

The Saving Work of Christ, II

Let us continue our study of Christ's saving work, but this time with a survey of five prominent historical views. I am not trying to be comprehensive here but rather representative of some of the most important ideas in the history of the Christian church concerning the work of Christ. No one of these views is perfect. They all have something good about them, although some of them have some very serious drawbacks and they are far worse than better.

Of the historical views of the atonement, the first we will look at is the ransom to Satan view. The early fathers painted a variety of pictures and there was no formal thesis written on the atonement until Anselm around the year 1100, which was the satisfaction view, the second one we will discuss. But the predominant view in the early church would have been the ransom to Satan view. This is the notion that Christ's death was a price paid to Satan to purchase the release of the prisoners. The theology behind it was that Satan had gotten prisoners at the Fall. Satan had a claim on humanity, God is viewed as the redeemer who is out to rescue the human race, and Christ's death is thus paid to Satan. Are there elements of truth in this? Yes. I should mention at times it went to ridiculous extremes and there developed a motif of divine deception. I believe it is Gregory of Nyssa who painted the picture of God fishing and he uses the humanity of Christ as the bait to catch that big, nasty fish, Satan, and he just chomps down on the bait only to find that there is a golden hook of Christ's deity underneath. The divine logos is playing the line and reeling in the devil. We cringe at some of these ideas of God deceiving the devil. In fact, we react favorably overall by raising fair questions such as what claim does the devil have over humanity anyway? And what does God owe the devil except a good, swift kick in the pants? I mean, He does not have to buy him off and certainly He uses no deception.

There is some truth to it: Christ's death is a ransom; He does redeem, and He accomplishes redemption. As a matter of fact, the Bible takes this imagery and presents us as slaves who could say to the evil one, "We are children of the devil." The first few verses of Ephesians 2 come close to portraying us as those who do the devil's will. He does not have any claim, but we kind of belong to him by default, and the Bible presents Christ as redeeming, paying a redemption price in His blood, found in 1 Peter 1. Where this theory goes afoul is that it extends the biblical imagery and has God paying Christ's ransom to the devil. The Bible never does that. If you have got to have the ransom paid somewhere, it would be paid to God Himself. The Bible does not even do that so I would rather not extend the imagery. There is no buying off of the devil.

There is, in another strain of biblical teaching, the cross directed to Satan to defeat him. There is a destruction metaphor. Christ is the champion who defeats our enemies, including the devil. Hebrews 2, for example, tells us that the Son of God became a human being. "Since the children have flesh and blood, he too shared in their humanity so that by His death He might destroy him who holds the power of death—that is, the devil"—not only is there destruction imagery, but also redemption: "and free those"—that, is redeem those—"who all their lives were held in slavery by their fear of death." So the church fathers were not making this stuff up, they just were stitching together the biblical data in a way that went beyond the biblical bounds of legitimacy. So yes, Christ's death was a ransom. Yes, He redeemed sinners. Yes, the cross was directed toward Satan, but not to pay him off, not to fool him. He did not have anything owed him except condemnation, which he will get. This view goes too far and it is a misdirection and misunderstanding, although there is some truth to it.

Satisfaction is the view of Anselm, who was ultimately Archbishop of Canterbury. He lived from approximately 1033 to 1109. We do not know his birth date for sure. I will give you some dates for Origen and Gregory as well. Origen lived from approximately 185 AD to approximately 254. We are not

positive of those dates—they are estimates. We know Gregory's birth date was 330 AD. We are not sure when he died, but possibly around 395. Anselm made one of the major accomplishments in the history of the Christian church, which was the first major treatise on the work of Christ in his *Cur Deus Homo*, or *Why God Became A Man*. He used feudal imagery. He lived in the Middle Ages in a feudal system and he portrayed God as the Lord of the manor. The picture of God in each of these views is very important. The picture of God and the picture of human need sets you up for how the cross is portrayed. Here, God is the Lord of the manor whose honor has been offended. God's honor, offended by the Fall, demanded one of two things: either satisfaction or punishment. Anselm set up the formula. It was a choice. It is very important because here he differs from Luther and Calvin, who taught satisfaction through punishment. Anselm no doubt set the stage for their contributions. They are Anselmic in that sense, but Calvin and Luther have more than this satisfaction view of the atonement, though they do have it. They gave it a little different twist. I would say they improved upon it. When Anselm taught God, the Lord of the manor, the world, he was extrapolating from his own feudal context. God's honor was attacked in the Fall, and a terrible injustice was done to God Himself. Now God became a man. Why the God-man? The title of his treatise, *Why the God-Man*, answers that human beings could not rescue themselves and God, the Lord of the manor, sought to rescue them. God became a man because only God could save us. Thus Anselm strongly affirmed the deity of Christ. It was only appropriate for a human being to save us because human beings got us into trouble in the first place. It was appropriate for a man to redeem us, but a mere man could not redeem us. That is why the redeemer had to be God and man in one person. Only God had the ability, but only for man was it fitting to make redemption since man transgressed in the first place and gave God the gigantic slap in the face that was the Fall.

The God-Man's death had infinite value, but not because He was a man—in that sense even for Christ His death was owed God—but because He was the God-man. It was the work of supererogation; it earned a surplus, it is kind of commercial, it is kind of tacky, it is kind of mathematical. I agree. We give the man great credit for what he has done, but nevertheless the theory as well. The God-man's death had infinite value by virtue of His divine nature. It restored the divine honor, thus God chose the track of satisfaction rather than punishment. There was no punishment. Anselm does not teach that Christ suffered the punishment that we sinners deserved. That is one of Luther's two major ideas. That is one of Calvin's main ideas as well. No, either satisfaction or punishment, and God chose satisfaction. It is not the divine wrath that is propitiated; the divine wrath is not satisfied; it is the divine honor that is satisfied. God's honor is restored through the Son of God making satisfaction in His death. This is a gigantic step forward in the history of the doctrine of the atonement because the cross is directed toward whom? It is directed toward God Himself. It is a God-centered atonement. This is basically right. We will see in a moment that the liberal views of the atonement direct the cross toward mankind and the ransom to Satan view. Although having some truth to it, fundamentally that was off in that most profoundly the cross is directed toward God. Secondarily, it is a defeat of our enemies. The church fathers had the cross chiefly designed to buy off the devil. That was wrong. Anselm set matters right. The cross is directed toward God Himself. One way to take the temperature of modern views of the Gospel even is to ask two questions: where is the cross directed and was it necessary for Jesus to die? Most modern views say the cross was directed toward human beings to change our attitudes, to change our feelings, to move us in some way, and if they were honest, they would say it was not necessary for the Son of God to die. God could have demonstrated His heart in other ways. For Anselm, it was necessary for Christ to die, given God's desire to save humanity. There was no internal necessity within the God-head that demanded this Incarnation and death, but given the Fall, given the slap in the face that God receives in the Fall, if God were to redeem sinners then there was a consequent necessity for Christ to come and die. Anselm would say it was necessary. There was no other way that the divine honor could be restored than through the death of the Son of God. It is true this view is marred by feudal imagery, but nonetheless, it is fundamentally right. I give it credit for its God-centeredness, but the Bible

does not present the cross as chiefly designed to rectify God's besmirched honor. The view is not quite biblical in that way. God is not presented as the Lord of the manor, rather, He is the Lord of the universe, and we need to think more in terms of the biblical attributes of God and how the cross shows divine justice, love, wisdom, power, and so forth to do a complete job. Furthermore, Anselm rejected the notion that the cross is directed toward the evil one. God did not owe the devil anything except the gallows. No, God's presentation of His Son on the cross was directed toward God Himself.

Anselm has been unjustly criticized for being a cold, calculating, medieval logician and not a warm theologian. These critics misunderstand literature. This is in a form of a dialogue between Anselm, the teacher, and Boso, the pupil. It is so obviously stylized. It is a kind of medieval dialectic. They meander, they go down some false roads, and they come back. Boso says things like, "Oh wonderful master, now I see it plainly." Then they get to the true view, which is Anselm's view. It is very logical. It is not warm, but if one were to even just skim *The Prayers and Meditations of St. Anselm* translated by Benedicta Ward, you can hardly read any one of them without being moved spiritually. He just cries out, "Oh, Son of God who loved me and gave Himself for me," and on like that, page after page, those are his prayers and meditations. So keeping the different genres distinct helps us see he was not cold at all, but when one did academic treatise-type work at the time, one worked in terms of dialectic and that is what he did. And when one poured his heart out to God, that was a different form. He does both and let us let him be himself.

Let us move on to the moral influence theory. No sooner had Anselm given the satisfaction view than Peter Abelard—who was a brilliant guy but got himself in trouble repeatedly in all kinds of ways—rejected not only the ransom to Satan, which he regarded as mythological, but also Anselmic satisfaction, which he regarded as unworthy of the Bible's portrait of God. Now Abelard was a controversial figure. He was a maverick in his day, and there is no doubt about it. He lived from 1079 to 1142 AD. He began his career by stealing the pupils of William of Champeaux. He went and heard the master and said, "I can do better than he could." He was right; he did, and he stole the guy's pupils away. That type of thing just was not considered acceptable in the Middle Ages, but he was a maverick. Furthermore, he scandalized Bernard of Clairvaux and other worthies by his teaching style. I think he had good intention but this was not fashionable in the late 11th/early 12th century either. He had his famous *Sic et Non*, yes and no. He lined up biblical statements and quotations from the church fathers, even Augustine, the crown of the fathers, and he put the biblical statements and even Augustine's on both sides of the ledger yes and no, giving opposite answers to questions. Was he really a relativist ahead of his time? No, nor a proto-liberal, as he has been called. He wanted to make his students think. He wanted to show them that theology is not a simple matter of just gathering together these authorities, but that one really had to think. He did not think things ultimately contradicted, but it sure looked like it to Bernard and others. He also got himself into some trouble with Heloise, but I will leave the rest of that story for another time. His end was not happy. He got into trouble with the church and in moral trouble with Heloise. Her uncle did not think very well of that at all and had him attacked and castrated—it was a bad story. But anyway, his love letters to Heloise are a famous part of church history. He was tutoring a young teenage girl and got in trouble. Anyway, he was brilliant. He was a magi—a brilliant guy who could not quite keep on the right side of the ecclesiastical law.

Christ did not die to pay off the devil and He certainly did not die to rectify God's honor. That is not worthy of God either. No, Abelard said that rather the problem is we are afraid of God and we are ignorant of God, so Christ died to demonstrate God's love for us, to dispel our fear, and to remove our ignorance. Where is the cross directed chiefly for Abelard? Toward man, toward human beings. Now this is somewhat unfair. As I said, he has been called a liberal ahead of his day and so forth. He had many ideas in his writings. Richard Winegart has written *The Logic of Divine Love and the Analysis of*

the Soteriology of Peter Abelard, which shows he was very traditional in incorporating all kinds of biblical imagery, including redemption—not to buy off the devil—and sacrifice. He could sound much more traditional. It is true that this theory was propounded in his mature work, *Commentary on Romans*, so I think maybe it was his major idea, but he certainly had other ideas as well. Nevertheless, his major idea falls short. Did Christ die to demonstrate God's love for us? Yes, Romans 5:8 says the very thing: "God demonstrates His own love for us in this: while we were still sinners, Christ died for us." But if you ask me why that is the case, I would say because, most profoundly, the work of Christ was directed toward God Himself, to assuage His righteous anger and so forth. And in that the cross is God-ward and saving, then secondarily, it is an example and a demonstration; it is didactic. It teaches us about the love of God, it is true, but only because it is atoning—only because it deals with sin. So Abelard has a right idea, but if you make a man-ward perspective of the cross your major idea, as modern theology has, you are in trouble because there is no forgiveness. In those systems any need for forgiveness is usually not seen either. And likewise, it is not necessary for Christ to die because God could have showed His love in other ways. In short, Abelard has more ideas than this one, but it does seem to be his prominent one because it is most prominent in the *Romans* commentary, which was a very mature work on his part.

The Socinians, Lelio and his nephew Fausto, reacted to the teaching of the Reformers. Lelio Sozzini lived from 1525 to 1562 AD and Fausto from 1539 to 1604 AD. They taught a radical theology for the 16th century, to be sure. Rome had warned the German monk Luther if you break with the holy mother church, you will open up a Pandora's Box of evils and all kinds of cults and sects will come forth. Rome was right and Protestantism has suffered with a problem of subjectivity from the beginning. The major Reformers countered this with creed, catechism, and confession to try to bring some stability and they lamented all the different teachings that went out. These particular Italian thinkers, the Sozzinis or Socinians, taught—though they denied the Trinity—that Jesus was only a man. This is liberalism before its time. There is a direct link between Socinianism and Unitarianism, which continues in our day. The human Jesus died to demonstrate perfect love for God. That is what we need. We need to love God more. My how God gave us an example to really love Him! And we follow Jesus' example of love for God in order to be saved. Obviously the cross is directed toward us. It is merely an example. If you ask me if the cross is presented as an example in the Scriptures, my answer is yes. Is it primarily presented as an example? No. Think of Philippians 2: "Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus." The epitome of humility is the Son of God who counted the Philippians more important than Himself and who not only looked out for his own personal interests—He did not look out for them—but He looked out for their interests. I have said that before. But the only reason the cross is a great example of humility, obedience, love, and all kinds of things, is because it is redemptive. So here again is a good idea—though I hesitate to even say it is a good idea because they have got no Trinity or deity of Christ. Although they have some verses they can appeal to, their framework is just horrendous. There is no gospel. British and American Unitarianism has its roots in this Italian anti-trinitarianism. Fausto ended up in Poland and there are Socinian churches, which taught this same heresy. Death was the end of human beings, except for those who faithfully followed Jesus' example—they would enjoy resurrection. For the rest of the human race, death was the end. You ask, "How does this square with the biblical teaching concerning the Trinity, the deity of Christ, eternal heaven and hell, and many other things?" I will not try to begin to try to justify it. It was not good teaching.

Notice, again, that we can evaluate theories of the atonement based upon the direction of the cross. In Abelard's moral influence theory and in Christ's death as a mere example or chiefly an example as in Socinianism and the old liberalism, the cross is primarily directed to human beings. For Anselm, it is directed toward God. Ransom to Satan theory is directed toward the evil one. (The truth of the matter is that it is directed toward all of these different directions, but we need to major on major things and minor on minor things and get things sorted out.) Fundamentally, it is directed toward God. Underneath

that, it is directed toward our enemies and even toward us, but to redeem us. In its being directed toward God, it is also being directed toward us to rescue us, not just to be revelatory and not just to give us an example. The liberal gospel of following Jesus' example to be saved is utter futility. It is no good news at all.

The governmental view of the atonement, also called the Grotian view, was set forth by a Dutch jurist named Hugo Grotius, who lived from 1583 to 1645 AD. Grotius thought he was answering the Socinians errors, but he still was not exactly endorsing Calvin's views, though he saw himself as a champion of orthodoxy. Unfortunately, he was not. He tried hard. Remember I said the view of God is important? In the governmental view, God is viewed as a moral governor of the world who acts always in the best interest of moral government. God, viewed as moral governor, put the Son of God to death though He did not have to die. It was deemed by God as the most fitting way to demonstrate God's attitude toward sin and it was definitely in the best interest of God's moral government. In that way it is very tricky and the language is confusing. He could use biblical expressions and he has confused many people having made them think his view is orthodox, but in the end, it is not. Christ's death was a substitute for a vicarious substitution. It was not a vicarious substitution. It was not Christ dying in the stead of the guilty. No, it was Christ dying to demonstrate God's attitude toward sin. At bottom thus, it is didactic. Christ died to reveal God's hatred of sin. Christ died to maintain the moral government of the universe on a grand scale. You could claim that the death of Christ is legal, but not in the biblical sense of Jesus dying in the place of sinners. No, this view is a substitute for that which shows God's hatred of sin. Could God not have shown His hatred for sin in other ways? Yes. The cross is not necessary and although it looks like propitiation at the beginning, if you really think about it, where is the cross directed in this scheme? It is directed to human beings. It is didactic again, teaching us what God thinks of sin. This is the governmental view of the atonement.

I will tell you a funny story about why you have got to keep your notes straight. Back east there was a Bible-believing seminary that will go nameless—it was neither my alma mater nor Westminster. A guy trained at this good, conservative seminary went before his presbytery in order to be examined, to be licensed, and later on ordained. He passed with flying colors except on one area of little importance; it was the doctrine of atonement that he failed as he perfectly enunciated the governmental view of the atonement. The presbyters were scandalized. They said, "Young man, do you understand what you are saying?" He said, "I am giving you what I was taught in seminary." They said, "What you were taught in seminary?" He named a professor—it was not me—who is a godly man, and claimed he had taught this. They said, "That is impossible." He said, "It is in my notes. I can see it right now at the top of a page of my notes, there it is." They said, "We think so highly of him and his reputation; you have to show us your notes." So sure enough, he went home, got his notes, and brought them back and there it was at the top of the page, the Grotian view of the atonement. At the bottom of the preceding page was the heading, "False Views of the Atonement." He had it letter perfect. He gave a false view.

With this brief historical survey, let us proceed to a systematic summary of Christ's saving work and when we move along here a little bit we will start to study some passages. For the first category we hardly need to do it. Christ's death is salvific. It is saving. Christ's death saves. I am not going to go through the 13 proofs. Letter d, as the Lamb of God He took away the sins of the world. Not only the sins of the Jews but of the Gentiles as well. This is seen in many places. In fact, the passages we will look at to prove other things as we move along in the notes will serve for this as well. Isaiah 53, likewise, is a proof text in that it taught substitutionary atonement—that Jesus' death saves.

Second, His death is voluntary. He died voluntarily. He willed to die. He died for us because He loved us. Let us look at Mark 10, the famous ransom saying. Jesus, in the verses immediately preceding Mark

10:35, had again predicted His death and resurrection. It was not the first time. The disciples, the spiritual giants that they were, were in deep meditation concerning what He meant when He said He would die and rise again. That was not the case. No, they are just like we are; they were quibbling. Look at verse 35. James and John—in Matthew’s account it is their mother, how embarrassing—came to Him and asked Him to honor their request. There is no contradiction; Jesus hears her request and answers them, so she is asking on their behalf.

“‘What do you want me to do for you?’ He asked. They replied, ‘Let one of us sit at your right and the other on your left in Your glory.’” Their thoughts are not on the cross and on Him; their thoughts are on themselves! They want glory without the cross. That is now how it works in the kingdom of God. “‘You do not know what you are asking,’ Jesus said.” You have no idea.” The implication is something like glory does not come without the cross, not even for me. After I do my work and you come to understand it, you will see that it does not come for you either, because when you are joined to me, you are joined to me in my death and later on in my resurrection. “‘Can you drink the cup I drink—the cup of suffering—or be baptized with the baptism I am baptized with?’” Presumably this is the notion of God pouring out His wrath on his Son. Glibly they say, “We can,” no problem. Now how about that glory, Lord? “Jesus said to them, ‘You will drink the cup I drink and you will be baptized with the baptism I am baptized with, but to sit at my right or left is not for me to grant. Those places belong to those for whom they have been prepared.’ When the ten heard about this”—the spiritual pygmies that they were—“they became indignant with James and John”—the two trying to get ahead of them. They are unspiritual. It is a good thing that the Bible really presents their warts. If all we had was superheroes and heroines we would be discouraged and likely want to quit sometimes. No, the great saints of God, if you have more than two verses on them, we see their warts. They are plainly exposed. Here the two are just glory-hunters and the ten are indignant because they did not ask first. Jesus is a patient teacher, but He takes them to task by telling them they are thinking the way unsaved people think. “Jesus called them together and said, ‘You know that those who are regarded as rulers of the Gentiles lord it over them, and their high officials exercise authority over them. Not so with you.’”—You are thinking just the way unsaved leaders think and this is not the way it works in the Kingdom of God. Not so with you. Instead, “‘whoever wants to become great among you must be your servant, and whoever wants to be first must be slave of all.’”—And then He pulls a real zinger on them—“‘For even the Son of Man did not come to be served, but to serve,’”—Now He rightly could have come to be served, but He did not. He came to serve, and the epitome of His service is expressed in these words, “‘And to give His life as a ransom for many.’” This is the famous synoptic ransom saying. It contains the Gospel in seed form. For our purposes right now, we want to see that the death of the Son of God is voluntary. He came to serve and to give His life. How embarrassed they should have been.

It contains themes that are very similar to the themes we studied in Philippians 2. Some regard that passage as almost a commentary on the ideas presented here, in any case. Jesus is a patient teacher. He wants them to have the mindset that He has. He wanted them to have this mind in them, which is also in the Son of Man, you could say. It is too early for them to drink it all in. The time will come when they will understand that the glory is theirs, but to be partakers of His glory they also have to be partakers of His cross. And they do take up the cross and follow Him, especially after His resurrection. Christ’s death is not only saving and voluntary, but it is substitutionary. Christ died in the place of sinners to save them who could not save themselves. We see this in a great many places, as in the good shepherd in John 10 in contrast to the shepherds of Israel. The reference to Israel’s shepherds, seen plainly in chapter 9, is to the Pharisees and Jewish leaders who persecute the blind man who believes in Jesus. They put him out. They are false shepherds who harm the sheep, who even destroy the sheep and drive them out. They do not rejoice that one of the sheep believes in the Messiah. They drive him out. But in contrast to those false shepherds who are thieves and robbers and do not even belong to the people of God at all, “The

good shepherd lays down His life for His sheep.” Think of it. A shepherd dying for his sheep is a unique image. A shepherd might fight the wolves for his sheep, but he surely would not die. For one thing, that would leave them exposed. The Son of Man lays down His life and He takes it up again. The good shepherd dies in the place of his sheep.

Christ’s death is according to divine appointment. Christ’s death was according to the plan of God. He died to accomplish God’s will. This is important. This refutes the notion that He was an unfortunate martyr as presented, for example, in the blasphemous *Passover Plot* by Hugh Schonfield where Jesus kind of got carried away with Himself and ended up on the cross. That certainly was not His intention. It is a scandalous piece of writing whereby Jesus is a conniver. He sends somebody ahead and sets it up so that when His disciples come and ask for the cult, they give it to them. It is all a set-up. Well, it was all set up all right, but by the Trinity in heaven before the creation of the world, not by such dissembling on the part of the Son of God. His death was in God’s plan. We saw it already in Isaiah 53. Is it not incredible? It was the Lord’s will to crush Him and to cause Him to suffer. We find it in the Lord’s Supper sayings, the so-called, eucharistic sayings, of Jesus: “The Son of Man must go as it has been decreed.” (Luke 22:22). “This cup is the new covenant in my blood,” verse 20, “which is poured out for you. But the hand of him who is going to betray me is with mine on the table. The Son of Man will go as it has been decreed.” There is a divine plan that stands behind His death. “But woe to that man who betrays him.” Here divine sovereignty and human responsibility kiss; it is incredible. The death of Christ is decreed and He willingly obeys that decree. But woe to that man who betrays Him. It is amazing. This is the teaching behind the notion in John’s gospel that the Son of Man must be lifted up; this must indicate a prior plan of God that is fulfilled in time and space.

Let me introduce to you point number 5. I put the greatest importance on these themes, these pictures, and then point 6, the fact that Christ’s saving work includes events. What do I mean by pictures? To understand the richness of the biblical teaching on Christ’s saving work we must investigate these pictures, these themes, that the Bible gives. Christ’s death is a mighty victory, first. There is that victory theme. Second, the death of Jesus Christ, the second Adam, overturns the effects of Adam’s fall. There is a new creation theme, a recreation theme—a second Adam typology in the Bible. Third, Christ’s death is sometimes presented in Scripture in legal terms. Christ suffered the penalty of the law. Fourth, sometimes His death is presented in priestly terms. He is both priest and sacrifice. Fifth, Christ’s death is an example. I have found 10 places in the New Testament where His death alone is an example, so He is an example. The old liberal theology is incorrect; we do not become Christians by following His example, but having become Christians by believing in His saving death, we are responsible to follow His example and that includes His example in His death. Sixth, His death is revelatory, though not chiefly. It does reveal God’s love, justice, power, wisdom, and more. Seventh, His death ratifies the new covenant. “This cup is the new covenant in my blood.” What a shocking statement! Eighth, His death is the basis of justification. Ninth, it accomplishes redemption, reconciliation, and any other way the Bible pictures salvation. It is grounded in the work of the Son of God.

Here is my thesis: evangelical Christianity has correctly latched on to a couple of these biblical themes and for that I thank the Lord, especially the third and fourth pictures listed. We see Jesus’ death in terms of the law when we say He paid the penalty for our sins. I will show you that that is thoroughly biblical. Likewise, in the fourth one, He dies as the great high priest who makes a sacrifice to cleanse us, to bring us to God, to make us perfect, and Hebrews says those different things. But here is my contention: we are suffering from emphasizing those two themes and neglecting equally biblical themes. We need to get a richer, fuller picture of the work of Christ in order to improve our worship and in order to give us more tools in that evangelistic toolbox. If God gives it to us, we want to enjoy it. We want to see every way His Son is pictured as saving us.