



*Mercy  
Not Sacrifice*

**Ruben Olschewsky**

# Ruben Olschewsky Sabbath sermon

24<sup>th</sup> October 2020

Maranathamedia.com

This morning before I start I am going to ask that we kneel, but just to give your minds a bit of charge, my message this morning I have titled "I Will Have Mercy and Not Sacrifice". So my focus is going to be the sacrificial system. It's going to be on the coming of Christ to this earth as the Meshiach and what our understanding is in regard to what God was actually looking for.

So before we continue, let us pray. Father in heaven I thank you for this Sabbath and I thank you for the outpouring of Your Spirit toward each and every one of us and I pray that our hearts will be open to receive of that Spirit, that our ears will be open to hear Your voice and our hearts willing to respond. Father I pray that You will give me the right words to speak, to edify my brethren here in the group and also on line. I pray that these thoughts and this study will be a blessing to them. Father, please help to present these thoughts clearly that they may give work upon which can be built for this message and this movement and I thank You and praise You in the precious Name of Your Son Yeshua, Amen.

My brother still lives in the Northern Territory and is working there now for 11 or 12 years in an aboriginal community just outside Mt Isa. Before he moved there he worked as a builder carpenter around the northern New South Wales area and just over the border in Queensland. And while he was working there he once shared a story with me about an experience of a co-worker of his. He was a guy they called him "the forklift". He could just about lift anything. He was a mammoth of a man ... he was a man-mountain. What was very interesting is that he had a temper to boot and those two combinations don't generally go well.

And so he was very temperamental ... and particularly when he got on the road ... and say if someone did something to him that he thought was particularly unjust he was the sort of person that given the opportunity, he would get out of the car and not just speak to that person but there would be an engagement.

He didn't like this behaviour ... he didn't like this character component in him but it seemed to just explode at times. And on one occasion he was driving to work and he had a traffic jam or at least what he considered to be a traffic jam because it was going slower than he wanted to go. The traffic was still moving but he felt he was getting late for work. I am not sure whether he was or not. But as my brother told the story, out of nowhere he could see ... well he

couldn't see ... but from his blind spot this lady comes past in a car and cuts past in front of him and goes into the exit and bang, he had to slam on the anchors ... and that was just that little thing that set the fuse.

And so he decided to make out of this woman an example that day. So he pursued her and ran her off the road so she had to stop as he basically cut off in front of her and then got out in front of her and just about took the door off its hinges ... and he was about to reach and grab this woman and was like hurling abuse at her ... and the woman was crying! He didn't actually know why ... but for him it was such an emotion ... such a thrust of emotion that he didn't even consider why, but he probably figured it was just because he's a big guy, he is really angry, he has just cut her off.

Anyway this woman just profusely apologised to him. And she explains to him that the reason why she cut him off was because she has just had a phone call from the emergency department saying that her daughter was involved in a really tragic accident and she was fighting for her life and she can't think straight and just trying to get to the hospital.

This arrested this man. In that moment he was standing there and not really sure what to do. He just apologised to her and closed the door quietly, got back in his car and pulled out and gave her the right of way and then he drove to work. Then he said when he got to work, it's like he was a different guy. It broke him up inside because what he had perceived in this woman and in her actions was based on an idea he had in his mind and the reality when he actually met this woman was completely the opposite and it just ... it changed his whole paradigm ... changed his perception and actually brought in him deep **contrition** in that moment.

My brother just mentioned that he said like "something has got to change with me". But what really stood out for me was the fact that you can go into a

situation assuming you know what someone is like and find out at the end you are completely wrong. And it's this concept that I want to take this morning into our study of the scriptures.

So I want to start this morning with Proverbs Chapter 30, verse 4 ... and it says:

“Who hath ascended up into heaven, or descended? who hath gathered the wind in his fists? [H:handfuls, hollow of the hand] who hath bound the waters in a garment? who hath established [H: raised up] all the ends of the earth? **what is his name, and what is his son's name, if thou canst tell?**”

By the way, when it says “who hath gathered the wind in his fists?” I always find that interesting because it's an expression where you naturally think of something clenching in anger. In Hebrew, it's simply talking about hands. He gathers the wind up in His hands. It changes the picture, doesn't it? ... Interestingly enough ...

“What is his name, and what is his son's name ...” On the internet it's interesting that there is a lot of debate about what do you call God? There are whole movements that go about what is God's name. You spell it this way! I am sorry you are saying it wrong ... it's this and then there is a plethora of different names that come on that list that tell you what you are supposed to call it. It seems like in that whole process there is actually a really deep point that's being missed.

And I will give you a comparison for this. I was travelling with Pastor Adrian once and a programme was given as to all the meetings that were happening and I wondered, oh, guest speaker, “Adrain” [pronounced a drain] is going to be preaching today.

Congregation: Laughter

[Jokingly] I must find out who this guy is ... but in my head I knew. I thought wow that's interesting! So I thought here comes someone to the meeting and says oh there's the guy ... Hi Pastor Adrain! Because that's what is written in the programme. That's not his name but you call him a drain! And ok, in the course of the conversation there is a clarification ... I know it's written there but my name is actually Adrian ... it's ok.

Does getting the name right in that moment mean that you have a deep intimate relationship and you know everything about the man? No! All you know now is his name ... that's it. It says **nothing** of the relationship! So the question in this verse in Proverbs Chapter 30, verse 4 is **not** how do you spell His name? Because the Hebrew when it's talking about name it's talking of ...?

Congregation: Character

Character! What is His character like and what is His Son's character like, if you can tell? If you are able to tell ... So this question is actually a KEY QUESTION. It's a really an important question and the answer reveals much to each and every one of us and **about us**.

**What we understand about God determines our relationship to Him.** And what we understand about God will be revealed in our actions towards others (... and that's what Pastor Adrian was talking about this morning). If you believe that God condemns it will be manifest in your life and if you believe that God takes life I guarantee you, under the right circumstances you will find yourself doing exactly that ... all you need is the right ingredients. Because it's a "Go" signal. You see that as a green light ... it's justifiable. If it's justifiable you will find yourself doing it under certain circumstances.

It's a warning I have given in Germany many times. For those who are advocating that God actively and aggressively takes life. If that is true of what you are convicted of my warning to you is, that it will be manifested in your life. SO BE CAREFUL WHAT YOU BELIEVE.

The fall of mankind was the introduction to an altered view of God. Does that make sense to every one?

Congregation: Yes

Because of the lies that Satan told to Adam and Eve, the shift was that they saw God through a different set of lenses. They now saw a god in a different light so that the God that still loved them ... the God that hadn't changed would now come to reveal Himself in the garden as He normally did, with the intention to commune with them and they ran and hid. So who changed here? Their perception of Him had changed. Nothing had changed about His character. And so deep was that impact that just because Adam had confessed his sin to Christ

and acknowledged that he had made a mistake in eating of the fruit of the tree that he ought not to have eaten from, and in listening to his wife over listening to God and therefore choosing a new god, in his confession of sin, did it just naturally eradicate that issue?

Congregation: No

No ... It was perpetuated. And God was seen as a tyrant by Adam. We have expressed that through other presentations many times now. That is why the accusation or the **condemnation** as Pastor Adrian has expressed recently through Romans 5:16, came through one man. That condemnation was against God, not FROM God: The woman that YOU made ... You're the one responsible ... You [God] are the source of this problem.

What I want to do now is to track for a moment just in our discussion, how this issue has not been resolved through the **whole course** of the scriptures. Man carries with him this view of a tyrannical God.

You remember in the story of Job. Right? The main character in the story is the man Job. Correct? What does the name mean? Do any of you know? Hated! Right, interestingly enough, the name "Iyob" means hated. That's why he is in some sense a parallel to the Messiah because Christ was hated. But in the story of Job, he's got three friends. Do I remember them? Bildad, Zophar and Eliphaz I think are their names. They are the so called friends of Job whose intention was originally was to comfort him, to sit with him in sackcloth and ashes ... to comfort him. And as they were beginning to realize that he is bewailing this is happening to him and not acknowledging any sin, they're starting to reveal what's in their hearts.

Job, you need to get this clear: you're sick, everything has fallen away, you've lost everything you've ever had; it's pretty clear that you have done something wrong and you are being punished for your wrong. Is that right? Is that ultimately where their argument is?

Congregation: Yes

And all three of them were in unison. They just used different ways to attack the elephant. Essentially their point at him was that you've done something wrong and because you did something wrong you're being punished.

The prevailing thought of mankind at that time, and I believe Job was written as a time contemporary with Abraham. So in the time of Abraham, it was the consensus of most that when you do wrong, God punishes you. And so you need to do something to make it right again, which interestingly enough doesn't separate you much from the pagans ... does it?

When the weather is not conducive to what you are looking for, what do you do? Well, you offer your first born or you go and offer some sacrifices or you give some of your money to the priest or whatever it is to make everything to go right again ... TO MAKE THE GODS HAPPY ... which is what we've expressed as **appeasement** ... to change the character or the mind of the individual you are worshipping to become conducive to be favourable to you again.

Is that making sense?

So that was the basic idea that was being conveyed in the story of Job and of course at the end of the book of Job, reveals that these three friends and their idea was totally wrong. In Chapter 40 of that book God makes it abundantly clear that you will need to offer a sacrifice THROUGH Job because he actually represented Me correctly ... or most correctly should I say out of all you lot ... unless I deal with you according to your judgement ... in Matthew 7:1 ["Judge not, that ye be not judged."]

So that's one situation, and then we come forward through history and we look at Second Samuel, Chapter 6, you recall that's the story where the ark is being brought, and it's being brought back to the city of David. Uzzah is attending the ark and are they carrying it on their shoulders?

Congregation: No

No ... on a bullock cart. So it's a cart drawn by horses. Is that's what is written in the Torah of how the ark is to be transported from one place to another? No, it's to be borne on the shoulders of the priests ... Correct? So there is a transgression that takes place and if you have studied the stories as we've expressed before in the story of Uzzah, you will find that he had an irritation [with Ahio his younger brother who led the ark whereas it should have been, himself, the first born]. He had a spirit of irritation that was working within him and he places himself in a position of vulnerability and touches the ark when it

looks like it's going to topple and it seems that God strikes him dead. And I want to just pick this up for a moment, as I think it's worthwhile bringing up. ... as I think I will make the point better if we look it up.

So in Second Samuel Chapter 6 we are going to look at verse 9. We are starting at verse 8 :

“And David was displeased, because the Lord had made a breach upon Uzzah ... “

I am not going to go into the depths of pulling all this apart at the moment:

... “and he called the name of the place Perez-uzzah (which means simply, breach upon Uzzah) to this day.”

And then it says the following in verse 9: “And David was **afraid** ... What?

Congregation: Afraid

Afraid ... scared! Is that an intimate relationship with God? No, that is a view of a man that says ok, Uzzah has done something wrong ... he touched the ark and BANG! He's struck dead ... by God ... well at least that's the impression. David is afraid of the Lord that day and says, “How shall the ark of the Lord come to me?”

So fear is the motivation because David, in order to be afraid, David has assumed that God did it, which means that the idea of a tyrant is being perpetuated. Then it says that “David would not remove the ark of the Lord unto him into the city of David”.

Right ... so he waited and it went to another person's place and what they found out in the story was that when it went to this member's house ... the guy was blessed!!! He was so blessed and then that testimony comes back to David and it's like ... that's confusing ... so what did I do wrong? He then goes and comes back to try to move the ark.

Verse 12: “And it was told King David, saying, The Lord hath blessed the house of Obed-edom, and all that pertaineth unto him, because of the ark of God. So David went and brought up the ark of God from the house of Obed-edom into the city of David with gladness.”



And here is verse 13: “And it was so, that when they that bare the ark of the Lord had gone six paces, he sacrificed oxen and fatlings.”

Can you imagine what kind of blood fest that would have been? Why is he offering sacrifices with every six steps?

Congregation: Appeasement

And we are going to look at this later on. I just want you to keep this in mind. You're trying to convey the vessel that represents blessing by taking six steps and taking life. You can't tell me that this is not an appeasement based sacrificial understanding. That represents CONFUSION. You have a perverted idea as to who God is when every six steps you are offering up animals. There can be no other reason because you don't want more people to die, which means you never understood what actually took place. But it is clear that when David looked upon God through this situation, he saw God as a tyrant. Now if you would have asked him at that time, he would probably have said, “No I love God. I just don't want to die.”

Pastor Adrian: Is that why they sacrificed [in the Sanctuary] and then took six hours and then sacrificed again?

Wow! I pray that's not why it was set up ... If you look at the Spirit of Prophecy it says to remember the sufferings of Christ for an hour a day but I guess context would suggest that yeah we are making sure we are covering the day! Lord protect me before I start the day ... and Lord protect me before I start the night.

Pastor Adrian: It's the motivation.

Yes.... And so this we have in the time of David which is the time of the kings ....

Comment from Congregation: I just want to say for the people listening, when Solomon brought the ark to the temple, he did the same sacrificing as his father did ... he sacrificed the same amount of sheep and oxen

Perpetuated ... And that makes sense doesn't it? Because it's building from one generation to the next. It's simply building on the theology of the previous generation. So when at the time of the kings, this idea is still perpetuated. This idea is still very much present!

Then we come all the way to the time of Christ. And you would think at the time of Christ this issue is resolved but we have numerous examples where like the disciples in John Chapter 9, do you recall? There's the blind man ... and what question do they ask him?

Congregation: Who sinned, this man or his parents?

Thank you! Who sinned, this man or his parents? What is the underlying thought about God in relation to that question?

Congregation: Punishment of sin

He's done something wrong ... and God's punished him. Is that a correct view of God? What is His name? What is His Son's name? He is represented by His Son who is right there and they are asking Him. Who sinned?

And what I find really interesting about this is that the disciples assumed that the blind man exhibited the works of God. ... He was punished for something he had done. So he was exhibiting the works of God! And Jesus said to them, "No, he is blind so I can show you the works of God!" ... which is to make him see. THE TOTAL OPPOSITE!

The disciples had to change their way of thinking ... about what is His **Name**?

Congregation: As did the blind man

Correct.

It is with this tyrannical view in mind that the idea of punishment for transgression was lodged firmly in the mind of man. And just to put this point clear because I don't want to move on because I know that sometimes we have people present in our congregation who are visiting who may not have even ventured on to this journey.

The point I am making is the following that people do get punished but it's just not coming from God. In Galatians Chapter 6, verse 7, it says that "as a man sows, so shall he reap". Punishment is coming out of a circumstance that you have created. And I want to add two other texts to that just so to make that point.

I want to look at one that is found in the Psalms and most of you who are on this journey for a while will know this Psalm well. It's Psalm Chapter 9, verse 16. It says that "The Lord is known by the judgement which **He** executes: the wicked is snared in the work of his own hands."

Whose hands?

Congregation: His own hands

His own hands.

And I want to add just another one to it because that is not the focus of my presentation this morning. I would like you to come to Ecclesiastes Chapter 10, verse 8. It says: "He that diggeth a pit shall fall into it; and whoso breaketh an hedge, a serpent shall bite him."

What is a hedge?

Congregation: Protection

Protection. ... And who is that serpent?

Congregation: Satan

The great adversary! If you destroy God's protection then you are going to get bitten. You dig a hole ... and what does it mean to dig a hole? What are you digging a hole for?

In relation to the message this morning why are you digging a hole? It's an act of **condemnation**. You are just trying to catch someone else in it. You set the situation up to watch them fall so you can condemn them. And invariably you will fall in it yourself.

So that was just to clarify this point. The point I'm making is punishment does attend wickedness, but God is not the active force bringing that punishment. It is coming through natural established laws in the earth and is coming from the direct action of Satan himself, by a combination of those two things.

I want to now read you a statement from Christ's Object Lessons page 126, paragraph 2. I am going to read the lot but my main point is just under halfway,

or just below the halfway mark where it starts with the rites of the Jewish economy. That's going to be the focal point toward the end.

So it says: "The word of God includes the Scriptures of the Old Testament as well as of the New. One is not complete without the other. Christ declared that the truths of the Old Testament are as valuable as those of the New ... "

One is not complete without the other. You remember in an oppositional structure people oftentimes find to wrest those two apart: the old one is done away with ... we are now in the new ... so on and so on. The point is, in a divine pattern one leads to the other.

"... Christ was as much man's Redeemer in the beginning of the world as He is today. (... a fairly major statement) Before He clothed His divinity with humanity and came to our world, the gospel message was given by Adam, Seth, Enoch, Methuselah, and Noah. Abraham in Canaan and Lot in Sodom bore the message, (...That's an amazing statement!) and from generation to generation faithful messengers proclaimed the Coming One. (... and then she says) **The rites of the Jewish economy were instituted by Christ Himself ...**"

Which means the sacrificial system was instituted by Yeshua, by the Son of God! So I am not saying that Christ did not institute a sacrificial system. I want to make that point clear.

**"... He was the foundation of their system of sacrificial offerings, ..."**

This is talking about the Jews ... the Jewish system ... Israel ... **He was the foundation, "... the great antitype ..."**

Which is an interesting statement ... It's more like the **substance!** Antitype seems like a bit of an unclear statement.

**"...the great antitype of all their religious service. The blood shed as the sacrifices were offered pointed to the sacrifice of the Lamb of God. ALL the typical offerings were fulfilled in Him." COL 126.2**

So I want you to consider for a moment that we're talking here about concepts like shadow and substance or type and antitype. What I am saying by that is, the lamb that the Jew took and slayed was pointing toward something. And in "Patriarchs and Prophets" [Ellen White], it uses the words that when Adam

performed the first sacrifice because it was HIM that took the first life, she says his hand must be raised to take life which God alone could give ...

**So the sacrificial system was instituted by Christ for the purpose of the individual to recognise that he is taking life.** And the point that was being and trying to come across was that when you offer up the lamb you recognise that it's not about the fruit in the case of Adam ... Understand? Adam took of the fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil and all of a sudden he's got to offer up a lamb? So you've got to ask yourself the question is that because God is angry for taking the fruit you weren't supposed to, giving Him a sacrifice in order to make Him happy again? Or is the sacrifice instituted for you to recognise what that sin actually was, that YOU engaged in? It's not about the fruit. The principle of the fruit is that something inside of you saying, this is not the right thing to do ... And that voice speaking to you, you had to crucify. And so therefore Christ was crucified in Adam at that moment in order for him to take of a fruit and eat though he was forbidden.

And because he offered up Christ inside of him in order to do what he did, Christ instituted a sacrificial system for Adam to see with his eyes **what he had actually done spiritually to the Son of God.** And so therefore the sacrificial system was instituted as an acknowledgement of your sin. It was part of a confession process.

And while you are confessing your sin, what's being offered you?

Congregation: Forgiveness

Forgiveness, mercy ... because the institution of this sacrifice was not to change the mind of God, and we are going to come to this at the end. But I just want to lay that out.

I have another statement for you from the Great Controversy. I have taken this from the 1888 version and that's on page 568, paragraph 4. And these are two subsequent statements that I am going to read now. This one first and the one after. For me it's very revealing.

The first one is a little bit longer so please bear with me. It says:

“It is Satan's constant effort to **misrepresent the character of God** ... “

To misrepresent what?

Congregation: His character

To misrepresent His Name.

“... the nature of sin, and the real issues at stake in the great controversy. His sophistry lessens the obligation of the divine law, and gives men license to sin. At the same time he causes them to cherish **false conceptions of God**, so that they regard him with fear and hate, rather than with love ...”

What happened to David?

Congregation: He feared

Afraid!

**“...The cruelty inherent in his own character is attributed to the Creator; it is embodied (...now get this) in systems of religion, and expressed in modes of worship...”**

I will just reiterate that: The cruel aspects of Satan’s character imposed upon God made themselves manifest in systems of religion and in MODES OF WORSHIP...

And that is true even for the sacrificial system.

**“... Thus the minds of men are blinded, and Satan secures them as his agents to war against God. By perverted conceptions of the divine attributes, heathen nations were led to believe human sacrifices necessary to secure the favour of Deity; ...”**

And yet we as Christians believe that God is exactly like that who offered up His first born Son as an offering to atone and make right what we have done wrong in the law.

**“...and horrible cruelties have been perpetrated under the various forms of idolatry. The Romish Church ... (...now we are not pointing fingers) The Romish Church, uniting the forms of paganism and Christianity ...”**

What is it doing? Lifting up paganism with Christianity ...

“... and, like paganism, misrepresenting the character of God, has resorted to practices no less cruel and revolting...”

And of course because she is the mother of Christianity, all her daughters have inherited these principles who call themselves Protestant. And I may just add there that we now as a church call ourselves **Protestant**. And through the deceptions that sadly our history has gone through, **we base our foundation no longer upon the fulfilment of prophecy but upon Protestantism and by doing that we inherit this same issue** ... pagan principles into our belief. Do we too perpetuate the idea that God wanted to kill His own Son to make things right and offered Him up that way?

It says right at the end there in the last part of the paragraph, “Dignitaries of the church studied, under Satan their master”. I am not suggesting here that they worshipped Satan, but indirectly they did.

Now I want to look a little bit more home and want to look in the “Desire of Ages” and focus in on this mode of worship principles which is the sacrificial system. This is from the “Desire of Ages” page 115, paragraph 1. It’s a relatively short paragraph and says:

“Since the announcement to the serpent in Eden, “I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed” (This is Genesis 3:15), Satan had known that he did not hold absolute sway over the world. There was seen in men the working of a power that withstood his dominion....”

Something he couldn’t understand ... something did not give him full access to humanity

And then she says, “With intense interest he watched the sacrifices offered by Adam and sons....”

**He was trying to figure out how you are connecting into something that stops me from having** access by just killing something! It makes no sense to me! So he is studying the sacrificial system of Adam and his sons with great interest.

“... In these ceremonies he discerned a symbol of communion between earth and heaven. **He set himself to intercept this communion....”**

And what do you do when you intercept? You come in between!

“... He misrepresented God, and **misinterpreted the rites** that pointed to the Saviour. Men were led to **fear** God as one who delighted in their destruction...”

So what had he done? He took a system of confession: ‘I have killed the Son of God afresh with my sin’ into ‘God is angry with me, I need to offer up a sacrifice in order to stop Him from being angry and to be happy with me again.’

“... The sacrifices that should have revealed His love (...that is God’s love) were **offered only to appease His wrath.**” (DA 115.1)

A masterwork isn’t it?

Congregation: Yes

It’s with this in mind, because this is hopefully speaking to this, I would like you to open up Matthew Chapter 9 and I am hoping we are going to get through this.

And I’m going to read from verse 1 through to verse 13. The reason I am reading from verse 1 is to just to try and set the foundations of what is actually coming in verse 13, otherwise it’s a little bit disjointed.

It says: “And he entered into a ship (...that is Christ), and passed over, and came into his own city. And, behold, they brought to him a man sick of the palsy, lying on a bed: and Jesus seeing their faith said unto the sick of the palsy; Son, be of good cheer; thy sins be forgiven thee....”

A man is brought in ... Right. He’s got a problem. Jesus offers Him forgiveness.

“... And, behold, certain of the scribes said within themselves, This *man* blasphemeth....” (verse 3)

Here in the KJV it says this *man* blasphemeth. You will notice that the word “man” is actually introduced. If you look at the Greek here it actually just says ‘this is blasphemy’. You ... a man ... forgiving sins ... that’s blasphemy because you are putting yourself in the position of God.

“... And Jesus knowing their thoughts said, Wherefore think ye evil in your hearts? For whether is easier, to say, *Thy* sins be forgiven thee; or to say, Arise, and walk? But that ye may know that the Son of man hath power on earth to



forgive sins, (he then turns to the individual who has the palsy and says) Arise, take up thy bed, and go unto thine house. ...”

And the guy does, proving forgiving sins ... What did that man do in order to get forgiveness? **Come!** That’s it! **There was no sacrifice.** The man just came and he was forgiven.

“... And he arose, and departed to his house. But when the multitudes saw *it*, they marvelled, and glorified God, which had given such power unto men....”

And I find that interesting because Jesus makes the same proclamation to everyone else around Him and says “Let your light so shine (...that specific!) that men may see your good works and glorify your Father which is in heaven. Now this is **exactly** what happened here. No one glorified Christ! They glorified the Father for what took place. Jesus was not drawing any attention to Himself although you would think that He would get them to go ‘Wow! He’s incredible!’ No ... everyone walked away saying, ‘Praise Father!’

“... And as Jesus passed forth from thence, he saw a man, named Matthew, sitting at the receipt of custom: and he saith unto him, Follow me. And he arose, and followed him. And it came to pass, as Jesus sat at meat in the house, behold, many publicans and sinners came and sat down with him and his disciples...”

And the Pharisees, again seeing it, they went to His disciples and they did what? They condemned Him. [“Why eateth your Master with publicans and sinners?”] Why? Because they assumed themselves better than publicans and sinners ... and so Jesus then responds, and says,

“...They that be whole need not a physician, but they that are sick.

But go ye and learn what meaneth, **I will have mercy, and not sacrifice...**”

What has that got to do with what they just said? To them they were willing to offer up these publicans and sinners to the flames ... **There was no expression of mercy in them.** [Already judged and concluded they were worthy of death]

And Jesus speaking to them said, “They that be whole need not a physician, but they that are sick.”

Who in that congregation was whole? No one! So why would Jesus say that? And He repeats and says, "I will have mercy, and not sacrifice... for I am not come to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance"

Who there was righteous? Only One. I haven't called the righteous, I have called the sinners. So these words of Christ are actually a mirror.

Congregation: As you thinketh ...

Yes ...

I am leaving the outcome in your perception. If you consider yourself in need of help ... come to Me and I'll give it to you. If you don't feel that then there is no need to come here.

But it's interesting that Christ is quoting from Hosea 6:6 ... [He is saying ...] ... But go and read what [it] says "I will have mercy, not sacrifice..."

That's the part that really stood out to me because what has sacrifice to do with the expression: I can't believe he sits with publicans and sinners... if you haven't already judged them to the flames! If you haven't already offered them up to hell. You have concluded these men are worthy of death ... And Jesus is speaking to their heart and revealing this to them.

He presents to them a mirror to contrast their perceived righteousness with the reality of them being actually sinners and he doesn't condemn them in the process.

I want to go across a couple of chapters to chapter 12. I find it interesting that these texts are sitting amongst the proof texts that we bring in talking about the fact that God does not condemn.

Matthew Chapter 12, verse 1 to 7.

"At that time Jesus went on the sabbath day through the corn; and his disciples were an hundred, and began to pluck the ears of corn, and to eat. But when the Pharisees saw *it*, they said unto him, Behold, thy disciples do that which is not lawful to do upon the sabbath day..."

Is that true?

Congregation: No

It was in their tradition ... in the Rabbinical or Talmudic teaching ...it was [not lawful]!

“... But he said unto them, Have ye not read what David did, when he was an hungred, and they that were with him; How he entered into the house of God, and did eat the shewbread, which was not lawful for him to eat, neither for them which were with him, but only for the priests?...”

This is Christ, Himself excusing that act.

“... Or have ye not read in the law, how that on the sabbath days the priests in the temple profane the sabbath, and are blameless? ...”

Because they are working! This is the day they work the most! All the pastors are flat out on Sabbath ... hopefully.

“... Or have ye not read in the law, how that on the sabbath days the priests in the temple profane the sabbath, and are blameless? But I say unto you, That in this place is *one* greater than the temple. But if ye had known what *this* meaneth, I will have mercy, and not sacrifice, ye would not have condemned the guiltless.”

So what is He connecting with sacrifice? Condemning the guiltless.

Congregation: Can you read that again?

Verse 7: “But if ye had known what *this* meaneth, I will have mercy, and not sacrifice, ye would not have condemned the guiltless.”

They were willing to condemn the guiltless. Christ said that’s not the sacrifice that has anything to do with my Father’s kingdom.

Who was guiltless in the sacrificial system? The Lamb ... because the Lamb is not a party to the act. It just gets dragged into the sacrifice.

Who is the Lamb representative of? Christ! Is He saying that you are willing to condemn and kill the innocent? My father is not like that. He didn’t offer me up for a sacrifice as I am guiltless.

I want to add one more text if I may for this point. It was actually interesting walking in the garden on the property of my home and this text popped into my head. I quickly ran back and looked at it and it really startled me.

In Mark Chapter 12, starting in verse 28 and I want to go to verse 34. I am going to read this as this again deepens this image.

In Mark Chapter 12, verse 28 to 34, it says,

“And one of the scribes came, and having heard them reasoning together, and perceiving that he had answered them well, asked him, Which is the first commandment of all? ...”

What does he mean by first? Just to make that point.

Congregation: The greatest ... the most important

The greatest ... the most important ... the one of highest priority. That's the point I am getting across.

“... And Jesus answered him, The first (... or greatest) of all the commandments *is*, (...Sh'ma Ysrael, **listen!**)

“... Hear, O Israel; The Lord our God is one Lord: And thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength: this *is* the first commandment. And the second *is* like, *namely* this, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. There is none other commandment greater than these. And the scribe said unto him, Well, Master, thou hast said the truth: for there is one God; and there is none other but he ...”

Get this in verse 33... And to love him with all the heart, and with all the understanding, and with all the soul, and with all the strength, and to love *his* neighbour as himself, is **more than all whole burnt offerings and sacrifices.**

And then Jesus in verse 34 says, “And when Jesus saw that he answered discreetly, he said unto him, Thou art not far from the kingdom of God. ...” You have made an incredible connection! It's not about sacrifices and offerings.

So I want to come from this and just reflect on the last two paragraphs we have looked at which was in Matthew Chapter 9 and 12 which said:

“I desire mercy and not sacrifice”

Jesus was quoting from the Tanakh, from the Old Testament. He was quoting from the book of Hosea. And if you quickly come across to there, Hosea Chapter 6, verse 6. It says:

“For I desired mercy, and not sacrifice; and the knowledge of God **more than** burnt offerings.”

This has always been a bit of a problematic text for me in just a surface reading. It says “I desired mercy, and not sacrifice” ... that’s a very definitive statement ... and the next is a parallelism. And it states, “and the knowledge of God **more than** burnt offerings.”

And the inference placed by the interpreters in this text says that ‘I accept sacrifices ... I just like this more’ It actually reduces the statement placed at the beginning of the verse because it says, ‘I desired mercy NOT sacrifices’ ... not ‘more than’.

And when you look in the Hebrew here the term “more” is being expressed by the interpreter ... it doesn’t actually belong there... “the knowledge of God **than** offerings”. That’s the context, not ‘more than’. So it retains it, if I can use the term loosely, in an oppositional structure. I am not interested in sacrifices and offerings ... because the context in which you are bringing them is wrong.

I desire MERCY. I desire a knowledge of you to know how much I love you ... and the only way you can do that is to acknowledge your sin and see Me shine!

You can never acknowledge My character for what it truly is if you are coming to Me to change My character ... To change My perspective towards you ... to stop Me from being angry because you have transgressed My law ... and to make Me happy again. You can never have love come forward in that because you’re actually the one that is changing Me!

Pastor Adrian: If you look at “more than” there is no Hebrew word there.

No ... If you look, there is a prefix with the word “sacrifice” and it’s just “than”. It’s just a word to contrast the two ... “the knowledge of God” rather than, or than sacrifice.

Interestingly enough, to make this same point more, if you come into the Proverbs and go to Proverbs Chapter 21, verse 3. In fact start with verse 2.

“Every way of a man *is* right in his own eyes: but the LORD pondereth the hearts. To do justice and judgment is **more acceptable** to the LORD than sacrifice.”

And again MORE acceptable is not in the Hebrew text. The word aptly translated is “chosen”... so it would actually read, “To do justice and judgement is **CHOSEN** by God than sacrifice”.

It changes the context! Greatly ... as to how we read. God does **not choose** sacrifice. Why? Because like I reiterated before, the point of a sacrifice is a means of confession. It is **not** a means of appeasement. God instituted sacrifices for you to acknowledge your sin. It’s just a **channel** for you to come to Him.

And **through** that sacrifice you are acknowledging that it wasn’t about the chocolate bar! It wasn’t about the bad word that just came out. It wasn’t about the act, it was about the act that’s taking place **inside**... And what’s taken place inside, is **for you to sin, you have to sacrifice the Son of God! Because He is the conscience speaking to you!**

So it has nothing to do with changing the mind of God. It has to do with you changing your mind to **acknowledge the severity of your sin** and that’s the beautiful thing about the sacrifice ... It shows you it’s not just a fruit ... **it’s showing you there is a life on the line. You took it to do what you wanted to do.** That **deepens conviction** ... and in the light of that to **see that God is then willing to FORGIVE in your public demonstration of your acknowledgement of sin. He is willing to show you mercy that does one thing that is to break your heart in contrition and come to Him in LOVE!**

CONGREGATION: Amen

CONGREGATION Sister J: I thought as you were saying this, that there is another aspect too ... yes we are crucifying Christ, but we are killing ourselves because ultimately it’s going to lead to your own death. So it’s like a confrontation. This is the path you are on ... You are on the path of death. You can’t go back. So the two play together don’t they?

Absolutely!

Pastor Adrian: That's why the cross ... and Jerusalem 40 years later. They crucified Him ... they got the same.

That, what Pastor Adrian just said is the principle of Matthew 7:1 ["Judge not, that ye be not judged."] They judged and condemned Him ... it came back **magnified** in a channel back on them. It was said that there wasn't enough places to stick the crosses in the ground.

Ok ... Hosea if I understand correctly is contemporary with Daniel. It's at a time when the issues between Israel and God are at a culmination point and Babylon is playing a big part in the history at this time... and Hosea is speaking to this.

Of course the life of Hosea is expressing this because what is he told to do by God? Is to marry a harlot... a woman who is unfaithful, because Israel has been unfaithful to God. So as Hosea is penning these words, in chapter 6, verse 6, there is a history preceding Hosea which also bears the same message. And we find that in the book of Psalms. I want to come there a moment because I want to express a thought in this, that will hopefully deepen a part of this a little ... and I do apologise if I am going a bit overtime.

Congregation: Forgiven! ... No sacrifice required ... or appeasement.

See ... all we have to do is confess our sins!

In Psalms Chapter 40, verse 6 where it says, "Sacrifice and offering thou didst not desire; mine ears thou hast opened: burnt offering and sin offering hast thou not required."

Paul says, in his interpretation of this text: "Sacrifice and offering thou didst not desire but a **body** thou hast prepared for me." [Heb 10:5]

Interesting interpretation of "mine ears thou hast opened"!

What I want to present to you as a thought ...Consider carefully the wording in this text: 'Sacrifice and offering God didst not desire but mine ears thou hast opened'

What does it mean to have your ears opened? What's the context he has given behind it?

Congregation: Doesn't the servant when he decides to stay with his master... doesn't he have his ear put through an awl?

So his ear is ...?

Congregation: Listening

Always listening ... always sh'ma.

The relationship of the servant ... and here's the important point at least according to my interpretation ... The important point for me as I am reading this text, is the fact that when this individual who we understand is the individual whose ears hast thou opened ... who is speaking to the Father, he is operating as a **servant of choice**, not a servant under contract ...

**It's not an appeasement based relationship to God. The Son of God always has His ears open to be a willing servant, in an act of humiliation or humility or submission to the Father. To receive the word which He acknowledges to be a blessing.**

So what's actually happening is, 'sacrifice and offering thou didst not desire, however my ear hast thou opened.' So these two are actually being placed, if I can use this term ... in contrast ... because what brings about in God's system sacrifices and offerings? NOT LISTENING!

And the reason why sacrifices and offerings had to come was because we go our own way, and the way the New Testament expresses that is it's the Old Covenant. **It was never God's intention that anyone should enter the Old Covenant ... to try to do something themselves.** It was always God's intention that His Son would be the mirror to show everyone what God is like and to give the example of what to follow in. [The Sh'ma principle]. **The Son of God has always had His ears open to His Father.** He has always been in an "Amen" relationship with His Father. Father says it! ... Amen! Christ is the Amen. That's why in the gospel record it is given to us the example of faith that we require in order to have salvation is **the faith of Jesus.**

He hears the words of His Father and responds, Amen ... Not yea but! And sacrifices and offerings are a result of yea but! It's the action of a goat! To **but** against that which is standing in front of him.



So God is saying, 'Sacrifices and offerings thou didst not desire ... what I desire is as your ears are opening is to hear My voice ... then we can stop with all the sacrifices.

Pastor Adrian: And the sacrifice comes because the Spirit of Christ in Adam has to be killed off to get a 'yeah but'

...Correct.

Pastor Adrian: He gets to be forced out

Because you are not listening to the voice of conscience. If you are not listening to the voice of conscience, you are willing to crucify that entity ... because it's not an ethereal presence ... **It's a person who is speaking to you and to shut Him up you have to kill Him ... because He won't stop.**

What caused sin to abound in the **flesh** of Adam? ... What caused sin to abound in the flesh of Adam? **Not** listening.

What caused sin to abound in his **conscience**? The sacrifice. It was through the sacrificial system that Adam got a deeper understanding of what he actually did ... and he spent the next almost thousand years dealing with that ... and carried it with him.

Congregation, Sister F: Have you referenced Jeremiah 7:22 and Psalm 51:16-17?

...I will be.

The point I'm making is that by not listening ... by choosing to make a sacrifice of the Son of God, Adam caused sin to abound in his flesh. By being willing to sacrifice an offering as a confession of his sin, caused **conviction** or the sin to be magnified in his conscience ... and **deepen his confession ... deepen his repentance.**

Because as he offered up the sacrifice with the understanding that he has caused the death of that lamb and God was willing to forgive him in the light of that ... It broke his heart and gave a response of love.

In Psalms 51, verses 16 and 17 it says, “For thou desirest not sacrifice; else would I give *it*: thou delightest not in burnt offering. The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit ...”

**That broken spirit comes through the sacrificial system and when understood as a confessional system.**

“...The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit: a broken and contrite heart, O God thou wilt not despise.”

And I want to throw another verse in there as we are going on this. Just to reiterate a point, from the New Testament. You are all familiar with Paul’s ministry to those on Mars Hill, in Athens ... Mount Arapegus ... in Acts 17.

You recall we use this often as a life source principle ... in this verse 24 and 25 ... it says “God that made the world and all things therein, seeing that he is Lord of heaven and earth, dwelleth not in temples **made with hands** ...”

What temples does He dwell in?

Congregation: In the hearts

... In the hearts.

“... Neither is worshipped with men’s hands, as though he needed any thing ...”

What’s Paul pointing towards?

Congregation: The sacrificial system

Sacrifices! **Appeasement** based sacrifices! If you’re bringing your sacrifice to bring something to God to give to Him, you’re on the wrong track. God is not worshipped with men’s hands as though He needed something ... but He gives “to all life, and breath, and all things;” ... including FORGIVENESS!

If you’re act of sacrifice is to bring God something you’ve misunderstood Him. ...What is His Name? What is His Son’s Name?

There are many additional parallel texts. I’ve got them here and I want to bring them so it’s at least brought into the presentation and others can look at it later on.

I have Ecclesiastes Chapter 5, verse 1. It says,

“Keep thy foot when thou goest to the house of God, and be more ready to hear, than to give the sacrifice of fools: for they consider not that they do evil.”

We have another one ... Isaiah Chapter 1, verse 11:

“To what purpose *is* the multitude of your sacrifices unto me? saith the Lord: I am **full** of the burnt offerings of rams, and fat of fed beasts; and I delight not in the blood of bullocks, or of lambs, or of goats.”

Jeremiah Chapter 7, verse 22:

“For I spake not unto your fathers, nor commanded them in the day that I brought them out of the land of Egypt, concerning burnt offerings or sacrifices:”

God didn't?

Micah Chapter 6, verse 6 to 8 ... it's a beautiful song:

“Wherewith shall I come before the LORD, and bow myself before the high God? shall I come before him with burnt offerings, with calves of a year old?

Will the LORD be pleased with thousands of rams, or with ten thousands of rivers of oil? shall I give my firstborn for my transgression, the fruit of my body for the sin of my soul?

He hath shewed thee, O man, what is good; and what doth the LORD require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?”

In Matthew Chapter 5, Verse 7 it says:

“Blessed are the merciful: for they shall obtain ...” What?

Congregation: Mercy.

“... mercy”

I want to now show you what the Lord actually wants. I am going to give you some texts to show you **what the Lord is actually looking for**.

In Psalms Chapter 32, verse 5 it says:

“I acknowledged my sin unto thee, and mine iniquity have I not hid. I said, I will confess my transgressions unto the LORD; and thou forgavest the iniquity of my sin.

That’s it!

Another one in Jeremiah Chapter 3, verse 12 to 14. It says:

“Go and proclaim these words toward the north, and say, **Return**, thou backsliding Israel, saith the LORD; and I will not cause mine anger (...or grief) to fall upon you: for I *am* merciful, saith the LORD, and I will not keep *anger* (...be grievous) for ever. Only **acknowledge** thine iniquity, that thou hast transgressed against the LORD thy God, and hast scattered thy ways to the strangers under every green tree, and ye have not obeyed (... or sh’ma) my voice, saith the LORD. **Turn**, O backsliding children, saith the LORD; for I am married unto you: and I will take you one of a city, and two of a family, and I will bring you to Zion:”

Just come! ... acknowledge your sins.

And you know this one as a memory text: 1John 1:9

“If we ...”

Congregation: ... confess our sins”

“... he is ...”

Congregation: ... faithful and just to forgive us our sins ...”

As long as you sacrifice!

Congregation: No!

No! “He is faithful and just to forgive us our sins and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness.”

There is no mention in there of what you must do except to come and confess!

In Proverbs Chapter 28, verse 13 it says:

“He that covereth his sins shall not prosper: but whoso confesseth and forsaketh them **shall have mercy.**”

And that beautiful one in Second Samuel 12, verse 13 it says this about David after he committed the sin against Uriah and against Bathsheba ... and Nathan had come to him to tell him a story and finally David realized his condemnation of that man was a story of condemnation upon himself!

In verse 13 it says:

“And David said unto Nathan, I have sinned against the LORD...”

And Nathan’s response to David was: “...The LORD also hath put away thy sin; thou shalt not die.”

That’s it! No sacrifice! ... No time for sacrifice.

Thus we see that the sacrificial system which God instituted through His Son Yeshua was a system of **confession** that **revealed the gross sinfulness of the sin**. That’s what the sacrificial system does ... while at the **same time revealing the Love of God in pardoning the confessing sinner**.

ISN’T THAT WHAT THE CROSS DID? It revealed the wickedness of Satan’s plan while at the same time revealing the beauty of God’s glory. That’s what the sacrifice did. **The sacrificial system was a means to exhibit the gospel in the Old Testament and was perverted by Satan to become a pagan system of appeasing a tyrannical God.**

**No change takes place in the character of God throughout all of this process. This is the system which God ordained.**

I am just going to finish up now with two statements from E.J.Waggoner.

(on RECONCILIATION) These are my final two statements:

“From all that has preceded it is very evident that the only object that Christ could have in coming to earth and dying for men, was the reconciliation of man to God, so that he might have life. (... Then he quotes ...) “I am come that they might have life.” **John 10:10.** “God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself.” **2 Corinthians 5:19.** “And you, that were sometime alienated and enemies in your mind by wicked works, yet now hath He reconciled in the body of His flesh through death, to present you holy and unblameable and unreprouceable in His sight.” **Colossians 1:21, 22.** Christ suffered for sins, the

just for the unjust, “that He might bring us to God.” **1 Peter 3:18**. “If when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of His Son, much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by His life.” **Romans 5:10**. {PTUK September 21, 1893, p. 386.6}

“But,” someone will say, “You have made the reconciliation all on the part of men; I have always been taught that the death of Christ reconciled God to man; that Christ died to satisfy God’s justice, and to appease Him.” Well, we have left the matter of reconciliation just where the Scriptures have put it; and while they have much to say about the necessity for man to be reconciled to God, **they never once hint of such a thing as the necessity for God to be reconciled to man.** (... Congregation: Amen! ...) To intimate the necessity for such a thing is to bring a grave charge against the character of God. **The idea has come into the Christian Church from the Papacy, which in turn brought it from Paganism, in which the only idea of God was of a being whose wrath must be appeased by a sacrifice.**” {PTUK September 21, 1893, p. 386.7}

Now this is the last part:

“Why have we dwelt so long upon the fact that man must be reconciled to God, and not God to man? ... (AND THIS FOR ME IS PROFOUND) ... Because in that alone is man’s hope. **If God ever had any enmity in His heart against men, there would always arise the torturing thought, “Perhaps He is not yet sufficiently appeased to accept Me; surely He cannot love so guilty a being as I am.”** And the more one realised his guilt, the greater would be his doubt. But when we know that God **never** had any enmity towards us, but that He has loved us with an **everlasting love**, and that He has loved us so much that He gave Himself for us, that we might be reconciled to Him, we can joyfully exclaim, “If God be for us, who can be against us?” {PTUK September 21, 1893, p. 387.3}

Congregation: Halleluyah

I pray this morning that these thoughts may give confidence to the idea that Christ was never sent with the idea that His death would somehow cause the Father to feel differently toward humanity or that there is something we need to do in regards to the fact that the Law broken caused God to be upset

Jesus came for one purpose and that was to reveal the Father ... And in revealing the Father we were revealed for who we really are ... and we took His life.

In the light of that revelation of taking His life He was still willing to forgive us.

THAT'S THE TRUTH OF THE GOSPEL.

Let's close in prayer:

Gracious Father in Heaven I thank you for this time with You and my brethren. I thank You for the Gospel, Father that You have given us in your great mercy. I thank You for the foundations that have been laid upon that solid Rock, Yeshua, the Son of God.

Thank You for the light You have given us ... light that we could never have discovered ourselves. In Your mercy and great patience You have waited for millennia for this message to come to light ... that the earth may truly be filled with Your glory ... not perverted through Satan's injustice ... but that You may be seen in the glory of Your character ... that we may know Your Name ... and the Name of Your Son that You have proclaimed from the beginning.

Father help us that this may transform our lives ... that we may not condemn others. I pray that this may work a deep work in our hearts of confession and of repentance ... And I thank you in the Name of Your precious Son Yeshua, Amen.

Congregation: Amen

For an expansion on this subject please see the book  
Cross Examined and Cross Encountered  
available at [fatheroflove.info](http://fatheroflove.info)

## *Mercy Not Sacrifice*

Our Father in Heaven never desired sacrifices for sin. The ears of humanity have not been open to this truth. Through Christ our ears can be opened and we can be set free from false views of our heavenly Father.

“Why have we dwelt so long upon the fact that man must be reconciled to God, and not God to man? Because in that alone is man’s hope. If God ever had any enmity in His heart against men, there would always arise the torturing thought, “Perhaps He is not yet sufficiently appeased to accept Me; surely He cannot love so guilty a being as I am.” And the more one realised his guilt, the greater would be his doubt. But when we know that God never had any enmity towards us, but that He has loved us with an everlasting love, and that He has loved us so much that He gave Himself for us, that we might be reconciled to Him, we can joyfully exclaim, “If God be for us, who can be against us?” {PTUK September 21, 1893, p. 387.3}