

6/26/14

Limited Atonement
Calvinism, Pt. 5

We have seen that the first two points of the “Five points of Calvinism” are not compatible with the Scriptures.

1. The doctrine of “Total Depravity” is base on the definition of human logic and reasoning, yet the depravity of man is a Biblical doctrine.
2. The doctrine of “Unconditional Election” of the “elect” is not found anywhere in the Old or New Testament, but election is a Biblical doctrine.
3. The third point “Limited Atonement” deals with the death of Jesus only for the “elect”, while the Bible teaches atonement for all sinners, the world!
* Vance says, “Therefore according to Calvinist, election saves no man, it only marked out certain ones who were to be saved by an atonement made just on their behalf.” One put it this way, “Limited Atonement is simply “adding insult to injury”, the injury being Unconditional Election.”
(Vance:405,9)

The Bible declares the atonement of Jesus to be the sacrifice of Jesus as our substitute to be forgiven of our sins, ransoming us in full payment delivering and redeeming us from the bondage of sin, expiating vicariously the removal of our guilt, impurity and penalty of sins, through the only

propitiation to satisfy the wrath and displeasure of God by the precious blood of Lamb of God to reconcile sinners in fellowship back to God. Is. 53:10; 1Cor. 5:7; Matt. 20:28; 2Cor. 5:21; Heb. 9:12, 14; 1Pet. 1:18-19; 1Jn. 2:2; 4:10

The third point of the acronym TULIP is the doctrine of “Limited Atonement” that has been called “deadwood” or “excess baggage”.
(Vance:405-6)

1. What does it matter if Christ died for the non-elect or not, if they can not be save because God has elected them for damnation, it is irrelevant!
2. Remember Calvinistic doctrines were unknown during the first three centuries of church history, the five point of Calvinism did not exist till the 16th Century, but it was taught by Augustine (354-429 A. D.) in the Catholic Church up to the reformation (1517-1555), who was the originator of Predestination and election of the “elect” and damnation of the “non-elect”, Calvin formulated it.
* Again it will be unavoidable as we study each point there will be a cross-over and overlapping at times because the five points depend on each other for the foundation, justification and rationalization.

We want to look at the doctrine of “Limited Atonement” in three ways:

- I. The doctrine of “Limited Atonement” as taught.

- II. The doctrine of “Limited Atonement” examined in light of Scripture.
- III. The doctrine of “Limited Atonement” in view of pivotal Scriptures.

I. The doctrine of “Limited Atonement” as taught.

- A. The doctrine of “limited Atonement” teaches that the blood atonement of Jesus on the cross is limited to the “elect” alone.
 - 1. This point is due to the limitation Calvin placed on the love of God.
 - * He believed God loved **only** the elect.
 - 2. One of their prominent apologist, Edwin H. Palmer says, “... the Bible teaches again and again that God does not love all people with the same love... ‘loved by God’ is not applied to the world but only to the saints...” Rom. 1:7. (Hunt:237)
 - 4. A. A. Hodge explains how important this doctrine is to Calvinism, “If they [critics] could prove that the love which prompted God to give his Son to die, as a sin-offering... had for its objects all men... that Christ actually sacrificed his life with the purpose of saving all... on the condition of faith, then the central principle of Arminianism is true [and Calvinism is false]... (Hunt:237)

- 5. D. A. Carson, who is the exception among Calvinists, attempts to take a more balanced view in his book The Difficult Doctrine of the Love of God, page 73 says, “Limited Atonement, is singularly unfortunate for two reasons. First, it is a defensive, restrictive expression: here is atonement, and then someone wants to limit it. The notion of limiting something as glorious as the Atonement is intrinsically offensive. Second, even when inspected more coolly, ‘limited atonement’ is objectively misleading. Every view of the Atonement ‘limits’ it in some way, save for the unqualified universalist.” (Hunt:238)
- 6. R. C. Sproul writes, “The world for whom Christ died cannot mean the entire human family. It must refer to the universality of the elect (people from every tribe and nation).” (Hunt:238)
 - a. They try to soften the third point calling it “particular, specific, efficacious or effective atonement.”
 - b. Some of the great opponents of this third point are 4-point are Calvinist, yet if you deny it, you are accused of denying the doctrine of Atonement as found in the Bible and labeled an Arminian, which is untrue!

7. In our previous study of “Unconditional Election” we stated that the word “whosoever” or “whoever” is found 183 times, in 163 verses in the Bible.
- a. Webster’s Dictionary defines the word “whosoever” as “whoever; whatever person: an emphatic form”, there is no alternate meanings.
 - b. Not once in 183 times does the word mean anything except “whoever”, so the only way Calvinists can justify the teaching of “Limited Atonement”, is based on their view of God’s limited love for man and to interpret all the places the words or phrases “world”, “any”, “whosoever”, “sinners”, “all men”, to mean “elect”, violates the context and intended meaning.
- B.** The moral attribute of God “love”, is consistently taught as unlimited in it’s nature and capacity.
1. The moral attribute of “love” is the attribute that describes God’s very nature to be bestowed on man.
 - a. John tells us that God is love “apapeo”. 1Jn. 4:8b
 - b. This very love is exemplified in the book of Hosea as the prophet is told by God to marry Gomer who plays the prostitute and bore children by her

lover and Hosea was to redeem her from the slave market. This was to be a picture of God’s love for Israel and what He would do in the latter days.

* God’s covenant relation of loving-kindness “hesed” or steadfast love is “affiliated with the grace of God in the Old Testament. Ex. 33:13; Deut. 7:12; Jer. 31:3

- c. The first time the word love appears in the Old Testament is in the context of father and son, as God commanded Abraham to take his only son Isaac, whom he loved and to offer him on Mount Moriah. Gen. 22:2
* Prophetic of the sacrifice of God’s own Son to come 2,000 years later, on the very same mount.
 - d. The first time we see the love of father and son in the synoptic gospels is when God spoke from heaven declaring, “This is My beloved Son in whom I am well pleased.” Matt. 3:17; Mk. 11:11; Lk. 3:22
 - e. The first time love appears in John’s gospel is regarding the love of the Father for His Son as His expression of love for the world. Jn. 3:16
2. The moral attribute of love brings judgment on a person or nation, as the

result of sinning against God's love, **this is the only thing that limits God's love.**

- a. The flood of Noah. Gen. 6-8
 - b. The abomination of the Amorites. Gen. 15:16
 - c. Sodom and Gamorah. Gen. 19
 - * God's love and holiness are tied together and by His sacrifice of love He approaches man!
 - d. God demonstrates His own love toward us, in that **while** we were still sinners, Christ died for us. Rom. 5:8
3. God's moral attribute of love is uncaused and is not dependent or conditional on outward appearance, as man's love.
- a. God's attribute of love expresses and reveals it is void of self-interest, not imparted due to debt nor prompted by any outward attraction, but bestowed sovereignly for the good of man.
 - b. God did not set His love on Israel due to being more numerous or the least of all peoples; but because the LORD loves them and would keep His oath. Deut. 7:7-8
 - c. God's attribute of love is unconditional for the provisions of salvation, no person is excluded.
 - 1) Scripture declares about God, "Who will have **all men** to be

saved, and to come to the knowledge of the truth." 1Tim. 2:4

- 2) "God is longsuffering, not willing that **any** should perish, but that **all** should come to repentance." 2Pet. 3:9
 - 3) Jesus demonstrated his love as He touched the leper, honored the prostitute's repentance, washing his feet with her tears and wiping them with her hair. Matt. 8; Lk. 7
 - 4) Jesus reached out to the demoniac, the Samaritan woman and forgave the sins of the woman taken in adultery. Lk. 8; Jn. 4; Jn. 8
 - * John says, "we love him because he first loved us." 1Jn. 4:19
4. The object of God's love is three-fold:
- a. His Son.
 - * "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased... hear Him", at His baptism and Mount of Transfiguration. Matt. 3:17; 17:5
 - b. The Believer.
 - * The love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Spirit, which is given to us. Rom. 5:5
 - c. The World.
 - 1) God demonstrated His love right after the fall by promising the birth of the Redeemer. Gen. 3:15

- 2) The Father sent the Son to be the Savior of the world. 1Jn. 4:14
 - 3) The proof was manifested on Calvary upon the cross. Jn. 19
- d. But Calvinist because of their dogma of total depravity, which they interpret to mean **inability**, must claim that universal language of changing every scriptures of “whosoever”, “anyone”, “world” to mean the “elect”, for whom “Limited Atonement” is provided.
- 1) Therefore the doctrine of “Limited Atonement” teaches the cross of Christ provides a sure, secure and real salvation **only** for those God intended it to save.” (Hunt:239)
 - 2) This because God decreed them for “Unconditional Election, they are unable to resist the Grace of God and will be save no matter what!
 - 3) Then who is being called to believe and repent, if the non-elect can not repent and the “elect” are already “Unconditionally Elected”?
 - 4) How can the “elect” be reconciled at the cross already, if they have not been born, there must be actual faith and repentance, if not why does Paul have the ministry of reconciliation? 2Cor. 5:20

Illustration

The proclamations and explanations to defend the theory of “Limited Atonement” by Calvinists is like a person in an traffic accident with someone else and they tell the other person that the traffic laws benefits them only, everyone else is excluded.

This is the teaching of “Limited Atonement” as taught is man-made!

II. The doctrine of “Limited Atonement” examined in light of Scripture.

- A. The Scriptures are clear and authoritative in the matter of “unlimited atonement”.
 1. **All we** like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way; and the LORD has laid on Him the iniquity of us **all**. Is. 53:6
 2. “And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of Man be lifted up, that **whoever believes** in Him should not perish but have eternal life.” Jn. 3:14-17; Num. 21:8
 3. “Christ died for the **ungodly**.” Rom. 5:6
 4. “The **wages of sin** is death; but the gift of God is **eternal life** through Jesus Christ our Lord.” Rom. 6:23
 5. “We trust in the living God, who is the Savior of **all men, especially of those that believe**.” 1Tim. 4:10

6. The Lord is not willing that **any** should perish but that **all** should come to repentance. 2Pet. 3:9b-d
7. These Scripture are very simple and clear in their meaning, unless one changes the meaning of the object of the verb.
 - a. Calvinist John Piper explains the limited atonement in 1 Timothy 4:10, “Christ’s death so clearly demonstrates God’s just abhorrence of sin that he is free to treat the world with mercy without compromising his righteousness. In this sense Christ is the savior of all men, but he is especially the Savior of those who believe. **He did not die for all men in the same sense...**the death of Christ actually saves from all evil those for whom Christ died “especially”. (Hunt:245)
 - b. He says Christ did not die for all men in the same sense, **where is that taught in the Scriptures? Nowhere!** But it is a dogmatism to their own human system of TULIP. Calvinists are slaves to their unbiblical theology!
8. To Calvinist believing the gospel is not the means of salvation, but the proof or evidence of salvation as one of the elect regenerated by God by “Unconditional Election.”

- B. Calvinist must defend this third point of “Limited Atonement not with Scriptures, but with rationalizations by their own words.
 1. Listen to Michael Horton, “If Jesus died for every person, but not every person is saved, His death did not actually save anybody...If Christ died for people who will be in hell, His efforts cannot accurately be called a “saving work” and there is no real saving power in the blood. Rather, the power would seem to be in the will of the creature...These points lie at the heart of the Christian message, for they rest at the foot of the cross.” Wrong, unbiblical(Hunt:239-240)
 2. Herman Hanko provides an example of such rationalistic arguments, “If Christ died for all men and all men are not saved, the cross of Christ is of no effect, Calvary is a sham.” (Hunt:240)
 3. Dave Breese, one of the most respected Bible teachers said, ‘By contrast to the doctrine of limited atonement, **the Bible teaches most strongly the doctrine of unlimited atonement...**The doctrine of limited atonement is specifically denied in Scripture...’ (Hunt:240)
 4. H. A. Ironside states, “No matter how far they [any sinner] have drifted from God; no matter what their sins may be, they do not have to peer into the book of the

divine decrees in order to find out whether or not they are of the chosen or the elect. If they come in all their sin and guilt, confessing their iniquities and trusting in Christ, then they may have the assurance from His word that they are saved. It has been well said, that the “Whosoever wills are the elect, and the whosoever won’ts are the non-elect. (Hunt:238-38)

C. The controversy is even among Calvinist.

1. Spurgeon, the Prince of preacher did not believe in the theory of the doctrine of “Limited Atonement” as we have stated.
2. A leading Calvinist author put it like this, “It is in this truth of limited atonement that the doctrine of sovereign election (and, in fact, sovereign predestination with its two aspects of election and reprobation), comes into focus.” (Hunt:248)
 - * In other word, the entire Calvinistic system built on extreme views of sovereignty and predestination, collapses if limited atonement is not Biblical, guess what it is not Biblical!
3. Some Calvinists consider this teaching as “the Achilles Heel of Calvinism”, one declares, “Give up this point and we have

lost the battle on the sovereignty of God in salvation”. (Hunt:241, 405)

* The teaching can not be found in the Scriptures, it must be read into the text and forced to comply with the theory of Calvinist, it all hangs together or falls.

4. Dave Hunt says, “Hodges notes that the God of Limited Atonement “is hardly the God of love whom we meet in the Bible. The deity of the determinist creates human beings for whom he has no direct love, and who have no free will, and thus they are created solely for a destiny in everlasting torment. Christ’s death in no way affects them, and so they stand totally outside of any redemptive provision...the non-elect are both unloved and doomed.” (Hunt:241)
 - * Not one verse can be produced for this teaching of “Limited Atonement” in context!

D. Calvinist talk about a “Double Jeopardy”.

1. Calvinist reason that for sinners to suffer eternally after Christ had suffered and died for them, would mean that God was demanding double payment for their sins.
 - * Like being tried twice for murder!
2. Another states, “Christ died not for an unorderly mass, but for His people, His

Bride, His Church. For God to have laid the sins of all men on Christ would mean that as regards the lost He would be punishing their sins twice, once in Christ, and then again in them.” (Hunt:247)

3. Where in Scripture is this taught or even hinted at? This human logic and reason!
 - a. “Therefore, as through one man’s offense *judgment* came to all men, resulting in condemnation, even so through one Man’s righteous act *the free gift came* to all men, resulting in justification of life.” Rom. 5:18, 12
 - b. “But Christ’s payment for sin cannot be divided into pieces in order to apply it to individuals, says Dave Hunt, nor is it automatically credited to the account of anyone who does not acknowledge his guilt before God, repent and accept Christ as his Savior.” (Hunt:248)
 - c. Therefore the death of Christ having paid the price in full for the sins of the world, no one will spend eternity in the Lake of Fire because of their sins, but because they have rejected Christ and the salvation He obtained and freely offering to all forgiveness. Rev. 20:14-15
 - d. Those who do not believe in Christ are in their sins and trespasses and

will experience the second death, those who have believed are crucified with Christ and Christ lives in and through them. Gal. 2:20

- e. No one will be able to blame God for ending up in the Lake of Fire, only themselves, for it was made for Satan and his angels. Matt. 25:41
4. Another form of logical reasoning is that if the blood of Christ was shed for multitudes who will not believe, then His blood was shed in vain and wasted, but there is not Scriptures to substantiate this.
 - a. Hebrews disagrees, “Of how much sorer punishment...shall he be thought worthy, who has trodden under foot the Son of God, and has counted the **blood of the covenant, wherewith he was sanctified**; an unholy thing, and has done despite to the spirit of grace? Heb. 10:29
 - * The clear teaching is that the blood of Christ was not shed for the elect alone, but even for those who despite it and trample under foot the Son of God.
 - b. Peter says, “But there were also false prophets among the people, even as there will be false teachers among you, who will secretly bring in destructive heresies, even denying the

Lord who **bought them**, and bring on themselves swift destruction”. 2Pet. 2:1

* Dave Hunt stated, “Here Calvinist must either admit that one who was once saved lost his salvation through turning against Christ—or that the one who “was sanctified” by Christ’s blood and those who deny “the Lord that bought them” are not among the elect, yet, obviously, His blood was shed for them. (Hunt:250)

5. Another attempt to rationalize limited atonement is to explain the nature of the Atonement of Christ, as Christ dying not for individual sins, but for sin itself, which is foolishness.
 - a. But the paying of the penalty for sin itself could not occur without His paying for all sins, providing salvation for all mankind, this is the teaching of the Bible, the Lamb of God. Jn. 1:29
 - b. Therefore what Jesus did on Calvary was efficacious for all mankind. 1Jn. 2:2
 - c. In fact the Scriptures teach that Christ died for the remission of sins, plural and sin, singular. Is. 53:10, 12; Matt. 26:28; Rom. 5:12

- d. If the atonement was limited to the “Unconditionally Elect”, how could Peter say to the crowd at Pentecost, “Then Peter said to them, “Repent, and let every one of you be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins; and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit.” Acts 2:38
- e. Paul to the audience in Antioch in Pisidia, “To you is the word of this salvation sent.” **Not elect.** Acts 13:26
- f. Paul told the Philippian jailor, “Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and you shall be saved, your and your household”. **Not the elect.** Acts 16:31
* Of the 80 times the word “world” occurs in the gospel of John, not once does it mean “elect”, **it has to be read into the text!**
- g. Richard Baxter said around 1694, “God telleth us as plain as can be spoken that Christ died for and tasted death for every man...others will deny these plain truths, because they think that [God cannot justly punish those for whom Christ hath paid the penalty]... But doth the Scripture speak...these opinions of theirs as plainly as it saith that Christ died for all and every man? Doth it say as

plainly anywhere that He died not for all...? Doth it say anywhere that he died only for His sheep, or His Elect, and exclude the Non-Elect? There is no such word in the Bible...”
(Hunt:254)

Illustration

A person thinks they are in the best of physical shape, confidently saying they never felt better, but when they take a physical and blood work it reveals the truth, refuting what they think or feel!
* So it is with the theory of “Limited Atonement” when compared to Scripture!

The doctrine of “Limited Atonement” examined in light of Scripture fails!

III. The doctrine of “Limited Atonement” in view of pivotal Scriptures.

- A.** One of the key texts for Calvinist is in the book of Romans. Rom. 9:16
* “So then it is not of him who wills, nor of him who runs, but of God who shows mercy.”
- 1.** R. C. Sproul declares that Romans 9:16 alone is fatal to Arminianism, but remember we are not defending Arminianism, the other extreme of

Calvinism, but we are testing the theory of TULIP by God’s word.

- 2.** Paul said that God loved Jacob and hated Esau before even being born, “that the purposes of God according to election might stand.” Rom. 9:11-13
 - a.** Calvinists consider this text to be one of the strongest passages to prove that before birth all men are predestined either to heaven or hell. Rom. 9:11
 - b.** But on the contrary, if one reads carefully the passage and the related quotes, Paul is quoting from Malachi, the prophet is not referring to Jacob and Esau as individuals, but to the **nations**, which descended from them.
 - c.** “The burden of the word of the LORD to Israel by Malachi. “I have loved you (Jacob)... But Esau I have hated, And laid waste his mountains and his heritage... Edom has said, we will return...they may build, but I will throw down; They shall be called the Territory of Wickedness, And the people against whom the LORD will have indignation forever”. Mal. 1:1-4
 - d.** The context of Malachi has nothing to do with eternal salvation of either Jacob or Esau or their descendants predestined for heaven or hell.

- * Certainly no one would dare say all of Jacob's descendants were secure eternally automatically, for certainly many were lost and the same with the Edomites, not all were lost.
- e. Professor H. H. Rowley of the University of Manchester, England, stated, "Election is for service...God chose Israel...not alone that He might reveal Himself to her, but that He might claim her for service...God chose Israel..." (Hunt:262)
- f. Samuel Fisk in his book on Calvinism says, "Rowley, indeed, goes so far as to suggest that election is something which, if not fulfilled by the elect, may be withdrawn from them, a thought at which committed Calvinist would shudder." (Hunt:262)
- g. Vance points out that, "the basic error of Calvinism is confounding election and predestination with salvation, which they never are in the Bible, but only in the philosophical speculation and theological implication of Calvinism..." (Hunt:262)
- * Election and predestination always have to do with a particular purpose, ministry or blessing to

- which one has been elected—not salvation!
- 3. Malachi is quoting Genesis. Gen. 25:23
- * "And the LORD said to her: "Two nations are in your womb, Two peoples shall be separated from your body; One people shall be stronger than the other, **And the older shall serve the younger.**" Rom. 9:12
- a. Two nations is the subject not the individuals, the stronger is not Jacob, he was weaker than Esau, the stronger refers to the nation Israel, the weaker Edom.
 - * So Esau never serve Jacob, but Edom did serve Israel.
- b. Calvinist ignore this simple contextual observation and leading Calvinists do not exegete Gen. 25:23 as a national position and historical fulfillment, but insist on individual election and predestination.
- c. Dick Sanford writes, "Circle the word, "**Serve.**" It's not saying, "The elder shall be saved and the younger shall not be." Never mix the scripture that is talking about service with scripture that is talking about salvation...Service includes works that are rewarded. Salvation is grace apart from works...He the Lord says

that before they were ever born, He knew which one was going to be born first and...am I going to switch this service pattern...[and] the inheritance is going to come through the younger instead of the older. That is a reversal also..." Dick Sanford continues,

- e. "Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated". Rom. 9:13, now it does not say, "Jacob have I saved and said he can go to heaven and Esau have I lost an said can't go to heaven." That is not what God is saying...[but] I told you that I'm going to work through Jacob, and that I haven't chosen to work through Esau...the blessing is not going to come through Esau...the children of Esau are not going to lead up to the Messiah; it's the children of Jacob that are going to lead up to the Messiah." vs. 13 (Hunt:264)
- f. In fact verse eleven of Romans nine says, "(for [the children] not yet being born, nor having done any good or evil, that the **purpose** of God according to **election** might stand, not of works but of Him who calls).
 1) In other words **God's election** was determined by His **foreknowledge** on who would receive his

birthright and who would despise it as a nation.

- 2) Romans has nothing to do with salvation for the individual!

B. Another key scripture for Calvinist is again in Romans. Rom. 9:16-20

- 1. Calvinist use verse eighteen to prove "Unconditional Election" and "Limited Atonement", "Therefore He has mercy on whom He wills, and whom He wills He **hardens.**" vs. 18
 - a. On the contrary the hardening of Pharaoh's heart has nothing to do whether or not Pharaoh went to heaven or hell. And certainly not that God caused Pharaoh to do the evil he committed.
 - b. It only has to do with the **purposes** of God to show His power and that God's **name** be declare in all the earth. vs. 17
 - * God did the signs before Pharaoh so they could be told to the sons of the Israelites, that they might know He was LORD. Ex. 10:1
 - c. Calvinist teach that God is the one who hardened Pharaoh's heart as predetermining those for damnation, but in reality the quote in it's context teaches the opposite, free-will.

- d. God told Moses, “But I am sure that the king of Egypt **will not let you go**, no, not even by a mighty hand”. Ex. 3:19
 * God foreknew the heart of Pharaoh, like the heart of Esau!
2. Listen to God, “And the LORD said to Moses, “When you go back to Egypt, see that you do all those wonders before Pharaoh which I have put in your hand. But **I will harden his heart**, so that he will not let the people go.” Ex. 4:21
- a. God would **strengthen** the heart of Pharaoh based on his own rebellion
- b. There are different words used for the word harden and hardened in the Exodus text.
- 1) When it says Pharaoh hardened his own heart, the word “kabed” is used to indicate his own rebellion, obstinate and stubborn heart and appears four times. Ex. 7:14; 8:15; 9:7
- 2) When it says that God hardened the heart of Pharaoh, the word “Chazaq” is used and means God honored his decision and strengthen the heart of Pharaoh regarding his decision to not obey. Ex. 4:21; 7:13, 22; 8:15; 9:12; 35; 10:20, 27; 11:10; 14:4, 8, 17

- * God will honor your choice, but you can not blame God for your choice!
- 3) God said, “And I will harden “Qashah” Pharaoh’s heart, and multiply My signs and My wonders in the land of Egypt.” Ex. 7:3
 * This third word means to become stiff-necked, but only as the result of his own choice.
- c. Forester and Manston in their in-depth word study confirm this, ‘The Bible does not teach that God made Pharaoh unrepentant. The main word used for the hardening of Pharaoh’s heart is “chazaq”, and it seems to mean that God emboldened or encouraged Pharaoh’s heart so that he had the stubborn courage to stand even in the face of very frightening miracles...God never prevents anyone from repenting. “Do I have any **pleasure** at all that the wicked should die?” says the Lord GOD, “[and] not that he should turn from his ways and live?” Ezk. 18:23
- d. The example of Pharaoh does not support the teaching of “Total Depravity”, “Unconditional Election” or “Limited Atonement” as Calvinist

teach, in fact it reveals a dishonesty in their exposition to fit their theory where they can.

- C. The illustration of the potter and the clay is also use by Calvinist to teach the predestination of some to heaven and others to hell. Rom. 9:21-24
1. The illustration must be in line with the proclamation of Jacob and Esau, as well as Pharaoh, otherwise it would not serve as an illustration.
 - a. So from this simple principle we can only conclude that the illustration simply confirms what we have observed about free will and the purposes of God.
 - b. Not like Calvinist teach that God “Unconditionally Elected” some by predestination, while others for destruction and the evil to be done!
 2. God is sovereign as the Creator of man and can do as He pleases, to whom He pleased, but He never violates man’s free-will nor His holiness, love, justice or any of His other attributes, He can not! vs. 20-21
 - * The text is not teaching God willed this for them nor that they have no choice in the matter, **it is read into the text** to teach “Limited Atonement”!

3. God’s sovereign choice to be longsuffering regarding His wrath to the vessels of wrath prepared for destruction is His patience towards them. vs. 22-24
 - * The text is not teaching He made them evil or predetermined them for destruction, **it has to be read into the text**, but these vessels represent Esau and Pharaoh who chose to rebel of their own free-will, becoming vessels of wrath.
 - a. Christ died for all men, you can not be selective like the Calvinist and change the plain meaning of the Bible texts, all is all, whosoever is whosoever.
 - b. Spurgeon himself castigated the Calvinist for this in their exposition of First Timothy, “Who desires all men to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth.” 1Tim. 2:4
 - * “What then? Shall we try to put another meaning into the text than that which it fairly bears? I trow not... You must, most of you, be acquainted with the general method in which our older Calvinistic friends deal with this text. “All men” say they “that is , some men”: as if the Holy Spirit could not have said “some men” if He meant some men. “All men,”

say they: “that is, some of all sorts of men”: as if the Lord could not have said, “All sorts of men” if He had meant that. The Holy Spirit by the apostle has written, “All men,” and unquestionable he means all men.... My love of consistency with my own doctrinal views is not great enough to allow me knowingly to alter a single text of Scripture.” (Hunt:274)

- D.** There are other key text that are used for “Limited Atonement.
- 1.** Hebrews warns the believer about not drifting, hardening the heart, departing from the living God, but Calvinist seem to avoid these passages. Heb. 2:1; 3:7-8, 14; 4:1, 6
 - a.** In his book to refute Arminianism and defend Calvinism, Hunt says, White completely avoids these verses and chides Arminians for avoiding the context!
 - b.** The stern warning in Hebrews is explained away like others, “Of how much worse punishment, do you suppose, will he be thought worthy who has trampled the Son of God underfoot, **counted the blood of the covenant by which he was sanctified**

a common thing, and insulted the Spirit of grace?”

- b.** The text teaches the plain truth that “Limited Atonement is not Biblical”, but the explanation by Calvinists is that these were sanctified, but not saved.”
 - c.** Calvinist explain the passage of Jesus tasting death for everyone by saying it refers only to the elect. Heb. 2:9
* A. W. Pink changes it to “every son” violating the Greek. (a-c all from Hunt:275-76)
- 2.** The Second epistle of Peter is another text.
- a.** As we have noted Peter said there would be false prophets among the people, even as there will be false teachers among them, who would secretly bring in destructive heresies, even **denying the Lord who bought them**, and bring on themselves swift destruction.” 2Pet. 2:1
 - 1)** The text clearly refutes “Limited Atonement”, Jesus died for all and bought them by paying the price.
 - 2)** The fact that some are lost is not by God’s predetermination, but man’s choice of rejection!
 - b.** Peter again says, “The Lord is not slack concerning His promise, as

some count slackness, but is longsuffering toward us, **not willing that any should perish** but that all should come to repentance.” 2Pet. 3:9

- 1) White says, “the passage is not speaking about salvation as its topic”
- 2) Dave Hunt in his book, *What Love Is This*, responds to the statement, “On that basis he summarily rules out the possibility that Peter means what the words he uses so clearly declare”. (Hunt:277)
- 3) The verse is addressing both saved and unsaved, but the unsaved are the “all should come to repentance”, refuting the theory of “Limited Atonement”!

Illustration

It much like an add in the news paper reading, “anyone test driving a car gets free lift tickets”. Then as people come in, some are told, “the add was limited to the first hundred people we chose”, It would be contrary to what was written and dishonest in the explanation of it!

* Article 31 of the Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England, adopted shortly before Calvin’s death state, “the offering of Christ once made is the perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction, **for all the sins of the whole world.**”

In 1592 it was changed by the Lutherans, then in the Arminian controversy at the Canon of Dort (1619) and the Westminster Confession of faith (1646) the doctrine of Limited Atonement” was expressly affirmed. (Vance:460)

The doctrine of “Limited Atonement” in view of pivotal Scriptures proves to be dishonest exposition!

Conclusion

This is the third point of “Five point Calvinism”, under the acronym TULIP, “Limited Atonement”:

- I. The doctrine of “Limited Atonement” as taught is man-made!
- II. The doctrine of “Limited Atonement” examined in light of Scripture fails!
- III. The doctrine of “Limited Atonement” in view of pivotal Scriptures proves to be dishonest exposition!