

Dr. Robert A. Peterson, Christ's Saving Work, Session 15, 6 Pictures of Christ's Saving Work, Part 2, Redemption and Substitution

© 2024 Robert Peterson and Ted Hildebrandt

This is Dr. Robert Peterson in his teaching on Christ's Saving Work. This is session 15, Six Pictures of Christ's Saving Work, Part 2, Redemption and Substitution.

We continue our study of Christ's saving work by turning to the picture of redemption.

Unlike reconciliation, which is found in only four key Pauline passages, there are too many passages that pertain to redemption to list. Instead, I'll just talk about sections of the Bible where this is found. The Old Testament, the Synoptic Gospels, Acts, Paul, Hebrews, 1 Peter, and Revelation.

David Reitmeier talks about the sphere. Each one of these pictures of the work of Christ comes from a sphere, of course. In this case, the metaphor of redemption, quoting Reitmeier, includes the ideas of losing a bond, setting free from captivity or slavery, buying back something lost or sold, exchanging something in one's possession for something possessed by another, and ransoming.

Biblical background. Redemption has Old Testament roots in God's deliverance of the Israelites from Egyptian bondage, Israel's redemption of firstborn sons, and Isaiah's message of a new exodus for Jews taken in Babylonian captivity. The immediate background for people in New Testament times is the manumission of slaves.

Definition. Redemption in the New Testament is a picture of Christ's saving work that depicts lost persons in various states of bondage and presents Christ as the Redeemer, who, through his death, expressed in a number of ways, claims people as his own and sets them free. Leon Morris, in the Apostolic Preaching on the Cross, taught three aspects of redemption.

The state of bondage out of which we needed to be delivered, the payment of a ransom, redemption price or ransom, and the consequent state of freedom or liberty. John Stott, in his wonderful book, *The Cross of Christ*, added a fourth aspect to my thinking, and that is that we now have a new master, and that is the Lord Jesus Christ. The need for redemption is bondage in its different forms.

The Israelites suffered Egyptian bondage before the exodus, and citizens of the southern kingdom endured captivity in Babylon and later Persia before Yahweh released them. The forms of bondage from which Christ delivers people are moral or

spiritual. They are frequently implied but sometimes are explicit, including, quote, the domain of darkness, Colossians 1:13, enslavement to the elementary principles of the world, Galatians 4:3, futile ways inherited from ancestors, 1 Peter 1:18, and all lawlessness, Titus 2:13-14, and our sins, Revelation 1.16. Initiator: no surprise here; God is always the initiator in redeeming his people.

It's true of Yahweh: I am the Lord, I will bring you out from under the burdens of the Egyptians, and I will deliver you from slavery to them, and I will redeem you with an outstretched arm and great acts of judgment, Exodus 6:6. And it's true of Jesus, the son of man, who came not to be served but to serve and to give his life as a ransom for many, Mark 10:45, the famous ransom saying. We notice Jesus' willingness to give himself to redeem us. I'll give the text to that in a little bit.

In both testaments, the deity initiates redemption out of love for his people. We see it in the law. He, the Lord your God, loved your fathers and brought you out of Egypt with his own presence by his great power, Deuteronomy 4:37. We also see it in scripture's last book, quote, to him who loves us and has freed us from our sins by his blood, to him be glory and dominion forever and ever, Revelation 1:5 and 6. In love, Yahweh delivered Israel from Egypt.

In love, Christ delivers us with his blood. Mediator: in the Old Testament, Israel's God is called the Most High God, their Redeemer, Psalm 78:35. In the New Testament, Paul uses the Old Testament title for God, Deliverer, and applies it to Christ, citing Isaiah 59:20 in Romans 11:26. The apostle thereby sets the tone for the whole New Testament, which consistently presents Christ as the Redeemer, the mediator of redemption. The work.

Redemption requires work. Yahweh brought the plagues and exodus to redeem the Israelites from Egypt, Deuteronomy 9:26. He moved Cyrus to deliver Judah from captivity, Ezra 1:1-4, Isaiah 45:1-6. In the New Testament, redemption is the work of Christ, Psalm 49:7. He declares, truly, no man can ransom another. In Mark 8:37, Jesus asks, what can a man give in return for his soul? And in 10:45, he says, the Son of Man came to give his life as a ransom for many.

Revelation's imagery is powerful. John says I saw a lamb standing as though it had been slain. And then the hymn of praise goes up to the lamb, for you were slain, and by your blood, you ransomed people for God from every tribe, and language, and people, and nation.

Revelation 5:6 and 9. Voluntariness. A striking difference between the Testaments is Christ's voluntarily suffering as our Redeemer. This idea is reflected in the ransom saying, the Son of Man came to give his life as a ransom for many, Mark 10:45. Again, two passages in the pastorals combine the statements of Jesus' self-giving with redemption.

1 Timothy 2:5 and 6. For there is one God, and there is one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus, who gave himself as a ransom for all, which is the testimony given at the present time. 1 Timothy 2:5 and 6. And then Titus 2:13 and 14. Our great God and Savior, Jesus Christ, gave himself for us to redeem us from all lawlessness and to purify for himself a people for his own possession who are zealous for good works.

Titus 2:13 and 14. Our Redeemer willingly gave himself to deliver us from bondage. Scripture sometimes views this, not always, but sometimes views it as the payment of a price.

Ransom price. While Leon Morris, who did exemplary work on the biblical words that describe Christ's saving work, may have overemphasized Christ's death as a ransom, others have rejected the ransom idea altogether. Overdoing it and rejecting it are both mistakes.

Shriner, citing an important essay by Howard Marshall, strikes just the right balance. Some scholars, he wrote, have argued that in the scriptures, redemption always involves the notion of the payment of a price. Howard Marshall has demonstrated, however, that the idea of a price is not invariably present, though there is always the idea of the cost or effort involved in redemption.

In some texts, the emphasis is on deliverance, and nothing is said about price. Luke 21:28, Romans 8:23, Ephesians 1:4, Ephesians 4:30. On the other hand, some scholars are too eager to strike out any notion of price at all. Shriner is surely correct.

At least eight passages portray Christ's death as the redemption price. How can you deny that? Acts 20:28. Pay careful attention, Paul said, to yourselves and to all the flock, to care for the church of God which he obtained with his own blood. 1 Corinthians 6:19-20. You are not your own, Paul wrote, for you were bought with a price.

So glorify God in your body. 1 Corinthians 7:23. You were bought with a price. Do not become slaves of men.

1 Timothy 2:5-6. There's one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus, who gave himself as a ransom for all. Hebrews 9:12. He entered once and for all into the holy places by means of his own blood, thus securing, and by means of his own blood, there's the price, thus securing an eternal redemption. 1 Peter 1:18-19. You were not; you were redeemed, sorry; you were ransomed from the futile ways inherited from your forefathers, not with perishable things such as silver or gold, but with the precious blood of Christ.

That is the redemption price. Revelation 1:5-6. To him who loves us and has freed us from our sins by his blood, be glory and dominion forever and ever. Amen.

Revelation 5:9-10. Again, for you were slain, and by your blood, you ransomed people for God. Substitution. Some texts present Christ's redemption as a substitution for sinners.

The most famous is the ransom saying of Mark 10:45. That verse is important because in that verse, in Mark's gospel, Jesus states the meaning of his atoning death. It's very important. Even the son of man did not come to be served but to serve and to give his life as a ransom for many.

His disciples were arguing which one is the most important. And Jesus humbles them by using himself as an example of servant leadership. Among the Gentiles, the unsaved people, the leaders lorded over the people under them.

It's not to be that way among you. He would first, should be, should be, he would be first, should be last. He who wants to lead should be the servant of all.

For even the son of man did not come to be served but to serve. And the epitome of his service is this and to give his life as a ransom for many. William Lane, who wrote a great commentary on the gospel of Mark, ties together ransom, redemption, and substitution.

Quote, the ransom metaphor sums up the purpose for which Jesus gave his life. Because the idea of equivalence or substitution was proper to the concept of a ransom, it became an integral element in the vocabulary of redemption in the Old Testament. Excuse me.

In the context of Mark 12:45a, with its reference to the service of the son of man, it is appropriate to find an allusion to the servant of the Lord in Isaiah 53, who vicariously and voluntarily suffered and gave his life for the sins of others. The specific thought underlying the reference to the ransom is expressed in Isaiah 53:10, which speaks of making his life an offering for sin. Jesus, as the messianic servant, offers himself as a guilty offering.

Leviticus 5:14 to 6:7, Leviticus 7:1 through 7, Numbers 5:5 and 8, in compensation for the sins of the people. William Lane's commentary on the gospel of Mark. The following three texts also teach that Christ's redemption is substitutionary.

Readers will gain much from William Lane's commentary on Mark as well as on the book of Hebrews. But these texts teach redemption is substitution. Galatians 3:13, Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law by becoming a curse for us.

1 Timothy 2:5 and 6, there's one God and one mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus, who gave himself as a ransom for all. Titus 2:13-14, our great God and Savior Jesus Christ, gave himself to redeem us from all lawlessness. While discussing Galatians 3:13, Graham Cole contemplates humanity's inability to rescue itself.

Quote, God has acted in Christ to address the human predicament at this point. The divine move is astounding, for a great exchange has taken place. As Jeffrey Ovi and Sack suggest, it is hard to imagine a plainer statement of the doctrine of penal substitution.

Paul is drawing on the language of the marketplace. A price is paid to set a slave free, and the price of this redemption is unfathomable. Galatians 3:13 says Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law by becoming a curse for us.

Cole was right. Christ gave himself vicariously as a ransom price to deliver sinners. He died in their place, paying a ransom they could not pay.

Moreover, redemption was accomplished with his blood, Christ's blood. Morris has shown Leon Morris in the apostolic preaching on the cross, Morris has shown that the word blood in the expression the blood of Christ depicts Christ's death, even a violent death. This usage of blood occurs frequently when scripture speaks of Christ's work of redemption.

We have redemption through his blood, Ephesians 1:7. He entered once and for all to the holy places, not by means of the blood of goats and calves, but by means of his own blood, thus securing an eternal redemption. Hebrews 9:12. I saw a lamb standing as though it had been slain.

For you were slain, O Lamb of God, and by your blood you ransomed people for God. Revelation 5:6. 5 verse 6 and verses 9 and 10. Morris explains the relationship between Jesus' blood and sacrifice.

Quote, the term blood is not used as often in the Old Testament as in the Old. It is found 98 times. But as in the Old, the most frequent single classification is that which refers to violent death.

The New Testament writers meant that Christ, when it speaks of his blood, they meant that Christ has died. And if they use the expression in a way that recalls the sacrifices and the bloodshed in them, then they mean that the death of Jesus is to be seen as a sacrifice, which accomplishes in reality what the old sacrifices pointed to but could not do. Forgiveness.

Because Christ, the mediator of redemption, voluntarily gave himself as a ransom for sinners. His death procures forgiveness for all who believe. For that reason, scripture associates redemption and forgiveness.

Ephesians 1:7. In him, we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of our trespasses. Colossians 1:13-14. God has delivered us from the domain of darkness and transferred us to the kingdom of his beloved son, in whom we have redemption, the forgiveness of sins.

Redemption pertains to the past, present, and future. When viewed from a temporal perspective, redemption pertains to the past, present, and future. First, the past.

You are not your own, for you were bought with a price. 1 Corinthians 6:19-20. You were ransomed with the precious blood of Christ.

1 Peter 1:18-19. Revelation 14:4. These saints have been redeemed from mankind as firstfruits for God and the lamb. Redemption also pertains to the present.

He has delivered us from the domain of darkness and transferred us to the kingdom of his beloved son, in whom we have redemption, the forgiveness of sins. Colossians 1:13 and 14. The deliverance is described as past, but the transference to Christ's kingdom is present, as is forgiveness.

Redemption pertains to the future as well. Romans 8:23. And not only the creation, but we ourselves, who have the firstfruits of the Spirit, groan inwardly as we wait eagerly for adoption as sons, the redemption of our bodies.

Romans 8:23. Romans, excuse me, Ephesians 4:30. And do not grieve the Holy Spirit of God, by whom you were sealed for the day of redemption.

In sum, Christ purchased a complete redemption for his people, even for anyone who believes in his name. His deliverance pertains to the past, present, and future. Furthermore, redemption is, am I seeing a pattern here? Yes.

As with reconciliation, redemption is individual, corporate, and cosmic. Christ redeems individuals, the church, and the cosmos. His redemption of individuals is demonstrated in the context of sexual immorality.

1 Corinthians 6:18 to 20. Flee from sexual immorality. Every other sin a person commits is outside the body, but the sexually immoral person sins against his own body.

Or do you not know that your body is a temple of the Holy Spirit within you, whom you have from God? You are not your own, for you were bought with a price. So,

glorify God in your body. Thus, in 1 Corinthians 6:18 to 20, it's individuals who are redeemed by Christ.

There's also a corporate dimension of redemption, as the following passages illustrate. Acts 20:28. Paul speaks of the church of God, which he obtained with his own blood.

1 Timothy 2:5 and 6 speaks of Christ Jesus, who gave himself as a ransom for all. Revelation 5:9. O Lamb of God, you were slain, and by your blood, you ransom people for God from every tribe and language and people and nation. As is the case with reconciliation, there's also a cosmic dimension of redemption, and Paul refers to this in Romans 8. Romans 8:19 to 22, for the creation, waits eagerly for the revealing of the sons of God.

For the creation was subjected to futility, not willingly, but because of him who subjected it in hope that the creation itself will be set free from its bondage to corruption and obtain the freedom of the glory of the children of God, for we know that the whole creation has been groaning together in the pains of childbirth until now. Romans 8:19 through 22.

We conclude our presentation of the picture of redemption for Christ's saving work by thinking about the wonderful results that we obtain. The results of Christ's redeeming work are incredible. In addition to what has already been mentioned, as I went through the categories already spoken of under redemption, these are in addition to those.

Jesus' death ratifies the new covenant and brings about what Jeremiah 31:31, 31 to 34 promised, especially the forgiveness of sins, including those of Old Testament saints. Hebrews 9:15. Therefore, he's the mediator of a new covenant so that those who are called may receive the promise of eternal inheritance since a death has occurred that redeems them from the transgressions committed under the first covenant.

Hebrews 9:15. Redemption purchases believers for God so that henceforth they belong to him. You are not your own, for you were bought with a price.

Paul wrote 1 Corinthians 6:19 and 20 in the same regard. Consider 1 Corinthians 7:23 and Revelation 14:4. At the same time, Christ's death frees us from bondage, so you are no longer a slave but a son. And if a son is then an heir through God,

Galatians 4:7. In addition, redemption leads Christians to do good because Christ quote gave himself for us to redeem us from all lawlessness and to purify himself a people for his own possession who are zealous for good works. Titus 2:14. Christ

redeemed his people that they may fulfill the roles that Old Testament Israel failed to perform.

Quote Revelation 1:5 and 6. He has freed us from our sins by his blood and made us a kingdom priests to his God and father. Christopher Wright sounds a good note on which to end this study of redemption. Quote sin puts us into slavery, a bondage from which we need to be released.

But redemption always comes at a cost. God chose to bear that cost himself in the self-giving of his son who came to quote, give his life as a ransom for many. Mark 10:45.

In Him, therefore, we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins. Ephesians 1:7. The cross spells freedom and release for captives. Six major pictures of Christ saving work.

We've looked at reconciliation and redemption. We move now to consider Christ our legal substitute. Before summarizing its aspects, I am motivated to answer objections to penal substitution.

It makes me sad that these not only come from critical scholars who don't believe the Bible's teaching but evangelicals as well. Some oppose penal substitution. It is understandable in that sometimes penal substitution has been presented without great care and almost crudely.

For example, by setting the Father against the Son, the cruel Father punishes the gentle Son. That is totally wrong. Or pitting the Son against the Father who in his cross work rests from the Father that which the Father is reluctant to give.

Oh, these are terrible, terrible, grotesque distortions of the doctrine. Nevertheless, penal substitution has just been lambasted. And with the help of Gary Williams, who wrote Penal Substitution, a response to recent criticisms in a book I mentioned in previous lectures, The Atonement Debate.

That is a big help to me, Gary Williams, penal substitution, a response to recent criticisms. If we look at penal substitution as a whole, our need is guilt or condemnation before a holy and just God. And if Christ is, if Christ is our peace in reconciliation, if he is our redeemer in redemption, he is our substitute in the theme of legal penal substitution.

The sphere, of course, is not personal relations like reconciliation. It's not slavery and manumission as in redemption. The sphere of penal substitution is, as the name penal implies, is the law.

God is the lawgiver and judge. We are lawbreakers. We cannot pay the penalty for our sins.

The father sends his son. The son loves us and gives himself for us. The result is justification.

God declared righteous all who, by his grace, believe in Jesus. And once again, I'll say it: we will summarize at the end of the treatment of the objections to penal substitution. I agree with the assessment of Thomas Schreiner when he writes, quote, I conclude that the penal substitution view needs defending today because it is scandalous to some scholars.

We know that it is scandalous to radical feminists who see it as a form of divine child abuse. I'm not making any of this up, my friends, or to scholars like Denny Weaver, who promote nonviolent atonement. I cannot comprehend from Holy Scripture what nonviolent atonement is in either testament.

Indeed, among all the views of atonement, penal substitution provokes the most negative response. Objection number one. It was not taught until the Reformation.

The first object, one objection, which I'm putting in my own order, says that penal substitution was invented by the reformers. It was unheard of before. This is plainly wrong.

It is true that Luther taught this doctrine along with Christus Victor, Christ our champion, and that it was the prominent motif in the work of John Calvin. But that does not mean it was unheard of before; as Howard Marshall explains quote, a distinction must be made between the existence of the doctrine and its prominence. The doctrine of penal substitution may not have been prominent before the Reformation, but this is quite different than saying it was unknown.

It was known. Irenaeus spoke of propitiation. Saint Augustine did the same thing.

It was known before the Reformation. Thomas Aquinas has penal substitution comments. Now, these are not the only statements of these figures, but they are figures, they are statements that they make before the reformers.

So penal substitution was not taught until the Reformation. Even if it was, it doesn't mean that it's not God's truth. The truth of the matter is whether it is taught in Holy Scripture.

Secondly, it is said penal substitution is merely a product of individualism. Joel Green, again an outstanding New Testament scholar, and Mark Baker together wrote a book, *Recovering the Scandal of the Cross*, in which they attacked grotesque and

misconceived notions of penal substitution, but unfortunately attacked penal substitution itself as well. Green and Baker claim that penal substitution coheres, quote, fully with the emphasis on autonomous individualism characteristic of so much of the modern middle class in the West, close quote.

Gary Williams responds that this objection is strange, historically inaccurate, and even ironic. It's strange because penal substitution, by its very definition, relies heavily on corporate categories and denies individualism. Quote, quoting Williams, no proponent of penal substitution has ever conceived of it as a transfer of punishment between two wholly unrelated persons.

Rather, Christ is viewed as the covenant and corporate head who dies in the place of his people. Galatians 3:13, Christ takes the curse of the covenant himself to redeem those under the curse. To cite examples, and again this justifies the first, this answers the first criticism that penal substitution began at the Reformation.

Eusebius of Caesarea, John Calvin, and John Owen all maintain that penal substitution depends on a mystical union between Christ and his people. I should correct myself; Eusebius is pre-Reformation, Calvin, of course, is Reformation, and Owen is post-Reformation, so I misspoke. But Eusebius should be added to those who taught penal substitution before the Reformation.

Second, the charge that substitution is a product of Western individualism is historically inaccurate because there are examples of church fathers employing union with Christ to explain God's justice in penal substitution. Williams cites a quotation from Eusebius of Caesarea, how can he make our sins his own and be said to bear our iniquities except by being regarded, our being regarded as his body? And the Lamb of God not only did this, but was chastised on our behalf and suffered a penalty. He did not owe but which we owed because of the multitude of our sins, and drew down on himself the apportioned curse, being made a curse for us.

And what is that but the price of our souls? And so, the oracle says in our person, by his stripes we were healed, Isaiah 53, and the Lord delivered him for our sins, with the result that uniting himself to us and us to himself and appropriating our sufferings, he can say, I said, Lord have mercy on me, heal my soul, for I have sinned against thee. This is a patristic penal substitution undergirded by union with Christ, which tells how the sufferings of the one became the salvation of the many. It is not accurate, therefore, to say that penal substitution is the product of modern Western individualism.

Third, the charge is ironic because it is the critics of penal substitution who have embraced individualism. In the Church of England's 1995 doctrine commission report, *The Mystery of Salvation*, which opposes penal substitution, we read that in

the moral sphere, each person must be responsible for their own obligations. Moral responsibility is ultimately incommunicable.

This report rejects penal substitution, as quoted by the authors because they endorse this species of individualism. That's sad, indeed. Objection number three, penal substitution, contradicts Jesus' teaching to turn the other cheek.

In reaction to Reformation teaching, as we saw earlier, Faustus Socinus in the 17th century brought arguments against penal substitution that are still used today. One of them was that penal substitution involves retributive justice, and this makes God inconsistent with himself. Jesus teaches his followers not to oppose evil but to turn the other cheek when slapped, Matthew 5:39. The idea that God exacts punishment on the cross, therefore, contradicts Jesus' plain teaching.

Stephen Chalke, a respected British preacher and author, writing in 2004, agrees and claims that such a view makes God hypocritical. Quote, if the cross has anything to do with penal substitution, then Jesus' teaching becomes a divine case of do as I say, not as I do. And then he goes on to say, I, for one, believe that God practices what he preaches.

Gary Williams decisively answers both Socinus and Chalke; I'm sad to see Steve in that company, by presenting a clear counter-example. It is found in Romans 12, where Paul sharply differentiates how justice works for God's relations with his human creatures and for their relations with each other. Paul, like Jesus, prohibits human beings from taking revenge against their fellows.

Does he then urge them to follow God's example? No, just the opposite. Quote, repay no one evil for evil, Romans 12:17 to 21. Beloved, never avenge yourselves, but leave it to the wrath of God.

For it is written, Vengeance is mine, I will repay, says the Lord. On the contrary, if your enemy is hungry, feed him. If he's thirsty, give him something to drink.

For by so doing, you reap burning coals on his head. You will heap burning coals on his head. Do not be overcome by evil, but overcome evil with good.

Again, Romans 12:17 and 19 to 21. Williams drives home the point. Thus, Paul denies vengeance in the sphere of relationships between individual people and, at the same time, ascribes it to God, who shares it in limited part with the ruling authorities.

Where Chalke infers that God would never do what he tells us not to do, Paul argues exactly the opposite. God tells us not to do what he does precisely because he does it. God says, do as I say, not as I do, and justly so, since he is God and we are not.

Objection four. Penal substitution makes punishment impersonal rather than personal. Critics view retributive punishment and penal substitution that is based on it as impersonal and, therefore, less than biblical.

Stephen Travis, an outstanding evangelical Anglican, implies as much when he writes opposing retributive punishment. "The judgment of God is to be seen not primarily in terms of retribution, whereby people are paid back according to their deeds, but in terms of relationship or non-relationship to God."

Travis apparently views retribution and relationship as incompatible. Incompatible. Therefore, penal substitution is impersonal, as an impersonal transaction is unworthy, an unworthy view of the atonement.

But Travis's view is mistaken. Retributive punishment and relationships are not necessarily opposed. Retribution, according to Hugo Grotius, involves two aspects.

An ill will, an ill, excuse me, which is responsive to an ill and the infliction of some kind of proportional pain. But based on these two aspects, punishment can be both retributive and relational. Such is the case where punishment is deserved for evil, evil character or behavior, and where punishment involves pain.

Now, separation from the blessed presence of Christ is surely pain. Quote, the category of exclusion from a loving relationship with Christ is a relational category, as Williams insists. For the sinner stands in a relationship of hostile confrontation with Christ.

One more before as we wrap up this lecture. Objection five. Penal substitution misrepresents God as needing to be appeased before he forgives.

Critics sometimes portray advocates of penal substitution as maintaining that it is the cross of Christ that causes God to abandon his wrath and to extend forgiveness. Though responsible proponents of substitution do not hold this, the accusation continues, as Joel Green demonstrates. Quote, over against the model of penal substitutionary atonement, then, God's saving act is not his response to Jesus' willing death.

Close quote. But this is itself a misrepresentation, as Howard Marshall shows in his very good book, *The Theology of the New Testament*. Quote, the motive for Jesus' death is stated to be the loving purpose of God.

And there is not the faintest hint in the New Testament that Jesus died to persuade God to forgive sinners. On the contrary, his death is the way in which God acts in his grace and mercy. Hence, the death of Jesus is not a means of appeasing a father who's unwilling, unable, or unwilling to forgive.

It is what God himself does while we are yet sinners. It is true that the wrath of God is operative against sinners who have not accepted the gospel, but it is not true that God's wrath has been appeased before he will be merciful. In our next lecture, we'll continue on with five more objections against penal substitution and then summarize penal substitution as a whole.

This is Dr. Robert Peterson in his teaching on Christ's Saving Work. This is session 15, Six Pictures of Christ's Saving Work, Part 2, Redemption and Substitution.