

The Fellowship for Reformation and Pastoral Studies
Volume 28 Number 8

Modern Views of the Atonement

Presented by:
Stephen Kring
Pastor of Bethesda Baptist Church, Delhi
April 10th, 2000

Author's Preface

Brethren, I thought I would have more time than I did to prepare this paper and I apologize, because you are the ones being "cheated". I do feel that this leaves a lot of loose ends just hanging there. But perhaps you can help tie some of them up during the discussion period. Leaving behind, then, my lame excuses, such as I have I give you!

Introduction

Whenever we say that something is "crucial", we are, unknowingly perhaps, pointing to the vital importance of the atoning work of Jesus Christ on the cross. Think for a moment. What does the word "crucial" literally mean? It means "pertaining to a cross". Therefore, as Leon Morris comments, "When we say that anything is crucial we are saying that it is as central to that to which we apply it as the cross is to Christianity." (New Dictionary of Theology, 54).

That the atonement of Jesus Christ is of central importance to Christianity is evident from all of Scripture. From Genesis to Revelation we find it to be so:

Gen. 18:22 "...My son, God will provide for Himself the lamb for a burnt offering."

Ex. 12:13 "...And when I see the blood, I will pass over you..."

Lev. 17:11 "...for it is the blood that makes atonement for the soul."

Num. 21:9 "So Moses made a bronze serpent, and put it on a pole; and so it was, if a serpent had bitten anyone, when he looked at the bronze serpent, he lived."

Deut. 21:22 "If a man has committed a sin deserving of death...and you hang him on a tree, his body shall not remain overnight on the tree...for he who is hanged is cursed of God."

Jud. 16:30 "...So the dead that he killed at his death were more than he had killed in his life." (see Brian's paper)

Ruth 4:6 "...You redeem my right of redemption for yourself, for I cannot redeem it."

2 Sam. 24:25 "And David built there an altar to the LORD, and offered burnt offerings and peace offerings. So the LORD heeded the prayers for the land, and the plague was withdrawn from Israel."

1 Ki. 18:38 "Then the fire of the LORD fell and consumed the burnt sacrifice, and the wood and the stones and the dust, and it licked up the water that was in the trench."

2 Ki. 5:13, 14 "...My father, if the prophet had told you to do something great, would you not have done it? How much more then, when he says to you, 'Wash, and be clean?'"

2 Chr. 4:1 "Moreover he made a bronze altar: twenty cubits was its length, twenty cubits its width, and ten cubits its height."

Ezra 6:20 "...And they slaughtered the Passover lambs for all the descendants of the captivity, for their brethren the priests, and for themselves."

Job 42:7, 8 "...My wrath is aroused against you and your two friends...take for yourselves seven bulls and seven rams, go to My servant Job, and offer up for yourselves a burnt offering; and My servant Job shall pray for you..."

Psalms 22:1 "My God, My God, why have You forsaken Me?"

Isaiah 53:5 "But He was wounded for our transgressions, He was bruised for our iniquities; the chastisement for our peace was upon Him, and by His stripes we are healed."

Dan. 9:24 "Seventy weeks are determined for your people and your holy city, to finish the transgression, to make an end of sins, to make reconciliation for iniquity, to bring in everlasting righteousness..."

Hos. 13:14 "I will ransom them from the power of the grave; I will redeem them from death..."

Jon. 1:17 "...And Jonah was in the belly of the fish three days and three nights."

Zech. 13:7 "Awake, O sword, against My Shepherd, against the Man who is My Companion...Strike the Shepherd, and the sheep will be scattered..."

Mt. 26:28 "For this is My blood of the new covenant, which is shed for many for the remission of sins."

Mk. 10:45 "For even the Son of Man did not come to be served, but to serve, and to give His life a ransom for many."

Lu. 24:46 "Then He said to them, "Thus it is written, and thus it was necessary for the Christ to suffer and to rise from the dead the third day, and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in His name to all nations..."

Jn. 1:29 "...Behold! The Lamb of God who takes away the sin of the world!"

Acts 20:28 "...shepherd the church of God which He purchased with His own blood."

Rom. 3:24-26 "being justified freely by His grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, whom God set forth as a propitiation by His blood...that He might be just and the justifier of the one who has faith in Jesus."

1 Co. 2:2 "For I determined not to know anything among you except Jesus Christ and Him crucified."

2 Co. 5:14 "For the love of Christ compels us, because we judge thus: that if One died for all, then all died;"

Gal. 2:20 "I have been crucified with Christ; it is no longer I who live, but Christ lives in me; and the life which I now live in the flesh I live by faith in the Son of God, who loved me and gave Himself for me."

Eph. 1:7 "In Him we have redemption through His blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of His grace"

Phil. 2:8 "And being found in appearance as a man, He humbled Himself and became obedient to the point of death, even the death of the cross."

Col. 2:14, 15 "having wiped out the handwriting of requirements that was against us, which was contrary to us. And He has taken it out of the way, having nailed it to the cross. Having disarmed principalities and powers, He made a public spectacle of them, triumphing over them in it."

1 Th. 1:10 "and to wait for His Son from heaven, whom He raised from the dead, even Jesus who delivers us from the wrath to come."

1 Ti. 2:5 "For there is one God and one Mediator between God and men, the Man Christ Jesus, who gave Himself a ransom for all, to be testified in due time"

2 Ti. 2:14 "This is a faithful saying: For if we died with Him, we shall also live with Him."

Titus 2:14 "who gave Himself for us, that He might redeem us from every lawless deed and purify for Himself His own special people, zealous for good works."

Heb. 9:26-28 "...but now, once at the end of the ages, He has appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself. And as it is appointed for men to die once, but after this the judgment, so Christ was offered once to bear the sins of many..."

1 Pt. 1:18, 19 "knowing that you were not redeemed with corruptible things, like silver or gold, from your aimless conduct received by tradition from your fathers, but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot."

2 Pt. 1:9 "For he who lacks these things is shortsighted, even to blindness, and has forgotten that he was cleansed from his old sins."

1 Jn. 4:10 "In this is love, not that we loved God, but that He loved us and sent His Son to be the propitiation for our sins."

Rev. 5:9 "And they sang a new song, saying: You are worthy to take the scroll, and to open its seals; for You were slain, and have redeemed us to God by Your blood out of every tribe and kindred and people and nation..."

Hallelujah, what a Saviour! As we consider how His great work of Atonement has been viewed, we will go by the following outline:

I. The Orthodox View

II. Long-standing Objections and Older Divergent Views

III. Modern Views

Conclusions

I. The Orthodox View

With a number of major doctrines of Scripture, we can turn to church councils and benefit from the distillations of careful thought on that subject, but this is not so with the doctrine of the atonement. The church of Christ in its councils has never met and pronounced what the orthodox view is.

However it is accurate to say that there is still a recognition that what Protestant believers have consistently held to is what is often called the "Penal Substitutionary" doctrine of the Atonement (Berkhof, 373). This is also called the "Satisfaction" doctrine of the Atonement (ibid.). This view emphasizes that the atonement is "objective", that is, it has its primary effect on the one to whom it is made - God. The priests had a Godward ministry primarily. The sacrifices were to produce their effect on God. To propitiate, reconcile, pay a ransom price to release, all these

emphasize the Godward focus of atonement. The atonement is meant to do something to God, that is, to satisfy Him.

The orthodox view also emphasizes that the atonement is "vicarious", or "substitutionary". As such it involves the transfer of sin and guilt from the sinner to the "vicar", Christ, and a consequent bearing of the holy wrath and judgment of God in the place of the sinner.

Luther expresses it in this way, "[Christ] says to me, "You are no longer a sinner, but I am. I am your substitute. You have not sinned, but I have....All you sins are to rest on Me and not on you."...The Son of Man performs the basest and filthiest work. He does not don some beggar's torn garment or old trousers, nor does he wash us as a mother washes a child, but He bears our sin, death, and hell, our misery of body and soul." (Luther's Works, p. 167).

As the Philadelphia Confession of Faith states it, "This office [of Mediator and Surety] the Lord Jesus did most willingly undertake, which that he might discharge he was made under the law, and did perfectly fulfill it, and underwent the punishment due to us, which we should have borne and suffered, being made sin and a curse for us; enduring most grievous sorrows in his soul; and most painful sufferings in his body; was crucified, and died...The Lord Jesus, by his perfect obedience and sacrifice of himself, which he through the eternal Spirit once offered up unto God, hath fully satisfied the justice of God, procured reconciliation, and purchased an everlasting inheritance in the kingdom of heaven, for all those whom the Father hath given unto him. (P. C. of F., 23).

From the apostolic fathers, in the Epistle to Dognetus, chapter 9, comes the following ancient quote, "He himself took on him the burden of our iniquities, he gave his own Son, as a ransom for us, the holy One for the transgressors, the blameless One for the wicked, the righteous One for the unrighteous, the incorruptible One for the corruptible, the immortal One for them that are mortal. For what other thing was capable of covering our sins than his righteousness? By what other one was it possible that we, the wicked and ungodly, could be justified, than by the only Son of God? O sweet exchange! O unsearchable operation! O benefits surpassing all expectation! that the wickedness of many should be hid in a single righteous One, and that the righteousness of One should justify many transgressors!"

II. Long-standing Objections and Older Divergent Views

1. This kind of atonement was unnecessary, because "sin is not guilt" or because there is no obstacle to free forgiveness of sins. God is love. If we forgive without demanding payment, why wouldn't God?
2. It is incompatible with the character of God. As just, He would not punish the innocent for the guilty. As a God of love, he would not be so severe and relentless as to demand blood to appease His wrath. As Peter Abelard wrote, "How cruel and wicked it seems that anyone should demand the blood of an innocent person as the price for anything...still less that God

should consider the death of his Son so agreeable that by it he should be reconciled to the whole world." (Abelard, 283). As gracious, he would not demand payment before He can or will forgive.

3. It assumes an impossible transfer of guilt, punishment and wrath. It is unthinkable and illegal. It is "legal fiction".

4. Jesus never taught it.

5. It is immoral and injurious in its practical outworking. It will destroy incentives to holy living.

6. The finite sufferings of Christ cannot satisfy the infinite demands of the law.

Resultant alternative theories of the Atonement:

1. The Ransom-to-Satan Theory. Justin Martyr, Origen and several early Church Fathers held this. Origen states, "...Now it was to the devil who held us, to whom we had been sold by our sins. He demanded therefore as our price, the blood of Christ" (McDonald, p. 142). The devil thought he had won, but as Peter Lombard, in the 12th Century writes, "The cross was a mousetrap baited with the blood of Christ" (McDonald, p. 144). Satan agreed to release sinners in exchange for Christ, but then found that he couldn't hold on to Christ. He lost everything. Revived and adapted by Aulen in *Christus Victor (1930)* which emphasizes, as the title suggests, Christ's victory over Satan and his demonic hosts at the cross.

2. The Commercial Theory (Anselm's (1033-1109) Satisfaction Theory). According to Anselm in *Cur Deus Homo*, sin is robbing God of the honour due Him. In the performance of His duty to God, Christ rendered complete obedience to the law, thus honouring God. But he also suffered and died for the honour of God, something not required of an innocent man. Such zeal for God merited a reward. The reward took the form of forgiveness of sins and eternal bliss which could be passed on to sinners.

3. The Moral Influence Theory. (Also called the Love of God Theory.) Origen, Abelard and many others held this. Christ suffered in sympathy with us to reveal how much God loves us and to soften our hearts and persuade us to repent. As Abelard says, "...all this was done in order that he might show how great love he had for men, and so inflame them to greater love in return" (McDonald, p. 176). (A very popular concept in our day as well).

4. The Example Theory. (Also called the Martyr Theory.) This was a reaction against the Reformers' view of vicarious punishment. It was promulgated by the Socinians of the 16th Century, founders of the modern Unitarian movement. Christ's obedience in His life and death is an inspiration to us all to live as He did. (Shades of WWJD?) We need to reform our lives. Christ's reward for what He did is the power to grant eternal life to believers.

5. The Governmental Theory. This comes from Grotius (1583-1645) and several New England theologians. Although Christ did not suffer the exact judicial equivalent that our sins demanded, what He did was accepted by God as sufficient to set sinners free. Thus God could be gracious and yet still remind sinners of His displeasure with sin. He could declare that He was a moral governor of the universe. Christ's token sufferings and death demonstrate God's high regard for the law. Thiessen (p. 318) says that it is the Arminian view of the atonement and says that the Wesleyan soteriology requires this view. Jacobus Arminius claims that Christ's sufferings are "a substitute for a penalty" that God accepts in lieu of that penalty (McDonald, p. 201).

6. The Mystical Theory. (Also called the Theory of Gradually Extirpated Depravity.) This theory is put forward by Schleiermacher (professor of theology at the University of Berlin and called the "father of modern theology"), Edward Irving (regarded as the father of the Charismatic movement - 1792-1834). Christ, by the Holy Spirit kept His corrupt human nature from manifesting sin and gradually purified this sinful nature until at death all that was sinful in it was eradicated. We can mystically share in that salvation. Christ's activity is meant to influence and inspire us.

7. The Accident Theory. This is held by extreme rationalists. Jesus was a man, subject to death. His methods and principles were opposed by the powerful of his day. They killed Him. It had no further, deeper significance.

The 19th Century Debate in the United States:

The three men who dominated the scene were: Charles Hodge at Princeton Seminary, Nathaniel Taylor at Yale College, Horace Bushnell, pastor of North Congregational Church, Hartford, Connecticut.

Hodge's view - the orthodox view - penal theory

Taylor's view - the atonement was the ground on which God could forgive sins - the cross was "the occasion when God showed His general displeasure about sin. Having done so and thereby sustained His own moral government of the world, God had secured for Himself as it were a free hand to forgive all or any without requiring of them a strict equivalent of punishment in Christ for sins committed." (Wells, 251). (Shades of Hugo Grotius and the Governmental Theory!)

Bushnell's view - like Taylor, he sees the atonement as God's way of forgiving while keeping His moral government of the world intact. But he goes further and emphasizes that the atonement is important for the effect it has on people. He sees it as persuading men of God's love and actually ends up with a cross between the Governmental Theory and Abelard's Moral Influence Theory.

In 1899, James Orr noted that there was a growing move away from the emphasis on justice when considering the atonement. He states that the tendency was "to give a spiritual interpretation to the great fact that lies at the heart of our Redemption, not necessarily to deny its judicial aspect...but to remove from it the hard, legal aspect." (*The Christian View of God and the World*, p. 296). Hughes, who quotes him, and who is writing in 1949, goes on to comment, "The trend thus noticed has proceeded far since the above words were written, so far that the judicial aspect has been almost wholly eliminated. Its basal principle has been changed from justice to love, whilst the view of God on which it rests is that of Father, rather than Judge or Moral Governor." (Hughes, xiii.)

III. Modern Views of the Atonement

Three "modern" objections to the orthodox view:

1. It glorifies and encourages human suffering. This is particularly stressed by feminists, who say that women are told to accept and submit to abuse and suffering, because Jesus did.

Hear their accusation. "Christianity has been a primary--in many women's lives the primary--force in shaping our acceptance of abuse. The central image of Christ on the cross as the savior of the world communicates the message that suffering is redemptive. If the best person who ever lived gave his life for others, then, to be of value we should likewise sacrifice ourselves. Any sense that we have a right to care for our own needs is in conflict with being a faithful follower of Jesus." (Brown & Parker, p. 2).

Their complaint is that the cross of Christ teaches us that victims are to passively endure their victimization.

2. It portrays God as abusive and vindictive. (Nothing new.)

3. It (vicarious punishment) makes no moral sense. That the innocent should be treated as guilty and that the guilty should go free is an unthinkable suggestion.

Several "Modern" Views:

Girard and the Scapegoat Myth (1980's):

Girard's forte is secular literary criticism, but he has brought his "expertise" to bear on the question of the atonement, and how to make it palatable to modern minds. Humankind has followed a predictable pattern throughout the ages of imitation and rivalry. We see someone with a beautiful house, we want one too, and a better one. Or we try to take it away from them. Competition and rivalry lead to violence. However, in order for societies to survive, we have devised a way to cope without destroying one another completely. When conflict becomes too intense, we find a scapegoat among us. We find someone or a group of

someones to target and blame all of our problems on. We persecute them and thus let off the pent up emotions within us. The Germans had the Jews, the States have used the coloured people, Pat Buchanan blames unemployment problems on the homosexuals. When Jesus came, he became the scapegoat for the Jewish religious leaders and the Roman rulers. He's the problem. He's the troublemaker. Get rid of Him and our problems will be gone. But, the glory of the gospel, is the scapegoat is proclaimed as being innocent! And as the gospel story is told, people start to realize that the other scapegoats of the world are also innocent of what we have leveled at them. And then "the myth of scape-goating" will be exposed and destroyed. We will learn that forgiveness is far better and thus escape the cycle of violence.

Jon Levenson: The sacrifice of the beloved son

A Jewish scholar, Levenson compares the sacrifice of Christ by the Father to that of Isaac by Abraham or the sacrifice (dedication) of the firstborn to God in the O.T. He also ties this in with Israel, God's firstborn, whose chosenness involves suffering. He notes how chosen, favoured ones often have to endure humiliation and become the servants of others (cf. Jacob and Joseph). So, whether we look to the O.T. or to Jesus' death and resurrection, the message is the same. We are called to give God everything, be ready to serve, to reconcile with alienated brothers and sisters, to think again about what it means to be God's chosen ones. (Placher, 10-12).

B. F. Westcott:

"No support remains for the idea that Christ offered in his sufferings, sufferings equivalent in amount to the sufferings due from the race of men or from the elect: no support for the idea that he suffered as a substitute for each man or for each believer, discharging individually the penal consequences of their actions." (Westcott, *The Victory of the Cross*, 78-79).

Through Christ's union with our humanity and because of his learned obedience unto death, He shows us that He can sympathize with us and purify us. It is an inspiration to faith.

Paul Tillich:

Tillich starts with the assumption that all theological language is symbolic. "Saviour", "Mediator", and "Redeemer" are the symbols which convey something to us about Christ. Atonement is God's active "participation in the suffering of existential estrangement" (McDonald, 309). How enlightening! Tillich's theology (or lack thereof) stands as a warning to us to beware of those who try to empty biblical language of real meaning and describe such language as symbolic or metaphorical. This is not to deny that God's word contains both symbolic language and metaphors. But Tillich clearly goes too far. For him, "the cross is a symbol of Christ's subjection to the actualities of existence." (McDonald, 308).

James Dunn:

James Dunn's *The Theology of Paul the Apostle*, (1998) is reviewed by Richard Gaffin (WTJ - spring 2000). Dunn states, "Paul uses a rich and varied range of metaphors in his attempt to spell out the significance of Christ's death...As with all metaphors, the metaphor is not the thing itself but a means of expressing its meaning." Dunn then tells us that it would be "unwise" to treat metaphors as in any respect literal, "as though, for example, Christ's death were literally a sacrifice provided by God..." Dunn has a particular problem with "sacrifice", since it is "a difficult metaphor for contemporary commentators...one of the most repellent features of Paul's (and early Christian) theology for modern readers...generally abhorrent to post-Enlightenment culture, something to be consigned to a more primitive and cruder period of conceptualization of divine-human relationships." His solution to this is as follows, "As the debate about myth and demythologization has demonstrated, the outdated metaphor has to be remetaphored rather than simply discarded if the potency of its message for Paul and the first Christians is not to be lost." (Dunn, 231-233). (We look in vain for Dunn to "remetaphor" sacrifice.)

Dunn's work also reflects the ongoing movement to see the cross as primarily dealing with the power of sin, as opposed to the guilt of sin. The cross is "the ultimate royal victory...the liberating victory of the one true God...over all the enslaving powers that have usurped his authority." "For this reason I suggest that we give priority - a priority among equals, perhaps, but still a priority - to those Pauline expressions of the crucifixion of Jesus which describes it as the decisive victory over the 'principalities and powers'." (Dunn, 47). Aulen's *Christus Victor* seems to be his model here.

According to Gaffin, Dunn also, like many in our day, steers clear of stating that Jesus is our substitute who in our stead bears the guilt of our sin, thus satisfying the demands of God's own justice and holiness. The notion of "imputation" is rejected. Christ is our "representative" (Dunn, 93), but this is not the same as Christ being our "substitute" in Dunn's thought.

Vernon White: *Atonement and Incarnation: An Essay in Universalism and Particularity*, 1991.

In seeking to answer the question of how a single event so long ago in a particular location in our vast world holds universal significance, White asserts, "...unless and until God himself has experienced suffering, death and the temptation to sin, and overcome them, as a human individual, he has no moral authority to overcome them in and with the rest of humanity" (White, 39). This is clearly a restatement of the old Moral Influence Theory. (See Carson's comments in *The Gagging of God*, p. 327, 328).

Gustavo Gutierrez: Liberation Theology

This position has its chief advocates in Latin America and finds expression in such books as *Jesus Christ Liberator* (1980) by Leonardo Boff. Here is a statement of their general position. "The supreme significance of Jesus is that of proclaimer and inspirer of all efforts and ways for

the liberation of all classes and peoples from the exploitation of whatever form - social, political, or national - that robs them of their human dignity and denies them their just rights as equals in the human family." (McDonald, 338). Liberation Theology is concerned almost exclusively with the social nature of sin and salvation. Social justice and the liberation of the poor is paramount. The kingdom of God can and must be established now and by human endeavor.

Where does the cross fit into the picture? Perhaps as a picture of one who gave His life for the cause of the kingdom, but it is certainly not to be understood in terms of substitutionary suffering for guilty sinners.

Conclusion:

1. Here is where you will find my "loose ends" that need tying up. Perhaps in discussion we can consider various responses we might offer to the objections that are sometimes raised against the orthodox view. This is something I did not have time to do.
2. As we have surveyed various views of the atonement, what becomes evident is that many of them have an element of truth in what they say. Frequently, the error involved is in making this element the whole picture, or the dominant note of the atonement. Also, it is often what they fail to include, or even downright deny in their theory of the atonement that constitutes its distortion. That the centre of the gospel is "Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures" must never be relinquished. Without this, the gospel is no longer "good news". Without this, it is no longer "the power of God unto salvation for everyone who believes" (Romans 1:16).
3. In our presentation of the atonement, we must not neglect those elements that are not at the centre of a "penal substitutionary" presentation. We do need to emphasize that we died "with Christ" as well as He died "for us". Christ did gain the victory through his death over all the hosts of darkness. The cross does exert a "moral influence", but the Scriptures portray it as an influence on those who have already come to trust in the Saviour. The love of Christ constrains believers. There is liberation in Christ, but the freedom purchased at the cross is spiritual. Even a slave is Christ's freedman! And there are social implications flowing from the cross. Every true believer will seek to "visit orphans and widows in their trouble" (James 1:27) and help those who are "naked and destitute of daily food" (James 2:15).
4. We must not only have clear views of the atonement, but we must be sure that we ourselves have turned from sin to trust only in the Saviour, Jesus Christ, who there accomplished the greatest deliverance imaginable. Then we must preach Christ, and Him crucified. We must clearly portray Him before sinners as crucified. (Gal. 3:1). We must show our people all of the rich blessings of grace purchased for us there on the cross. All because of Calvary, Christ is made unto us wisdom and righteousness and sanctification and redemption! (1 Cor. 1:30).

Finally, may our prayer to God be that He might help us more and more to comprehend the love of Christ which passes knowledge, even as the following Puritan prayer so powerfully expresses it:

Love Lustres at Calvary

My Father,

Enlarge my heart, warm my affections, open my lips,

supply words that proclaim 'Love lustres at Calvary.'

There grace removes my burdens and heaps them on thy Son,

made a transgressor, a curse, and sin for me;

There the sword of thy justice smote the man, thy fellow;

There thy infinite attributes were magnified,

and infinite atonement was made;

There infinite punishment was endured.

Christ was all anguish that I might be all joy,

cast off that I might be brought in,

trodden down as an enemy

that I might be welcomed as a friend,

surrendered to hell's worst

that I might attain heaven's best,

stripped that I might be clothed,

wounded that I might be healed,

athirst that I might drink,

tormented that I might be comforted,

made a shame that I might inherit glory,

entered darkness that I might have eternal light.

My Saviour wept that all tears might be wiped from my eyes,

groaned that I might have endless song,

endured all pain that I might have a glory-diadem,

bowed his head that I might uplift mine,

experienced reproach that I might receive welcome,

closed his eyes in death that I might gaze on unclouded brightness,

expired that I might forever live.

O Father, who spared not thine only Son that thou mightest spare me,

All this transfer thy love designed and accomplished;

Help me to adore thee by lips and life.

O that my every breath might be ecstatic praise,

my every step buoyant with delight, as I see

my enemies crushed,

Satan baffled, defeated, destroyed,

sin buried in the ocean of reconciling blood,

hell's gates closed, heaven's portal open.

Go forth, O conquering God, and show me the cross,

mighty to subdue, comfort and save.

(The Valley of Vision, 42, 43)

Bibliography

- Bennett, Arthur, Editor. The Valley of Vision. Carlisle: The Banner of Truth Trust, 1975.
- Berkhof, L. Systematic Theology. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1939.
- Carson, D. A. The Gagging of God - Christianity Confronts Pluralism. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1996.
- Gaffin, Richard. "Paul the Theologian - a Review Article". (Includes a review of James Dunn's The Theology of the Apostle Paul. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998. This review is to appear in the Spring 2000 issue of the Westminster Theological Journal).
- Hughes, Thomas. The Atonement - Modern Theories of the Doctrine. London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd., 1949.
- McDonald, H. D. The Atonement of the Death of Christ. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1985.
- Morris, Leon. "Atonement". New Dictionary of Theology. Editors: Sinclair Ferguson, David Wright, J. I. Packer. Downers Grove: Inter-Varsity Press, 1988.
- Philadelphia Confession of Faith. Sterling: Grace Abounding Ministries, Inc., 1977.
- Placher, William. "Christ Takes Our Place - Rethinking Atonement". *Interpretation*. pp. 5-19.
- Thiessen, Henry. Lectures in Systematic Theology. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1949.
- Wells, David. "The Debate over the Atonement in 19th-Century America". (in four parts) *Bibliotheca Sacra*. January-March, 1987, pp. 123-143. April-June, 1987, pp. 243-253. July-September, 1987, 363-376. January-March, 1988, pp. 3-14.