

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW ON THE THEOLOGY OF SACRIFICE

A. Terminology

Sacrifice is an essential element of a belief. In Latin, there is the word "*sacrificiurn*" which the word is taken from the root "*sacer*", meaning "holy," as well as word "*facere*" means "to make." This word later became the basis of the English etymology of "sacrifice," namely Sacrifice. Sacrifice, as a translation of the English Sacrifice derived from the Latin noun '*sacrificium*' and the verb '*sacrificare*', includes terms for any religious act in which something is considered sacred, given to God, and belongs to him. Sacrifice defined as a gift from food, object, or animal life to a higher purpose or God or the gods as an act of worship or worship. While sacrifice often refers to ritual killings, the term giving (English offering; Latin *oblatio* can also be used for sacrifices such as seeds or other objects that are 'bloodless').¹² The term used is '*libation*.'

The concept of sacrifice that often comes to mind when hearing the word 'sacrifice' is the idea that describes a kind of renunciation, usually the destruction of something of value so that something more valuable can be obtained. One may sacrifice duty for pleasure, pleasure for duty, or honesty for profit or gain for

¹² Loren T. Stuckenbruck and Wendy E. Sproston North, *Early Christian and Jewish Monotheism* (London: A&C Black, 2004) 67.

honesty. A person can sacrifice his eyes, teeth, fingers or other limbs and life for the sake of his country or religion.¹³ Modern and secular understandings related to this 'sacrifice' can be analyzed as follows: The various forms of sacrifice can be in the form of material (e.g., money, limbs) or also immaterial (e.g., pleasure, loyalty, honor). The sacrifice made must give value to the person performing the ritual sacrifice.

Due to deprivation, sacrifice always means sorrow or misfortune; it should be avoided, if possible, or at least it kept to a minimum level. If someone wants to get as much as possible with the least possible cost, people often compare the cost of sacrifice with the desirability of the property obtained. The sacrificed goods are worth more than any gains received. If the person making the sacrifice shares the benefits with his group, that person considered fortunate.¹⁴

The sacrifice is carried out in society so that all expressions of violence such as tension, competition, and hostility are inflicted and dissipated into the sacrifice. Although sacrifices were associated with various interests, such as asking for rain and soil fertility, these were only secondary goals. The sacrifice of a scapegoat would bring peace and harmony to society¹⁵. Like music, laws, and punishment, the sacrifice ceremony has the same goal: to unite the community and establish its order. In this case, the relationship between sin and sacrifice is still secondary.

There are several definitions of sacrifice. The following is a concept of sacrifice based on specific disciplines, namely:

¹³ Royden Keith Yerkes, *Sacrifice in Greek and Roman Religions and Early Judaism* (Oregon: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2010), 2.

¹⁴ Robert J. Daly, S.J., *The Origins of the Christian Doctrine of Sacrifice* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1978), 2.

¹⁵ Rene Girard, *Conversations with Rene Girard: Prophet of Envy* (London: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2020). 54

- a) Anthropologically, it can interpret that the sacrificial ritual symbolizes togetherness in society.¹⁶ Then, individuals who eat sacrifices in the sacrificial ritual are declared part of the community. Jan Van Baal explains the meaning of sacrifice through three different words but has almost the same meaning: offering, sacrifice, or gift/gift. Giving is the key word for other activities, both offerings and sacrifices. The activities of offerings and sacrifices cannot be carried out without giving.¹⁷
- b) Sociologically, sacrificial ritual is an action in a society filled with symbols. Viktor Tumer defines a Symbol as something that has many meanings, both social (ideological, moral, normative) and individual (emotions, senses, desires).¹⁸ *Valerio Valerie* researched the model of the sacrifice made by the people in Hawaii. In short, he concluded that sacrifice is a complete series of rituals that offer animals, plants, or other symbolic components that have value, not to mention the offering of human sacrifices.¹⁹
- c) From a psychological point of view, a community's sacrificial rituals originate from the soul's desire and longing to make sacrifices to the gods to achieve social harmony in the community, especially within each individual.²⁰

¹⁶ Carter, *Understanding Religious Sacrifice*. 370-

¹⁷ *Ibid.* 272-91.

¹⁸ Carter, 292-94.

¹⁹ Carter, *Understanding Religious Sacrifice*, 317-18.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 239-41.

Sacrifice is a symbolic process in a society. In the process, there are personal interests and group interests to achieve something ideal in this life. In particular, the sacrificial rites performed in several places in Indonesia, including *Toraja*, are a sacrifice for the ancestors and gods. The sacrifices given are always in the form of animals, so the critical thing that needs to be seen from the sacrifice is its symbolic function as a way for humans and gods to meet and communicate with one another. In the 'ultimate sacrifice,' the person who sacrifices gives up everything and gets something in return, at least for himself, maybe even nothing. Reality proves that the meaning of sacrifice is often hostile; because there is no reward or higher value, the reward received is lower in value than the value of the sacrifice given.

B. The Theology of Sacrifice: An Overview

1. Access to God

Animal sacrifice is known in almost every tribe and culture, including very strongly carried out by the nations around Israel. Ritual sacrifice is an essential thing for religion. In every sacrificial ritual, the process of killing the animal to be sacrificed is carried out, and the best animal from nature is chosen.²¹ However, in the book of Leviticus, sacrifices are often stated to “redeem” (Leviticus 1:4). The word sacrifice, in this case, belongs to one of the word groups for “offering,” which

²¹ Carter, *Understanding Religious Sacrifice*, 326-27.

comes from the verb “to bring near.”²² In the context of the teaching of Judaism, the word sacrifice describes as (*korbanot*, or qorban refers to giving up objects or goods that are justified according to the intent of the Torah. The offering that is brought is called the 'sacrifice,' which correctly means 'the sacrifice that prepares the way' or 'the sacrifice of the entrance.'²³

In the Bible, there are two kinds of sacrifices, namely blood sacrifice and bloodless sacrifice (such as grain and wine). Daly put forward the meaning of sacrifice among the ancient Jewish Christians, namely that there were differences in the meaning of each sacrifice. According to Daly, the sacrificial ritual performed is a form of surrender and a sign of obedience to love. A sacrificial ritual is always an offering to God, who has a higher status than humans do.²⁴ The act of making a sacrifice means that one has access to God: and this is in light of the universal custom prevailing in the East that no one is permitted to approach a higher person without a gift.

2. Theories of Sacrificial Worship

There are five theories for understanding sacrificial worship in Israel's religion. The theoretical study is broken down as follows: gift theory, sacramental-

²² Merrill C. Tenney, *The Zondervan Encyclopedia of the Bible, Volume 5: Revised Full-Color Edition*, vol. 5 Q-Z (Michigan: Zondervan Academic, 2010).

²³ Robert Mackintosh Paterson, *Tafsiran Alkitab, Kitab hnamat* (Jakarta: BPK Gunung Mulia, 1994), 79.

²⁴ J. Daly, S.J., *The Origins of the Christian Doctrine of Sacrifice*. 1%

communion theory, homage theory, Symbol theory, and the *piacular* theory. The following is a summary of each theory as explained by Louis Berkhof.²⁵

- a) The gift theory sees sacrifices as gifts or gifts to gods to maintain good relationships and get protection.
- b) The sacramental-communion theory. The background of this theory is the worship of the totem. Members of the worship community meet at the time to slaughter the totem animal to be eaten together as a sign of their communion with the divine and receiving the totem's divine benefits.
- c) The home theory. The actual sacrifice is an expression of respect and dependence. Humans draw closer to God not because of guilt but because they feel dependent on and show respect to God.
- d) The symbol theory. Here the sacrifice is understood as the symbol of restoration, in terms of a disturbed relationship with God. The presence of sacrificial animal blood, which is a symbol of life, is to restore that relationship.
- e) The *piacular* theory. The sacrificial rite was understood as a deed of atonement. The sacrificial animal that is slaughtered acts as an atonement that replaces or covers the sin of the sacrifice. This meaning accommodates all the sacrificial practices found in both Israelite worship and worship in various human religions.

Thompson R.J., in his book,²⁶ sees a relationship between regret/repentance and sacrifice. He then showed some of the motives behind the ritual of the sacrifice through the sketches he made. Thomson then divides four ages to see the form of sacrifice development in the history of Israel's, starting from: The time of ancestors, formation of the tribes of Israel, the kingdom era, and the post-exilic era.

3. Christian Sacrifice

²⁵ Louis Berkhof, *Systematic Theology* (Cambridge: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing,

²⁶ R. J. Thompson, *Penitence and Sacrifice in Early Israel Outside the Levitical Law: An Examination of the Fellowship Theory of Early Israelite Sacrifice. With a Foreword by H. H. Rowley* (London: Bell Academic, 1962), 6-15.

The most basic starting point of Christian sacrifice begins through a form of 'moment' First, not in oneself only, however, above all is the existence of God the Father's self-offering in offering the sacrifice through His Son. It continues through the second 'moment.' in this case, through the 'response' offered by Son. His following response or action manifests in His humanity, which is enabled through the power of the Holy Spirit for the glory of the Father. Then, the essence of this sacrifice continues further through the existence of a third 'moment' - which in turn begins to become a Christian sacrifice-when, in action, human beings who are empowered by the Spirit, who is also the Lord Jesus, enter into the perfect Spirit, seeping into one another. This cannot be overemphasized. It may be something a Christian does or something some Christians think is a sacrifice, but if it is not the Trinity in this sense, then it is not a Christian sacrifice.²⁷

The Bible shown that the sincerity of sacrifice is a condition for humans to have a right relationship with God and others. Our capacities for deep empathy with each other are twisted to construct intentions and instigate conflict of a sort that did not exist before.²⁸ At its peak, after Jesus' sacrifice on the cross, sacrifice becomes a way of living that seeks to avoid any participation in sacrifice. The concept of sacrifice in Christianity is not some object that can be manipulated, nor is it something that is done carelessly, especially if it causes someone to give up. Mutual sharing and self-giving manifest themselves in the form of events that

²⁷ Robert J. Daly, *Sacrifice Unveiled: The True Meaning of Christian Sacrifice* (London: A&C Black, 2009). 89

²⁸ Mark S. Heim, *Saved from Sacrifice: A Theology of the Cross* (Cambridge: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing, 2006), 71.

occur between people. The essence of sacrifice is both the very personal and the relational event we can think of.

C. Biblical Foundation of Sacrifice

1. Old Testament

Sacrifice and peace were not unique to ancient Israel, as were their neighbors in ancient Israel; however, ancient Israel also had an appreciation of the relationship with the Divine through the form of ritual sacrifices. Alternatively, in other words, according to Robert Davidson, sacrifice is a religious ritual carried out by the Israelites along with other peoples. Sacrifice, in this case, are not unique to Israel, but considered capable of expressing Israel's faith.²⁹

Although there are several motives underlying the Israelite ritual sacrifices: 'offerings' and 'thanksgiving', it is apparently continuing to emphasize the motives of atonement, for example, the rite of purification in Genesis 15:9-11, the sacrifice made by the prophet. Noah is not only giving thanks but at the same time repentance or penance. In short, the element of penance for Beckwith cannot be ignored in the Israelite sacrifice. It is precisely this that indirectly becomes the most critical motive in every Israelite sacrifice.

The meaning of sacrifice found in the Old Testament and in Judaism has another meaning that the God worshiped here is the living God, the God who

²⁹ Robert Davidson, *Knowing Christianity Series, The Old Testament* (London-

speaks, the God with whom humans can associate.³⁰ Bible commentators consider this a critical discussion because it is oriented to two main things, that is: the Jesus' death, which completely done on the cross and the sacrifice for peace. There are experts who divide the period in giving sacrifices as follows:

a) Pre-Holy Tent

Before the founding of the Tabernacle, you can see and learn from the lives of the patriarchs in the Book of Genesis. The first word 'offering' appears in Hebrew is *Minchah*, which means gift, gift or sacrifice. The word sacrifice first appears in Genesis chapter four.

“And in process of time it came to pass, that Cain brought of the fruit of the ground an offering unto the LORD. And Abel, he brought of the firstlings of his flock and of the fat thereof. And the LORD had respect unto Abel and to his offering”. (Verse 3-4)

At that time, people began calling on God, which was the beginning of worship and sacrificial offerings. The Abel described here was the first hero of the faith. It said that Abel offered to God a sacrifice finer than Cain because of Abel faith. It tells us in Genesis 4 that both were sacrifices to God and that He heeded

³⁰ Pagan religion States that humans, through their sacrifices, can come to gods. Judaism does not allow this to happen because it is not humans who come to God, but instead God who comes to humans. Sacrifice in Judaism is a gift from God to man, and not from man to God. In other religions, man seeks through his sacrifices to ascend to the God in which he resides. Whereas in Judaism, it is God who descends to earth. Concerning the blood sacrifice, God said: “For the life of the flesh is in the blood: and I have given it to you upon the altar”. (Leviticus 17:11)

the sacrifice of Abel's and ignored Cain's offered. At first glance, we see that there is no justice, but it is God who determines whether the offering is received or not.³¹

It can be said that Cain symbolizes cynicism towards others. The desire in his heart had made himself the center of all things and related to others only insofar as they served his interests. Meanwhile, Abel symbolizes an unreliable person who is helpless and meaningless, a person who, according to the world's judgment, is not to be thought about and does not count. It is understandable why the cloth was so hot-hearted to see that his offering ignored. In contrast, his brother's offering of an insignificant person is valued more highly. Finally flared into a lust to kill. The terms firstborn and fat are used to denote the best, and many interpreters understand that Abel offered to sacrifice the best of his flock. His sacrifice is sanctified because what he sacrifices is the most precious to him. It was different with Cain sacrificing whatever happened to be in his hands.³² Cain and Abel brought the sacrifice to the altar with clean hearts. However, they are offerings as God wills. Cain is not to blame because he mistakenly offered something displeasing to God. He is blamed for being angry when God does not heed the

³¹ God is free to act according to his will and has no right to demand anything from God because no one has the right to demand anything from God; only God knows what is fair or what is unfair. Only He can decipher why something happened the way it did, whether it was just or unjust. According to his sovereign wisdom, he chose Abel's

³² David Atkinson, *Kejadian 1-11, (the Message of Genesis 1-11)* (Jakarta: OMF,

offering of the Law that applies in the Garden of Eden, and this life is complete obedience and trust in Him.³³

Sacrifice connects God with his people through offerings. Furthermore, God responded to the offering with His love and sovereignty. This proves how necessary the sacrifice was in the Old Testament. Noah made a fragrant offering to please God (Genesis 8:20-21). In addition, Abraham also sacrificed the best calf and flour. When God and his two angels visited him at Mamre to inform him of the birth of Isaac, God and his angels disguised themselves as humans.³⁴ “Then he left there and moved from place to place, going toward Bethel. He reached the place between Bethel and Ai where he had camped before, and had built an altar. There he worshiped the LORD. Then, in the name of the God whom his father Isaac worshiped, Jacob solemnly vowed to keep this promise. He killed an animal, which he offered as a sacrifice on the mountain, and he invited his men to the meal” (Gen.31:53-54). However, Jacobs offers a sacrifice only to the Lord of his father, namely Isaac.³⁵ The story of the most moving and complex sacrifice is when Abraham was ordered to sacrifice Isaac, the promised son. He commanded Abraham to offer up his son Isaac. By his faith, so Abraham obeyed God, and when he was ready to sacrifice his son, then God intervened and provided a ram to die

³³ *Ibid*, 131.

³⁴ Emmanuel Gerrit Singgih, *Dua konteks: tafsir-tafsir Perjanjian Lama sebagai respons atas perjalanan reformasi di Indonesia* (Jakarta: BPK Gunung Mulia, 2009), 129.

³⁵ Katie Hoyt McNabb, *Does It Really Say That in the Bible?* (Bloomington: WestBow Press, 2014), 57, 58.

in Isaac's place. (Gen. 22:10-13). God intervened. He replaced Isaac with a ram because it is not pleasing to him.³⁶

There so many religious experiences tell behind these nineteen verses: *Yahweh* often seems contradictory to himself, wanting to erase the history of his self-initiated salvation. Another thing, that can be referred are: God confronted Abraham (in this text) with the question of whether he could surrender God's gift of God promise. For that reason, raising the question of Abraham whether he understood the gift of promise as a pure gift when Israel read and told the story this later could only see himself represented by Isaac, that is, laid upon the altar of *Yahweh*, given back to him, then given life again by himself. That is, it can base its existence in history not on a legal title as other nations have done but on the will of Him who, in the freedom of His grace, allowed Isaac to live.³⁷ In von Rad's words, "Therefore, unfortunately, one can only answer all sad doubts about this saga by saying that it concerns something more terrifying than child sacrifice. Abraham did not yet know God was testing him." As is clear from Von Rad's interpretation, this proved to be perfectly valid.³⁸

³⁶ The story will only work with some kids. It depended mainly on Isaac. Second,

Gen 22 is not a story about Isaac; this is the story of Abraham. Therefore, his little booklet in Gen 22 bears the title "Abraham's Sacrifice," not "Isaac's Sacrifice" or the like. These two points are closely related to each other and require explanation. Above all, one must consider Isaac, who was more than a 'paper' to Abraham, that is, a more or less random object in which his obedience was to be proved. Isaac is the son of promise. In him, every

saying thing the Lord promised was to be done, prepared, and guaranteed. The point
³⁷ Gerhard von Rad, *Genesis: A Commentary* (Philadelphia: PA: Westminster Press,

³⁸ Konrad Schmid, "Abraham's Sacrifice: Gerhard von Rad's Interpretation of Gen 22," accessed June 18, 2022,

From the several examples above, there are at least four principles of offering in the era before the Tabernacle was founded; in the Old Testament, namely:

(1) Personal Initiative

Becoming a personal initiative is a response from the giver of God's love, blessing, inclusion and protection. Offerings are a Personal Initiative. Pay attention to the example of the patriarchs above, and if we read the biblical text from the passages or chapters that record their stories, we will not find God giving orders to them to give offerings, meaning that the offerings they make are personal initiatives in response to their love, God's blessing, inclusion and protection.

(2) Relationships Reflection

In Hebrew, the word: QOR'BAN comes from the verb קרַב- QARAV, its meaning is "to come near" with the meaning of bringing something close and offering it to God, compare it with the Arabic word: *qarib/qurb/taqorrub*. Thus, with the sacrifice, a person actively seeks to draw closer to God. Or passively, he is brought closer to God. The point is that a relationship exists between the giver of the offering and God. At the time the patriarchs made offerings, in that era, there was no written law that required and regulated the giving of offerings. Furthermore, if we look more carefully in the Book of Genesis, those who give offerings to God are those who have a personal interaction with God. In Book of Genesis, we will

https://www.academia.edu/1328799/Abraham_s_Sacrifice_Gerhard_von_Rad_s_Interpretation_of_Gen_22.

not find people who do not have a close connection with God and then act an offering to God. These two principles should be a blueprint, be our role models and enthusiasm in giving offerings.

(3) True Obedience

When God wants to govern a person, this arrangement often contradicts human understanding and is difficult for him to understand, but it is precisely this contradiction and difficulty to understand God's test and test for humans.

Meanwhile, Abraham was able to show obedience in himself to God, which was the most fundamental condition for him to satisfy God's demands. It was only then when Abraham could obey God's requirements and offered Isaac that God truly felt His affirmation and approval of humankind—against Abraham, whom He had chosen. Only then was God convinced that the person He had chosen was an indispensable leader who could carry out His promises and further management plans. Even though it was just a test, God felt satisfied, He felt man's love for Him, and He felt comforted by a man like never before.

b) Post Tabernacle

Moses was commanded by God to build the Tabernacle, after the Israelites left out the Egypt for worship God. The purpose of setting up this tent is in the context of a meeting where the LORD will meet His people. With the establishment of the Tabernacle, the Lord gave laws and regulations governing worship procedures, high priests and priests' Service procedures, offerings, moral laws and regulations, social laws and regulations, and others. This system of

offering arrangements reached its peak in the days of the Israelites. God himself commanded this nation to carry out various forms of worship offerings. The purpose of this commandment is to maintain fellowship with God, that is, a fellowship that occurs because of a covenant background.

According to Leviticus 1:1-4, there are specific Standard procedures that must follow and, of course, must obey. First, the sacrificial animal offered must be perfect or, in other words, without blemish. Then the death of the sacrifice becomes a meaning or symbol of the death of a sinner. Then the person offering must kill the sacrificial animal. This offering means forgiveness for human sins and mistakes. The offering itself is more valuable or less valuable, but if it is offered with a sincere heart and under God's laws, it will be accepted by God.³⁹ God required animal sacrifices so God willing to forgive the sins of man. (Leviticus 4:35; 5:10).

The sacrifices of animals are a significant and essential theme throughout the Scriptures. Animal sacrifices were always offered daily in the Temple. Besides that, there were also sacrifices on the Sabbath in addition to the daily sacrifice. A unique sacrifice on the new moon in the form of two young bulls, a ram, seven lambs (a year old) without blemish and one male goat as a sin sacrifice. All of this must offer along with complementary offerings in the form of grain offerings and drink offerings. The same sacrifice to the regular daily sacrifice on the Passover. Which is the same as the new moon at the meeting in the 7th month of the first day

³⁹ Joseph T. Lienhard and Thomas C. Oden, *Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy* (Madison: InterVarsity Press, 2014), 110.

and in the seventh month on the 10th day, sacrifices carried out with the same conditions for the sacrificed animal except for the bull, no longer two bulls, but one only on the 15th day, in the seventh month. Sacrifices increased 13 young bulls two rams 14 rams a year old in the number 29 after the description of the 15th month starting from verse 17 the narrator talks about the 2nd day the 3rd day and so on, until the eighth day.⁴⁰

It seems that here is assumed a sequence of celebrations of the celebration of the holiday, which is added to the eighth day as the day of the meeting. It is clear that according to the requirements of the animal sacrifice.⁴¹ There is an impression that shows that the temple was overflowing with the festivities of animal sacrifices and non-animal sacrifices more than the abundance of feasts. Because of the many sacrifices brought by God's people, it is broadly as follows:

- (1) A sacrificial meal is held after the Thanksgiving sacrifice, also known as the "salvation sacrifice" or the "communion sacrifice that is offered. Some of this sacrifice was offered on the altar, and the person who offered the sacrifice along with his family and friends ate the rest. If the sacrifices are offered following the established procedures or rules, an individual who offers them is pleasant to God, so sacrifice is also acceptable.
- (2) The grain offering that 'produces' atonement is the dedication of human

⁴⁰ Emmanuel Gerrit Singgih, *Korban dan Pendamaian, Studi lintas ilmu, lintas buday dan lintas agama mengenai upaya manusia menghadapi tantangan terhadap*

⁴¹ Martin Noth, *Leviticus: A Commentary* (Louisville: Westminster Press, 1965),

work, and the result is offered to God. Some offerings were burned on the table and called the sacrifices 'remember memories. The theological idea of "remembering" in Old Testament means "to mention the name of the Lord" (Proverbs 6). These sacrifices were often accompanied by singing Psalm 38 and Psalm 70.

- (3) Apart from the sacrifices above, the ritual sacrifice in Judaism also recognizes the existence of the vulture sacrifice, namely voluntary sacrifices, sacrifices of fire and demonstration sacrifices whose implementation is moved left and right up and down.
- (4) Then besides that, Judaism also recognizes the existence of rites of guilt offerings and sin offerings.⁴²

Burnt offerings symbolize orientation and dedication to God, the basis of true life. As for the food offering, it means the need to remember God's generosity. Furthermore, this sacrifice of salvation means that people are invited to enjoy happily all the blessings and gifts God has bestowed upon them. Indeed, the Symbol of the dedication of this memorial and the joy of having a close relationship with one another. Likewise, it is the same as when the ancient Israelites offered various sacrifices. Moreover, when they offer only the sacrifice of salvation, acts Symbolizing dedication to God and a remembrance of his goodness are performed, as well as the opportunity for them to rejoice while eating together with family and guests. The connection between memorial dedication and enjoyment holds for

⁴² Abineno Jl. C.H., *Mazmur Dan Ibadah* (Jakarta: BPK Gunung Mulia, 1987),

every Christian. Sincere surrender and sacrifice to God will lead to more profound happiness.^{43 44}

Law regulates the types of sacrifices and their procedures. The sacrifice-bearer must present his sacrifice personally at the altar or at the door of the Tabernacle, so that God will be delighted with him. The offering represents the life of the person offering; an animal that is kept or the grain it harvests is of the highest quality, usually a male animal without blemish or fine flour or the best first fruits. The economic status of the person who brings the offering considered according to his economic capacity. Bringing an offering not only sacrificed a chosen animal he had kept but also a substitute for himself. Whatever he did in offering the sacrifice must have given him the impression of the punishment for sin, namely taking his life. That is why he offers animals that have been cared for with great care.⁴⁴

In all the regulations regarding sacrifice, blood is emphasized. This is the core teaching of the Christian faith, both in Christ's sacrifice on the cross and as a Symbol in the Lord's Supper. The literal meaning is simple: the shedding of blood means the sacrifice's death. Its symbolic meaning lies in the Identification of the identity of the bearer of the sacrifice with the sacrifice itself, and this is because the sacrificial death symbolizes the death of a sinner. The punishment for sin is death, but the animal that dies is considered to replace the person's sin.

⁴³ Paterson, *Tafsiran Alkitab, Kitab Imamat*, 60-61.

⁴⁴ William Sanford La Sor et al., *Old Testament Survey: The Message, Form, and*

There are various sacrifices of atonement, which mean the rehabilitation of the relationship between humans and God, as well as sacrifices of gratitude for fellowship rehabilitation. The fellowship that has been restored begins to take place on the altar, namely through the death penalty or in the blood because the life of the creature is in the blood (Leviticus 17:11). Blood must be offered on the altar, that is God's right. The sacrificial offering proceeds as follows: the person offering the sacrifice puts his hand on the head of the animal he is offering. By that act, he identified himself with the beast so that he laid his own life on the altar of the animal that was offered as a sacrifice instead of the one who offered it. So, for this, this recovery is celebrated in the form of a sacrificial banquet. The banquet in question is the restoration of the covenant through the communion banquet rites so that the relationship between God and humans is restored; including the relationship between humans is become also good again. It can be concluded that in essence, the atoning sacrifice helps to restore human fellowship and human relationship with God.

c) Types of Sacrifices

In detail, the book of Leviticus clearly distinguishes several types of sacrifices that govern the types of lives and relationships among the Israel people, concerning Yahweh. Leviticus I to 7 provides so much information about the law and the types of sacrifices it refers to. So based on the first part of the book of Leviticus, then some scholars classify sacrifices into 5 types, namely: burnt offerings '**olah**', "grain offerings" (*minkhah*), "sin offerings" **chata'ah**,

Jif&UTHT!',

$h^{nv} 4\{i^7:n<x w\sim. r.ct Mar.. he vw'<*$

- ',^>1 itc-^ A. > nienr/cned. tienrc.,^

H ..*^m4 'ie-y^rZA-5f .acr.c^i ritu^s-wia se exp»2.ried~

* m f Gf feri n » f)

e*:tww 4:?' ctarly States the czccution actions were: The bn

ff^nr.o fn'p.t refnain 6n the *Alfar* (>f sacrificc all night; the priest miist keeci

b'iming confinnAusly. Herc, sacnTicc was burned to the ground exceptfr

h'* kin ihe -ikin w<>ul(l laler bdong to the priest who offered someo'zj

bnmf (>ffrin^ (cf loviidn / K) Hvcuiuse i(was burned to the ground. theno'i

r-: ih'n irinslih'tl n bumi olTviing. (?/u/? itsclf ineans 'which asceri

i», jippr»'^ th-if the *>nciiHcv iwcvmK (v Ged (hrvugh the smoke. Three kindscf

»'lk .irr ti.w.iiv owh/vvw^ gk\Hs er sheep, and tunletioves/pigec®

Whct, $l_e<.K'$ I-UVHU RTVH| H. H,V (V(„1>K TH<> CTRVVD BIA.^
S)ME THINKTHISACA

•1^1 |.,.| (|| ||,v ((l.jlu^ (v ^.,,[1^ .bul typBij

In this regard, Davidson notes three reserves behind the fact that it
expressed (d) for an expression of gratitude and acknowledging a relationship
that in order to ask for something "the sacrifice was brought about
the morning after, and then the sacrifice was the third (summers) on the second
head. The act of giving knowledge of the sacrifice was given on the afternoon of the

resulting in several different interpretations. Balentine calls this action a symbol of the statement that the animal is part of the sacrifice self and hopes that it is accepted as a representation of the sacrifice. Kaiser specifically calls this action a "transfer of sin" from humans to animals (sacrifice).⁴⁶ During the process of cutting to burning, the cleanliness of the sacrifice must be maintained.⁴⁷

In this case, the principle that is best for God is consistently implemented. Burning is also often referred to as a "sacrifice of fire" that pleases God. The burning process is more focused on the appearance of smoke, which Milgrom calls a transformation,⁴⁸ namely the process of changing animal sacrifices into smoke. It may be for this reason that *'olah* is also often referred to as *'isseh* (sacrifice of fire) which smells pleasing to God. In addition, *olah* has become a routine ceremony meaning every year (1 Kings 9:25), then becomes a significant concern in major events (1 Kings 3:4), even its role can survive until the last. (cf. Ezra 3:2-4; Ezek. 43:18). The ultimate purpose of sacrifice is stated in Job 1:5; 42:8 and is the reason for the sacrifice in Leviticus 1:4, where the burnt offering is directly linked to the forgiveness of souls. However, such a motive may exist, or at least be hidden in the self-consciousness of every sacrificer.

(2) Grain Offerings (*minkhah*)

⁴⁶ Leander E. Keck et al., *The New Interpreter's Bible: General Articles & Introduction, Commentary, & Reflections for Each Book of the Bible Including the Apocryphal/Deuterocanonical Books: 12*, 0 edition (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1998), 1001.

⁴⁷ Noth, *Leviticus*, 25.

⁴⁸ Noth, 161.

There are several translations used for the term *minkhah*, including the

NIV refers to grain, the RSV refers to cereal, the Today English Version refers to a grain offering, sometimes called 'tribute' (cf. 1 Kings 4:21), and 'gifts' (2 Kings 20:12).⁴⁹ The root of the word may be "*manakh*" which is 'to give*. Except for the *minkhah*, all the materials that are sacrificed are animals. What is offered here comes from plants such as flour, oil, and frankincense? It can also be in processed form, either roasted, roasted, or cooked in a frying pan, provided that it must be of the best flour with oil, frankincense, and salt but without yeast.⁵⁰ According to Gerstenberger, these three processed forms refer not only to the physical differences in offerings but also to the preparation process. The toaster (*jtannfir*) is always placed on the ground, thus outside the house. Leviticus 6:14-23 describes how *minkhas* are processed before being offered.⁵¹

However, regarding the motives behind the sacrifices of '*minkhah*', S.R. Driver⁵² provides a little information about the problem. He explains that we cannot simply express neutral thoughts about gifts but also as 'gifts given to ensure or maintain good will'. It can be understood that to ensure that one's actions or intentions are good; it is proven through the giving of 'gifts' and possibly to God so that there is reconciliation between the sacrifice and God. This meaning of

⁴⁹ Paterson, *Tafsiran Alkitab, Kitab Imamat*, 45.

⁵⁰ Noth, *Leviticus*, 189.

⁵¹ The *minkhah* that had been set apart was to be eaten by "Aaron and his sons" in the court of the "Tent of Meeting" (verses 15-16). It is not clear, whether

⁵² "Ensiklopedi Alkitab Masa Kini" (Jakarta: Yayasan Komunikasi Bina Kasih/OMF, 1996). 308

atonement stands out also in sacrificial references such as 1 Samuel 3:10-14; 26:19. The consequence of this kind of understanding is that when there is no *minkhah*^ an action (intention) is difficult to say is good.

(3) Salvation Sacrifice (*zebah shelamim*)

It is unclear why the two words *zebah* and *shelamim* are used together to refer to one case: the sacrifice of salvation. Separately *zebah* means "slaughtering," while *shelamim* gets a different emphasis. The Southeast Asian theologian E.G., Singgih, following the Septuagint (*LXX*) translation: *thousia sooterion* means the sacrifice of salvation. The daily translation of the Bible calls it a "peace sacrifice" because it connects the word '*shelem*' with '*shalom*'. Following de Vaux, E.G. Singgih proposed a "communion sacrifice". Another translation is "sacrifice of well-being from Balentine."⁵³

Rendtorff,⁵⁴ emphasizes the different meanings of the two words: the phrase *zebah shelamim* consists of two words that are usually used separately. The former refers to personal sacrifices and the latter refers to communal sacrifices. Furthermore, Milgrom explains that the altar is connected with the word *mizbeh*, which generally refer toward sacrifice condition who slaughtered at the altar and then the sacrifice eats the meat. At the same time, the word *shelamim* refers to the motivation or situation behind the ritual.⁵⁵ The motivation in question is not clearly

⁵³ Emmanuel G. Singgih, *Korban dan Pendamaian, Studi lintas ilmu, lintas budaya dan lintas agama mengenai upaya manusia menghadapi tantangan terhadap kehidupan*
⁵⁴ Rolf P. Knierim, *Text and Concept in Leviticus 1:1-9: A Case in Exegetical Method* (Tubingen: MohrSiebeck, 1992), 119-68.
⁵⁵ Lienhard and Joseph Oden, *Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy,*

stated, but it can be assumed that this ritual was carried out in a happy atmosphere.

Some doubt that all uses of the *zebah shelamim* refer to the altar's offering alone.

Shelamim, when used alone, according to R. Rendtorff's observations, may not be a banquet but a guilt offering with a solemnity similar to *olah*.⁵⁶

Here female sacrifices are allowed. Not all parts of the sacrifice were burned, but all the fat that covered and as an offering made by fire adhered to the entrails (*isseh*) will be acceptable to God (cf. Lev. 3:3-4, this is repeated in vv.9-10). The question that can be asked is why the pigeon/turtle is not mentioned in the list of sacrifices (Leviticus 3:1-17).⁵⁷

(4) Sin Offering (*khatta'th*)

In the previous sacrifice description, sin has not explicitly been mentioned. It turns out that one's status determines what kind of animal should be sacrificed. If a priest sins - meaning the whole community also sins — the sacrifice is a young bull. If the sinner is a leader, then the sacrifice is a male goat without blemish. The fat of the *khatta'th* sacrifice was burned on the altar, while the meat was for the priest (Leviticus 6:22). Anything that remains must be burned down in a landfill.

InterVarsity Press, 2014,6.

⁵⁶ "Ensiklopedi Alkitab, 578."

⁵⁷ The motivation of *zebah shelamim* in chapter 3 has not been clearly explained, and it only appears in chapters 7:11-21, which divides three types of sacrifices of salvation accompanied by their background (motive), namely: verse 12 as an expression of gratitude (*toda*) which is accompanied by *minkhah*, then in verse 16 the sacrifice of 'votive' (*nedher*) and voluntary sacrifice (*nedabah*). The sacrifice can eat all kinds of sacrifices, but the *toda* must be consumed on the same day while the *nedher* and *nedabah* if still left until the third day, must be burned until they are finished. If not, it means that the sacrifice is considered invalid, and the person who eats it will bear his guilt.

In the ritual of *khata'th*, the blood has an important function: the priest sprinkles it on the veil that separates the holy place.

This practice is the basis for the substitution theory argument that animal blood replaces human sins so that they deserve atonement (*Jekapper*). In the *khatta'th* sacrifice, the blood with the life of the sacrifice in it is not an indication that the animal is a substitute for humans but becomes an agent that brings life to the sacrificer so that he receives atonement for sins that cause humans to be in a critical position, between life and death.⁵⁸ The difficulty can be seen in Leviticus 5:6. What can be said is that sins against God are more conspicuous in the *khatta'th*, while sins against others are conspicuous in the *asham*. Sins and mistakes made in connection with sacrificial offerings are all seen as unintentional sins and based on the context; these are considered ritual or sacred offenses.

There is an understanding that laying the hands of the sacrifice on the sacrifice is understood as transferring sin to the sacrificial animal. It is difficult to accept this, but if it is related to Leviticus 10:17 regarding the obligation of the priest to eat the remaining *khatta'th* to carry the guilt of the people and make atonement for them before God, then the term 'transfer' can be accepted as a transfer of conscience of sin and the desire for forgiveness.⁵⁹ Not only *khatta'th* but also *asham* refers primarily not to moral transgressions but also to anything

⁵⁸ Frank H. Gorman Jr, *The Ideology of Ritual: Space, Time and Status in the Priestly Theology*. 1st edition (London; Gordonsville: Sheffield Academic Press, 2009),

⁵⁹ Wenham Gordon, J., *The Book of Leviticus (New International Commentary on*

deemed tainted or unclean according to ceremonial rules or priestly laws, such as

leprosy and motherhood. However, this does not eliminate the element of morality.

It is not difficult to find the motive behind the *khatta'th* ritual because it is clear that the sacrifice was intended to atone for sins.

(5) The Guilt Offering (*asham*)

The distinctive meaning of the terminology of *asham* is the meaning of compensation, which is a kind of return, replacement, or fine due to someone's wrongful actions, not communally. If the error is, for example, because it may involve a deposit, seizing goods, extorting money, finding the lost item but not announcing it, swearing a lie (cf. Leviticus 6:2-3), then he must return or pay the same amount plus a fine one-fifth at a time. Provide the sacrifice as an *asham* to receive pardon.

d) Intimate Personal Relationship with God

From the explanation above, detailed regulations and standards that must be met in making sacrifices have been regulated. Does this then become something rigid and Standard? Furthermore, make people give offerings only based on the law (legalism) alone? It should not. Because through the spirit and principle of giving to the patriarchs, namely giving as an answer to the love of God, blessing, inclusion, protection and based on regarding the offerings given by God should be a means of simplifying, confirming and clarifying. The clarity is seen in giving offerings so that our offerings are precisely what God wants.

Unfortunately, the zeal and principles of the patriarchs when it came to offerings seemed to be fading away in the people of Israel. This resulted in the sacrifice of offerings as mere legalism, as seen in several Bible verses. The outward sacrificial worship was vehemently opposed by the prophets and was not accepted by God.⁶⁰ The prophet Amos strongly emphasized this point (Amos 5:21). Before all that, the prophet Samuel had informed King David in advance.⁶¹ God, in his law, gospel, and administration, still has to take account of the poor. It can be observed that the little creatures chosen as sacrifices are all the most gentle, harmless and tame animals. This is to illustrate the innocence and meekness in Christ. Also, it teaches about the purity, gentleness which must exist among Christian.⁶² The existence of a critical attitude towards sacrifices in the Old Testament is usually used as a reference for Christians today to no more prolonged practice sacrifice. Why is the smell of a *zevakh* sacrifice suddenly distasteful to God? Is it because what is offered is not the best, so that it raises disdain for God?⁶³

⁶⁰ Gordon, J, 51-52.

⁶¹ Before that, all Samuel had told King David about the legality of worship that was not following God's will. As Samuel declare, "Which thing does GOD like more? Does He like obedience or offerings and sacrifices?" Indeed, God is more pleased with obedience and obedience than sacrificing even the best sheep for him. (ISam. 15:22). If we read the law regarding the offering of burnt offerings originating from flocks of sheep and

⁶² Henry Matthew, *Tafsiran Matthew Henry: Kitab Keluaran, Imamat* (Surabaya:

⁶³ If it is true that Israel's sacrifice in its development is no longer under God's will, it means that there has been a shift in the meaning of sacrifice from Sinai to Canaan. Thus, the spirituality of the sacrifice also experienced a shift. What we want to say about

The understanding that Almighty God had created heavens and earth became a significant theme in the beliefs of the priests and even became the daily confession of faith of all the Israelites. So, it is understandable why each sacrifice must be chosen from the best and not done haphazardly. Everything is arranged so that the sacrifice does not become a displeasing offering to God.⁶⁴ God's rebuke is related to offering prominent offerings so that God's people become God's proper sacrifices. That is why the sacrifices from Judah and Jerusalem will please God. Thus, it is the same as in the past and the years that have passed. (Malachi 3:2-4).⁶⁵

Jewish scholar Jon Levenson says, "As the Story of humiliation and, at the same time, glorification of the beloved son is so powerfully narrated in the entire Story of the Bible because that is the essence of what human stories are about, who they are and to whom the Story was written."⁶⁶ In summary, the offering of this sacrificial animal was commanded by God so that humans could obtain forgiveness

of the Priest duty or calling.

⁶⁴ If Israel offered the best sacrifices, then they would enjoy life because "... I (God) will show My steadfast love for thousands of people, to those who always love Me and those who faithful in keeping my commandments" (Exodus 20:6). If they are loyal, they will live. If Israel gave the best sacrifice, then God was pleased to provide. It seems that this concept animates the sacrifice rituals carried out by Israel so that it can be suspected that the spirit of worshiping God is the beginning of the spiritualization of the sacrifice, but the ultimate goal of all sacrificial rituals is for the survival of the Israelites themselves.

⁶⁵ Therefore, everyone should make offerings with the spirit and principles of the patriarchs. It means giving not because of obligation, not because of fear of being cursed, not because of fear of not being blessed, primarily because of fear of going to hell, but let our offerings be our response to God's love, blessing, inclusion and protection, and we give because we have a personal relationship that intimate with God.

⁶⁶ Levenson Jon D, *The Death and Resurrection of the Beloved Son: The Transformation of Child Sacrifice in Judaism and Christianity* (Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1995), 67.

of sins. Animals become substitutes, namely animals that die for sinners. Animal sacrifices were no longer necessary after the work of the cross of Jesus Christ.

2. Sacrifice in the New Testament

When Jesus said: “This is what is written: the Messiah must suffer and must rise from death three days later” (Luke 24:46) Jesus did not just show evidence of the prophecies of Isaiah 52:13, 53:12 or evasive personal prophecies of the Messiah suffering ⁶⁷ but fulfills all the prophecies in the Old Testament and closes the animal sacrifice.

a) Genuine Transaction for Redemption

Jesus Christ is the ultimate sacrifice; He is the most mediator only in the middle of God and human being (1 Timothy 2:5). Animal sacrifices symbolize the sacrifices made by Christ for all humankind. It provides true forgiveness that can only be described and symbolized by animal offerings.

Paul wrote the message to the church in Rome explaining position or human existence status before the Lord. Indeed, all creatures have sinned and fallen short of glory of God's. This means that everyone is aware that since humans have fallen into sin, they have been declared unrighteous or guilty and will receive ^{* 66}

⁶⁷ Jeremy R. Treat and Michael Horton, *The Crucified King: Atonement and Kingdom in Biblical and Systematic Theology* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan, 2014), 66.

punishment from God.⁶⁸ Sacrifice, whether made by Christ for us or made by us

for Christ, both are genuine transactions. Sacrifice makes a difference. Such Sacrifice is not simply a practice of self-denial by individual Christians. But more than that, Sacrifice means surrender, offering, giving.⁶⁹

One could tell that sacrifice appears not only as an idea of the past or present but also as a discourse of the future. Believers can see every act of God as a form of sacrifice, which then appears in the culmination of His redemptive work to humans. This view can show the most significant offer of new perspectives and can be imagined as a form of a Symbol of superiority.

b) Sacrificial Love

When a person offers something precious, and he loves very much, so that his heart is "heavy" to let go of something very precious to God or fellow human beings, then actually, at that time, he is offering his heart to God. Because if his heart does not love what he offers to God, then our offering has no value or meaning because his heart is not in the offering. However, if his heart loves something and, after much deliberation, even though it sits "heavy-hearted" chooses to deny his desire to offer something so loved to God, he is offering love

⁶⁸ Then, impossible for human to effort the salvation, it only by grace alone, and the response of our faith; the faith toward what Jesus did on Calvary. Paul explained, "The Sacrifice in question is the suffering that Christ Jesus went through, then through Jesus' death on the cross for bearing the world's sins based on God's love for a man until

⁶⁹ G. Raymond Carlson, *Surat Roma* (Malang: Yayasan Penerbit Gandum Mas,

as well his heart. Heart in biblical language means "desire"/"will", not "feeling".

Thus, sacrifices and offerings are a way of obeying the first and greatest commandment of Jesus Christ: "Love the Lord your God with all your heart, with all your soul, and with all your mind, and love your neighbor as yourself."

Sacrifice is the heart's choice to surrender the heart's treasures to God, above all other things. Nevertheless, it is not suffering that is a sign that our offering is valuable, not suffering that gives value/meaning to a sacrifice; it is a sacrifice that gives meaning to suffering. Sacrifice always results in a heavy burden of even suffering. However, the sacrifice also causes an intense feeling of happiness if the sacrifice is genuinely motivated by faith and love.

Christ Jesus, who is truly God, in His incarnation willing to become a suffering servant and even become the same as human beings. As all recognize, that servants considered lowly, worthless, during the Roman reign. Their employers can treat servants arbitrarily. By studying this, it can be seen that it turns out that the true sacrifice that Jesus Christ took over was essentially for the sake of the salvation of all. In Greek, the word love is "Agape," which means sincere, selfless, unconditional love, no hidden motivation, and no shrimp behind a rock. This is the sincerity of a sacrifice.⁷⁰

The Christian faith believes and understands that Jesus' sacrifice on the cross is not limited to redeeming humans from sin; moreover, the cross also confirms God's government, which is in solidarity and on the side of all those who

⁷⁰ Christian A. Eberhart, *The Sacrifice of Jesus: Understanding Atonement Biblically* (Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2018), 109.

suffer in history of human life. This sacrificial love of Jesus is also called by

Niebuhr perfect love, which is not commensurate with the values of kindness or an act that does not violate the demands of various laws.⁷¹ The Christian faith asserts that the same Christ who reveals God's sovereignty over history is also the perfect norm of human nature.

The love of Jesus is love that does not seek revenge, for it is the perfection of sacrificial love⁷² God's attributes, such as omniscient, omnipresent, omnipotent, omniscient, omnipotent, and so on, are like silence in the presence of the impurity of the cross. The filth and abominations of the cross filter out all the attributes of God and leave God hanging on the cross. The vacuum of God's understanding, God's presence, God's power, God's justice, and the vacuum of God's love culminated in the universe's history during the few hours Christ was crucified. God withdrew His face, His presence, and His power from His Son. God angered His own Son, God withdrew His love from His beloved Son, and He did not help His son. Why is God so heartless, inconsistent with His promises, and cruel and stupid? That is God's love for humans. God acts like a clown in ignorance; the cross became a symbol of stupidity, weakness, humiliation, disgust, uncleanness, abomination, corruption, fatality, and death of man; but verily, The Lord is the one hanging there.⁷³

⁷¹ Amy Caswell Bratton, *Witnesses of Perfect Love: Narratives of Christian Perfection in Early Methodism* (Toronto: Clements Publishing Group Inc.,

⁷² Allen J. Frantzen, *Bloody Good: Chivalry, Sacrifice, and the Great War*

⁷³ Anthony Clarke and Andrew Moore, *Within the Love of God: Essays on the Doctrine of God in Honour of Paul S. Fiddes* (Oxford: OUP Oxford, 2014)

Jesus' sacrifice was built on love (John 3:16). One of the attributes of God that we read about in the Bible is Holy, which means that sinners must be punished. Under such conditions, Christ, who was in heaven, had to be incarnated as a human and become a ransom sacrifice for humankind. The Bible explains: "who, though he was in the form of God, did not regard his equality with God as something to behold, but emptied himself, taking the form of a servant, being in the likeness of men." (Philippians 2:6-7)

God perfect love, reveals not only the wisdom and love of God but also the norms and rules that direct human life. Only through the cross-can man discover the suffering love of Christ (agape) as perfect and unending love. God's love expressed through the act of Christ's suffering is perfect proof of holy love as a reference and core value of moral life.

c) Sacrifice for God's Glory

Christ's sacrifice is a living example for all Christians. Imitating it in every action and sacrifice, every follower of Jesus has faith and action that believes that everything that is done or done is for God. Every believer should imitate Christ in every action and sacrifice in response to our love for God. Paul wrote to Colossian: to do their completely live with all heart, as it for God and not for people. (Col.3:23).⁷⁴

The sacrifice exemplified by Jesus is built on the theological basis, namely that the Father is glorified, and the fullness of God's promises is fulfilled through

⁷⁴ John MacArthur, *Colossians and Philemon MacArthur New Testament Commentary* (Moody Publishers, 1992), 107.

His life. All the sacrifices and ministry of Jesus in this world are directed at one

definite and clear goal; namely, the Father is glorified so that the Father's promise of saving the world is fulfilled. That is God's mission (*Missio Dei, Missio Christi*). Jesus performed many miracles not for Him to be glorified or exalted, but so that the Father Himself might be glorified (John 11:40).

d) The end of the Cult Sacrifice

All forms of ritual sacrifice end in failure and must be repeated, at least because they seek to appease an indifferent god or a vengeful one who is immune to deception. This is the story of how to sacrifice as selfless devotion is likely to result in a bloody execution at the hands of the State. Denys Turner speaks of Jesus being 'extra-judicially executed at the recommendation of the majority of a corrupt committee that appears to be very religious of the people.'⁷⁵

In religious sacrificial cults, this human self-sacrifice is celebrated through symbols *asparspro toto*. The basic form of all sacrifices is the sacrifice of the first fruits. Through them, the whole flock or entire harvest was consecrated to the gods and sanctified. It was considered a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, expressing the deity's acknowledgment of ownership rights.⁷⁶ Offering a part for the whole can never mean more of a part than a whole.⁷⁷

⁷⁵ Turner, *Thomas Aquinas*, 24.

⁷⁶ Jürgen Moltmann, *The Crucified God*, 40th Anniversary Edition (Fortress Press, 2015), 41.

⁷⁷ In comparative religion, it is not a tenable view that human gift sacrifices are calculated to bring about the good of the gods. This is the "*do ut des* formula," repeated in many forms of late religion, especially in Rome. Nevertheless, it could be

Sacrifice is at the heart of religion, and at the heart of their social religion is the cult and the essence of the cult was sacrifice to the gods of the country and communion with them was established at festivals.⁷⁸ However, the bloodless repetition of Christ's self-sacrifice occurs at the point of encountering one another in the reality of public life as well as in the life of each ministry. This is important because religion is the domain of ancient sacrifices that has been celebrated and become effective. Therefore, Christian customs and traditions also take care of the nature of Christ's sacrifice so that it is maintained in the cults. As a result, there are efforts to keep it so that various meanings can be beneficial and used to fulfil several purposes at once.

The problem regarding the teaching of the concept of sacrifice lies in the development of understanding of the concept of sacrifice. On the one hand, it seems fair to compare religious data in general (no matter how diverse the perspectives of various religions); but at the same time, it applies well to interpret the 'sacrifice' of Christ on the cross; and also, in terms of dogma to underlie the meaning of celebrating Mass as a precious form of worship. 'Sacrifice', understood

⁷⁸ The more the Christian Church gains public recognition, the more it is obliged to meet this public need for worship and sacrifice. The Church did suppress pagan acts of sacrifice and cult drama but replaced them with her cult. This radically changed the meaning of cult sacrifice. The gods no longer had to be reconciled to human sacrifice. Life is no longer considered a gift from the ultimate reality of existence in nature, society, and politics, a gift of grace that must be recognized and sanctified. He is the only God

without sorting and sorting, can be an opponent to these two concepts of sacrifice

in the New Testament.⁷⁹

Actually, and rightly so, the attempt to interpret the story of 'sacrifice' in the story of Christ's Resistance through His suffering on the Cross at Golgotha has led to an interpretation of the cross and the masses that can be known from themselves. So far as one attempts to conceive of it as 'sacrifice', it would be a "tautological" form which seems impossible to assume as a stand-alone concept of sacrifice, insofar as it applies to them at least in an appropriate way and through modification.

The story of tearing the curtain on the temple is proof that gives more confirmation and firmness. Even further, this narrative makes it clear that the crucified Jesus Christ is, in essence and principle, the final representation of the cult. When Jesus says "it is complete," he means He died 'once for all. The death of Jesus was not simply a sacrifice that could be repeated or transferred, but what is meant is that in the end Jesus rose from the dead also once and for all, just as Paul reiterated, that 'no one will ever die. Never die again, but live eternally. He could not be turned into a cult god who died and rose forever. He is not drawn into a cycle of eternally similar returns' (Mircea Eliade) but escapes the compulsive repetition of the cult. The Eucharist or celebration of the Lord's Supper indeed commemorates and presents Christ's death 'until He comes (1 Corinthians 11:26), but in the form of a 'proclamation', not in the form of a 'repeat' of Christ's death on

⁷⁹ Frances M. Young, *The Use of Sacrificial Ideas in Greek Christian Writers from the New Testament to John Chrysostom* (Oregon: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 1989).

the cross. So, one must distinguish between Christ's death on the cross on Golgotha,⁸⁰ which occurred once and for all, and the repeated celebrations of hope that remember him, to the point of using different terms.

Paul and Barnabas condemned animal sacrifice as useless in the Apostles' Acts. The Bible elevates the Samaritans as moral role models, although the Samaritans were by no means admirers of the Jewish sacrificial cult.⁸¹ One can interpret the New Testament as holding that Jesus replaced ritual sacrifice with love and Service. The Apostle John speaks of sacrifice in moral rather than cult terms. This is a question of laying down the sacrifice of one's life for another and, as such, is an ethical-political matter, not primarily a question of religious observance. If ritual sacrifice makes sense, it is only in such a context.⁸²

The unique historical nature of his death on the cross, outside of religion and the temple, makes Identification of the crucified Christ with cult impossible. Of course, it is not sufficient if what is being done is only 'doing justice' because, in truth, in the theology of the cross, there is a comparative meaning to the concept in the comparison of religious sacrifices with the idea of accepting it equally and or following it.⁸³

⁸⁰ Richard Stans Brown, *About Perfect Crimes* (Darmstadt: Stefan Hoffmann,

⁸¹ John Barton and John Muddiman, *The Oxford Bible Commentary* (Oxford:

⁸² Terry Eagleton, *Radical Sacrifice* (Cambridge: Yale University Press,

⁸³ Carrie Ann Murray, *Diversity of Sacrifice: Form and Function of Sacrificial*

The reality on the cross always brings a lot of changes and paradoxes in the

worldview and life of Christians. There is a new dimension that shows how strong and great God's love flows from what is considered the highest to what is regarded as the lowest by humans, then overturns all the norms and structures of life laid down by humans. Christ emptied Himself as Paul wrote in Philippians 2

(*kenosis*)⁸⁴ which identifies Himself as the least of people (Matthew 5:40). With

this new insight into reality, Every Christian realizes that they are asked and awarded some form of valid consecration as saints in progressive sanctification.

Perseverance must be understood as fundamental because of the sacrifice of Christ

Jesus in the reality of the cross, which is genuinely paradoxical. The sacrifice of

Jesus frees the believer from the compulsive repetition of the cult. Indeed, the

story of the Lord's Supper presents Christ's death "until He comes" (I Corinthians 11:26), but in the form of a "proclamation", not in the form of a 'repeat' of Christ's

death on the cross. It gives meaning to the celebration of hope repeated, to the point of using different terms.

D. The Trinity Sacrificial Theology by Jurgen Moltmann

Jurgen Moltmann, a dogmatic theologian, works on the Theology of Hope^{84 85} that appeared in 1964. Moltmann's thoughts on the theology of hope is structured

⁸⁴ John P. Keenan, *The Emptied Christ of Philippians: Mahayana Meditations*

⁸⁵ Jurgen Moltmann, *Theology of Hope: On the Ground and the Implications of a Christian Eschatology*, 1st Fortress Press ed edition (Minneapolis: Fortress

and regulated under the influence of the context, namely the reality that humans deepen after the Second World War. Moltmann's experiences of faith and theology are inseparable from suffering experiences.⁸⁶ Through this suffering, he tries to see the revelation of God. Through this, Moltmann considers it experimental theology, namely dynamic theology or dynamic hope,⁸⁷ emphasizing the factor of discussion and dialogue with God that provides specific experiences that someone cannot deny. Furthermore, as a counterbalance to “theology of hope”, he compiled the book *The Crucified God*, which explains in depth the meaning of Jesus' sacrifice concerning the Triune God on the cross.

1. The Dichotomy of the Cross

According to Moltmann, the pain experienced by God the Father was directly related to the death of His Son. It was here that he saw the deepest depths of the “Blessed Trinity”. In this context, the love of God the Father, whom himself took the initiative to communicate, then turned into immense (infinite) pain when His Son was sacrificed. This is where the love of the Son who answered [His Father] became infinite suffering because of the rejection of the Father. What happened at

⁸⁶ Sang Yun Lee, *A Theology of Hope: Contextual Perspectives in Korean Pentecostalism* (Oregon: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2019), 130, 146.

⁸⁷ Colin J. D. Greene, *Christology in Cultural Perspective: Marking Out the Horizons* (Eugene: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2015) 318.

Golgotha goes into the deepest depths of the life of the Triune God in eternity.⁸⁸

Moltmann saw the dichotomy of the cross of Christ on Golgotha.⁸⁹

On one dimension, the meaning of the crucifixion of Jesus Christ is to describe that the Father and the Son in this sacrifice story are very separate, so in the context of the sacrifice for the sake of human sin, it can be interpreted that the relationship between the two is broken. Jesus died without God. However, on the other hand, the cross of Christ also shows that the Father and the Son are one entity, so they both form a single surrender movement. This surrender means that God essentially gives Himself. On the cross, God gave Himself to humankind. If we explain the Triune God doctrine, Moltmann argues that the theological mystery to be shown believes: that the Father, through his Holy Spirit, allowed Jesus, His Son, to sacrifice Himself. So, the Father is the cross of Love, while Jesus is the Love that was crucified, and the Holy Spirit becomes an invincible force in the event of the cross.⁹⁰

Jiirgen Moltmann adopted the thought of Kari Rahner, who said that “the immanent Trinity is the economic Trinity.” Those talks about God revealing Himself to humans through His works.⁹¹ Based on this thought, Moltmann saw a close interconnection between the events of the cross and the person of the Triune

⁸⁸ Jiirgen Moltmann, *The Trinity and the Kingdom* (Minnesota: Fortress Press,

⁸⁹ Gary J. Dorrien, *Reconstructing the Common Good: Theology and the Social*

⁹⁰ Kari Rahner, *The Trinity* (New York: Independent Publishers Group, 1997) 3.

⁹¹ Moltmann, *The Trinity and the Kingdom*, 160.

God. Jesus cried out with a loud voice on the cross: "My God, my God, why have you forsaken me?" must say something about the Triune God that this call cannot be ignored. God, who reveals himself to man through his works, reveals God's self-identity and has a retroactive effect on himself. In this case, the work of the cross, Moltmann sees that what God reveals to a man about himself is God as he is and as God is what God reveals to man to be known. There should be no difference between God in Himself and what is revealed to man.⁹²

In the mystery of Jesus' death on the cross, both vertically and horizontally, Moltmann can find a deep connection and meaning regarding the direct relationship between the nature of the Father and Jesus. For the first time, Jesus called out to the Father not as Father but as "God".⁹³ If, throughout Jesus' life introduced Himself to have a special relationship with the Father, why at this moment did Jesus change His call to the Father? Moltmann sees this as an indication of something crucial happening in the harmonious, complete, and perfect intra-trinity relationship.⁹⁴

Moltmann applies the concept of "the immanent Trinity is the economic Trinity" to the cross event so that the conclusion that Moltmann comes to is that the cross event helped shape the personality of the Triune God. This certainly

⁹² Moltmann. 100

⁹³ Murray J. Harris, *Jesus as God: The New Testament Use of Theos in Reference to Jesus* (Oregon: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2008) 296.

⁹⁴ Meredith Minister, "Following the Cracks of Trinitarian Theology," in *Trinitarian Theology and Power Relations: God Embodied*, ed. Meredith Minister, New Approaches to Religion and Power (New York: Palgrave Macmillan US, 2014), 109-

raises the question of to what extent the economic Trinity can explain the

immanent Trinity.⁹⁵ It can be said that the economic Trinity can change and explain the principle of the immanent Trinity.⁹⁶ This does not contain an understanding that wants to assert that Moltmann argues that "the immanent Trinity itself is or is of the same substance as the economic Trinity". Therefore, we as researchers consider it necessary to study Moltmann's view of the relationship between the position of the Father on one side and the Son on a separate side in the story of the cross on Golgotha Hill.

2. Intra-Trinity Relationship on the Cross

Jiirgen Moltmann does not deny that the Triune God is made up of three distinct persons, but also one simultaneously. The three persons of the Trinity are actually exactly the same and one substance, are unique in each of them as Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, and are unique in their relationship to one another.⁹⁷ Because of the uniqueness of each individual, Moltmann sees the knowledge of the Triune God must also be seen from a Trinitarian point of view. The exclusive relationship between the Father and Jesus is shown through Jesus' call to the Father as "My

⁹⁵ Paul D. Molnar, *Divine Freedom and the Doctrine of the Immanent Trinity: In Dialogue with Kari Barth and Contemporary Theology* (London: Bloomsbury Publishing,

⁹⁶ "The Function of the Immanent Trinity in the Theology of Kari Barth: Implications for Today | Scottish Journal of Theology | Cambridge Core," accessed August 18, 2022, <https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/scottish-journal-of-theology/article/the-function-of-the-immanent-trinity-in-the-theology-of-kari-barth-implications-for-today/9780521875611>

⁹⁷ Moltmann, *The Trinity and the Kingdom*, 145.

Father".^{98 99} This call reflects the intimate relationship between the Father and Jesus.

However, when Jesus died on the cross, Moltmann found that Jesus called out to the Father not as Father but as "God". He saw this as an indication of something happening in the Intra-trinity relationship because Jesus replaced His call to the Father.

In an attempt to discover what happens in this Intra-trinity relationship, Moltmann looks at the relationship between the individual persons. A clue is obtained from Paul in Romans 8:32, which clearly says that the Father gave up His Son to get sinners." Based on this statement of Paul, he then saw the Father as the one who left Jesus and gave Him up to death. Jesus is a person abandoned by the Father, and in total submission, He gave Himself to the Father and then died in terrible suffering.

For Moltmann, the Holy Spirit was the one who continued the suffering of the Father and the surrender of the Son by resurrecting Jesus.¹⁰⁰ For him, the Holy Spirit does not exist as an independent person.¹⁰¹ The Holy Spirit is seen as the love that comes from the suffering of the Father and the Son on the cross.¹⁰² In other words, the Holy Spirit is the result of the cross event which acts as the spirit that reunites the Father and the Son after the death of Jesus on the cross and brings

⁹⁸ Moltmann, 70.

⁹⁹ Moltmann, *The Crucified God*, 294.

¹⁰⁰ Moltmann, 295.

¹⁰¹ Moltmann, *The Trinity and the Kingdom*,

¹⁰² Moltmann, *The Crucified God*, 245.

all creation to be integrated into the life of the Triune God. The Father, Son, and

Holy Spirit are closely related at the cross but have different roles.

By looking at each person's differences in this Intra-Trinity relationship,

Moltmann concludes that this relationship also forms the unity of the Triune God.¹⁰³

The sacrifice on the cross must be experienced through Triune God to reach that perfect unity.¹⁰⁴ In the mystery of the cross, Moltmann tries to see the unity of Triune God manifested in the willingness of the Father and the Son to be one in suffering.¹⁰⁵ Theologically, Moltmann asserts that not only Christ suffered on the cross, but the Father also suffered. By referring to Paul's Epistle to Galatians 2:20, Moltmann shows that the Son also gave Himself up. In other words, not only did the Father give Jesus up, but Jesus, with His will, also gave Himself up to become a sacrifice for human sins.¹⁰⁶ Moltmann saw this form of the unity of the Father and Jesus, namely one in suffering. Even though the Father and the Son are one in suffering, the act of surrender that the Father does to the Son not only has an impact on the intra-trinity relationship, but also on the unity of the Triune God. The unity of the Triune God is seen as a result of the historical cross event because

¹⁰³ Quentin P. Kinnison, *Transforming Pastoral Leadership: Reimagining*

Congregational Relationships for Changing Contexts (Oregon: Wipf and

¹⁰⁴ Moltmann, *The Crucified God*, 255.

¹⁰⁵ Seung Goo Lee, "The Relationship between the Ontological Trinity and the Economic Trinity" *Journal of Reformed Theology* 3, no. 1 (January 1, 2009): 90-107,

¹⁰⁶ Carolyn E. L. Tan, *The Spirit at the Cross: Exploring a Cruciform Pneumatology*

there are times when the Holy Spirit reunites the Father and the Son, experiences separation, and then at the time of Jesus' resurrection.¹⁰⁷

The mutual workings of the Father and the Son is The Father subjects everything to the Son, the Son subjects himself to the Father. Through the power of resurrection, the Son subjects himself to the Father. Through the power of the resurrection, the Son destroys all other powers and death itself, then transferring the consummated kingdom of life and the love that is free of violence, to the Father. Therefore, the kingdom of God is transferred from one divine subject to the other; and its form is changed in the process. So, God's triunity precedes the divine lordship. The Unity of the Triune God is a dynamic concept in which this process will continue until it reaches the peak of its revelation at the time of eschatology.

3. Separation of the Intra-Trinity

When Jesus shouted, "*Eloi Eloi Lama sabakhtani*"\ This cry of loss cannot be separated from the basic existential understanding of the two natures of Jesus.¹⁰⁸ The person who suffered and died on the cross was not only human, but He was also God. For Moltmann, Jesus' suffering and death on the cross would first affect the person of the Triune God because of the two natures that Jesus had. Moltmann criticizes the doctrine of two natures held and believed by church tradition. The

¹⁰⁷ John W. Robinson, "Life in the Spirit as Life In-Between," *Pacifica: Australasian Theological Studies* 17, no. 3 (October 2004): 283-96, <https://doi.org/10.1177/1030570X0401700304>.

¹⁰⁸ Louis Roy, "The Passion of Jesus: A Test Case for Providence," *New Blackfriars*

two natures in Jesus should emphasize not only the different natures between the divinity and humanity of Jesus but also emphasize the unity of these two natures.¹⁰⁹

Moltmann saw that the difference between the divine and human nature of Jesus would cause attraction and contradiction and have a reciprocal relationship. This reciprocal relationship is what Moltmann calls the unity of the two natures.

Concerning the events of the cross, Moltmann sees the death of Jesus as influencing the Triune God, especially the relationship between the Father and the Son. The cross event is first understood as a "God-mission" because what happened to Jesus on the cross also happened to the Father.¹¹⁰ Moltmann quoted Luther as saying that whatever happened on the cross was an event between God and God where God fought God, cried out to God, and died with God.¹¹¹

In this sense, Moltmann further sees that the event of the cross is not only about God cooperating with an obedient human being to accomplish the work of salvation but also about His relationship with His own Son and, in other words, concerning Himself. Therefore, the cry of Jesus, which says, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" cannot simply be ignored. The Father truly abandoned Jesus. The condition of Jesus being abandoned by the Father is challenging to understand. How could the Father leave Jesus? However, Moltmann

¹⁰⁹ Randall E. Otto, "The Use and Abuse of Perichoresis in Recent Theology,"

Scottish Journal of Theology 54, no. 3 (August 2001): 366-84,

¹¹⁰ Andrew Lord, "The Pentecostal-Moltmann Dialogue: Implications for Mission,

Journal of Pentecostal Theology 11, no. 2 (January 1, 2003): 271-87,

¹¹¹ Jürgen Moltmann, "The Crucified God," *Theology Today* 31, no. 1 (April 1,

saw that just as the unique fellowship between the Father and Jesus existed throughout the life of Jesus, so the situation Jesus experienced on the cross was also a unique form of neglect.^{112 113} This unique abandonment cannot be understood and understood with human feelings because it is more than just a feeling of abandonment. The call of Jesus is interpreted as a cry that comes from Himself because the Father left Jesus, and because of that, the relationship between the Father and Jesus has been severed, and there is a separation in the intra-trinity relationship.^{1,3} Moltmann quoted Luther as saying that the cross does not reveal the invisible existence of God through His visible works, but the visible Work of God itself, which is part of God's existence that God revealed to be seen by humans. Moltmann then saw the call of Jesus to declare the occurrence of separation in the intra-trinity relationship.

Moltmann believed there was a natural separation in the relationship between the Father and the Son at the cross. Separation means the Father and the Son are separated in His existence as God.¹¹⁴ The Triune God is not something that exists eternally in Himself but with one another.¹¹⁵ Therefore, the Father's act of

^{1,2} Samuel J. Youngs, *The Way of the Kenotic Christ: The Christology of Jurgen Moltmann* (Oregon: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2019) 117.

¹¹³ Paul C. Anders, "Analytic Theology: New Essays in the Philosophy of Theology," *Faith and Philosophy* 29, no. 2 (May 1, 2012): 236-40, <https://doi.org/10.5840/fai.thphi.1201229223>.

¹¹⁴ Moltmann, *The Crucified God*, 2015; Minister, "Following the Cracks of Trinitarian Theology." 230

^{1,5} Moltmann sees the relationship between the Father and the Son as a dynamic one. The dynamic relationship that is meant is each person in the relationship formed through the event of the cross. This is how the Triune God forms His being, including the unity among Him. According to Moltmann, in the event of the cross, the unity of the Triune God lies not in His being but action and will. The Father and the Son remain one in suffering even though the forms of suffering experienced by the two are different.

leaving Jesus on the cross is considered to have damaged the relationship between them and became a separate history for the Triune God.¹¹⁶

Moreover, the Father and the Son are also one in the will. This unity in the will is expressed through the separation between the Father and Jesus on the cross. The Triune God is known as a God of love. A loving God willingly sacrificed to save lost humanity from before Him. The Father and Jesus are one in His will to save humankind which can only be fulfilled through the death of Jesus on the cross, even though the Father and the Son must experience separation in their complete, perfect, and eternal relationship.¹¹⁷

Through this understanding, Moltmann's unity is not only the unity in substance in the identity of the Father and Jesus as God but also includes the differences in the character of each person of the Triune God and the different roles in particular in the event of the cross. The Father and Jesus were separated at the cross and one in suffering. The Holy Spirit raised Jesus from the dead and reunited Jesus with the Father.

This concept of separation is considered necessary in seeing the relationship between the Father and the Son because only in this way can Jesus bring sinful human beings to be reconciled to God. Man can enter into the unity of the Triune God through unity in Jesus.¹¹⁸ The event of the cross has broken the

¹¹⁶ Roger Olson, "Trinity and Eschatology: The Historical Being of God in Jürgen Moltmann and Wolfhart Pannenberg," *Scottish Journal of Theology* 36, no. 2 (May

¹¹⁷ Matthew Lee Sanders, "Subordinate but Equal: The Intra-Trinitarian Subordination of the Son to the Father in the Theologies of P. T. Forsyth and Jürgen Moltmann" (Thesis, University of St Andrews, 2010), <https://research-repository.st-andrews.ac.uk/handle/10023/1440>.

¹¹⁸ Paul D. Molnar, "The Function of the Trinity in Moltmann's Ecological Doctrine of Creation," *Theological Studies* 51, no. 4 (December 1990): 673-97,

eternal relationship between the Father, and the cry "My God, my God, why have you forsaken me" must be understood in the proper context to be able to see the relationship of the Father and the Son at the cross event. This call of Jesus can be interpreted as a "demonstration" of the consequences of sin, which has separated God from man.

Calvin believed that the Father had left Jesus at the cross. The statement of the Father leaving Jesus must be understood that Jesus was bearing the sins of humankind as it is written in Isaiah 53:5 in His two natures, so that the Father had to leave Jesus because Jesus was bearing the wrath and judgment of God. Calvin emphasized that it does not mean that the Father is angry with Jesus because Jesus cannot become a sacrifice for human sins if Jesus does not please the Father or the Father is angry with Him.¹¹⁹ It is crucial to pay attention to Jesus' call as a genuine call, namely the Father forsaking Jesus, but at the same time remembering that the Father and Jesus remain faithful to each other.¹²⁰ The statement of the Father leaving Jesus on the cross cannot be directly interpreted as the occurrence of separation in the relationship between the Father and the Son. The search for meaning in the call of Jesus is crucial to understanding the relationship between the Father and the Son on the cross. Because Jesus is a substitute sacrifice for

¹¹⁹ Edith M. Humphrey, "Orthodox Christian Reception of the Pauline Teaching on *Dikaiosyne*". Chrysostom, in Conversation with Calvin, on Romans 1-3: Orthodox Christian Reception of Pauline *Dikaiosyne*," *International Journal of Systematic Theology* 20, no. 2 (April 2018): 269-84, <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijst.12284>.

¹²⁰ Christiaan Mostert, "Moltmann's Crucified God," *Journal of Reformed Theology* 7, no. 2(January 1, 2013): 160-80, <https://doi.org/10.1163/15697312-12341293>.

humans and human salvation, it cannot be said that there was a separation in the relationship between the Father and the Son at the cross.

Just as God reveals Himself to be love, even in the event of the cross, God's love does not change. The unity of the Father and the Son who remained intact on the cross was essential to the salvation of sinful humankind. McCal! cites Torrance's belief that the whole message of the gospel becomes meaningless when the relationship between the Father and the Son is severed at the cross.¹²¹

The Father left Jesus on the cross, but at the same time, the Father and Jesus remain one in His existence as the Triune God, so that no relationship is broken.

4. Eschatological Cross and Salvation

The following historical and hermeneutic question is how the preached Jesus became the Christ who was preached. Therefore, a Christological question is how the dead Jesus became the living and the crucified the resurrected and the humiliated to glorify.¹²² This goes beyond any other question and is essentially a theological question in Christology. Faith in God is faith in the cross and the resurrection. The identity of the historical Jesus and the Christ in whom one believes, of the crucified and risen Jesus, is an eschatological mystery and lies in the faithfulness of God,¹²³ who manifests himself equally in the abandonment and the resurrection of Jesus.

¹²¹ Thomas F. Torrance, *The Christian Doctrine of God, One Being Three Persons*

¹²² Jesper Tang Nielsen, "The Narrative Structures of Glory and Glorification in the Fourth Gospel," *New Testament Studies* 56, no. 3 (July 2010): 343-66,

¹²³ John E. Thiel, "For What May We Hope? Thoughts on the Eschatological

Historically and hermeneutically, continuity and differences can be discovered and explained on several levels. There is an appropriate response between the love shown by faith and the attitude and behavior of Jesus. There is a correspondence between the preaching of Jesus and the kerygma of the church. There is a correspondence between the food that Jesus brought with the disciples and the Lord's supper in the church, between the meal that Jesus brought with sinners and tax collectors, and the agape of the church feast. There is a correspondence between the sufferings of Jesus and the sufferings of the apostles and martyrs. However, the legitimacy of this analogy is found only in the personal identity of Christ in the crucifixion and resurrection, which is determined by theological considerations. This argument forces the conclusion that understanding.

Jesus crucified must be the origin of all Christology. Otherwise, his death on the cross would mean the end of all Christology.

The crucifixion of Jesus also denies his preaching in the view of the person, or the person in the view of his preaching, and so refutes the two together, or the sermon is drawn into a person until his death so that under the resurrection from the dead it must continue to be preached as the 'word of the cross. However, in that case, it can continue to be preached only with and in the form of its proclamation, that is, in the kerygma of Christ. Either the cross makes every *Jesuology* and every Christology impossible, or else, in conjunction with His resurrection, it makes *Jesuology* possible as Christology, and Christology possible as *Jesuology*!^{*}

Authentic Christian sacrifice is a profoundly Trinitarian event, or in terms of what people should have in mind when thinking of the Eucharist as a sacrifice, *

Imagination," *Theological Studies* 67, no. 3 (September 2006): 517-41, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056390606700303>.

¹²⁴ David Braine, "What Makes a Christology into a Christian Theology?," *New Blackfriars* 77, no. 905 (1996): 288-302, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/43249883>.

it is highly defective. It asks the wrong question. It approaches the matter completely backward, in a completely upside-down way. It disastrously assumes that one should look to the religions of the world, and the characteristics of sacrifice derived from them, to find out what we mean when we speak of the ‘Sacrifice of Christ, the ‘Sacrifice of the Mass, or ‘Christian sacrifice’. In contrast to this, the right way, as we have been insisting, and as we will now proceed to point out in some detail, is to look first to the Christ-event, and primarily from the perspective of that Trinitarian event, rather than primarily from the practices of other religions, to try to understand sacrifice. This detailed explanation will be arranged in accord with the three ‘moments’ of Trinitarian Christian sacrifice¹²⁵: the self-offering of the Father, the ‘response’ of the Son, and the responding self-offering of the believers.¹²⁶

¹²⁵ Daly, *Sacrifice Unveiled*, 5, 10.

¹²⁶ John Baker, “The Priesthood of All Believers: Reunion: Theological Explorations, 2,” *Theology* 69, no. 548 (February 1, 1966): 60-65, <https://doi.org/10.1177/0040571X6606954804>.