

Discussion May 29-30th with Bret M. Theis Jr.

Bret's comments are in yellow

My comments are in green

Bret M Theis Jr

Imagine rejecting the sacrifice of the Mass but embracing the return of sacrifices in FRONT of the glorified King Jesus.

Ian A. Hicks

Bret M Theis Jr - Let's work through this, shall we? Rather than popping your head into the comments and then ignoring all comments we make, shall we have a discussion? Let's start with an easy one.

Are temple sacrifices efficacious?

Bret M Theis Jr

Ian A. Hicks - now or then?

Ian A. Hicks

Bret M Theis Jr - Let's first deal with past, did the animal sacrifices effectually do anything? What was the purpose of them in Leviticus when they were implemented? I am talking all sacrifices broadly, not just the Day of Atonement, which was the climax.

Bret M Theis Jr

Ian A. Hicks - they were made in faithfulness with contrition toward and obedience to God, looking forward in faith to the once for all sacrifice

Ian A. Hicks

Bret M Theis Jr - I am not asking what they were "made in" I am also not asking what they looked forward to, I am asking if they effectually accomplished anything at the moment

they were offered? What did they actually do?

BTW, just so it is clear, I am going to argue for 2 atoning realms (external and internal). Animal sacrifices were efficacious to cleanse the external, not internal, that is why they could never effectually remove sin internally, or cleanse the conscience, but they did have a functional purpose as seen in scripture, in that they did effectually cleanse the outward. Our argument is NOT that we need another internal mechanism to cleanse the conscience, Jesus' work is sufficient, but because sin is still present and will be present in the future, purgation (purification) is still a required practice in temple worship.

Bret M Theis Jr

Ian A. Hicks - I hear you and understand, I just don't buy what you're selling. I think Jesus actually won, His Church will actually win, and it's just gonna take a long long time.

Ian A. Hicks

Bret M Theis Jr - Let's get back to the subject. What did animal sacrifices effectually do Bret, in the OT, did they effectually accomplish anything?

Bret M Theis Jr

Ian A. Hicks - ANYTHING? What do YOU mean by anything?

Ian A. Hicks

Bret M Theis Jr - Yes, what was their function? What did they actually do?

Bret M Theis Jr

Ian A. Hicks - they were a means of grace from God which provided a means of faithfulness, repentance, and obedience to God - conducted in faith until the substance came. And they perfectly fulfilled that purpose as God's purpose cannot fail. [OBJ]

Ian A. Hicks

Bret M Theis Jr - That's not what the bible teaches. The bible nowhere teaches that the sacrifices that were instituted in the Mosaic Covenant were a "means of grace." This in essence means that they did nothing, since they were of no substance. Let's go through

them one at a time, and I will show why this isn't consistent.

Let's start with the burnt offering, Moses says in Leviticus 1:4 that the burnt offering is a voluntary offering that may also be accepted for him to make "atonement":

"4 And he shall lay his hand on the head of the burnt offering, that it may be accepted for him to make atonement on his behalf."

What does making "atonement" mean in the context of Leviticus?

Bret M Theis Jr

Ian A. Hicks - it wasn't the blood of the animals that made atonement possible; it was the faith with which they were done, which is to say the OBJECT of the faith toward which the sacrifices were made that made them efficacious to any degree
Again, a means of repentance and obedience

Ian A. Hicks

Bret M Theis Jr - You aren't engaging with what I said. You're telling me what something isn't not what something is. Leviticus 1:4 does not say that the burnt offering was made as a means of repentance and obedience, this means that the sacrifice did nothing. The term "atonement" is first used in conjunction to the burnt offering. How does the "burnt offering" make atonement on his behalf? There is nothing about faith in the text, the sacrifice itself is efficacious, so what does it do?

Bret M Theis Jr

Ian A. Hicks - I refuse to prioritize the old testament over the new, sorry
God (speaking thru the apostles) is the authority on the Old Testament and I'm ok with that
=) OBJ:OBJ

Ian A. Hicks

Bret M Theis Jr - I am not prioritizing anything, we are discussing the function of the burnt offering in Leviticus. The text says that the burnt offering makes "atonement," how does it do this? There is nothing about obedience, faith, repentance here. If you were a Jew given this request, how would you understand it, contextually?

Bret M Theis Jr

[Ian A. Hicks](#) - see my previous answer, brother

[Ian A. Hicks](#)

[Bret M Theis Jr](#) - See mine.

[Bret M Theis Jr](#)

[Ian A. Hicks](#) - if you're dissatisfied with my answers, there's not much else I can do for you

[Ian A. Hicks](#)

[Bret M Theis Jr](#) - I am still waiting for an answer. My question relates to how the "burnt offering" pertains to "atonement" it is right there in the text. We are doing contextual exegesis here brother, and you're evading from dealing with what the text says. The text says that the burnt offering is for atonement, we need to explain what that means, and your position isn't explaining anything contextually, you're reading in foreign ideas to the text which don't explain what sacrifices do, at all.

[Bret M Theis Jr](#)

[Ian A. Hicks](#) - the NT clarifies the OT so I take my interpretation as to the efficaciousness of the sacrifices from that which is revealed in Christ and His apostles. That's why we Protestants need to love not only sola scriptura but also tota scriptura.

[Ian A. Hicks](#)

[Bret M Theis Jr](#) - You're showing me you have no understanding of the OT, that's what you're showing. You're showing me you don't even understand the basics of temple worship from Leviticus onward, because we couldn't even discuss the 1st offering, you just bailed the conversation with your NT priority presupposition. This is why your position has no explanatory power. I am willing to work through the text, verse-by-verse showing how your understanding of our position and not only our position but the texts in question is wrong. True love for totascriptura requires you to do the exegetical work to demonstrate your argument, and CT's simply cannot and will not do the leg-work.

[Bret M Theis Jr](#)

[Ian A. Hicks](#) - I don't owe you all that homework but thanks brother, have a good one!

[Ian A. Hicks](#)

[Bret M Theis Jr](#) - You haven't done any homework, it seems. I think again it has been proven that you can't exegetically defend your arguments or positions and that we can't walk through a text without you bailing.

[Bret M Theis Jr](#)

[Ian A. Hicks](#) - AUDIBLE SIGH. Because I'm giving you answers you won't accept. Just move on, brother 😊

[Ian A. Hicks](#)

[Bret M Theis Jr](#) - No brother, I'm trying to have a civil discussion about the scriptures (starting at the beginning in Lev. 1), and you can't explain what the text says, because if you concede that there is anything efficacious about a single sacrifice (whether burnt, guilt, peace, sin, or grain) your position crumbles. This would prove that animal sacrifices are efficacious outwardly, ergo, they could be argued for this in the future. I'm well aware of the reason you stopped the discussion, because (a) you can't exegete the OT, and (b) heading down this trail will stop you from misrepresenting our position, since you would see our argumentation.

The dual atonement argument is sufficient to answer your objections, but rather than work through each text and each sacrifice with me, you run from our discussion (again). It's obvious your system buckles under the pressure of biblical exegesis.

[Bret M Theis Jr](#)

[Ian A. Hicks](#) - brother, I have agreed that sacrifices were efficacious - through Christ.

[Ian A. Hicks](#)

[Bret M Theis Jr](#) - Audible sigh... Again, not following the discussion, at all.

[Bret M Theis Jr](#)

[Ian A. Hicks](#) - okay, let me ask you: are you attempting to argue that sacrifices carry objective efficaciousness *apart from faith*?

[Ian A. Hicks](#)

[Bret M Theis Jr](#) - I'm not going to be drawn into your red herring, go back and let's work through the sacrifices as we were above before you shut down the discussion.

[Bret M Theis Jr](#)

[Ian A. Hicks](#) - I don't know how to answer your question more than I have already. Genuine. Maybe ask your question a different way? I feel like your questioning for whatever reason winds up getting me...left behind 😊OBJ

[Ian A. Hicks](#)

[Bret M Theis Jr](#) - It's simple, say you were writing a commentary on Leviticus, doing a deep dive into the exegesis and someone asked you to explain how the original audience would have understood Leviticus 1:4?

And he shall lay his hand on the head of the burnt offering, that it may be accepted for him to make atonement on his behalf.

— Leviticus 1:4

How does the burnt offering make atonement (meaning you need to explain what atonement is, contextually)? What does נִמְלָא mean, and how does this function in light of the burnt offering?

[Bret M Theis Jr](#)

[Ian A. Hicks](#) - OKAY! That helps, thank you. A blood sacrifice was required for sin in an ongoing, unending way. There can be no forgiveness of sins without the shedding of blood. And so those who participated in the sacrificial system did so by faith, trusting in the terms God set and, whether they consciously knew it or not, were looking ahead to the once and for all sacrifice the Messiah would make on their behalf.

[Ian A. Hicks](#)

[Bret M Theis Jr](#) - Brother, your NT priority presupposition is blinding you from reading the OT, this is painfully obvious. Nothing in the text says anything about the Messiah, faith, conscious awareness, forgiveness of sins, etc.

You've again, gone to the NT imported foreign ideas into the text and explained absolutely nothing.

What is the burnt offering?
What is בָּרְאָה contextually?
How does the burnt offering atone?

You've never addressed once what the text says.

[Bret M Theis Jr](#)

[Ian A. Hicks](#) - why would I read the OT in a vacuum when God had not finished speaking and sent His Son to help me see what the Jews before were not able to see, the mysteries into which angels longed to look?

Your style of aggressive and seemingly personal argumentation reminds me of the atheist who demands we prove God exists but don't use the Bible. Sheesh, man.

[Ian A. Hicks](#)

[Bret M Theis Jr](#) - So, again, you've failed to answer the questions I've set before you.

//[Ian A. Hicks](#) - why would I read the OT in a vacuum when God had not finished speaking and sent His Son to help me see what the Jews before were not able to see, the mysteries into which angels longed to look?//

I'm not asking you to read it in a vacuum, I'm asking you to do biblical exegesis of Leviticus 1, without reading foreign things into the text (eisegesis) through your christocentric lens and NT priority. Let Moses speak to his audience (which didn't have the NT).

I'm asking you to respect authorial intent (using the literal, grammatical-historical hermeneutic) and the perspicuity of scripture. If you believe the OT is inspired, inerrant, infallible, then you should have no issues explaining to me what the text means (contextually).

As of right now, you've refused to handle Leviticus, explaining how the original audience would have understood the message given to THEM, in their context.

[Bret M Theis Jr](#)

[Ian A. Hicks](#) - ain't got time for all dat right now, gotta actually do some work now. Have a good night!

[Ian A. Hicks](#)

[Bret M Theis Jr](#)?

[Ian A. Hicks](#)

Since Bret has nothing further to contribute, I think it would be important to share the rest of my argumentation here for those reading. The argument that the OT sacrifices are merely shadows that point to Christ and have no efficacious function is erroneous.

John Whitcomb -- "...animal sacrifices could never remove spiritual guilt from the offerer or clear his conscience. The book of Hebrews is very clear about that (10:4, 11). But it is equally erroneous to say that the sacrifices were mere teaching symbols given by God to Israel to prepare them for Messiah and His infinite atonement. Such a view is contradicted by precise statements in Exodus and Leviticus. The Scriptures tell us that something really did happen to the Israelite offerer when he came to the right altar with the appropriate sacrifice; and he was expected to know what would happen to him. What happened was temporal, finite, external, and legal – not external, infinite, internal, and soteriological. Nevertheless, what happened was personally and immediately significant, not simply symbolic and / or prophetic. When an Israelite "unwittingly failed" to observe a particular ordinance of the Mosaic Law (in the weakness of his sin nature [Num. 15:22–29], not "defiantly," in open rebellion against God Himself [Num. 15:30–36]), he was actually "forgiven" through an "atonement" (a ritual cleansing; cf. Heb. 9:10, 13) made by the priest (Num. 15:25–26)." [1]

F.F. Bruce -- "...the blood of slaughtered animals under the old order did possess a certain efficacy, but it was an outward efficacy for the removal of ceremonial pollution. . . . They could restore [the worshipper] to formal communion with God and with his fellow-worshippers. . . . Just how the blood of sacrificed animals or the ashes of a red heifer effected a ceremonial cleansing our author does not explain; it was sufficient for him, and no doubt for his readers, that the Old Testament ascribed this efficacy to them." [2]

Richard Averbeck – "Only Christ's sacrifice was of the kind that could form the basis for eternal and spiritual salvation (Heb. 9:15). But this in no way refutes the . . . efficacy in the Old Testament atonement sacrifices. Those sacrifices had to do with the covenant relationship between God and the nation of Israel. Eternal or spiritual salvation was not the issue. Therefore, the animal sacrifices of the Old Testament and the sacrifice of Christ in the New Testament were effective at their own respective [and totally different] levels." [3]

[1] John C. Whitcomb, Christ's Atonement and Animal Sacrifices in Israel, 9-10.

[2] F. F. Bruce, The Epistle to the Hebrews (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964) 201, 204. Taken from John C. Whitcomb, Christ's Atonement and Animal Sacrifices in Israel.

[3] Richard E. Averbeck, "An Exegetical Study of Leviticus 1:4 With a Discussion of the Nature of Old Testament Atonement," (unpublished M.Div. Thesis; Winona Lake, IN: Grace Theological Seminary, 1977) 68. Taken from John C. Whitcomb, Christ's Atonement and Animal Sacrifices in Israel.

Animal sacrifices clearly effect one reality (outward), not the reality that the Lord Jesus effects (inward). This efficacious nature is seen in the outward ceremonial cleansing of the altar, and the sanctuary. The atoning sacrifice would cleanse the one making the sacrifice and would bring them back into communion with the Lord. The author of Hebrews calls this, "cleansing of the flesh" (Heb 9:13). However, none of these sacrifices ever cleansed the conscience (internal). Hebrews 9:14 says that the Lord's sacrifice was the only one efficacious to cleanse the conscience (Heb 9:14).

Animal sacrifices never took away sin, and never cleansed the internal conscience, but they did effectually clear ceremonial pollution. This is the proper understanding of the atoning sacrifices in the OT. I outline them here [see image], and as you can see, we couldn't even get through the other sacrifices with Bret. It is the dispensationalist that continues to do biblical exegesis of the pertinent texts and not the CT.

Reject the NT priority presupposition and Christocentric Hermeneutic, they will never allow you to do biblical exegesis properly.

[Bret M Theis Jr](#)

[Ian A. Hicks](#) - I never said they weren't efficacious 🤷 I actually said quite the opposite. Ian, if you're going to lie about me, at least tag me 😅

[Ian A. Hicks](#)

[Bret M Theis Jr](#) - No one lied about you, you reject that they accomplished anything functionally on their own in Leviticus, which is why you won't exegete the texts, you can see this here:

//I hear you and understand, I just don't buy what you're selling.//

You reject my argument that they are efficacious and that there are two atoning realms, that was the argument I set forth.

//...they were a means of grace from God which provided a means of faithfulness, repentance, and obedience to God - conducted in faith until the substance came.//

Which means they [the sacrifices] have no substance, the substance which effectuates change occurs when Christ comes, meaning that of themselves, they effectually do *nothing*. A means to ends doesn't mean that the "means" effectually does something, especially when it is a type/shadow in your eyes. You have no function UNTIL Christ comes, and the function is that they POINT forward, via FAITH. So, in Leviticus (which you can't exegete), you can't explain what the concept of atonement is in relation to the original audience, which is why you keep running from this discussion: " ain't got time for all dat right now, gotta actually do some work now. Have a good night!"

//the NT clarifies the OT so I take my interpretation as to the efficaciousness of the sacrifices from that which is revealed in Christ and His apostles.//

Notice, we have to wait until the NT and Christ's death for you to apply anything to the sacrifice, was that they were a means (effectually doing nothing) until Christ came. I mean the bogus study here is obvious. Please go read some commentaries on Leviticus, since you obviously haven't studied the texts we are discussing.

//brother, I have agreed that sacrifices were efficacious - through Christ.//

Not on their own. You won't answer this, because you can't concede this point. You believe that Hebrews is how we read the text of Leviticus, and then only apply efficacious nature to the sacrifices by means of "grace" and pointing to "Christ." As I said before, this is an error. As 3 scholars noted above, this is erroneous. Wenham, another scholar notes, "The burnt offering was the commonest of all the OT sacrifices. Its main function was to atone for man's sin by propitiating God's wrath." - p.63 NICOT.

Any study of Leviticus leads away from your understanding, since you need to explain what atonement means in Leviticus, which you haven't.

[Bret M Theis Jr](#)

[Ian A. Hicks](#) - I have no problem conceding that the sacrifices were efficacious - through Christ because this is what the Apostles taught.

Scholars are not my authority; the Scriptures are. I reject your LGH hermeneutic as the only means by which we can understand a text because - surprise, surprise - so did the Apostles.

[Ian A. Hicks](#)

[Bret M Theis Jr](#) - Here, I will try to unpack this again, since you're clearly not listening to what is being said:

1.) You keep supplementing your comment with "through Christ" meaning that the OT animal sacrifices tied to the Tabernacle, in their contextual usage, were not efficacious, this logically follows, they only BECOME efficacious in your *mind* when you make them a shadow that points to Christ. However, this is ultimately irrelevant since a contextual study of Leviticus 1 would never render this conclusion true, which is why scholars reject your assertion. We only got to discussing 1 of the 5 sacrifices, which you demonstrated that you couldn't exegete. You couldn't explain Lev 1:4, this was made plain above. You couldn't unpack the grammatical usage of atonement for us, you couldn't explain what the burnt offering was and how it related to atonement, without first reading the NT backwards into the OT [rendering the OT text meaningless], by ignoring the context of Lev undercutting the authorial intent and perspicuity of scripture. This is the consequence of your hermeneutic. I can exegete Leviticus contextually, you can't. That is difference. Just like the Arminian can't exegete Romans 9 contextually, and wants to talk about everything else under the sun, you do the same here when talking about Leviticus.

2.) Your issue is that you can't make sense of the sacrifices unless you first start with Christ's sacrifice, but this is where the error is (presupposing that the OT is unclear, and veiled, ergo, the audience couldn't have understood what they were doing until the NT). If you had read the comment above, the author of Hebrews breaks the sacrifices into two realms (outer/inner) - cf. Heb 9:13-14. The OT sacrifices actually did something under each of their conditions [documented above], but only Jesus' sacrifice impacts the internal, eternal, reality. This is why Jesus' work is superior as Whitcomb notes:

John Whitcomb -- "...animal sacrifices could never remove spiritual guilt from the offerer or clear his conscience. The book of Hebrews is very clear about that (10:4, 11). But it is equally erroneous to say that the sacrifices were mere teaching symbols given by God to Israel to prepare them for Messiah and His infinite atonement. Such a view is contradicted by precise statements in Exodus and Leviticus. The Scriptures tell us that something really did happen to the Israelite offerer when he came to the right altar with the appropriate sacrifice; and he was expected to know what would happen to him. What happened was temporal, finite, external, and legal – not external, infinite, internal, and soteriological. Nevertheless, what happened was personally and immediately significant, not simply symbolic and / or prophetic. When an Israelite "unwittingly failed" to observe a particular ordinance of the Mosaic Law (in the weakness of his sin nature [Num. 15:22–29], not "defiantly," in open rebellion against God Himself [Num. 15:30–36]), he was actually "forgiven" through an "atonement" (a ritual cleansing; cf. Heb. 9:10, 13) made by the priest (Num. 15:25–26)."

3.) Scholars should be an authority, not THE authority. The scriptures are the only infallible authority, but we should read commentaries, study what others have done with their gifts

of teaching.

4.) The LGH is sufficient, the Apostles used the LGH, they didn't use a Christocentric Hermeneutic, this argument has been thoroughly refuted.

<https://sakeofthetruth.wordpress.com/.../the.../>

All-in-all, you reject the efficacious nature of the atoning sacrifices in the OT because you can't explain what they mean contextually. Your NT priority presupposition blurs your ability to read the OT, which you've shown here. Only my position takes seriously the authors words in their historical context.

Bret M Theis Jr

Ian A. Hicks - I hear you, I just disagree. I was thoroughly indoctrinated through Saucy at Talbot 😊 You can reject my understanding, that's fine; I reject yours.

1) Atonement was made through sacrifice. That sacrifice was sufficient in its time. It was only efficacious *by faith*, not by works. Where was that faith directed? OT - toward God, NT - through Christ. I refuse to abandon God's revelation in the NT that clarifies the OT. The Apostles didn't, the Reformers didn't, the Puritans didn't. Apparently you do? 🤷 Do your thang, buddy.

2) No. The sacrifices were meaningful and efficacious by faith toward God (in the Messiah to come), even toward that which the OT faithful *couldn't understand* - just as Daniel prophesied but admittedly didn't understand fully.

3) Agreed. Darby and Scofield were wrong about a lot, you agree 😊

4) Sufficient for some things, not all.

I do not reject the atoning sacrifices; you saying that I do does not make it so. Your insistence that I agree with your assessment is childish and impudent. If you continue to assert your understanding over me, I have no choice but to block you as I will not endure you continuing to lie about me.

Ian A. Hicks

Bret M Theis Jr ~

// I hear you, I just disagree. I was thoroughly indoctrinated through Saucy at Talbot 😊 You can reject my understanding, that's fine; I reject yours.//

The difference here is that I can articulate my position via biblical exegesis and you can't. You couldn't even exegete one verse (Lev 1:4).

//1) Atonement was made through sacrifice. That sacrifice was sufficient in its time. It was only efficacious *by faith*, not by works. Where was that faith directed? OT - toward God, NT - through Christ. I refuse to abandon God's revelation in the NT that clarifies the OT. The Apostles didn't, the Reformers didn't, the Puritans didn't. Apparently you do? 🤷‍♂️ Do your thang, buddy.//

"That sacrifice was sufficient in its time" - you can't even explain what that means, now you are talking about "that sacrifice" as being "sufficient." The question is not about the means by which it was efficacious, you've continually dodged the point, it is astounding. Having faith, doesn't magically make the sacrifice work, what are you even on about? I have explained the "function" of the sacrifice (the first one mentioned in Leviticus) you have failed to explain it. When we talk about the sacrifice being "efficacious" we are talking about its "function" and in the first example, the burnt offering is said to be efficacious as an "atoning" sacrifice. You haven't addressed this from Leviticus, you keep going to the NT and saying that it is efficacious "through Christ" and yet, this is not a contextual conclusion from Leviticus 1:4. Nowhere is faith, Christ, mentioned. No one is discussing "soteriological categories" of faith, or works. All of this is you reading things into the text that aren't there because you can't make sense of Leviticus. The "direction" of faith is irrelevant to our discussion, another red herring. The Apostles hold to a LGH hermeneutic sorry bud. No one is asking you to abandon the NT, I told you let's first start in the past, and then you immediately went running to the NT.

//2) No. The sacrifices were meaningful and efficacious by faith toward God (in the Messiah to come), even toward that which the OT faithful *couldn't understand* - just as Daniel prophesied but admittedly didn't understand fully.//

No sir, this is not what efficacious means. Sigh, you're not even using the term correctly. For it to be efficacious, it needs to functional, and you've given it ZERO function that produces some result contextually. Pointing toward Messiah, is not what Leviticus is talking about, it is said to effect change there, in front of the people making the sacrifice, it isn't a means to something here, it has a function that you don't explain and can't explain. Nothing is veiled in the text, nothing is obscure, you're obscuring the text. "And he shall lay his hand on the head of the burnt offering, that it may be accepted for him to make atonement on his behalf."

What is the "atonement" made on his behalf, what is this for the Israelite? What is the result then and there, made by him laying his hand on the head of the burnt offering? Why does it

need to be accepted? Why does the blood of this offering need to be splashed on the altar and the doorway? Do you see how your explanation is meaningless? You can't answer these questions, you just tell me about your NT theology, you can't explain this contextually at all. I can answer this, the atoning sacrifice here in Leviticus 1:4 is meant to atone (לִכְפָּר) for the individual. It was a ritual sacrifice that cleansed the individual externally (the flesh). This is what Hebrews 9:13 says. These offerings had the purpose and function to cleanse, purge, purify the individual, the altar, the sanctuary. You have no function for the OT sacrifices, they do nothing and have no function.

//3) Agreed. Darby and Scofield were wrong about a lot, you agree 😊//

If you agree, you wouldn't have dismissed the sources I appealed to above as if their words meant nothing. I do disagree with them, but that's irrelevant.

//4) Sufficient for some things, not all. I do not reject the atoning sacrifices; you saying that I do does not make it so. Your insistence that I agree with your assessment is childish and impudent. If you continue to assert your understanding over me, I have no choice but to block you as I will not endure you continuing to lie about me.//

It is the sufficient methodology, one you've never once shown to be in error, but your NT priority presup has shown to cloud your judgment.

If you go back and look at our discussion, you will see that you have never given an explanation for the efficacious nature of the burnt offering in Leviticus, you have not explained the contextual nature of the text, you have not appealed to authorial intent, you have done no exegesis. You have read everything through your NT priority presup, but have ignored the context of Leviticus. The temple sacrifice has a purpose in its OT context. We don't have to wait for the NT (contrary your beliefs) to know what the text means. The text clearly states that the burnt offering provides atonement, and you have not explained how it does this. I have. Threatening to block me is merely a cop-out because you don't want to continue this discussion. I have shown that what you mean when you say efficacious is merely you asserting that with Christ there is some correlation made with between sacrifices, but that isn't my question, nor what I am driving at. I am reading Leviticus contextually, you are reading it through the NT lens, which is distorting Leviticus.

[Bret M Theis Jr](#)

[Ian A. Hicks](#) - I'm fully ok explaining that I'm still learning why I reject dispensationalism; it starts with my partial preterism.

I've said what I said, I tire of this insanity. I enjoy exegeting scripture for my church and kind brothers here and there - but my experience of you (and I share this with *many* others I'm

discovering) is that you make the exercise incredibly tedious and exhausting when it ought to be a joyful and thoughtful experience. You really ought to spend some time considering why you have the reputation you have.

To be fair, I'll 100% cop to being a pseudo-CT/postmil troll. It's fun/funny to me. Maybe take yourself a little less seriously online?

So feel free to take a victory lap because I'm out. I've said what I said - I'm definitely still learning, but I don't need to drink the dispensational ocean to know it's salty (and erroneous).

Go serve your King, brother.

[Ian A. Hicks](#)

[Bret M Theis Jr](#) ~

//I'm fully ok explaining that I'm still learning why I reject dispensationalism; it starts with my partial preterism.//

I am not talking at all about preterism or dispensationalism, we are talking about Leviticus 1:4, which you've again side-stepped.

//I've said what I said, I tire of this insanity. I enjoy exegeting scripture for my church and kind brothers here and there - but my experience of you (and I share this with *many* others I'm discovering) is that you make the exercise incredibly tedious and exhausting when it ought to be a joyful and thoughtful experience. You really ought to spend some time considering why you have the reputation you have.//

Ah yes, the classic complaints. I am not interested in CT's whining about my approach to discussions, when I deal tirelessly with your group of trolls. I could care less how the CT crowd sees me, the Arminian/Provisionist group sees me the same way because of my Calvinism. It ought to be joyful eh, "Imagine rejecting the sacrifice of the Mass but embracing the return of sacrifices in FRONT of the glorified King Jesus." - Amazing blindness.

//To be fair, I'll 100% cop to being a pseudo-CT/postmil troll. It's fun/funny to me. Maybe take yourself a little less seriously online?//

I know you are, it's obvious, which is why this entire discussion will be recorded down and shared.

//So feel free to take a victory lap because I'm out. I've said what I said - I'm definitely still learning, but I don't need to drink the dispensational ocean to know it's salty (and erroneous).//

You were never in bud. You had nothing to bring and nothing to present. We couldn't even get to a discussion on Leviticus 1:4, the first text in our discussion because you couldn't engage. Again, it will all be recorded.