage, per the original language, teaches Christ was made a sin-offering, not made sin (took on our sins). Also, they fail to consider that their twisting of the passage contradicts Heb 4:14-15; 7:22-27. They also love 1 Pet. 2:24. However, they fail to understand that the conclusion they draw from said text contradicts other passages (Heb. 4:14-15, et al) and is not the inspired commentary on the verse; i.e. that Christ offered up His body as the acceptable sin-sacrifice (cf. Heb 9:26-28).