

**Scriptures and Doctrine :: Governmental Atonement Illustrated: King Zalukas****Governmental Atonement Illustrated: King Zalukas, on: 2009/9/24 0:55**

I read this and thought that it was very good:

**WHY DID JESUS HAVE TO DIE?**

Someone asked me, "Couldn't God have simply forgiven our sins?" I explained why God couldn't simply forgive without atonement. Under God's government, as under any government, penalty serves a purpose. The purpose of executing penalties upon law breakers is to discourage crime. The purpose of punishment is not to gratify wrathful feelings or a vindictive spirit. The purpose of punishment is to maintain law in order to promote the well-being of a community. If God simply forgave us, by setting aside our penalty, than He would not be discouraging crime. The problem with mere forgiveness is that it would weaken the law of God and thus endanger all of His subjects. Therefore if God is going to forgive us by setting aside our penalty, He must substitute our penalty with atonement in order to accomplish what our penalty would have accomplished. If God can express His regard for His law through the atonement, as equally as He would have expressed it by executing the penalty of the law upon law breakers, then the problem of forgiven is overcome, crime is discouraged, and therefore mercy or pardon is made possible. I taught that now that atonement has been made, which substitutes our penalty, which satisfied the purpose of our penalty, God can remit our penalty if we repent and believe. I cannot see how a loving and intelligent God could forgive any criminal unless there is atonement made.

**THE STORY OF KING ZALUKAS**

In order to illustrate the atonement I told a story about an Italian King named Zalukas. The King saw how adultery had the potential to destroy a society. If there is adultery in a Kingdom, there could be children born out of wed lock. This breaks down the family unit. There could also be jealousy and murder when a husband finds out that another man has been sleeping with his wife. Therefore for the good of His Kingdom, the King outlawed adultery.

But laws are not respected or regarded unless they have consequences. Penalties give the law authority and influence. Therefore the King assigned a very severe penalty for those who violated his law. Those who were found committing adultery would have both of their eyes removed by a hot poker!

A few people were found committing adultery and quickly the penalty was executed. This showed the Kingdom that the King meant business. He surely regarded his law and meant to maintain it. It wasn't long until adultery literally ceased from his Kingdom.

One day a man was brought before the King who had been committing adultery. It was the Kings own son, the prince of the Kingdom. The King was in a dilemma. On the one hand the King wanted to maintain His law. The authority and influence of his law depended upon the execution of the penalty. If He didn't execute the penalty, his Kingdom would question whether or not the King really regarded his law or not. If the King did not execute the penalty, the Kingdom would think that he gave a bad law or that he gave too severe a penalty. But on the other hand, the King cared about his son and was prone to forgive him. The King naturally preferred to show his son mercy. How could he do both? How could the King show mercy to his son but still uphold the authority and influence of his law throughout His Kingdom at the same time?

The solution which the King found to his dilemma was a painful one. The King had one of the eyes of his son removed, and in lieu of the other eye of his son, he sacrificed his own. He substituted one of his own eyes for the eye of his son. In this way the King found a way to show mercy to his Son by not executing the full penalty of the law upon him, while also expressing to his Kingdom his regard for his law and thereby maintain the authority and influence of the precept.

I then explained that God gave his universe a very good law for our own good. The law of God promotes the highest well-being of all. In order to give authority to the precept, God has given a severe penalty. The penalty for violating God's law is to burn in hell for all of eternity. That is eternal death.

At first there were angels who rebelled against God. They were quickly thrust out of Heaven and are now waiting Judgment Day. But then mankind sinned. Mankind was made in the image of God. Men were the crown of God's creation. God was prone to forgive mankind, but He must also maintain His law. On the one hand, the authority and influence of His law

w throughout His universe or Kingdom depends upon Him making a proper expression of His regard for His law so that crime is discouraged. But on the other hand, God would prefer to forgive mankind by withholding or setting aside our penalty. How could God do both? How could God pardon disobedient men without encouraging the rest of His universe to sin? How could God remit our penalty of eternal hell but still uphold His law and maintain its authority and influence? The answer is the atonement.

God offered His own Son to make atonement for our sins. The atonement was given in lieu of our eternal punishment. The atonement of Jesus Christ substitutes the eternal punishment of sinners. The problem of mere pardon is that it leaves the purpose of penalty unfulfilled. The purpose of penalty is to prevent crime, to stop the spread of rebellion. The problem of mere forgiveness is that it encourages sin. But when an atonement substitutes our penalty, the problems of forgiveness are overcome. The atonement accomplishes what our penalty would have accomplished and therefore our penalty can be remitted. God expresses His regard for His law through the atonement in an even greater way than He would have through the punishment of sinners. Therefore His law is upheld throughout His universe, maintaining its authority and influence, through the atonement as it would have been through our penalty. God can safely pardon criminals, without endangering the well-being of His universe, because an atonement has been made. God promises that He will remit our penalty if we will simply decide to turn from sin and trust in Christ. God will turn from His wrath, withhold our punishment, or remit our penalty, if we are converted to Christ.

**Re: Governmental Atonement Illustrated: King Zalukas - posted by TaylorOtwell (), on: 2009/9/24 9:00**

So, is it accurate to say that the governmental view of the atonement doesn't *actually* secure the salvation of anyone - it simply makes it possible for people to be saved if they are wise enough to believe in Christ?

With care in Christ,  
Taylor

**Re: - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2009/9/24 9:04**

This sort of theology is not correct at all. But the purely opposite and extreme is not true either. It matters how we live. Yet the atonement is our only way to be saved.

it is not an example like Jehovah's Witnesses, Mormons, etc.

**Re: , on: 2009/9/25 10:12**

The atonement of Christ substitutes the punishment of hell fire for sinners, therefore no sinner has to go to hell, everyone can be saved from hell. All men can now have their sins forgiven. God can withhold the punishment of all.

The atonement is a substitution and it is the only reason we can have mercy and forgiveness. If there was no atonement, God could not remit our penalty. If there was no atonement, God could not pardon anyone. But now that an atonement has been made for everyone, God can pardon everyone, if they repent and believe.

How many sinners were saved at Calvary? Just one. The repentant thief. The rest of us were saved after the atonement. We were saved at conversion, not Calvary. Calvary made salvation available, but salvation did not become actual until conversion.

"Christ's work on Calvary made atonement for every man, but it did not save any man....Universal atonement makes salvation universally available, but it does not make it universally effective toward the individual." A W Tozer

"with a real atonement for all, some perish... the atonement is only provisory in its character; that it renders men salvable, but does not necessarily save them." John Miley

Jesus died for all but not all are saved from God's wrath. Many of those Jesus died for still went to hell. The atonement made it possible for God to turn from His wrath, but until sinners turn from their sins God does not actually turn from His wrath. Those Jesus died for (all men) are under God's wrath until they repent and believe.

**Re: - posted by Logic, on: 2009/9/25 16:16**

The Atonement does not actually save mankind; what saves man is the relationship with the Father through Christ because of the Atonement. The Atonement must be personally applied to each individual by the individuals themselves. Just as each household had to apply the blood to their own door post during the Passover (Exodus 12:7, 21), so we must apply Christ's blood to our own lives in order to be saved. This is a fact, if not, if the Atonement actually does the saving of mankind, then even those who stay in rebellion would be forgiven.

Atonement is required for the reason of proving the true worth of God and His character while forgiving the offender of the crime against God. The atonement acknowledges the true value and worth of God by the One who is sacrificed on behalf of the guilty. God must sacrifice something just as valuable, if not greater in actual worth as the one who offended Him. The sacrifice must be of equal severity as to the offence of the crime committed. The punishment must fit the crime.

The only one able to atone for the damage that is done to His name must be equally great, not only in worth but in all aspects to God whom we offended (not just deemed as valuable as mankind is); The one who makes atonement can not be a mere mortal, for then he would only be able to atone for just one man (Gen 9:5-6, Exodus 21:12-14, Lev 24:17, Numbers 35:31, Deut 19:11-12). Furthermore, he must be eternal so that He may atone for all (Hebrews 9:14). Therefore, it must be God Himself in the likeness of "sinful flesh" who must make atonement (Roman 8:3); for Jesus is the only one who has satisfied the Father, even until the cross, therefore, only He can satisfy Him on the cross.

The one being atoned for must change in order for him to be forgiven. He must first meet the set conditions in order for the atonement to be applied for the forgiveness; these requirements (or "set conditions") are faith in what Christ has said & done and repentance to prove the faith to be real and genuine. This proves that the one being atoned for understands the true value of the one who is forgiving and that he can not take this whole thing lightly. If one refuses to acknowledge the true value and worth of God and refuses to meet the set conditions in order to be forgiven; if he takes lightly all that God has said and done to forgive, he can not be forgiven. (Matthew 18:23-35, John 15:8) The atonement is an influence on one's heart/soul. The selfless, loving sacrifice on our account is to break the heart of the sinner and cause him to acknowledge his sin and the judgment of his sin. A revelation of the suffering of Christ should break and subdue one's heart and bring him to complete surrender to God. The atonement should so affect our hearts that we turn from our disobedience in humble, sincere, and deep repentance, repenting out of a motive of love, remorse, and sincerity (1 John. 4:19). God is drawing all men to Himself through the atonement (John. 12:32), and it is His loving kindness which draws us (Jer.31:3; Rom. 2:4). The Atonement transforms and liberates through reciprocation, when men obey the gospel of Jesus Christ from the heart because God was loving them all along, from the beginning.

Substitutional Atonement satisfies the law &/or justice so that God is justified in forgiving those who put their faith in/on what Jesus has said & done. However, there is no possible way that anyone to have a substitute for punishment of a crime such as murder in a moral government judicial system as we have in society; For example, a father could never take a son's place in his execution for murder. Furthermore, a King could never let a law breaker go free as in the case of Daniel and the lion's den. However, Jesus did take our place in judgment through His sacrifice that He might satisfy the law as our proxy. He could do this because sin is only against God personally and not against a moral governmental judicial system. (Some, maybe all of this is from what truefaithsav has written)

**Re: , on: 2009/9/25 16:50**

Quote:  
-----Just as each household had to apply the blood to their own door post during the Passover  
-----

I would absolutely agree that there would have been no salvation for any Jewish household that Passover night without an application of the blood of the lamb, just as the Gospel is only the Power of God unto Salvation to those who believe. I agree. But, if you look at Exodus 12 carefully, you will see that the Word of Lord, (that Word of Salvation) was only given to God's chosen people, Israel. Egypt was not given the opportunity to apply the blood to their door posts, only Israel. No Egyptian heard God's voice; God's warning and promise. (through Moses). They were left to themselves.

God spoke in times past through the prophets (like Moses) but He speaks now through His Son, and those who are His sheep will hear His voice. They will hear , "repent and believe the Gospel" , and they will obey.

**Re: , on: 2009/9/25 17:38**

First, I would like to say that I think this thread is a very fruitful one. To me, any discussion that causes me to really dig and consider what I believe is good.

Quote:  
-----"Christ's work on Calvary made atonement for every man, but it did not save any man....Universal atonement makes salvation universally available, but it does not make it universally effective toward the individual." A W Tozer  
-----

I have the book that this quote is from, Paths to Power, and I have read it many times. I like the book and I used to agree with Dr. Tozer concerning the atonement...

If we look at God's saving hand in the Old Testament; when He saved Israel. What we see is that God ACTUALLY SAVED Israel. When Israel was saved from their enemies, it was not a potential salvation. It was actual; they were not expelled from the land; their inheritance, and God's salvation in the Old Testament is a type and a shadow of what He did at the Cross.

I mentioned this before, but look at David in his defeat of Goliath. Israel was about to be destroyed and lose their inheritance, but God raised up a man, from obscurity, whom He chose and anointed to save His people. David defeated Goliath. His victory was a vicarious victory for all of God's chosen people, Israel. He actually saved them. It was not a potential salvation. It was real and definite. In fact, if you consider the covenant that Israel had with God, He actually saved them from Himself. They were a disobedient people, and according to the covenant that the nation had with God, He should have let them be defeated and driven out of the land. But, He did not. He gave them a King....and that King saved them....

Look at Acts 13 and you will see that Paul says as much to the people in Pisidian Antioch

**Re: - posted by roaringlamb (), on: 2009/9/25 17:48**

But did Jesus think that His death only made salvation possible? He said that He was the Good Shepherd who would give His life for the sheep.

So from this can't we say that He Himself limited it to "the sheep"?

And to be fair, we can look at Isaiah 53 where it says, "all we like sheep have gone astray...", but to whom is Isaiah speaking to first and foremost? is it not the covenant people of God since he was addressing Israel?

So when Isaiah goes on to say, "and the Lord has laid on him the iniquity of us all", is he not saying that the iniquity of all the covenant people of God (sheep) was put on Him (the Messiah)?

Just curious.

**Re: , on: 2009/9/25 18:33**

Atonement + nothing = no salvation: we must repent and believe

Atonement + faith = no salvation: we must also repent.

Atonement + repentance + faith = salvation.

God only has mercy when the conditions of atonement, repentance, and faith are met.

The atonement has been made for all but not all are saved. Nobody is saved from God's wrath until they repent and believe, even though Jesus Christ already died for them.

Jesus died for me before I repented and believed. But I was not saved from God's wrath until I repented and believed.

**Re: - posted by PreachParsly (), on: 2009/9/25 18:46**

Here is a question that I think may be pertinent.

Is the "moral law of God" something that God created or something that is innate in His being?

Did God create it because of His great wisdom or is it an essential part of His being, which in turn makes it eternal?

**Re: - posted by PreachParsly (), on: 2009/9/25 18:49**

If it is created by God, then it is something that is outside of God. If it is an essential part of God then it is God who is satisfied by the atonement, not an external law that should be upheld. Does that flow logically?

**Re: - posted by Logic, on: 2009/9/26 11:34**

Quote:

-----  
truefaithsav wrote:

Atonement + nothing = no salvation: we must repent and believe

Atonement + faith = no salvation: we must also repent.

Atonement + repentance + faith = salvation.  
-----

You can't separate repentance from faith as you are doing.  
True faith implies repentance. faith w/out repentance is not faith at all.

Or, are you putting that this way as to not have people discount repentance?

**Re: - posted by Logic, on: 2009/9/26 11:48**

Quote:

-----PreachParsly wrote:

If it is created by God, then it is something that is outside of God. If it is an essential part of God then it is God who is satisfied by the atonement, not an external law that should be upheld. Does that flow logically?  
-----

It is an essential part of God.

The law is not founded in mere randomness, but in the Personhood of God, it is a representation of who He is and a part of the foundation of reality.

God did not create the law, it is only a reflection of Him. Therefore, it is God who is placated by the atonement, however, the law still must be upheld and satisfied by justice when transgressed.

**Re: , on: 2009/9/27 0:44**

Moral law is not a "thing" or a "substance" to be created. Moral law is an idea of the mind. God has a conscience. His intelligence tells Him how people should be treated, according to their intrinsic value. He is supremely valuable and therefore should be loved supremely. Our neighbor is equally valuable to ourselves and therefore should be loved equally. The moral law of God originated in the mind of God, not in the arbitrary will of God.

The moral law, strictly speaking, only requires the death of the guilty. "The soul that sins, it shall die". That is retributive justice. Retributive justice is treating everyone as they deserve. In the atonement Christ the innocent died. He didn't deserve to die. Therefore his death did not satisfy retributive justice. Through the atonement we live. We are guilty. Therefore the atonement does not satisfy retributive justice.

But the object of penalty is public justice. The purpose of punishment is to discourage crime. The object or purpose of penalty, which is public justice, was definitely satisfied by the atonement. God's regard for the public order of His universe is satisfied through the atonement as it would have been by the penalty executed upon sinners. God is the Lord of hosts. He is the ruler over many moral beings. If he is going to set aside the punishment of mankind, He must substitute our punishment with an atonement in order to maintain His law throughout all of His Kingdom. If He simply forgave by His grace and mercy, without an atonement, the purpose of the penalty of the law would not have been

satisfied, crime would be encouraged instead of discouraged.

Repentance and faith are two sides of the same coin. To repent is to change your mind about breaking God's law. Faith is to put your trust in God and His atonement. When we truly turn to God, we turn to God in repentance and faith. Once that occurs, God remits our penalty of eternal hell.

I think definitions really help:

**The penalty of the law:** the eternal hell of the guilty (not physical death or else even Christians aren't saved; and not the death of the innocent) See Eze. 18:20; 2 Thes. 1:9

**The object of penalty:** to discourage crime (not to satisfy any vindictiveness in God, since God does not delight in the death of the wicked) See 2 Peter 2:6

**Forgiveness or mercy:** the setting aside or remission of penalty (it is not the payment of a debt, the satisfaction of wrath, or the execution of penalty. These are the opposite of forgiveness or mercy) See Ps 78:38, Ps 85:23, Micah 7:18; Matt 6:12; 18:27; Lk. 7:42

**Problem of forgiveness:** it encourages crime (it is not that God was unwilling, unforgiving, or unmerciful) See Ecc. 8:11, Eze. 18:32

**Atonement:** a substitute for the penalty (not the penalty itself) which makes our penalty remissable. See Matt. 26:28; Heb 9:22

**Necessity of atonement:** to fulfill or satisfy the purpose of penalty (public justice), to make it safe for God to pardon criminals without endangering the rest of His subjects by encouraging others to break His law. God must maintain His law throughout His universe by expressing His regard for it, either by punishing the guilty or through the atonement of Christ. (Not that God needed any personal satisfaction, but that God had a governmental problem - the purpose of penalty needed satisfaction). See Romans 3:25-26

Re: , on: 2009/9/27 1:13

I found these quotes on the atonement and really liked them:

“The atonement is something substituted in the place of the penalty of the law, which will answer the same ends as the punishment of the offender himself would. It is instead of punishment. It is something which will make it proper for the lawgiver to suspend or remit the literal execution of the penalty of the law, because the object or end of that penalty has been secured, or because something has been substituted for that which will answer the same purpose. In other words, there are certain ends proposed by the appointment of the penalty in case of violation of the law; and if these ends are secured, then the punishment may be remitted and the offender may be pardoned. That which will secure these ends is an atonement.” **Albert Barnes**

“The atonement is the substitute for the punishment threatened in the law; and was designed to answer the same ends of supporting the authority of the law, the dignity of the divine moral government, and the consistency of the divine conduct in legislation and execution. By the atonement it appears that God is determined that his law shall be supported; that it shall not be despised or transgressed with impunity; and that it is an evil and a bitter thing to sin against God. The very idea of an atonement or satisfaction for sin, is something which, to the purposes of supporting the authority of the divine law, and the dignity and consistency of the divine government, is equivalent to the punishment of the sinner, according to the literal threatening of the law. That which answers these purposes being done, whatever it be, atonement is made, and the way is prepared for the dispensation of pardon.” **Jonathon Edwards Jr.**

"the atonement is the governmental substitution of the sufferings of Christ for the punishment of sinners" **Charles Finney**

"The idea that penal justice must, always be done, in the sense that the penalty of the law must always be inflicted, would exclude the possibility of pardon and of atonement." **John Morgan**

"Under his violated law a sinning race was justly doomed to perdition. Some expression must needs go forth to sustain t

he sacredness and majesty of that law, so that pardon could be offered and given with no period to his moral kingdom."  
**Henry Cowles**

"The death of Christ is not a substituted penalty, but a substitute for a penalty. The necessity of an atonement is not found in the fact that the justice of God required an invariable execution of the deserved penalty, but in the fact that the honor and glory of God, and the welfare of his creatures, required that his essential and recortial righteousness be adequately declared." **Dr. Raymond**

"The sufferings of Christ, as a proper substitute for punishment, must fulfill the office of penalty in the obligatory ends of moral government." **John Miley**

"But should this penalty be set aside, and no substitute, as it respects the divine governments be intruded, the authority of law is prostrated at once." **Nathan Beman**

"To say then that Christ made an expiatory offering for us, according to my apprehension of the meaning of scriptural language, implies that his sufferings and death were, by divine appointment, accepted instead of the punishment due to us as sinners, and that God, in consequence of the offering made by Christ, pardons our offences and restores us to his favor." **Moses Stuart**

“It provides a substitute for the penalty of the law.” **Winkie Pratney**

“The Divine law has been broken; the interests of the universe demanded that its righteousness should be maintained, therefore, its penalty must be endured by the transgressor, or, in lieu of this, such compensation must be rendered as would satisfy the claims of justice, and render it expedient for God to pardon the guilty... Christ made such a sacrifice as to render it possible for God to be just, and yet to pardon the sinner.” **Catherine Booth**

"But if God pardoned sinners without an atonement, he could neither have supported his law, discounteanced wickedness, nor manifested his abhorrence of sin, and love of holiness. Hence if sinners were pardoned, an atonement was indispensably necessary." **Caleb Burge**

**Re: , on: 2009/9/27 15:53**

If the atonement was the payment of our debt, or a satisfaction of God's wrath:

1. Those Jesus died for would be born saved
2. You'd have to believe in limited atonement or universalism
3. You do not need to repent or believe to be saved
4. Your debt is paid and God has no wrath for you, even if you don't know it
5. There is no forgiveness or mercy in salvation

These are some serious problems!

God still has wrath after the atonement (Acts 12:23; Rom. 1:18; Rom. 2:5; Rom. 2:8-9; Col. 3:6; Rev. 6:17; Rev. 14:10, Rev. 14:19, Rev. 15:7; Rev. 16:1) and therefore the atonement did not satisfy God's wrath.

Nobody is saved from God's wrath until they forsake their sins (Isaiah 55:7; Jer. 26:13; Prov. 28:13; Acts 3:19; Acts 8:22).

The atonement is a substitute for our penalty (Heb. 9:22), so that God could remit our penalty (Matt. 26:28; Rom. 3:25) without dishonoring or weakening His law.

Forgiveness is the remission of penalty (Matt. 26:28; Rom. 3:25; Heb. 9:22). Forgiveness is when God turns away from His wrath (Ps. 85:2-3; Micah 7:18). But if Jesus took our penalty and satisfied God's wrath, there could be no real forgiveness. The atonement makes it possible for our penalty to be remitted, it makes it possible for God to turn away from His wrath when sinners repent.

Now that an atonement has been made, God can remit our penalty, withhold our punishment, and turn from His wrath. Jesus has delivered us from the wrath that is to come (1 Thes. 1:10). The wrath is still there. The wrath is still coming. But we are delivered from it. Because of the passover lamb, God's wrath can pass over us instead of being poured out upon us (1 Cor. 5:7).

**Re: - posted by ceedub, on: 2009/9/27 21:28**

It seems all believe in limited atonement save the universalists. Some believe the atonement is limited in its scope, some in its power. Both sides believe it is limited to those who believe.

It would be difficult to believe that Jesus did the exact same thing for those that are in heaven as in hell.

Can the man in heaven say to God the Father,  
'Did Jesus bear all my sins and iniquities?'

Yes

'Did Jesus accomplish what he came to do?'

Yes

Did he die in my place?

Yes

Did he save his people from their sins?

Yes

Was it nothing but the blood that procured my salvation?

Yes

Was His work finished at the cross?

Yes

Did he die to take away all my sin, even unbelief?

Yes

Did he then give the gifts of faith and repentance to His people?

Yes

Did he give his life for his people, for his church?

Yes

Did God do all these things for those that are in hell?...

Eph 5:25

If Jesus did for those in hell what he did for those in heaven and there is no difference as far as what Jesus did, then the difference between heaven and hell lies only in what man does. If that is true, how can all the glory be God's when his saving attempts left many in hell?

If that is true, what of Is 42 that says he will not fail? What will be the response of those in heaven that are asked who made the difference to get you here?

I know myself. We are all prone to wander, Lord we feel it, prone to leave the God we love. It is God who has taken and sealed us for His courts above. Alpha and Omega. Start to finish.

To God be the glory.



**Re: - posted by Logic, on: 2009/9/27 23:03**

Quote:  
-----ceedub wrote:  
If Jesus did for those in hell what he did for those in heaven and there is no difference as far as what Jesus did, then the difference between heaven and hell lies only in what man does. If that is true, how can all the glory be God's when his saving attempts left many in hell?  
-----

It is because those who are saved are the only ones who choose to obey the command to repent as proof of their faith, while those who are not saved, chose not to.  
That is how all the glory be God's.

There is no glory in saving those who do not choose to obey the command to repent as proof of their faith when that is why they are condemned.

Quote:  
-----We are all prone to wander, Lord we feel it, prone to leave the God we love.  
-----  
That is like saying, "I'm prone to wander from my wife and leave her." I am not prone to wander from God, whom I love.

**Re: - posted by ceedub, on: 2009/9/28 1:04**

It seems you left out the part where I said God is the one who seals us and keeps us for His courts above.

You're either trying to make me look bad or you don't like that part?

Logic, it's great you strive, but do you do it according to knowledge?

**Re: , on: 2009/9/28 2:59**

What is the forgiveness of sins and why does it require an atonement?

There are only three atonement views:

Ransom Theory  
Governmental Theory  
Penal Theory

The ransom theory can tell you what forgiveness is, but it cannot tell you why atonement is necessary for forgiveness. A ransom was paid to the devil, but it is God who forgives us. So the ransom was not necessary for God's forgiveness, but was necessary for being released from the captivity of the devil.

The penal theory never defines forgiveness and its view of the atonement excludes any real forgiveness. Sins are never actually forgiven, they are always punished. So the atonement was not necessary for forgiveness, but the atonement made forgiveness impossible. All sins are punished, no sins are forgiven. All debts are paid, no debts are pardoned. All penalty is executed, no penalty is remitted. The atonement is the opposite of forgiveness.

The governmental theory defines it very simply. Forgiveness of sins is when God remits the penalty of our sins. Forgiveness is the remission of penalty. Atonement is necessary for forgiveness in order to satisfy the purpose of penalty, in order to overcome the problems of forgiveness, so that the penalty of the law can be wisely and safely remitted. An atonement is necessary to substitute our penalty so that our penalty can be remitted. The atonement of Christ must accomplish what the penalty of the law being executed upon sinners would have accomplished, otherwise the penalty of the law has to be executed upon sinners. But if the atonement of Christ does what the penalty of the law upon the guilty would have done, then the penalty can be remitted (forgiveness).

Again let me ask what is the forgiveness of sins? And why is an atonement necessary for God to forgive our sins?

Re: - posted by Logic, on: 2009/9/28 10:12

Quote:

-----  
ceedub wrote:

It seems you left out the part where I said God is the one who seals us and keeps us for His courts above.

-----  
How is that discoun what I said?

Quote:

-----You're either trying to make me look bad or you don't like that part?

-----  
Niether.

Quote:

-----Logic, it's great you strive, but do you do it according to knowledge

-----  
Knowledg of what?

Re: , on: 2009/9/28 13:48

Someone recently told me:

1. There is no governmental need for an atonement
2. The Bible does not teach any type of moral influence from the atonement
3. The atonement is not a substitution
4. The Early Church did not teach any governmental necessity

All four of these statements are wrong. This was my answer to him:

1. If there is no governmental need to substitute our penalty with the atonement, then there is no governmental need of penalty at all. If penalty can be remitted without a substitute, then the penalty is simply not necessary and serves no necessary purpose. But God does execute penalties upon the wicked, which mean that penalties must serve a necessary purpose. And if they serve a purpose under God's government, how can they be remitted unless those purposes are fulfilled through an alternative means?

2. The Bible does teach the moral influence of the atonement. It says we love Him because He first loved us and His lovingkindness leads us to repentance. It says that we are born again by the hearing of the Gospel. When men hear how Jesus Christ died for them, as their substitute (the just for the unjust) this subdues their hearts and brings them to repentance.

3. The innocent (Christ) died so that the guilty (sinners) might live. This is substitution. There had to have been a necessity for this substitution. Jesus said he shed his blood for the remission of sins. Without the shedding of blood there is no remission. Remission is to remit penalty. If our penalty can be remitted because of the atonement, then the atonement must fulfill the purpose of our penalty. Otherwise there would be no connection at all with the shedding of blood and the remission of penalty.

4. And this is a quote from the Early Church on the governmental necessity of the atonement: "Is it not plain that the Father received the ransom, not because He himself required or needed it, but for the sake of the Divine government of the universe, and because man must be sanctified through the incarnation of the son of God?" Gregory of Nazianzus (yr 330-390)

Re: , on: 2009/9/29 0:24

There are serious problems with the idea that Jesus paid our debt! Think about it!

If you owe a person \$100 and I pay your debt for you, without you knowing it, your debt is still paid. You don't have to believe in order for your debt to be paid. Likewise if Jesus paid our debt, we are saved whether we have faith or not. The Universalist says that Jesus paid the debt of everyone, therefore everyone is saved, "they just don't know it yet". You are saved because your debt is paid and your debt is paid even if you "don't know it yet". This is a serious problem for the payment theory! The Bible clearly says that we must repent and believe in order to be saved from God's wrath.

Also, we are to pray for God to forgive us our debts as we forgive our debtors. But if our debt is paid, God cannot forgive us our debt. You cannot forgive a debt that has been paid! If Jesus paid our debt, Jesus made forgiveness impossible! There is no mercy or forgiveness in salvation if Jesus paid our debt. Therefore we cannot pray "forgive us our debts" and therefore we cannot obey Jesus who told us to pray this!

And if God only forgives debts that have been paid, does that mean that if a person owes me money and they ask for forgiveness I can say, "Sure I'll forgive your debt, as soon as you pay it. Now give me what you owe, or have someone else pay it.". What kind of forgiveness is that!?! To forgive a debt means that the payment of the debt is no longer demanded or required! Study Matthew 18 about the unforgiving servant. Is the God of your theology the Ruler who pardoned the unpaid debt, or is your God like the unforgiving servant who demanded that the debt be paid? Remember, Jesus condemned the unforgiving servant. We are supposed to forgive our debtors, not to demand payment.

“When a debt is paid, there is no forgiveness; when a penalty is endured, there is no mercy.” **Albert Barnes**

“...when the debt is paid, or the purchase made, it is the part of equity to cancel the bond, and consign over the purchased possession.” **John Wesley**

“If the atonement of Christ be considered as the payment of a debt, the release of the sinner seems not to be an act of grace, although the payment be made by Christ, and not by the sinner personally. Suppose any one of you, my auditors, owes a certain sum; he goes and pays the full sum himself personally. Doubtless all will agree, that the creditor, in this case, when he gives up the obligation, performs a mere act of justice, in which there is no grace at all...this...places the whole grace of the gospel in providing the Savior, not in the pardon of sin.” **Jonathon Edwards Jr.**

“If Christ have, in the proper sense of the words, paid the debt which we owed to God, whether by a delegation from us or not; there can be no more grace in our discharge, than if we had paid it ourselves. But the fact is, that Christ has not, in the literal and proper sense, paid the debt for us...Payment of debt equally precludes grace, when made by a third person, as when made by the debtor himself...Grace is ever so opposed to justice, that they mutually limit each other. Wherever grace begins, justice ends; and wherever justice begins, grace ends.” **Jonathon Edwards Jr.**

“If, in the obligation of an absolute retributive justice the Father must inflict merited punishment upon sin and if in the atonement he inflicted such punishment upon his Son as the substitute for sinners-then he does not remit the penalty. No dialectics can identify such an infliction with remission. And where there is no remission of penalty there can be no grace of forgiveness. Hence, the doctrine of Satisfaction does not admit the grace of the Father in forgiveness; which fact of grace, however, is clearly given in the Scriptures.” **John Miley**

“That if, as their substitute, Christ suffered for them the full amount deserved by them, then justice has no claim upon them, since their debt is fully paid by the surety, and of course the principal is, in justice, discharged. And since it is undeniable that the atonement was made for the whole posterity of Adam, it must follow that the salvation of all men is secured upon the ground of ‘exact justice.’” **Charles Finney**

“The atonement does not signify the payment of a debt, in the sense that would represent the world, in their unredeemed condition, as insolvent debtors, and God as a creditor. This view destroys the gracious character of salvation, and reduces it to a transaction of sheer justice. If the sinner simply owed a debt to Heaven, which Christ fully discharged for him, then his release from all liability to punishment and his introduction into heaven might be demanded on the ground of equitable and inalienable right...” **Asbury Lowrey**

**Re: - posted by roaringlamb (), on: 2009/9/29 0:49**

Quote:  
-----There are serious problems with the idea that Jesus paid our debt! Think about it!  
-----

Really? What does it mean to ransom someone then?

I think that too much of this has overlooked the many facets of the Cross and what it accomplished.

The focus has been on "atonement" while overlooking terms like propitiation, ransom, justification, reconciliation, and the term redemption as well.

One cannot talk of the Cross without mentioning ALL of the things it accomplished.

**Re: - posted by Leo\_Grace, on: 2009/9/29 1:02**

truefaithsav said:

Quote:  
-----There are serious problems with the idea that Jesus paid our debt! Think about it!  
-----

Honestly, I think there is too much word play, too much analyzing and rationalizing going on in this thread.

The gospel is beautifully simple:

Jn 3:16 "For God so loved the world that he gave his one and only Son, that whoever believes in him shall not perish but have eternal life."

I see no need to dissect God's grace.

**Re: , on: 2009/9/29 1:04**

Yes there are serious problems with the idea of paying a debt (which is different than paying a ransom). Read the rest of my posts and you'll see the serious problems of viewing the atonement as a commercial transaction where God is a creditor. This would exclude any "mercy" or "forgiveness" or "remission". These words are without meaning at all if our debt has been paid.

That is why Calvinists, Arminians, and even Pelagians have rejected the payment view. Calvinists (like Jonathon Edwards Jr) Wesleyan Arminians (like John Miley) and semi-Pelagians (like Finney) have rejected the payment view. They all taught the governmental view. At least there is one doctrine that transcends the Calvinist/Arminian debate!

What is the forgiveness of sins and why does forgiveness require an atonement? I do not see how those who hold to the payment view can properly answer these two questions. And please define the remission of sins.

**Re: , on: 2009/9/29 1:08**

Leo\_Grace,

God says come and let us reason together. God gave us an intelligence and He wants us to use it! Salvation is the rene wing of your mind, not the removal of your mind!

The atonement is the greatest truth that we can ever think about! We ought to think about it! It is the most reasonable and sensible doctrine in all of Christianity! You should fear any atonement view that fears reason!

Re: - posted by roaringlamb (), on: 2009/9/29 1:18

Quote:  
-----What is the forgiveness of sins and why does forgiveness require an atonement? I do not see how those who hold to the payment view can properly answer these two questions. And please define the remission of sins.  
-----

If you can, look up the words I provided in my previous post, and how they are used in Scripture, and I think you will get a bigger picture of the Cross.

If you can, I would highly recommend a wonderful book called "The Apostolic Preaching of the Cross" by Leon Morris. It deals with the Greek words used by the NT writers and how those words would have been understood then in both the Greek culture and in the NT writers thoughts.

Re: , on: 2009/9/29 1:26

Here are my definitions:

Forgiveness: the setting aside of punishment

Remission: to remit penalty

Atonement: that which makes pardon, forgiveness, or remission possible

propitiation: satisfaction, not of God's wrath (since God still has wrath after the atonement)but of public justice (the purpose of penalty)

ransom/redeem: a price paid to bring someone back

justification: to pardon and accept back into favor

reconciliation: to unite two parties previously conflicting

Jesus paid the price of His life to make an atonement for us, to bring us back to God (redeem, ransom). His atonement is a substitute for our penalty which accomplishes what our penalty would have accomplished (public justice). Now that public justice has been propitiated or satisfied, our penalty can be remitted (remission) which means our punishment can be set aside (forgiveness). The revelation of the atonement brings us to repentance. The atonement makes it possible for our penalty to be withheld while also bring us to repentance, thus making reconciliation. When we repent and believe, God turns from His wrath, He pardons us, He treats us as if we had never sinned, He accepts us into favor (justification).

This is really good stuff:

Quote:  
-----If you owe a person \$100 and I pay your debt for you, without you knowing it, your debt is still paid. You don't have to believe in order for your debt to be paid. Likewise if Jesus paid our debt, we are saved whether we have faith or not. The Universalist says that Jesus paid the debt of everyone, therefore everyone is saved, "they just don't know it yet". You are saved because your debt is paid and your debt is paid even if you "don't know it yet". This is a serious problem for the payment theory! The Bible clearly says that we must repent and believe in order to be saved from God's wrath.

Also, we are to pray for God to forgive us our debts as we forgive our debtors. But if our debt is paid, God cannot forgive us our debt. You cannot forgive a debt that has been paid! If Jesus paid our debt, Jesus made forgiveness impossible! There is no mercy or forgiveness in salvation if Jesus paid our debt. Therefore we cannot pray "forgive us our debts" and therefore we cannot obey Jesus who told us to pray this!

And if God only forgives debts that have been paid, does that mean that if a person owes me money and they ask for forgiveness I can say, "Sure I'll forgive your debt, as soon as you pay it. Now give me what you owe, or have someone else pay it.". What kind of forgiveness is that?!? To forgive a debt means that the payment of the debt is no longer demanded or required! Study Matthew 18 about the unforgiving servant. Is the God of your theology the Ruler who pardoned the unpaid debt, or is your God like the unforgiving servant who demanded that the debt be paid? Remember, Jesus condemned the unforgiving servant. We are supposed to forgive our debtors, not to demand payment.

Re: - posted by roaringlamb (), on: 2009/9/29 1:34

Quote:  
-----Now that public justice has been propitiated  
-----

Agree with everything you said, except for this part.

But I want to make sure I'm not jumping to conclusions, so let me just say that it was God who was propitiated, as the term means "wrath atoning sacrifice". So it was God's justice that was propitiated, so He might be just and the justifier.

I think that's what you meant?

Re: , on: 2009/9/29 1:44

Quote:  
-----I think that's what you meant?  
-----

There are two types of justice. There is public justice and there is retributive justice. Public justice is promoting the well-being of everyone by maintaining the authority and influence of the law. Retributive justice is treating everyone as they deserve to be.

The purpose of penalty is to uphold the law. The authority and influence of the law is maintained through punishments. Punishing the disobedient discourages disobedience in others. This protects the rights of others and promotes the well-being of others, because it upholds the law and keeps it from falling into contempt.

The atonement of Jesus Christ is a substitute for the eternal punishment of hell fire for sinners. If the atonement is an adequate substitute, it must fulfill the purpose of our penalty, otherwise it could not substitute our penalty. And if our penalty is not substituted, it could not be remitted. And if our penalty is not remitted, it must be executed. And if our penalty must be executed, we are going to hell. Therefore either Jesus satisfied public justice (the purpose of penalty) or else we are going to hell.

The atonement was not a satisfaction of retributive justice because Jesus didn't deserve to die and we don't deserve to live. Retributive justice requires only the death of the guilty. Only the guilty deserve to die and therefore only the death of the guilty can satisfy retributive justice.

Also, God's wrath was not satisfied by the atonement since God still has wrath after the atonement. Forgiveness is when God turns from His wrath. The atonement saves us from the wrath that is to come by making it possible for God's wrath to pass over (passover) us instead of being poured out upon us, by making it possible for God to turn from His wrath (forgiveness) without endangering His universe by weakening His law. The purpose of God's wrath is public justice, therefore if public justice is satisfied or propitiated, God can set aside, withhold, or turn from His wrath.

Now that an atonement has been made, God can turn from His wrath if sinners turn from their sins. But if God's wrath was satisfied at Calvary, we are not really fleeing from God's wrath at conversion, neither are we under God's wrath while we are impenitent and unbelieving. If Jesus satisfied God's wrath at Calvary, we are saved from God's wrath before we repent and believe. But that is unbiblical.

And if Jesus satisfied God's wrath, there is no real mercy or forgiveness. God does not turn from His wrath, nor does His wrath "passover", if it was poured out upon Christ and satisfied. Therefore Christ didn't really die for the remission of sins, nor is He our passover Lamb, if He satisfied the wrath of God.

**Re: , on: 2009/9/29 1:47**

I recommend that every Calvinist read the writings of Jonathon Edwards Jr on the atonement: [http://www.gospeltruth.net/Edwards\\_atonement/edwardsindex.htm](http://www.gospeltruth.net/Edwards_atonement/edwardsindex.htm)

He had a great grasp on this topic!

**Re: - posted by Leo\_Grace, on: 2009/9/29 1:51**

Dear truefathsav,

I'm sorry but I just cannot see how fussing about the transactional steps and perceived intentions of God's gift can be edifying to any believer. We are better off rejoicing in and appreciating the gift rather than taking it apart to see how it ticks.

Quote:

-----God gave us an intelligence and He wants us to use it!  
-----

This is true. Intelligence is a blessing from God, to be used for His divine purpose. It should be used to win others for Christ and to expand His kingdom, and not to complicate it. Dissecting, categorizing, and labeling God's methods or actions serves no heavenly purpose - it merely puffs up those who delight in philosophical pursuits.

Quote:

-----Salvation is the renewing of your mind, not the removal of your mind!  
-----

Right again. Salvation comes when one is reborn or renewed so that one becomes concerned with "things above" (how to glorify God) and no longer with "things below" (how to glorify men).

Quote:

-----The atonement is the greatest truth that we can ever think about!  
-----

I must disagree with this. God's love is the greatest truth we can ever think about. Knowing God's great and undeserved love for us is what sanctifies.

*Eph 3:17-19 And I pray that you, being rooted and established in love, may have power, together with all the saints, to grasp how wide and long and high and deep is the love of Christ, and to know this love that surpasses knowledge —that you may be filled to the measure of all the fullness of God.*

Having said my piece, I will refrain from further interrupting your enjoyment.

**Re: , on: 2009/9/29 1:58**

I think that one of the problems is that so many of us have heard Christian clichés regarding the atonement and we haven't really thought them through. "Jesus satisfied the wrath of God" or "We broke the law, Jesus paid our fine" or "He paid our debt" or "He took our punishment" or "He took our penalty". People have accepted these clichés without really thoughtfully and scripturally thinking about them.

We need more thinkers like Edwards, Finney, Beman, Burge, Miley, Cowles, Barnes, Stuart, etc.

The atonement is supposed to make sense! But these clichés only make it confusing and cause more problems than they solve!

I've had hard times witnessing in the past because I accepted these clichés. I would tell a person, "You broke God's law. You have a debt to pay. But the good news is that Jesus Christ has paid your debt. But if you don't believe it, you will have to pay our own debt...." and this didn't make any sense at all! They don't need to worry about paying their debt (going to hell) if Jesus Christ has already paid their debt. So they don't need to believe! Their debt is paid even while they are

unbelieving. If Jesus satisfied God's wrath for them, they are saved from God's wrath even if they don't believe in God, since not believing in God would not nullify the payment of their debt...

Thinking about the atonement, actually thinking about it, instead of just accepting popular cliches, has greatly blessed my life and understanding of God.

**Re: - posted by roaringlamb (), on: 2009/9/29 2:02**

Quote:

-----Therefore Christ didn't really die for the remission of sins, nor is He our passover Lamb, if He satisfied the wrath of God.  
-----

How does that square up with this-

"For our sake he made him to be sin who knew no sin, so that in him we might become the righteousness of God." 2 Corinthians 5:21 ESV

And I would wonder if God has wrath for Christ now as we as Christians are placed in Christ, and united to Him by faith.

If the source of God's anger is our sin, then once that is dealt with, there is no more anger that is why Paul uses these words from David-

“Blessed are those whose lawless deeds are forgiven, and whose sins are covered; blessed is the man against whom the Lord will not count his sin.” Romans 4:7-8 ESV

and it's good to note what Paul says before this-

"And to the one who does not work but believes in him who justifies the ungodly, his faith is counted as righteousness, just as David also speaks of the blessing of the one to whom God counts righteousness apart from works:" Romans 4:5-6 ESV

There are also the verses from Colossians that talk about our record being blotted out at the Cross, and that record was the very reason for God's wrath against us.

Everything changes once we believe in what Christ has done for us, and stop seeking to justify ourselves before God. We are sons and daughters that will never be kicked out of the family (and no I don't believe in OSAS as it is called but instead perseverance of the saints, and there is a difference).

**Re: , on: 2009/9/29 2:08**

Jesus was made a sin offering for us. A sin offering is an offering that God accepts instead of our penalty, it takes the place of our punishment. When there is a sin offering there can be real forgiveness, our penalty can be remitted and our punishment withheld.

Jesus died for me. But I was not born saved.

Jesus died for me. But I was under God's wrath until I was converted.

Do you agree with that?

But if Jesus satisfied God's wrath for me before I was born, wouldn't I have been born saved? Wouldn't I have been saved from God's wrath before I was converted because it was satisfied before I was converted?

Nobody is saved from God's wrath until they repent and believe. God still has wrath after the atonement, even for those Christ died for. Those Christ died for are only saved from God's wrath when they are converted, when they repent and believe.



Doesn't Calvinism teach that we are saved from God's wrath when we have FAITH? But if Jesus satisfied God's wrath before we had faith, wouldn't we have been saved from God's wrath before we had faith? Therefore if Jesus satisfied God's wrath, we are not justified by faith!!

**Re: - posted by roaringlamb (), on: 2009/9/29 2:18**

Quote:  
-----But if Jesus satisfied God's wrath before we had faith, wouldn't we have been saved from God's wrath before we had faith? Therefore if Jesus satisfied God's wrath, we are not justified by faith!!  
-----

In one sense, Jesus is the Lamb slain BEFORE the foundation of the Earth, and we (believers are chosen in Him before the foundation of the Earth), but in the working out of that truth, faith and repentance in the realm of time is needed as is the Cross.

But it all stems from something that was decided long ago.

Also, I found this quote from an Edwards sermon that shows some of his view on justification-

"A person is to be justified, when he is approved of God as free from the guilt of sin and its deserved punishment, and as having that righteousness belonging to him that entitles to the reward of life. That we should take the word in such a sense, and understand it as the judge's accepting a person as having both a negative and positive righteousness belonging to him, and looking on him therefore as not only free from any obligation to punishment, but also as just and righteous and so entitled to a positive reward, is not only most agreeable to the etymology and natural import of the word, which signifies to pass one for righteous in judgment, but also manifestly agreeable to the force of the word as used in Scripture."  
" Dated November, 1734

Just to let you know, in many ways, Edwards does not represent the Reformed view. He and Calvin would have had some interesting discussions to say the least, as would he and Luther.

To get the best idea of the Reformed ideology, it is always best to read the Reformers themselves, or read the Canons of Dordt and see what the debate was about, especially when it comes to the Calvinist/Arminian debate.

Maybe you have, I don't know. It just seems a lot of times people don't read it and if I am presuming please forgive me.

**Re: - posted by Logic, on: 2009/9/29 9:57**

The law was added because of transgressions, it exists for the reason of making unlawful affections to be evidently unlawful. In other words, the law exists so that our unlawful affections would be evidently more wicked in contrast to the specific commands of the law.

The purpose of the law is to teach one of the character of the Lawgiver also to guide us and to guard us while directing us to mercy of the Lawgiver, (Romans 7:13, Galatians 3:19,24)

The law is not founded in mere randomness, but in the Personhood of God, it is a representation of who He is and a part of the foundation of reality

Punishment for a crime against the law is not for the purpose of rehabilitation, but to satisfy the law. Punishment for transgression against God's law, or the act of satisfying the law is used as a deterrent for crimes by law enforcement.

In other words, the purpose of punishment is law enforcement; God enforced the law by punishing His Son so that all who put their faith in/on Him might be justified because they have reckoned themselves to be in Jesus' place as HE was in their place. We are to put ourselves in HIS position as to be united with him in the likeness of His death so that we shall be also in the likeness of His resurrection (Roman 6:5)

The punishment is to communicate to the sinner that God is not somebody to profane or defile in any way.

Law needs to be satisfied so that the Law Maker is proven to be of value in His own character which the law reveals. It isn't the law that needs to be proven valuable, but who or what it serves and protects, which is God's character and His creation who is created in His likeness and in His image.

The satisfaction of the law is called justice. Justice is the vindication of the offended, vengeance to be given or taken, a just retribution, recompense...etc...

Justice is meant to teach that whoever it serves and protects has personal worth so if one offended by a crime, or commits a crime, he will be judged as someone who is worth equal to but not greater than the criminal, or the victim if being the criminal.

In other words, Justice is to keep the establishment of both, the victim and the criminal as being equal in worth and in value.

All mankind has a personal worth because we are made in the image of God; so also is everyone who sins, as in breaking the law.

It is a fact that we are not equal to God, but shown that we are of as much worth as He is; this is proven by God giving His only begotten SON who is GOD Himself. We are not equal but deem as such in value, what a revelation, praise HIM!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

**The working of sin:**

A sin as to the degree of a slap on the face or steeling a shoe lace does not require the death penalty of the one who sinned, that would give the message of the sinner being as worthless as the shoe lace.

The punishment must fit the crime.

However, the theft of a shoe lace is still a breach of the same law which is against such heinous crimes as, rape, murder, or similar in degree which are a total tainting &/or maligning of personal worth and character of the Law Maker.

For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all (James 2:8).

A slap on the face or steeling a shoe lace is only breaking one aspect of the whole law which includes the greater aspects such as the heinous crimes.

All mankind has brought damaged to God's character or tainted His holy Name by breaking His Law, disobeying His Commandments, rebelling against His Word & authority.

Sin insults God to a degree that His character is maligned and He is defamed and virtually dethroned by the offender.

We did not sin in away as to owe God a debt as in the form of a sum, but in the way of disbelief and unfaithfulness, which deems God to be a liar on our behalf and in doing so, we destroy His character; this is elevating ourselves over God and putting ourselves in His place. We owe God the repair or renewal of His character which we maligned.

**Justification:**

There is a lot to say on the account of our righteousness that is imputed to us.

The Atonement incorporates the concepts of:

**1:** propitiation (appeasement, satisfaction) Of God because of our offence to Him.

**2:** forgiveness of the offender

**3:** reconciliation between God and the offender

For man to be legally pronounced justified, is not impossible, however, there is but one ground of the justification of man, that is by strict obedience to the law from day one of accountability to the law. I repeat, there can be no justification in a legal sense apart from grace, but upon the ground of perfect, and uninterrupted obedience to law. Our sins have offended God because we are able to do what He commands, but we refuse to obey (Romans 9:31-32).

God sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins. In other words, God sent Jesus to appease or satisfy Himself on account of our sins against Him by faith in His blood (Rom 3:25).

Jesus is the only Man that has performed the law perfectly as all mankind is able, which is what satisfies God.

Jesus was required perfect obedience to the law for Himself just as all mankind are, and since He perfectly obeyed, he did not need to suffer the penalty of breaking the law or sin. He could therefore suffer the penalty of sin in our place as a proxy.

Atonement appeases God by satisfying His demands, which are shown in His law, and fulfilling the judgment that is due

to us.  
The judgment is spiritual death which is actually a severed relationship from God. All who sin have died spiritually, for that is the wage of death (Romans 6:23) Physical death is only the circumstance of the way to the Tree of Life being cut off from humanity.

Therefore, we must die to the Law through the body of Christ by faith. We will then also rise from the dead with Him through faith. (Ephesians 2:5-6). We can only die to the law by being baptized into His death (Romans 6:3, 1 Peter 3:21) This is why Jesus needed to die physically and raise from the dead with His glorified body, so that we might die through Him and be raised with Him by and through faith so that by Him and through Him we might take the penalty for our own sins; all this is through the spirit of the law. (2 Corinthians 5:14-15, Galatians 2:20, Hebrews 2:9, 14, 17-18)

In regards to man sinning against God, we are not sinning against any moral governmental judicial structure. There is no atonement for sinning against such. All sin is against God personally. His law is only to show us what and how we accomplished by breaking it.

Whenever anyone disobeys God in any way, they are virtually not trusting God calling Him a liar, stating by their actions that God can not be trusted and that He is no authority to make any boundaries. Proclaiming that God is not good in providing what is needed for staying within His boundaries. In doing this they sin.

Whenever anyone sins, they are transgressing what they know to be true (that there is a law which is being broken) which proclaims that they are autonomous, self governing and in no need of support from anyone &/or anything apart from themselves. They are basically saying, "I am that I am". Doing this they are opposing and exalting themselves above all that is called God, or that is worshiped; so that they deem themselves as God (2 Thessalonians 2:4).

God says, in Romans 6:23, "for the wages of sin is death, but the gift of God is eternal (spiritual) life in Christ Jesus our Lord.

and, Deut. 21:23, "His body shall not remain overnight on the tree (cross), but you shall surely bury him that day, so that you do not defile the land which the Lord your God is giving you as an inheritance; for he who hangs on a tree is accursed of God."

Jesus was taken off the cross that same day He died so the curse of sin would stay on Him.

Lev. 17:11, "For the life of the flesh is in the blood, and I have given it to you upon the altar to make atonement for your souls; for it is the blood that makes atonement for the soul." Heb. 9:22, "for without the shedding of blood, there is no remission of sin"

When Jesus finished all that needed to be done:

**(1)** Curse of the law to be taken away (2 Corinthians 5:21, Gal 3:13).

**(a)** For the setting free of the captive slave of the law (Luke 4:18, Galatians 5:1).

**(2)** Blood to be shed for the cleansing/purging from the guilt and the clearing of the conscience of the guilt of sin (Ephesians 1:7 & Colossians 1:14)

**(a)** purchasing/redeeming from the judgment of sin which is our forgiveness (Ephesians 1:7 & 1 Corinthians 6:20 & 7:23).

God accepted Jesus' sacrifice; He raised Jesus from the dead in verification of His acceptance of Jesus' sacrifice. The resurrection is the basis of our Faith (1 Corinthians 15:14)

When we acknowledge our place in His death we may also acknowledge our place in resurrection (Rom 6:3-6), only then can we be redeemed & cleansed with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot (1 Peter 1:19, Titus 2:14) and freed from being under the law (Romans 6:14 & 7:4) as being under grace instead (Romans 6:14): acknowledging that He is representing us on that cross and we die through Christ and rise in newness of life (Romans 6:4 & 11).

We acknowledge this by baptism, which symbolizes our death and resurrection in Christ, not by the removing of outward filth of the flesh but by providing us with a good and clear conscience (inward cleanness and peace) before God through the resurrection of Jesus Christ 1 Peter 3:21.

Therefore, only after death (Rom 7:4), one can be born again and live perfectly according to the law, being brought out from under the law, that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit. Romans 8:4

All this is only through faith because of His grace (Ephesians 2:8).

I must repeat, all this is only through faith because it is impossible to please God without faith Hebrews 11:6.

Furthermore, it is only by this faith that righteousness is imputed to us. (Romans 4:3 Galatians 3:6 James 2:23)

**Re: - posted by whyme, on: 2009/9/29 11:47**

trufaitsav:

This may not be a Scriptural position, but Jesus' agony in the Garden to the point of sweating of blood does not appear to be a concern to Him over His impending "vicarious substitution". If it is, then some of those martyrs of the faith who went to their deaths singing with joy are far superior examples of dying for the faith than our Savior's display. Roaring Lamb makes an excellent point that the atonement is far more than just a pleasing sacrifice of the Savior. The multi-purposed and faceted sacrificial system of the Old Testament is proof enough of this. It respectfully appears that much of your argument is ethical rather than Scriptural.

**Re: , on: 2009/9/30 22:41**

Other men, besides Jesus, have sweated blood. When men come under severe stress and pressure, sometimes the blood vessels in their face literally burst. Jesus must have been agonizing in his prayer in the Garden.

And Jesus going to the cross is very different from martyrs going to their crosses, because Jesus was dying for the sin of the whole world and therefore the devil and hell came against him in a way that the average martyr would not have experienced.

**Re: - posted by roaringlamb (), on: 2009/9/30 22:50**

Quote:

-----When men come under severe stress and pressure, sometimes the blood vessels in their face literally burst.  
-----

Do you have proof of this? Just curious?

Also, how many of those men were God in the flesh? and were suffering for the very enemies He would redeem?

This is no mere man we are discussing, and I would hope we would all tremble a bit to write things that compare a mere man with our Savior and God.

**Re: - posted by Laviver, on: 2009/10/1 0:06**

Saints, does this feel like one of those heavy, thick threads, or is it just me? Certain threads like this one, give off an almost hostile aroma. I want to comment on a few things, but I don't know if it will help :( They're not really related to the bulk of the thread, which at this point I haven't read only the last page. Seems to late to hop into this one.

**Re: - posted by whyme, on: 2009/10/1 8:01**

Roaringlamb, I really wasn't trying to compare Him with a man. My point was to try to compare the agony of God to the apparent lack of agony in men over the same kind of death. Clearly, dying or even physical pain wasn't the issue. It was the prospect of drinking the cup of His Father's holy anger and wrath that each of us should have drunk that was so agonizing to Him. Minimizing the sacrifice leads almost invariably to minimizing the deity of the Savior.