

# Grudem Ch 10: "What is the Atonement?"

Grudem Section Divisions	Defy	Deny	Humbly Accept	Scripture / Comments
<b>10 What is the Atonement?</b>				
<b>1 Grudem</b>				
Jesus's "mission statement" was proclaimed by "an Angel of the Lord," to Joseph, at the announcement of Jesus's conception: " <i>He will <b>save</b><sup>G4982</sup> His people <b>from their sins</b></i> " (Matt. 1:21).				
<b>1 The Cause (of the Atonement)</b>				
* <b>Sin</b> (Chapter 9)				
A Mind?				Expulsion from "The Garden" of God's direct Presence. Consequence of the Fall was man now lacked both the means (the ability) and the desire toward restoration of all things (unlawful heart).
B Heart?				Can we 'connect the dots,' comprehend what's happened, its significance?
C Will?				Do we truly long for God's ways / will, or instead for a god who is a superpower available to do our bidding?
Augustine (400): we have no <u>good</u> will Luther (1520): Salvation is <u>necessarily</u> by Christ <u>alone</u> <i>Freedom of the Will</i> (Sept 1524, Erasmus) contra <i>Bondage of the Will</i> (Dec 1525 Luther) contra "The Free Will of Man" (Postmodernism) (Postmodern Neuroscience) we choose <u>before</u> "will"				
* <b>Justice</b>				
a Luke 18:13; Heb 2:17				
<i>hiláskomai</i> <sup>G2433</sup> verb, "to propitiate"				
<u>Luke 18:13</u> ESV <i>But the tax collector, standing far off, would not even lift up his eyes to heaven, but beat his breast, saying, 'God, be merciful to me, a sinner!'</i> YLT (& only the YLT) <i>And the tax-gatherer, having stood afar off, would not even the eyes lift up to the heaven, but was smiting on his breast, saying, God <b>be propitious</b> to me -- the sinner!</i>				
<u>Heb 2:17</u> ESV (and 10 other translations) <i>Therefore he had to be made like his brothers in every respect, so that he might become a <u>merciful</u><sup>G1655</sup> and faithful high priest in the service of God, <b>to make propitiation</b> for the sins of the people.</i>				
b Rom 3:25; Heb 9:5				
<i>hilastērion</i> <sup>G2435</sup> Noun, N, "that which propitiates"				
<u>Rom 3:25</u> ESV (and 20 other translations) <i>whom God put forward as <b>a propitiation</b> by his blood, to be received by faith. This was to show God's righteousness, because in his divine forbearance he had passed over former sins.</i> YLT (and a dozen other translations) <i>whom God did set forth <b>a mercy seat</b>, through the faith in his blood, for the shewing forth of His righteousness, because of the passing over of the bygone sins in the forbearance of God --</i>				
<u>Heb 9:5</u> ESV (and 40 other translations) <i>Above it were the cherubim of glory overshadowing</i>				

**the mercy seat.** *Of these things we cannot now speak in detail.*

Exodus 25:17-22

*You shall make a mercy seat (**hilastērion**) of pure gold, two and a half cubits long and one and a half cubits wide. You shall make two cherubim of gold, make them of hammered work at the two ends of the mercy seat (**hilastērion**). Make one cherub at one end and one cherub at the other end; you shall make the cherubim of one piece with the mercy seat (**hilastērion**) at its two ends. The cherubim shall have their wings spread upward, covering the mercy seat (**hilastērion**) with their wings and facing one another; the faces of the cherubim are to be turned toward the mercy seat (**hilastērion**). You shall put the mercy seat (**hilastērion**) on top of the ark, and in the ark you shall put the testimony which I will give to you. There I will meet with you; and from above the mercy seat (**hilastērion**), from between the two cherubim which are upon the ark of the testimony, I will speak to you about all that I will give you in commandment for the sons of Israel.*

c 1 John 2:2; 4:10

**hilasmós**<sup>G2434</sup> Noun, M, "the means of propitiation"

1 John 2:2 ESV (and 17 other translations) *He is **the propitiation** for our sins, and not for ours only but also for the sins of the whole world.*

NET (and 16 other translations) *and he himself is **the atoning sacrifice** for our sins, and not only for our sins but also for the whole world.*

1 John 4:10 ESV (and 17 other translations) *In this is love, not that we have loved God but that he loved us and sent his Son to be **the propitiation** for our sins.*

NET (and 16 other translations) *In this is love: not that we have loved God, but that he loved us and sent his Son to be **the atoning sacrifice** for our sins.*

\* Love

God was not obligated (had some duty) to save, nor was He lacking anything in Himself for which He had a need to save. He didn't owe us, or Himself, the act of **Agape** Love. The meaning of **Agape** is absolutely incompatible with any concept of "debt" or obligation.

John 3:16 ESV "For God so **loved agapáo**<sup>G25</sup> [Aorist Active Indicative] *the world, that he **gave** [Aorist Active Indicative] his only Son, that whoever **believes** [Present Active Participle] in him should not perish but **have** [Present Active Subjunctive] *eternal life.*"*

John 3:36 ESV *Whoever **believes** in the Son **has** eternal life; whoever does not obey the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God remains on him.*

John 5:24 ESV *Truly, truly, I say to you, whoever hears my word and **believes** him who sent me **has** eternal life. He does not come into judgment, but has passed from death to life.*

John 6:47 ESV *Truly, truly, I say to you, whoever **believes has** eternal life.*

\* Promise

But God had promises in the OT, requiring fulfillment, and thus, **the Faith(fulness) of Christ** [Christ as a **subjective genitive**]

**Faith of or in Christ?** 7x in NT: Romans 3:22, 26; and Galatians 2:16<sup>2x</sup>, 3:22.

[see also Gal 2:20; and Phil 3:9, which Grudem himself cites as "in" (an objective genitive)]

"A common phenomenon in many languages is the use of the possessive or genitive case with a noun

Grudem Section Divisions	Defy	Deny	Humbly Accept	Scripture / Comments
<p>implying action, where the possessive noun expresses either the one originating (<b>subjective</b>) or the one receiving (objective) the action implied in the noun. Thus the phrase "the love of God" may imply the proposition (1) "<b>God (subject) loves man,</b>" or (2) "Man loves God" (object). If the expression "of God" means the former it is called <b>subjective genitive</b>; if the latter, it is called objective genitive." J.W.Roberts (Abilene Christian University)</p>				
<p>"Gal 2:16 [in most modern translations] reads, "yet we know that no one is justified by <u>the works of the law</u> but through faith (διὰ πίστεως) <b>in Jesus Christ (Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ).</b>" The other verses are quite similar in their use of πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. Someone once told me that a simple way to look at the genitive is to see all genitives as either subjective or objective, if the head noun contains a verbal idea. Either the word in the genitive produces ("<b>subjective</b>") or receives ("objective") the verbal idea in the head noun. This may be a bit simplistic, but it has helped me a lot through the years.</p>				
<p><b>If Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ is a subjective genitive, then it refers to the faith produced by Jesus, his own faith; and so the KJV reads, "Knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law, but <u>by the faith of Jesus Christ.</u>"</b> The only modern translation I checked that goes this direction is the NET: "<b>yet we know that no one is justified by the works of the law but <u>by the faithfulness of Jesus Christ.</u></b>" [Also translated "of" by Tyndale!]</p>				
<p>If it is an objective genitive, then it refers to the faith received by Jesus. Most [modern] translations [and Mounce] believe it is the latter (including the NKJV), but how do you say that we are justified by faith when Jesus is the object of our faith? In English, you say "in Jesus." That is the answer to the question. Part of translation is realizing that your task is to say the same thing in one language that is said in another; the nice, neat divisions we often create in first year Greek don't ways let us do this. The genitive does not always mean "of," and the dative does not always mean "in." What you have to do is look at the deeper grammatical data, see what is said in one language, and try to say the same thing in the other language." Bill Mounce, noted author of multiple Greek texts.</p>				
<p>It is translated "<b>of Christ</b>" (in Gal. 2:16) by: KJV (and its derivatives excepting NKJV), NET, YLT, WYC (Wycliffe), CEB (Common English Bible), GNV, JUB (Jubilee Bible), and perhaps one or two others.</p>				
<p>2 The <b>Necessity</b> (Luke 24:26)</p>				<p>"Was it not <b>necessary</b> that the Christ should suffer these things...?" Luke 24:26</p>
<p>3 The <b>Nature</b>: the obedience of the One, Unique Mediator. The Uniqueness of Christ (birth, life, death) and Being the Only Son of God (Heb. 1)</p>				<p>Rom 5:19 NKJV "For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so also <b>by one Man's obedience</b> many will be made righteous." The awfulness of His death demonstrated the awfulness of sin and the horror of God's judgment. The aloneness of Christ at His death demonstrated that He alone could effect the Atonement.</p>
<p>4 The <b>Result</b>: something much greater than the restoration to sinless innocence</p>				<p>Rom 5:19 NKJV "...[the] many will <b>be made righteous.</b>" We are now adopted wherein God is "Our Father." This is because God's Justice has been fully, eternally satisfied: Col 1:13 "He has delivered us from the power of darkness and <b>conveyed</b><sup>Aorist Active Indicative</sup> <b>us into the kingdom of the Son of His love, 14 in whom we have redemption through His blood, the forgiveness of sins.</b>" (NKJV)</p>

Grudem Section Divisions	Defy	Deny	Humbly Accept	Scripture / Comments
<p>▼ <b>2 As to Propitiation, how much of what was necessary did Christ accomplish?</b></p>				
<p>1 <b>100%</b> and, so, we have "<b>Universal Salvation</b>" either immediately upon death or after a just suffering period, something like a term-limited prison sentence</p>				<p>"<b>universalism</b> or <b>apocatastasis</b>, the belief that hell is purgative and therefore temporary, and that ultimately all free moral creatures—angels, men, ..." [and, so, are forgiven and restored] Oxford Reference</p>
<p><u>Who believes this?</u></p>				<p>'Feels right' [but ain't] because "God is LOVE" however, the idea of "justice" leads to belief in some form of purgatory (purging of sins)</p>
<p>A Origen (ca 200 A.D.)!</p>				
<p>B Universalist Church of America, American Unitarian Association (since 1961 combined as Unitarian Universalists)</p>				
<p>2 <b>Close, but not quite, 100%</b>. So man has to close the gap, however tiny, by something meritorious and are so justly distinguished from those who fail to perform and thus become the damned / lost.</p>				<p>Satisfies our sense of the importance of Christ, and so of the love of God, while also reconciling (in our natural mind) the idea that God must at the same time have set up a just opportunity for all men.</p>
<p><u>Who believes this?</u></p>				
<p>a Arminians</p>				<p>Arminians (1610 A.D.) "remonstrated" in the form of five objections to the Reformed Doctrine (aka "Calvinism"), one of which was against Limited (or better "Definite") Atonement.</p>
<p>b Amaraldyanism / Four Point Calvinism (Calvary Chapel, Baptists, ...), but once saved, always saved</p>				<p>'Feels right' [but ain't] that everyone has 'a shot' at eternal life. But is that really true? Opportunity? Work of the Holy Spirit?</p>
<p>Matthew 11:21 ESV "Woe to you, Chorazin! Woe to you, Bethsaida! For if the mighty works done in you had been done in Tyre and Sidon, they would have repented long ago in sackcloth and ashes. 22 But I tell you, it will be more bearable on the day of judgment for Tyre and Sidon than for you. 23 And you, Capernaum, will you be exalted to heaven? You will be brought down to Hades. For if the mighty works done in you had been done in Sodom, it would have remained until this day. 24 But I tell you that it will be more tolerable on the day of judgment for the land of Sodom than for you."</p>				
<p>Luke 10:13 ESV "Woe to you, Chorazin! Woe to you, Bethsaida! For if the mighty works done in you had been done in Tyre and Sidon, they would have repented long ago, sitting in sackcloth and ashes. 14 But it will be more bearable in the judgment for Tyre and Sidon than for you. 15 And you, Capernaum, will you be exalted to heaven? You shall be brought down to Hades.</p>				

Grudem Ch 10: "What is the Atonement?"

Grudem Section Divisions	Defy	Deny	Humbly Accept	Scripture / Comments
<p>c Catholics (with respect to mortal sins), Methodists, Quakers, and many others: you have to be "faithful" to the very end.</p>				<p>"Faith" expressed once, or many times, however sincere and well-meaning, is itself not enough. Good "works" are needed, but especially needed is the absence of heinous sin. 'Feels right' [but ain't] because otherwise someone can say some 'magic words' of faith and then live like a hellion and 'get away with it.'</p>
<p>3 <b>100%</b> but only for <b>The Elect</b>, "Limited Atonement," better termed "Definite Atonement"</p>				<p>The heart of the Reformed Doctrine (aka the Five Points of Calvinism, though Calvin never heard of such term as "Five Points").</p>
<p><u>Who believes this?</u></p>				
<p>i "Reformed" Presbyterians</p>				
<p>ii "Reformed" Baptists</p>				
<p>iii Many independent "Bible" churches</p>				
<p><b>3 Arguments against Limited / Definite Atonement:</b></p> <p><b>All?</b></p>				<p>Generally leads to two 'problems:' God is not just (some never 'had a shot,') and 1 Timothy 2:4 ESV [God] <i>who desires all people to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth...Christ Jesus, 6 who gave himself as a ransom for all.</i> So what about "all?"</p>
<p>1 Jews only, or "all" Jews and Gentiles?</p>				<p>Rom 3:29 KJV <i>Is he the God of the Jews only? is he not also of the Gentiles? Yes, of the Gentiles also:</i></p>
<p>2 Men only, or "all" men and women?</p>				<p>1 Pet 3:7 ESV <i>Likewise, husbands, live with your wives in an understanding way, showing honor to the woman as the weaker vessel, since they are heirs with you of the grace of life, so that your prayers may not be hindered.</i></p>
<p>3 Free only, or "all" free and slaves?</p>				<p>Rom 4:11 KJV <i>And he received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had yet being uncircumcised: that he might be the father of all them that believe, though they be not circumcised; that righteousness might be imputed unto them also:</i></p>
<p>4 Civilized (Roman / Greek) only, or "all" including Barbarians?</p>				<p>Rom 10:12 KJV <i>For there is no difference between the Jew and the Greek: for the same Lord over all is rich unto all that call upon him.</i></p>
<p>5 Nobility only, or both the Nobles and the Commoners?</p>				<p>1 Cor 1:26 ESV <i>For consider your calling, brothers: not many of you were wise according to worldly standards, not many were powerful, not many were of noble birth.</i></p>
<p>6 Legalists (trying to walk the straight &amp; narrow), or "all" including the carnal / sensual?</p>				<p>Col. 3:11 ESV <i>"Here there is not Greek and Jew, circumcised and uncircumcised, barbarian, Scythian, slave, free; but Christ is all, and in all."</i></p>

# Grudem Ch 10: "What is the Atonement?"

Grudem Section Divisions	Defy	Deny	Humbly Accept	Scripture / Comments
7 'Venal' sins only, or "all" including those who have committed sins such as murder, and even career criminals?				Jacob deceived his father to grab the blessing belonging to his brother Esau. Joseph's brothers kidnapped him and sold him into slavery and "certain death." Reuben had sex with his father's concubine. Judah hired a 'prostitute.' King David committed both adultery and murder; Zacchaeus was an unjust (crooked) tax collector.
8 Those who have reached adulthood only, or both adults and children?				Matt 19:14 ESV <i>but Jesus said, "Let the little children come to me and do not hinder them, for to such belongs the kingdom of heaven."</i>
9 Intelligent (triple digit IQ, and very close thereof) only, or both double and triple digit IQ people?				Rom. 1:14 KJV <i>I am debtor both to the Greeks, and to the Barbarians; both to the wise, and to the unwise.</i>
10 Physically 'normal' only, or "all" including those with diseases / deformities?				Christ's healing of the lame, blind, lepers.
11 "The Rich" (prosperous, as evidence of having God's favor) only, or "The Rich" and even the destitute?				Luke 6:20 <i>"blessed are the poor."</i> Taking up the offering among the Gentile churches to relieve the poverty of the Jewish believers in Israel.
12 Sins of "the past" only, or sins of all time periods?				Paul corrects Peter for the sin of hypocrisy 'playing the legalistic Jew.'
13 Those who have done many and lifelong good works only, or "all" including those who "saw the light" in terms of faith at the '11th hour?'				Parable of the workers called to work in the vineyard of the Master for the pay of a denarius.

Grudem Section Divisions	Defy	Deny	Humbly Accept	Scripture / Comments
<p><b>4 SLJInstitute.net</b> About Dr. S. Lewis Johnson, Jr.</p>				<p><b>S Lewis Johnson on "Atonement"</b></p>
				
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>SLEWISJOHNSON</b></p> <p>Dr. S. Lewis Johnson, Jr., (1915-2004) devoted his life to ministering God's word. He was born in Birmingham, Alabama and grew up in Charleston, South Carolina, graduating from College of Charleston with an A.B. degree in 1937. Shortly thereafter, he began a career in the insurance business in Birmingham.</p>				
<p>Although reared in the Presbyterian church and a regular attendee, Dr. Johnson relates his conversion experience to the teaching of Dr. Donald Grey Barnhouse, an early 20th Century Calvinist and pastor of the historic Tenth Street Presbyterian Church in Philadelphia. Barnhouse was an early innovator of radio preaching, eventually establishing The Bible Study Hour. These broadcasts, and especially a visit by Barnhouse to Johnson's church in Birmingham shortly before World War II, led Dr. Johnson to the Lord.</p>				
<p>Dr. Johnson eventually received a call to ministry and left the insurance business in 1943. In 1946 he earned his Th.M. degree from Dallas Theological Seminary, followed by a Th.D. in 1949. He would serve as both Professor and Visiting Professor at three universities, including Dallas Theological Seminary and Trinity Evangelical Divinity School. He has also done extensive graduate work in the United States, Scotland and Switzerland. In addition to his career in theological education, Dr. Johnson spent fifty years in pastoral ministry, concluding it as teaching elder at Believers Chapel of Dallas.</p>				
<p>1 One of the very special aspects of Dr. Johnson's life was his 'conversion' from a Four Point Calvinist to a Five, occurring <u>after</u> he completed a PhD in theology and had been serving as a Professor of Theology at a leading seminary.</p> <p>Pasted in below is a posting by the wife of Dr. Gary D. Long, a student of Dr. Lewis, that summarizes the</p>				<p>I believe I was an observer of such conversion process. In about 1973, Dr. Johnson taught a Monday night class at the church Carol &amp; I attended in Dallas (Believer's Chapel) on "The Atonement." There was a very small group of us regulars who were totally immersed over a period of months following his 'going back to square one' as to what does the Scriptures actually teach us and systematically developing a Bible-based framework on the Atonement.</p>

Grudem Section Divisions	Defy	Deny	Humbly Accept	Scripture / Comments
story of Dr. Lewis's journey to Limited / Definite Atonement.				



<http://practicingtheology.blogspot.com/2007/07/limited-atonement-how-s-lewis-johnson.html>

Many of you will recognize the distinguished gentleman pictured in the middle above--**S. Lewis Johnson**. But, I'll bet that few will recognize the man on the left--Gary D. Long, ThD. I took this picture during the annual "Sovereign Grace Conference" (not associated with C.J. Mahaney's ministry) held in Salado, Texas in October 2000.

I've posted this picture, along with comments below by S. Lewis Johnson, in order to introduce you to Dr. Long. According to S. Lewis, he owes a "personal debt" to Gary for his clearer "understanding and acceptance of consistent soteriological Calvinism". That may be surprising to many people because S. Lewis was a "giant" in his own right! But, what may surprise you even more is the fact that while Gary was a student of S. Lewis' at DTS, God used Gary's theological studies and discussions to **impact S. Lewis' understanding of definite atonement!** What an amazing example of God's grace and mercy to use a student to "teach" the teacher, and grant such humility to both men as they followed their Savior together!

It is Gary Long's book, "Definite Atonement"--an expansion of his master's thesis at DTS (1965-1972) first published in 1976--that I will be using for further discussion and posts on the topic of Definite/Limited Atonement. Please understand that I do NOT claim to fully understand or grasp this detailed work! However, I do claim that it has helped me immensely as I sort through the various supports of and objections to the doctrine of definite atonement, I hope it will be of help to you, too!

I offer you the following quotes from S. Lewis Johnson who wrote the Foreword to the book:

**"My long friendship with Dr. Long goes back to the years in which he was a student and I a professor at Dallas Theological Seminary in Dallas, Texas. In those days we had many conversations and times together...I look back upon those years as a time of further spiritual and theological growth for me."**

**"My own theological position at the time was what might be called Amyraldian, although not strictly true to historical Amyraldism, or hypothetical universalism. I frequently used the term, "four point Calvinist," to express my view...I really did believe in the bondage of the will and rejected the capital Arminian doctrine of free will, embraced by so many evangelicals calling themselves "Calvinists," or "mild Calvinists.""**

**"The personal debt that I owe to Dr. Long consists in the fact that, through our talks together and the further study of the question of particular redemption in the Scriptures under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, which they fostered, I was brought to an understanding and acceptance of consistent soteriological Calvinism."**

"I am, therefore, very indebted to Dr. Long and to the insights that he shared with me concerning the biblical doctrine of grace. He was a fine student in his work at the seminary, and I believe that this is evidenced in his book, which was originally a master's thesis presented to the seminary as part of the requirements for the degree of Th.M."

"The method of treatment of the issue that Dr. Long has followed is both theological and exegetical. The first part of the work is theological, and the author argues persuasively and quite thoroughly for the accomplishment of a definite atonement by our Lord in His death upon Calvary's cross. As an Appendix he has treated in exegetical detail the leading texts offered by Arminians in objection to the author's position. The texts dealt with are 2 Peter 2:1, 1 John 2:2, and 2 Corinthians 5:19. Thus, there is both theology and exegesis in the defense."

Grudem Section Divisions	Defy	Deny	Humbly Accept	Scripture / Comments
--------------------------	------	------	------------------	----------------------

"There are so many useful and helpful discussions of important aspects of the doctrine of God's grace in this book that I can only say, "Read it! Ponder it! And embrace the truth! It will be mind-clearing, heart-warming, and spiritually nourishing."

"Perhaps I may be allowed to make one final comment. To my mind the concept of the universal and spiritually egalitarian love of God lies at the base of a great deal of the spiritual failure of our day. In fact, it is a doctrine that is eminently calculated to give comfort to the apathetic and indifferent among us, who seem to be dwelling in a spiritual coma."

"I heartily recommend Dr. Long's discussion of God's eternal love, immutable and distinguishing. It is surely a needed warning to the complacent and an antidote to evangelicalism's current superficiality in the preaching of divine grace."

Special thanks to my 'teacher' and best friend--my husband! When I first mentioned the discussion that had arisen and the passage in question he commented, "...it's a good question and a difficult passage...don't forget Gary Long's book on the topic..."

2 Pasted in below are certain statements of Dr. Lewis from the above linked resources. First, from his message: "Inconsistencies in Modified Calvinism, Part III" ["modified" here means deleting the "L" from TULIP, namely replacing limited / definite atonement with unlimited atonement].

--	--	--	--

"As for the struggle between universal redemptionists and particular redemptionist, I have no doubt that the redemption Christ accomplished is particular and is intended only for his own believing elect people. Further, I'm also convinced that the question of the design or extent of the atonement is really settled by an understanding of the nature of the atonement. If the atonement is a penal atonement, and by that I mean of course, Christ paying the penalty of our sins and rendering a satisfaction to the divine justice and holiness for our sins by the substitution of himself for his people as their mediatorial surety and head, then the redemption must be particular. Otherwise the substitution is no real substitution and our Father God would be frustrated in his purposes. And yet his word says, "The counsel of the Lord stands forever." "

"John Owen has cited several statements of the Arminian that confirm the fact that they accept the frustratability of God. God would have all men to be saved, but compiled with the stubborn malice of some he changes his purpose and will have them perish. That is a statement from Arminius himself. In the Remonstrant apology, which as you know was a statement of the Arminians who were objecting to reformed orthodoxy, it is said, "Men may make their election void and frustrate." In Augustine's Enchiridion that was one of his works. Enchiridion means something like "a handbook" from the Greek word chir, which means "the hand." And so an Enchiridion was a kind of handbook of theology which Augustine wrote, and in that he makes the Calvinist's point by saying of 1 Timothy 2:4 that we have a freedom to interpret the text in different ways, "so long as we are not impelled to believe that the omnipotent God has willed anything to be done which was not done. For setting aside all ambiguities, if he hath done all that he pleased in heaven and earth, as the Psalmist sings of him, he certainly did not will to do anything that he hath not done." That's from Augustine. "

"If God had willed that all men be saved, the one sacrifice being infinite in value would have sufficed for the sins of all persons. He wouldn't have had to do more than he did when he died on Calvary's cross. The distinction of the fathers and others namely that Christ died sufficiently for all, but efficiently for the elect only. Sefici inter pro omnibus sed, efficacitur tantum pro electives. I said that latter to clarify the matter for you. [Laughter]

That's the Latin of the expression. That expression is true if understood of the dignity of Christ's death, but it's not accurate if it's referred to the will and purpose of Christ. The question concerns the purpose of the Father in sending the Son and the intention of the Son in dying. So when we talk about this question we're talking about intent, purpose, design. We're not talking about whether Christ's death is sufficient for the sins of all. All Calvinists, all Reform people believe that the death of Christ is sufficient for all, and it's stated in their doctrinal affirmations. And so that's not an issue."

"The Reformed believe that Christ died with the intention of saving precisely those whom he does save. Our opponents, our adversaries, believe that the majority of those that he intended to save perish, thus significantly detracting from the value and the glory of the death of Christ."

"If Christ loved the whole world so as to die for it, why so say that the motive of his dying is that his sheep should be saved? It's unnecessary to say that. If you say that he died for all, you don't have to say he died for his sheep. Amyraldians contend that Christ died absolutely for some and conditionally for others. The Bible never states such a distinction. It always represents the application of the atonement as conditional, but the making of it never as conditional."

"He said he shed his blood for the remission of their sins. But if they do mean all, in other words if we are to take it in the sense of all, then it must be in the sense of all without distinction not all without exception."

"Since the Holy Spirit is given only to the elect, there is no reason that can be given why the Son should be more extensive than the gift of the Spirit. In fact, the harmony between the work of the Son and the Spirit, demands their work be co-extensive, as Romans 8:32 plainly says. Let's say the text again, "He that spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not with him also freely give us all things?" "

"...the inseparable connection between the gift of Christ and the gift of the Spirit is part of what John Murray meant when he spoke of the "inter-Trinitarian economy of salvation." We must presume that the persons of the trinity work in harmony in their redemptive work. And so we say the Father elected, the Son offered a satisfaction for the elected ones; the Spirit applies the work to the elected one. We do not have the trinity working in this way, the Father elected the people of God but the Son in an effusive display of overabundance died for everyone, but the Spirit passed all of that by and applied the work to the elect."

3 Selections from Dr. Lewis's sermon on "The Design of the Atonement:"

Here he quotes Spurgeon:

"This is what Mr. Spurgeon says in connection with this. "We are often told that we limit the atonement of Christ, because we say that Christ has not made satisfaction for all men, or all men would be saved. Now, our reply to this is that, on the other hand, our opponents limit it, we do not. The Arminians say Christ died for all men. Ask them what they mean by it. Did Christ die so as to secure the salvation of all men? They say, 'No, certainly not.' We ask them the next question-Did Christ die so as to secure the salvation of any man in particular? They say, 'No.' They are obliged to admit this if they are consistent. They say, 'No; Christ has died so that any man may be saved if'"-and then follow certain conditions of salvation. We say then, we will just go back to the old statement-Christ did not die so as beyond a doubt to secure the salvation of anybody, did He? You must say 'No; you are obliged to say so, for you believe that even after a man has been pardoned, he may yet fall from grace and perish. Now, who is it that limits the death of Christ? Why you... You say that Christ did not die so as infallibly to secure the salvation of anybody. We beg your pardon when you say we limit Christ's

death. We say, no my dear sir, it is you who do it. We say Christ so died that He infallibly secured the salvation of a multitude that no man can number, who through Christ's death not only may be saved, but are saved, must be saved, and cannot by any possibility run the hazard of being anything but saved." "

Now Dr. Lewis continues an imagined debate with an Arminian arguing the unlimited atonement case: "So, Jesus Christ died for all men and all men may be saved if they believed. Now, the facts are, and you will admit that, that not all men are saved. You will admit to me, that only the elect are saved, and of course, I have said that Jesus Christ came to save those elect. You say he came to save a great number, a great mass of humanity, all men, if. How many are saved? Why, the same number that are saved according to my limited theory. And as a matter of fact, not only the same number, but the same individuals, the same names. Now, I want to ask you, does my theory which says that God has accomplished precisely what he intended to accomplish, does that magnify and glorify the grace and power and plan of God more than a theory which says that Jesus Christ came to die for all men, but God's purpose was frustrated and defeated by his own creation. Now, I ask you, which one glorifies God the more a theory which leaves us with a frustrated deity or the plans of a deity that are frustrated, or one in which a deity sovereignly accomplished precisely what he intended to accomplish by the coming of his Son. It seems to me that the second theory glorifies God more than the first, for the first curtails the power, the depth, and the effectiveness of the grace of God. Well, I don't think too much of that argument as you can tell."

Next Dr. Lewis turns to the great theologian John Owen: John Owen was a great theologian, no doubt about it. He said this, "The Father imposed his wrath due unto, and the Son underwent punishment for either all the sins of all men; second, all the sins of some men, or some of the sins of all men." In other words, Christ died for all of the sins of all men, all the sins of some men, or some of the sins of all men. "In which case," Owen said, "it may be said that if the last be true, that Christ died for some of the sins of all men, all men have some sins to answer for, so none are saved. If the second be true, that Christ died for all the sins of some men, then Christ in their stead suffered for all the sins of all the elect in the whole world, and this is the truth. But if the first be the case that Christ died for all of the sins of all men, if the first be the case, why are not all men free from the punishment due to their sins? Well you answer," He says, "because of unbelief. I ask is this unbelief a sin, or is it not? If it be, then Christ suffered the punishment due unto it or he did not. If he did, why must that hinder them more than their other sins for which he died? If he did not, he did not die for all their sins."

"If Jesus Christ died for the elect, then I as an evangelist could not say to you, Christ died for you. I couldn't say that. I'll read you another statement. "The fact is that the New Testament never calls on any man to repent on the ground that Christ died specifically and particularly for him." Can you think of any text in the Bible in which men are called upon to repent on the ground that Christ died specifically and particularly for him?"

The man continues, "The basis on which the New Testament invites sinners to put faith in Christ is simply that they need him and that he offers himself to them. And that those who receive him are promised all the benefits that his death secured for his people. What is universal and all inclusive in the New Testament is the invitation to faith and the promise of salvation to all who believe. The gospel is not, 'Believe that Christ died for everybody's sins and therefore for yours' anymore than it is 'Believe that Christ died only for certain people's sins, so perhaps not for yours.' The gospel is, believe on the Lord Jesus Christ who died for sins and now offers you himself as your savior.

This is the message that we are to take to the world. We have no business to ask them to put faith in any view of the extent of the atonement. Our job is to point them to the living Christ and summon them to trust in him." "

"As a matter of fact, you cannot say, "God has a wonderful plan for your life." You couldn't even say that under either of these theories. Now, are you shocked? I hope that you're shocked, because that means that at least you're hearing what I'm saying. We don't have a right to say that. That's not a biblical truth. What can we say? Well, I can say Christ died for sinners, and I can say that God promises believers in Jesus Christ life. I can that with all of the authority of the word of God. Christ died for sinners, and if you've recognized the fact that you are a sinner, and you come in faith to Jesus Christ, you have the promise of the word of God that he receives you and gives you life.

Now, what more wonderful gospel would you want than that? Christ died for sinners. Are you a sinner? Well you say, "I'm not a sinner." Well, then no gospel would do you any good. You do not want a gospel. But if we say that Christ died for sinners, and God promises believing sinners life, what more do we need? I don't think we need anything more than just that. And that is the gospel, and that is the way we should preach it if we hold to a definite atonement by Jesus Christ."

#### 4 Selections from Dr. Lewis's sermon on "The Purpose of the Atonement:"

"Now, we must make a couple of careful distinctions, and that is the purpose of this section of our study, Atonement and the Love of God. Did the atonement cause God to love sinners? I think, and I know this is true in the theological world, I think many Christians feel that the result of the atonement is that God's attitude toward sinners has changed, and thus we can say that the atonement caused God to love sinners. The answer to the question, of course, is not yes, but no. No, it is the love of God that produced atonement. The atonement did not cause God to love sinners. The atonement was something that God brought to pass, because he loved sinners."

"Now, I want to talk for just a moment about the certainty of the salvation of the elect, because this is what we're going to be talking about in the weeks that follow. As far as the atonement and the sinner is concerned, one of the most significant things is the fact that as a result of the atoning work of the Lord Jesus, the salvation of the elect has been rendered certain. Not only did the atonement make salvation possible for the sinner, it actually secured the salvation of sinners."