

Systematic Theology session 33
Redeemed, Part 2

- The accomplishment of redemption by the work of the cross.
 - Atonement: the covering or removal of sin, and the resulting disposal of guilt, by means of an instrument of atonement.
 - Instrument of atonement: the means of atonement; the particular way that God chooses to provide atonement for our sins.
 - The motive of God in providing a means of atonement (what Berkhof called the “moving cause of the atonement”) as being the love of God for His people (John 3:16-17, Romans 5:6-8, Jeremiah 31:31-34)
 - The three tests of the proper instrument of atonement.
 - The instrument of atonement must be appointed by God, not chosen by man.
 - The instrument of atonement must be substitutionary.
 - The instrument of atonement must involve a flawless substitute.
 - The Old Testament instrument of atonement as being the blood of animals.
 - The temporary and imperfect nature of the blood of animals as atonement for sin (Hebrews 10:11-14).
 - The blood of animals as being a shadow of the perfect atonement yet to come in the cross of Christ (Hebrews 10:1-4, Colossians 2:16-17).
 - The work of the cross as having saved God’s elect people under the Old Testament, as well as under the New Testament (Psalm 32:1-2, Isaiah 53:6).
 - The cross as a public demonstration that God did not “lower the bar” on His standard of justice for Old Testament believers.
 - The atonement as being penal substitutionary atonement.
 - False theories of the atonement.
 - The Moral Influence Theory of the atonement: Christ was a martyr to provide us an example of devotion to truth and duty, so we will be emotionally influenced toward repentance and “turning over a new leaf.”
 - The Moral Government Theory of the atonement: The cross was a token acknowledgement that God’s law is holy and we violated that holy law, but the atonement does not save. God simply forgives without payment. The demonstration of God’s holiness at the cross makes it possible for God to “lower the bar” on His justice toward us.
 - Two views of the necessity of the atonement.
 - Hypothetical necessity: God could have chosen other ways to save, other than the way of atonement that He designed. The reason God chose the cross was it brought the most glory to God. God could “hypothetically” have chosen other ways to save, but God chose and decreed the cross.
 - Consequent absolute necessity: God was under no obligation to save; the decree to save the elect was by grace. But once God decreed to save the elect (the “consequent” part of the phrase), the means of salvation had to be the cross (“absolute necessity”).
 - Consequent absolute necessity proven by God’s absolute justice.
 - Consequent absolute necessity proven by the fact that God paid the highest possible price to accomplish redemption (Romans 8:31-32, Luke 24:25-26).