

# THE CROSS OF CHRIST: SUBSTITUTION? DEMONSTRATION? OR BOTH?

Scott A. LeMert, Assistant to the President  
Paper Presented to the Oregon Conference Pastors  
January 8, 2008

Many Seventh-day Adventist members and congregations in the Oregon Conference now find themselves in turmoil over various theories of the atonement of the cross. The current issues are rooted in a centuries old debate that has raged within Christendom. They are also rooted in Adventism's 1888 crisis, the debate over the book Questions on Doctrine, and in more recent years has involved views set forth by people such as Robert Brinsmead, Desmond Ford, Don Short, Robert Wieland, Morris Venden, Graham Maxwell, and others.

Most propositional theological constructs usually have implications over other doctrinal opinions. With the Cross of Christ so central to the Christian faith, changes in how we view the cross will force changes in most other Christian teachings. The general overview of this paper will deal with the issues of the substitutionary role of Christ on the cross in contrast to what is often labeled as the moral influence theory. The paper will branch out into other areas of Adventist doctrine of which the author feels are impacted by the various proposals. The author of this paper will argue for the view that holds that the substitutionary blood of the Christ was a legal requirement for our salvation.

## A. Dominate Historic Theories of the Atonement:<sup>1</sup>

**The Ransom Theory:** The earliest of all, originating with the Early Church Fathers, this theory claims that Christ offered himself as a ransom (Mark 10:45). Where it was not clear was in its understanding of exactly to whom the ransom was paid. Many early church fathers viewed the ransom as paid to Satan.

**The Satisfaction (or Commercial) Theory:** The formulator of this theory was the medieval theologian Anselm of Canterbury (1034-1109), in his book, *Cur Deus Homo* (lit. *Why the God Man*). In his view, God's offended honor and dignity could only be satisfied by the sacrifice of the God-man, Jesus Christ. Anselm offered compelling biblical evidence that the atonement was not a ransom paid by God to the devil but rather a debt paid to God on behalf of sinners. Anselm's work established a foundation for the Protestant Reformation, specifically the understanding of justification by faith.

**The Penal-Substitution Theory:** This view was formulated by the 16th century Reformers as an extension of Anselm's satisfaction theory. Anselm's theory was correct in introducing the satisfaction aspect of Christ's work and its necessity, however the Reformers saw it as insufficient because it was referenced to God's honor rather than his justice and holiness and was couched more in terms of a commercial transaction than a penal substitution. This Reformed view says simply that Christ died for man, in man's place, taking his sins and bearing them for him.

---

<sup>1</sup> The first section of this paper contains information, certain concepts, and phrases that have been borrowed from, *The Legal and Moral Aspects of Salvation*. Present Truth Magazine, vol. 26, art. 4.

The bearing of man's sins takes the punishment for them and sets the believer free from the penal demands of the law: The righteousness of the law and the holiness of God are satisfied by this substitution.

**The Moral-Example Theory (or Moral-Influence Theory):** Christ died to influence mankind toward moral improvement. This theory denies that Christ died to satisfy any principle of divine justice, but teaches instead that His death was designed to greatly impress mankind with a sense of God's love, resulting in softening their hearts and leading them to repentance. Thus, the Atonement is not directed towards God with the purpose of maintaining His justice, but towards man with the purpose of persuading him to right action. Formulated by Peter Abelard (1079-1142) partially in reaction against Anselm's *Satisfaction theory*, this view was held by the 16th century Socinians.

**The Governmental Theory:** God made Christ an example of suffering to exhibit to erring man that sin is displeasing to him. God's moral government of the world made it necessary for him to evince his wrath against sin in Christ. Christ died as a token of God's displeasure toward sin and it was accepted by God as sufficient; but actually God does not exact strict justice. This view was formulated by Hugo Grotius (1583-1645) and is subsequently found in Arminianism, Charles Finney, the New England Theology of Jonathan Edwards (the younger), and Methodism.

## **B. Our Adventist Debate is rooted in the Protestant Reformation:**

The Protestant Reformation was born out of the conviction that *justification* was a legal word and a forensic transaction. The Reformers did not devalue man's moral renewal, but they were careful not to include the moral change in justification itself. To be sure, justification opened the door to the new life in the Spirit and bore the fruit of transformation of character, but the *root* was not confused with the *fruit*. Pietism and Methodism did not wish to deny the Reformation based insights into the Pauline doctrine of justification, but wanted to plead for a vital heart religion as well as to protest against justification without personal holiness.

While in Luther and Calvin all the emphasis fell on the redemptive event that took place with Christ's death and resurrection, later under the influence of pietism, mysticism, and moralism, the emphasis shifted to the process of individual appropriation of the salvation given in Christ and to its mystical and moral effect in the life of believers. —Herman Ridderbos, *Paul, An Outline of His Theology*, p.14.

Today, the more liberal wing of the Christian movement has moved away from the concept of forensic justification as preached by the Reformers. Roman Catholic scholar Louis Bouyer (*The Spirit and Forms of Protestantism*, pp.186-197) sees Protestant revivalism as doing more than anything else to move Protestants away from the theology of the Reformation to a closer compatibility with Roman Catholicism.

Protestantism's more liberal theologians are typically well aware that they have drifted towards Rome in recent years. The paradox is that the more conservative wing of the church has also moved away from the Reformation doctrine, but in the main there is little awareness of the changes or the consequences. The fact is that the popular

evangelicalism of today does not really have a doctrine of justification. The modern evangelical thrust is generally based on the appeal to "Let Christ come into your heart." In this type of emphasis, salvation is not really based on God's righteousness historically revealed and transacted in the Christ event, but on the subjective religious experience called "Christ in the heart" — which can mean a lot of different things to a lot of different people.

Because we contend for the restoration of forensic justification to the primary place in soteriology, some will doubtless interpret this as an attempt to devalue the renewal of man. That too was Rome's argument against the Reformers, yet it was her fundamental error. The Protestant reformers held to the total depravity of the human soul. Rome advocated that the human being was just as capable of doing good works as it was evil. The modern sociological model of "I'm okay, you're okay", has also influenced the recent drift.

The strange irony that everybody ought to know is that the Reformers were the great destroyers of legalism in the church. They uprooted legalism by teaching a legal justification based on the legal doctrine of atonement. They proclaimed that Christ both fulfilled and satisfied the claims of God's law on our behalf. If sinners can be justified solely by faith in the satisfaction that Christ gave to the law, and if the life and blood of the Lord of glory are the price of their justification, then it is forever certain that they cannot be justified by anything done by them nor by anything done in them.

It can be demonstrated doctrinally and historically that the legal view of the atonement and justification kills legalism and is the only basis of moral renewal. On the other hand, the moral influence theory of the atonement and the moral renewal view of justification lead inevitably to legalism because they ground salvation on some phase of the human experience — whether that experience is said to be faith, new birth, new life in the Spirit, or the new obedience of the believer. "But this is really to rob the soul of the objective ground of righteousness and **confuses spiritual acceptance with spiritual attainments.**" (emphasis added) Griffith Thomas, *The Principles of Theology: An Introduction to the Thirty-nine Articles*, p.188.

The two aspects of salvation — the legal and the moral — must be maintained in soteriology as strenuously as we maintain the two natures of Christ in Christology. Both *distinction* and *harmony* must be upheld. True and original Protestantism affirmed both the **legal** and the **moral** aspects of salvation. It refused to subordinate the legal to the moral, but affirmed the *primacy* of the legal in three major areas.

1. In the matter of sin the primary problem was seen as *guilt* (legal) rather than *pollution* (moral).
2. In the nature of the atonement the primary work was *satisfaction* to the law (legal) and not just a *demonstration* to change man's idea about God (moral).
3. In the application of redemption justification (legal) must *precede* and be the foundation of sanctification (moral).

Salvation consists in a change in our standing before the law, which is called justification (legal), as well as a change in our state, which is called sanctification (moral).

## C. The Primacy of the Legal and the Matter of Assigning Sin

Sin must be viewed as guilt...

*“Now we know that what things soever the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law: that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may become **guilty before God.**” (Romans 3:19)*

...as well as pollution,

*“Man that is born of a woman is of few days, and full of trouble. He cometh forth like a flower, and is cut down: he fleeth also as a shadow, and continueth not. And dost thou open thine eyes upon such an one, and bringest me into judgment with thee? **Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? not one.**” (Job 14:1-4)*

*“The heart is **deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked:** who can know it?” (Jeremiah 17:9)*

*“For all of us have become like one who is unclean, And all our righteous deeds are like a filthy garment; And all of us wither like a leaf, And our iniquities, like the wind, take us away.” (Isaiah 64:6)*

In the theology of Romanism sin is thought of primarily in terms of pollution. Consequently, salvation is thought of primarily in terms of moral renewal. That which makes a sinner acceptable to God is said to be an inner transformation (*gratia infusa*) which removes the offense of inner pollution. Original Protestantism, however, being a revival of Pauline thought, saw sin primarily as guilt — man's indebtedness to the law.

The opponents of the Reformation saw sin primarily as a moral defect in man, but they had a shallow view of the utter ruin of man and how that moral defect permeates every part of his existence. The proponents of the Reformation saw sin primarily as man's guilt before the law, yet it was they who had such a profound view of man's moral condition that they held the doctrine of total depravity.

## D. The Doctrine of the Atonement Exalts the Love of God

There are two major aspects of the atonement. **(1)** There is the aspect of Christ's bearing our judicial punishment or penal satisfaction. This is often (and rightly) referred to as the *substitutionary* death of Jesus Christ. **(2)** Also, there is the aspect of the revelation of God's love to the darkened mind of sinful man.

When the second aspect alone is stressed (or even overshadows the first), we have what is known in theology as "**the moral influence theory** of the atonement." It goes along with the idea that sin is not a legal problem (guilt) but solely a moral problem (pollution). With a good deal of plausibility it argues that it was not God but man who changed in the Fall, and therefore salvation only consists in changing man. Man's heart needs reconciling to God, and in order to effect this change God must give man such a demonstration of His love that it will work the needed change of attitude in the sinner.

The cross is this revelation. In this theory salvation was not wrought out at the cross, but it is a subjective process wrought out in the heart of the sinner. When he repents and believes in God's love (which the cross enables him to do), he is declared right *because* he is now morally changed and is therefore in a right relationship with God.

We do not deny that there is a great moral influence factor in the atonement. After all, did not Paul say that the love of Christ, demonstrated in His dying "for all," constrained him to live for Christ.

*"For the love of Christ controls us, having concluded this, that one died for all, therefore all died; and He died for all, so that they who live might no longer live for themselves, but for Him who died and rose again on their behalf." (2 Corinthians 5:14-15)*

The error of the moral influence theory of atonement lies more in what it denies. To be specific:

- a) It denies the reality of the divine law, its sentence against sinners, and the wrath of God incurred because of sin.
- b) It fails to appreciate that the reconciliation in Christ's act of atonement was something which took place for us and in our interest while we were still God's enemies.

*"For if while we were enemies we were reconciled to God through the death of His Son, much more, having been reconciled, we shall be saved by His life." (Romans 5:10)*

*"For it was the {Father's} good pleasure for all the fullness to dwell in Him, and through Him to reconcile all things to Himself, having made peace through the blood of His cross; through Him, {I say,} whether things on earth or things in heaven. And although you were formerly alienated and hostile in mind, {engaged} in evil deeds, yet He has now reconciled you in His fleshly body through death, in order to present you before Him holy and blameless and beyond reproach-- (Colossians 1:19-22)*

This was therefore something which took place objective to us and was not a subjective process.

- c) It reduces the love of God to mere exhibitionism. If a man **jumped into the sea** and drowned just to prove his "love," he would be pronounced crazy. "Love" which is not based on some necessity is exhibitionism. If, on the other hand, a man jumped into a dangerous sea in order to save someone from drowning and lost his life in the process, we could appreciate this as genuine love. In like manner, the death of Christ was absolutely necessary for our salvation. Justice must be carried out. The honor of the law must be upheld. Only the One who is both Lawgiver and Offended Party could save us in this situation, *"and without shedding of blood there is no forgiveness."* (Heb. 9:22). The divine process of saving us was as necessary as the love God had toward us. But in the moral influence theory the process of atonement becomes practically irrelevant.

It is undoubtedly true that Paul, being a lawyer and judge, taught the legal doctrine of atonement. It is especially his way of interpreting the Christ event. The juridical nature of his gospel is clearly borne out by his frequent use of such words as *law, justification, judgment, judge, righteousness, wrath, condemnation, guilt*, etc. Further, he sees the atonement as a *propitiation*...

*"being justified as a gift by His grace through the redemption which is in Christ Jesus;whom God displayed publicly as a propitiation in His blood through faith. {This was} to demonstrate His righteousness, because in the forbearance of God He passed over the sins previously committed."* (Romans 3:24-25)

... as *reconciliation*...

*"For if while we were enemies we were reconciled to God through the death of His Son, much more, having been reconciled, we shall be saved by His life."* (Romans 5:10)

...and a *redemption*

*"being justified as a gift by His grace through the redemption which is in Christ Jesus."* (Romans.3:24)

*"Christ redeemed us from the curse of the Law, having become a curse for us-- for it is written, "CURSED IS EVERYONE WHO HANGS ON A TREE."* (Galatians 3:13)

Certainly Paul's epistles bear out that a moral transformation is made possible through, and springs from, the atonement, but the atonement itself is seen as a juridical and legal transaction between the Father and the Son. It did for us, in reverse, what Adam's Fall did for us.

Paul only negates law as a *method* of salvation, not as a valid demand of a righteous God.

*"Do we then nullify the Law through faith? May it never be! On the contrary, we establish the Law."* (Romans 3:31)

The Reformers thought of the atonement primarily in terms of *satisfaction* rather than *moral influence*. In this they followed on from Anselm rather than from Abelard. In the eleventh century Anselm had done some great work on the doctrine of the atonement. The Reformers were the first men since the apostles to concretely relate the atonement to the law of God. Says Dr. George Smeaton:

A further explanation of truth was reserved for the Reformation, by penetrating more deeply into the nature of the divine Law than was ever discovered by the great scholastic [Anselm]. What his theory wanted, indeed, was a full recognition of the claims of the divine law, and of the atonement as a satisfaction of these claims in all their breadth and extent. . . .

Previous theories wanted a full recognition of the claims of the divine law, and of

the atonement as a satisfaction of these claims in all their extent; and this became the element in which the theology of the Reformation moved, and by which all other truth was coloured. . . . Their main position, to which they were conducted by deeper views of the extent of the law, and of its unbending claims, was that Christ's satisfaction was perfectly identical with that which men should themselves have rendered; and in the atonement they read off the unalterable claims of the divine law —George Smeaton, *The Atonement According to Christ and His Apostles* (republished by Sovereign Grace Publishers, Grand Rapids, Michigan).

Anyone who takes the trouble to read these Reformers will know that they believed Christ's death was made necessary by God's law. They taught that the atonement was the *satisfaction* rendered to the divine law on our behalf. That which God's law required He provided for us in the doing and dying of Jesus Christ. His atonement fulfilled all that God's law requires of us, so that any person who believes in the blood of the cross is credited with all that Christ has done on his behalf and therefore stands as righteous in the eyes of the law. Faith in the atonement is not seen as a means of setting aside the demands of the law but as a method of meeting them. We come back to our premise that the *legal* aspect of redemption is the root and the *moral* aspect is the fruit. ***The legal is primary and always takes precedence over the moral.***

If anyone has the slightest doubt about the supremacy of the legal over the moral, let him consider how God dealt with Jesus Christ on the cross. As touching His moral condition, Christ was the righteousness of God. As touching His legal position, He was "numbered with the transgressors." Justice dealt with Him not according to what He was in Himself, but according to His standing in the eyes of the law. We might even say that when the sins of the world were imputed (legally reckoned) to Jesus Christ, He was treated according to His legal position and not according to His moral condition. The legal took precedence over the moral.

There is an eternity of comfort here for the believer. No man on earth is wholly without sin. There remains some depravity of nature in the best saints.

*"If we say that we have no sin, we are deceiving ourselves and the truth is not in us." (1 John 1:8)*

The man of God is often humbled and humiliated with a sense of his own sinfulness, but he is never cast down. He realizes that the righteousness of Christ is imputed (legally reckoned) as his, and in the eyes of the law he stands as righteous as Christ Himself. God does not deal with him on the basis of his state but on the basis of his *standing*. God does not behold iniquity in Jacob, for the new covenant promise declares, "In those days and at that time," declares the LORD, "search will be made for the iniquity of Israel, but there will be none". (Jer. 50:20).

What comfort and security, therefore, is found in the truth that the legal takes precedence over the moral! God does not deal with us on the basis of what we are in ourselves, but He treats us according to what we are in Jesus Christ.

If sin is primarily guilt before the law (legal) and if the atonement is a satisfaction to the law (legal), it follows that the legal aspect of salvation must take precedence over the

moral aspect. The biblical word *justification* is a juridical word relating to trial, judgment and law. It is the verdict of the Judge that the one tried stands righteous in the eyes of the law. The best Protestant scholars have always maintained that the verb *justify* means *to declare righteous* and not *to make righteous*. If *justify* is taken as a *making righteous* in the subjective sense, then it becomes confounded with sanctification.

Any doubts about the forensic meaning of *justification* should be put to rest when the *how* of justification is considered. In Romans 4 the apostle uses the word *logizomai* (impute, reckon, count) eleven times. Its meaning is transparently clear. The believer is credited with Christ's righteousness because Christ obeyed, even unto death, in the believer's place (Substitute) and in the believer's name (Representative).

Fellowship with God cannot be based on the experience of sanctification but on the imputation of Christ's meeting the claims of the law for us. We can never reach a point in sanctification where fellowship with God does not rest on forgiveness of sins.

Our fellowship with God is not founded upon our experience of sanctification but upon the oath of the covenant. The idea of covenant runs through the entire Scripture. Covenant is a legal word. It is a contract. Justification constitutes us "married" (legally) to Jesus Christ (Rom. 7:4).

## **E. The Results of Neglecting the Legal Aspects of Salvation**

Luther often said that if the article of justification is lost, all true Christian doctrine is lost at the same time. We will briefly draw attention to the consequences of neglecting the legal aspects of salvation.

**a) A Meaningless Cross:** First and foremost, the cross of Christ is emptied of real meaning. If Christ did not make satisfaction to the claims of the law on Calvary, then the cross becomes a senseless tragedy or some incomprehensible exhibitionism.

**b) Man, not Christ, is in the Spotlight:** When the legal aspects of redemption are neglected in favor of the moral renewal emphasis, man becomes the center instead of God. Instead of the New Testament's focal point being God's work in Christ, it becomes God's work in the human heart. Man and his experience inevitably take the spotlight. Man, and not God, becomes the center of religion.

**c) Salvation is Subjectively based on the Human Agent:** When the legal aspects of redemption are removed, the believer has no objective foundation for his salvation. The great acts of God which were done outside of the believer in Jesus Christ are no longer the object and anchor of faith. Then there is no salvation by substitution, representation and imputation. Salvation is reduced to a subjective process in man himself.

**d) Forgiven but never Declared Innocent:** The legal aspects of redemption are generally neglected in the interests of giving due honor to the reality of the believer's moral renewal. The believer no longer has assurance of salvation. The believer may have confidence in the Father's forgiveness, but then all rests on the sinner's ability to repent. In the substitutionary understanding of the cross, the sinner is declared



“innocent,” something moral influence theory cannot assure. To declare forgiven is one thing, but to declare innocent is entirely different.

**e) The Basis for the Protestant Reformation is Lost:** The drift away from, and in many cases the outright repudiation of, the legal aspects of redemption betrays the cause of true Protestantism. It is commonly thought that the Reformation, being a revolt against legalism, had no such vital interests in the legal aspects of redemption. Such is the superficial view that many have today of the issues at stake in Reformation theology. In fact, many think that they imitate the Reformers and demonstrate their antipathy to legalism by despising the legal aspects of our redemption.

## **F. Moral Influence Theories Inevitable Return to Legalism**

The moral influence theory of atonement leads inevitably to legalism. The idea of acceptance with God on the grounds of moral renewal is legalism. The concept that sin is primarily pollution (moral) and that salvation is effected merely by the process of purging away this pollution is legalism. This whole system proposes that it is the human agent who meets and satisfies the claims of justice by some personal experience (attainment) of his own.

On the other hand, the legal view of sin (guilt before the law), the legal view of Christ's atonement (satisfaction to the law), and the legal doctrine of justification (a setting right in the eyes of the law) kill legalism because they place our salvation wholly in what A another has done for us. Moral Influence advocates fail to see that *legal* is lawful, rightful and righteousness, whereas *legalism* is a perversion of the legal. Legalism is not legal but *illegal*.

Legalism is damnable not because it honors the law, but because it dishonors it! The legalist presumes that God's high and mighty demand of righteousness is going to be satisfied by the imperfect, broken obedience of a creature whose best actions are always defiled by the corrupt channel of human nature. The law, being no respecter of persons (for even Christ Himself had to suffer its penalty), will not accept any person who fails to render its due of perfect righteousness (see Rom. 2:13).

*“For {it is} not the hearers of the Law {who} are just before God, but the doers of the Law will be justified.” (Romans 2:13)*

It is perfectly biblical to preach that the law is abolished for the believer as a means of salvation, but it is sheer antinomian heresy to say that it is done away with as a rule of life.

How can the law effectively point out sin and lead to Christ (second use) if the law is not presented and accepted as a valid rule of life (third use)? It is only the person who comes to grips with the law's radical demand, knowing that he should keep it and *wanting* to keep it, who will be struck down by the law with a sense of sin and utter helplessness. If God does not seriously intend men to keep His law, how can it effectively point out sin?

Since only that which is in Christ can stand in the judgment of God, it follows that everything which is outside of Christ must be disapproved. The nature of all men is the

same. Jesus did not take the nature of some men and redeem that, but he took the nature common to all men and redeemed that.

We must say that in Jesus Christ human nature has been set free as surely as Christ has been set free from the grave. In Christ human nature is not only free from depravity, but having fulfilled and satisfied the law by life and death, it is free from all debt to the law (Rom. 7:4, etc.). The human nature which is in Christ is free to give everything to God which God requires and free to receive everything from God which God promises. All that happened to humanity in Adam has been more than reversed by what has taken place in Jesus Christ.

### **G. Ellen White and the Penal Substitution of Christ's Blood as seen in, The Desire of Ages**

(Note: The content is presented here without comment, however, key phrases and words pertinent to this topic have been highlighted for the purpose of quick reference.)

As the **substitute and surety for sinful man, Christ was suffering under divine justice**. He saw what justice meant. Hitherto He had been as an intercessor for others; now He longed to have an intercessor for Himself. {DA 686.4}

The sins of men weighed heavily upon Christ, and **the sense of God's wrath against sin was crushing out His life. Behold Him contemplating the price to be paid for the human soul.** {DA 687.1}

The fate of humanity trembled in the balance. Christ might even now refuse to drink the cup apportioned to guilty man. It was not yet too late. He might wipe the bloody sweat from His brow, and leave man to perish in his iniquity. **He might say, Let the transgressor receive the penalty of his sin, and I will go back to My Father.** Will the Son of God drink the bitter cup of humiliation and agony? **Will the innocent suffer the consequences of the curse of sin, to save the guilty?** The words fall tremblingly from the pale lips of Jesus, "O My Father, if this cup may not pass away from Me, except I drink it, Thy will be done." {DA 690.2}

He had borne that which no human being could ever bear; for **He had tasted the sufferings of death for every man.** {DA 694.1}

And now the Lord of glory was dying, **a ransom for the race**. In yielding up His precious life, Christ was not upheld by triumphant joy. All was oppressive gloom. **It was not the dread of death that weighed upon Him. It was not the pain and ignominy of the cross that caused His inexpressible agony.** Christ was the prince of sufferers; but His suffering was from a sense of the malignity of sin, a knowledge that through familiarity with evil, man had become blinded to its enormity. Christ saw how deep is the hold of sin upon the human heart, how few would be willing to break from its power. He knew that without help from God, humanity must perish, and He saw multitudes perishing within reach of abundant help. {DA 752.4}

**Upon Christ as our substitute and surety was laid the iniquity of us all.** He was counted a transgressor, that He might redeem us from the condemnation of the law. The guilt of every descendant of Adam was pressing upon His heart. **The wrath of God against sin, the terrible manifestation of His displeasure because of iniquity, filled**

**the soul of His Son with consternation.** All His life Christ had been publishing to a fallen world the good news of the Father's mercy and pardoning love. Salvation for the chief of sinners was His theme. But now with the terrible weight of guilt He bears, He cannot see the Father's reconciling face. The withdrawal of the divine countenance from the Saviour in this hour of supreme anguish pierced His heart with a sorrow that can never be fully understood by man. So great was this agony that His physical pain was hardly felt. {DA 753.1}

Satan with his fierce temptations wrung the heart of Jesus. The Saviour could not see through the portals of the tomb. Hope did not present to Him His coming forth from the grave a conqueror, or tell Him of the Father's acceptance of the sacrifice. He feared that sin was so offensive to God that Their separation was to be eternal. Christ felt the anguish which the sinner will feel when mercy shall no longer plead for the guilty race. It was **the sense of sin, bringing the Father's wrath upon Him as man's substitute, that made the cup He drank so bitter, and broke the heart of the Son of God.** {DA 753.2}

In the opening of the great controversy, **Satan had declared that the law of God could not be obeyed, that justice was inconsistent with mercy,** and that, should the law be broken, it would be impossible for the sinner to be pardoned. Every sin must meet its punishment, urged Satan; and if God should remit the punishment of sin, He would not be a God of truth and justice. When men broke the law of God, and defied His will, Satan exulted. It was proved, he declared, that the law could not be obeyed; man could not be forgiven. Because he, after his rebellion, had been banished from heaven, Satan claimed that the human race must be forever shut out from God's favor. God could not be just, he urged, and yet show mercy to the sinner. {DA 761.4}

**God did not change His law, but He sacrificed Himself,** in Christ, for man's redemption. "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself." 2 Cor. 5:19. {DA 762.1}

God's love has been expressed in His justice no less than in His mercy. **Justice is the foundation of His throne, and the fruit of His love.** It had been Satan's purpose to divorce mercy from truth and justice. He sought to prove that the righteousness of God's law is an enemy to peace. But Christ shows that in God's plan they are indissolubly joined together; the one cannot exist without the other. "Mercy and truth are met together; righteousness and peace have kissed each other." Ps. 85:10. {DA 762.3}

**By His life and His death, Christ proved that God's justice did not destroy His mercy,** but that sin could be forgiven, and that the law is righteous, and can be perfectly obeyed. Satan's charges were refuted. God had given man unmistakable evidence of His love. {DA 762.4}

Another deception was now to be brought forward. Satan declared that mercy destroyed justice, that the death of Christ abrogated the Father's law. Had it been possible for the law to be changed or abrogated, then Christ need not have died. But to abrogate the law would be to immortalize transgression, and place the world under Satan's control. It was because the law was changeless, because man could be saved only through obedience to its precepts, that Jesus was lifted up on the cross. **Yet the very means by which Christ established the law Satan represented as destroying it. Here will come the last conflict of the great controversy between Christ and Satan.** {DA 762.5}

## H. THE FINAL JUDGMENT: IS IT BASED ON WORKS OR CHRIST?

### a. Jesus and Nicodemus:

*“For God so loved the world, that He gave His only begotten Son, that whoever believes in Him should not perish, but have eternal life.” (John 3:16)*

*“He who believes in Him is not judged; he who does not believe has been judged already, because he has not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God.” (John 3:18)*

*“He who believes in the Son has eternal life; but he who does not obey the Son will not see life, but the wrath of God abides on him.” (John 3:36)*

### b. Jesus, the Jews and John 5:

*“For not even the Father judges any one, but He has given all judgment to the Son.” (John 5:22)*

*“Truly, truly, I say to you, he who hears My word, and believes Him who sent Me, has eternal life, and does not come into judgment, but has passed out of death into life.” (John 5:24)*

### c. Does this conflict with Paul’s statements?

*“For we shall all stand before the judgment seat of God.” (Romans 14:10) And, “For we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ, so that each one may be recompensed for his deeds in the body, according to what he has done, whether good or bad. (2 Cor 5:10)*

### d. The witness of Daniel seven:

The fourth beast (Rome) put Christ on the cross and became the great persecutor of God’s people. This beast is seen going through various changes over time. Nonetheless, it reigns in one form or another until (vs. 22) the time of the heavenly judgment when the Ancient of Days gives possession of the earth back to His people

*“I kept looking until thrones were set up, and the Ancient of Days took His seat; His vesture was like white snow, and the hair of His head like pure wool. His throne was ablaze with flames, its wheels were a burning fire.” (Daniel 7:9)*

*“A river of fire was flowing and coming out from before Him; Thousands upon thousands were attending Him, and myriads upon myriads were standing before Him; The court sat, and the books were opened.” (Daniel 7:10)*

Meanwhile our attention is diverted back to earth where in verses 11 and 12 we read that this end-time heavenly judgment scene takes place **while** the fourth beast is continuing the work of persecution. This reign of tyranny began under the Old Roman Empire and continued through a new system of religious and civil governance. After a momentary glance down to the earth, Daniel now returns our attention back to the heavenly courtroom.

*"I kept looking in the night visions, and behold, with the clouds of heaven One like a Son of Man was coming and He came up to the Ancient of Days and was presented before Him. And to Him was given dominion, glory and a kingdom, that all the peoples, nations, and men of every language might serve Him. His dominion is an everlasting dominion which will not pass away; and His kingdom is one which will not be destroyed." (Daniel 7:13-14)*

The Ancient of Days proclaims a verdict; justice will be carried out.

*"And judgment was passed in favor of the saints of the Highest One, and the time arrived when the saints took possession of the kingdom." (Daniel 7:22)*

*"God will judge the secrets of men through Jesus Christ." (Rom. 2:16)  
"This is the One who has been appointed by God as Judge of the living and the dead." (Acts 10:42)*

**e. God the Father and Jesus Christ are together with the same mind in the judgment of the righteous.**

*"My little children, I am writing these things to you that you may not sin. And if anyone sins, we have an Advocate with (the Greek reads, 'in addition to') the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous." (1 John 2:1)*

*"Now all these things are from God, who reconciled us to Himself through Christ, and gave us the ministry of reconciliation, namely, that God was in Christ reconciling the world to Himself, not counting their trespasses against them, and He has committed to us the word of reconciliation." (2 Corinthians 5:18-19)*

**f. The Opening of the Book of Life is Based Only of the Blood of the Lamb.**

*"Rejoice that your names are recorded in heaven." (Luke 10:20)*

*"He who overcomes shall thus be clothed in white garments; and I will not erase his name from the book of life, and I will confess his name before My Father, and before His angels." (Revelation 3:5)*

*"And one of the elders said to me, 'Stop weeping; behold, the Lion that is from the tribe of Judah, the Root of David, has overcome so as to open the book and its seven seals.'" (Rev 5:5)*

*"And they sang a new song, saying, 'Worthy are You to take the book and to break its seals; for You were slain, and purchased for God with Your blood {men} from every tribe and tongue and people and nation.'" (Rev 5:9)*

**g. The Glory of the Lamb's Book of Life is proclaimed while Revelation still anticipates a final Judgment:**

*“How long, O Lord, holy and true, wilt Thou refrain from judging and avenging our blood on those who dwell on the earth?” They were told to, “rest for a little while longer.” (Revelation 6:10,11)*

*“And I saw another angel flying in midheaven, having an eternal gospel to preach to those who live on the earth, and to every nation and tribe and tongue and people; and he said with a loud voice, ‘Fear God and give Him glory, because the hour of His judgment has come.’” (Revelation 14:6-7)*

*“And I saw heaven opened; and behold, a white horse, and He who sat upon it is called Faithful and True; and in righteousness He judges and wages war.” (Revelation 19:11)*

In Revelation 20, the great judgment is carried out.

*“The rest of the dead did not come to life until the thousand years were completed. This is (or was) the first resurrection. Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection; over these the second death has no power (or authority).” (Revelation 20:5-6)*

*“And I saw the dead, the great and the small, standing before the throne, and books were opened; and another book was opened, which is the book of life; and the dead were judged from the things which were written in the books, according to their deeds.” (Revelation 20:12)*

*“And if anyone's name was not found written in the book of life, he was thrown into the lake of fire.” (Rev 20:15)*

The first judgment which occurs prior to the second coming and the second judgment which occurs at the end of the millennium and is seen in Revelation 20, are but two phases of the same. It is the same setting, same throne, same books, but with one major difference. In the first Christ stands before the Father in place of His people; and the second is a judgment based on the works of those who have rejected the blood of the Lamb. Without the blood of the Lamb in their defense, they are now destroyed in the second death.

Jesus had foretold of two resurrections in John 5,...

*“Do not marvel at this; for an hour is coming, in which all who are in the tombs shall hear His voice, and shall come forth; those who did the good deeds, to a resurrection of life, those who committed the evil deeds to a resurrection of judgment.” (John 5:28-29)*

*“The Father loves the Son, and has given all things into His hand. **He who believes in the Son has eternal life; but he who does not obey the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abides on Him.**” (John 5:35-36)*

## **I. Issues of Human Works in the Judgment: Ellen White Responds to the 1888 Christ Our Righteousness Debate.**

*All Statements are from the MS - 36 - 1890*

“The danger has been presented to me again and again of entertaining, as a people, false ideas of justification by faith... Let the subject be made distinct and plain that it is not possible to effect anything in our standing before God or in the gift of God to us through creature merit... all must be laid upon the fire of Christ's righteousness to cleanse it from its earthly odor before it rises in a cloud of fragrant incense to the great Jehovah and is accepted as a sweet savor... If you would gather together everything that is good and holy and noble and lovely in man, and then present the subject to the angels of God as acting a part in the salvation of the human soul or in merit, the proposition would be rejected as treason.”

“The idea of doing anything to merit the grace of pardon is fallacy from beginning to end... Men are educated to think that if a man repents he shall be pardoned, supposing that repentance is the way, the door, into heaven; that there is a certain assured value in repentance to buy for him forgiveness. Can man repent of himself? No more than he can pardon himself... Impossible!”

“There is danger in regarding justification by faith as placing merit on faith. When you take the righteousness of Christ as a free gift you are justified freely through the redemption of Christ... They need to see by faith the righteousness of Christ as their only hope for time and for eternity... Eternal life is an infinite gift. This places it outside the possibility of our earning it, because it is infinite. It must necessarily be a gift. As a gift it must be received by faith, and gratitude and praise be offered to God.”

“Let this point be fully settled in every mind: If we accept Christ as a Redeemer, we must accept Him as a Ruler... The will must be brought into complete harmony with the will of God... The light from heaven is welcomed, as light filling all the chambers of the soul. This is making melody to God... Draw nigh to God, and God will draw nigh to you. This means to be much with the Lord in prayer.”

“Angels ascribe honor and glory to Christ, for even they are not secure except by looking to the sufferings of the Son of God. It is through the efficacy of the cross that the angels of heaven are guarded from apostasy. Without the cross they would be no more secure against evil than were the angels before the fall of Satan. Angelic perfection failed in heaven. Human perfection failed in Eden, the paradise of bliss. All who wish for security in earth or heaven must look to the Lamb of God.

## **J. The Biblical Record**

The substitutionary role of blood atonement is first rooted in the Passover.

*“The blood shall be a sign for you on the houses where you live; and when I see the blood I will pass over you, and no plague will befall you to destroy {you} when I strike the land of Egypt.” (Ex 12:13)*

In the Passover there is both salvation from the bondage from the Egyptians and the judgment of God. There was no basis of righteousness on the part of the Israelites whereby God could select them over the Egyptians. Only the blood of the lamb on the door post granted that God could be just in taking one people and destroying another.

*“On the first day of Unleavened Bread, when the Passover {lamb} was being sacrificed, His disciples \*said to Him, ‘Where do You want us to go and prepare for You to eat the Passover?’” (Mark 14:12)*

*“While they were eating, He took {some} bread, and after a blessing He broke {it,} and gave {it} to them, and said, ‘Take {it;} this is My body.’ And when He had taken a cup {and} given thanks, He gave {it} to them, and they all drank from it. And He said to them, **“This is My blood of the covenant, which is poured out for many.”**” (Mark 14:22-24)*

Peter emphasizes the blood redemption model:

*“Knowing that you were not redeemed with perishable things like silver or gold from your futile way of life inherited from your forefathers, but with precious blood, as of a lamb unblemished and spotless, {the blood} of Christ. (1 Pet 1:18-19)*

*“And while being reviled, He did not revile in return; while suffering, He uttered no threats, but kept entrusting {Himself} to Him who judges righteously; and He Himself bore our sins in His body on the cross, so that we might die to sin and live to righteousness; for by His wounds you were healed.” (1 Pet 2:23-24)*

God associated the sacrificial blood as a sacred atonement, so much so that blood was not to be used in any other way.

*“For the life of the flesh is in the blood, and I have given it to you on the altar to make atonement for your souls; for it is the blood by reason of the life that makes atonement. Therefore I said to the sons of Israel, ‘No person among you may eat blood, nor may any alien who sojourns among you eat blood. So when any man from the sons of Israel, or from the aliens who sojourn among them, in hunting catches a beast or a bird which may be eaten, he shall pour out its blood and cover it with earth.” (Lev 17:11-13)*

Psalms 51 is often quoted by moral influence advocates (and was used by Rome in the Counsel of Trent) as showing that the only real sacrifice needed by God was that of our hearts, and that once God has our hearts, He can do the rest.

*‘Be gracious to me, O God, according to Your lovingkindness; according to the greatness of Your compassion blot out my transgressions. Wash me thoroughly from my iniquity And cleanse me from my sin. For I know my transgressions, And my sin is ever before me.*

*Against You, You only, I have sinned and done what is evil in Your sight, so that You are justified when You speak and blameless when You judge. Behold, I was brought forth in iniquity, and in sin my mother conceived me. Behold, You desire*



*truth in the innermost being, And in the hidden part You will make me know wisdom.*

*Purify me with hyssop, and I shall be clean; wash me, and I shall be whiter than snow. Make me to hear joy and gladness, let the bones which You have broken rejoice. Hide Your face from my sins And blot out all my iniquities. Create in me a clean heart, O God, and renew a steadfast spirit within me. Do not cast me away from Your presence And do not take Your Holy Spirit from me.*

*Restore to me the joy of Your salvation And sustain me with a willing spirit. {Then} I will teach transgressors Your ways, and sinners will be converted to You. Deliver me from bloodguiltiness, O God, the God of my salvation; {Then} my tongue will joyfully sing of Your righteousness. O Lord, open my lips, that my mouth may declare Your praise. For You do not delight in sacrifice, otherwise I would give it; You are not pleased with burnt offering. The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit; A broken and a contrite heart, O God, You will not despise.' (Psalms 51:1-17)*

The failure of the moral influence theory is not what it affirms, sanctification, but in what it denies, justification. Moral influence assumes that sanctification makes justification of no need. However, it is the opinion of this author (and others) that this superimposes upon scripture a construct that the Bible does not endorse. How else does one now read Isaiah 53:

*"Who has believed our message? And to whom has the arm of the LORD been revealed? For He grew up before Him like a tender shoot, and like a root out of parched ground; He has no {stately} form or majesty that we should look upon Him, Nor appearance that we should be attracted to Him.*

*He was despised and forsaken of men, a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief; and like one from whom men hide their face He was despised, and we did not esteem Him. Surely our griefs He Himself bore, and our sorrows He carried; yet we ourselves esteemed Him stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted. But He was pierced through for our transgressions, He was crushed for our iniquities; The chastening for our well-being {fell} upon Him, and by His scourging we are healed.*

*All of us like sheep have gone astray, each of us has turned to his own way; but the LORD has caused the iniquity of us all to fall on Him. He was oppressed and He was afflicted, yet He did not open His mouth; like a lamb that is led to slaughter, and like a sheep that is silent before its shearers, so He did not open His mouth.*

*By oppression and judgment He was taken away; and as for His generation, who considered that He was cut off out of the land of the living for the transgression of my people, to whom the stroke {was due?} His grave was assigned with wicked men, yet He was with a rich man in His death, because He had done no violence, nor was there any deceit in His mouth. But the LORD was pleased to crush Him, putting {Him} to grief; If He would render Himself {as} a guilt offering, He will see {His} offspring, He will prolong {His} days, And the good pleasure of the LORD will prosper in His hand.*

*As a result of the anguish of His soul, He will see {it and} be satisfied; by His knowledge the Righteous One, My Servant, will justify the many, as He will bear their iniquities. Therefore, I will allot Him a portion with the great, and He will divide the booty with the strong; because He poured out Himself to death, And was numbered with the transgressors; yet He Himself bore the sin of many, and interceded for the transgressors.* (Isaiah 53:1-12)

To understand the Cross, one must appreciate the nature of the cup that Christ drank in Gethsemane. The cup was described in Old Testament scripture; in reality, it was ours to drink.

*“For a cup is in the hand of the LORD, and the wine foams; It is well mixed, and He pours out of this; surely all the wicked of the earth must drain {and} drink down its dregs. (Ps 75.8)*

*“Rouse yourself! Rouse yourself! Arise, O Jerusalem, you who have drunk from the LORD'S hand the cup of His anger; the chalice of reeling you have drained to the dregs.” (Is 51:27)*

*“You will be filled with disgrace rather than honor. Now you yourself drink and expose your {own} nakedness. The cup in the LORD'S right hand will come around to you, and utter disgrace {will come} upon your glory.’ (Hab 2.16)*

*“They said to Him, ‘Grant that we may sit, one on Your right and one on {Your} left, in Your glory.’ But Jesus said to them, ‘You do not know what you are asking. Are you able to drink the cup that I drink, or to be baptized with the baptism with which I am baptized?’ They said to Him, ‘We are able.’ And Jesus said to them, ‘The cup that I drink you shall drink; and you shall be baptized with the baptism with which I am baptized.’” (Mark 10:37-39)*

Like their boasts in the upper room, the disciples failed to understand the gravity of the cup Christ was about to drink. They were eager to drink the cup so long as it brought earthly glory. They knew not the nature of the cup from which Christ would drink. They would soon watch Christ drink the cup.

*“And He \*said to them, “My soul is deeply grieved to the point of death; remain here and keep watch. And He went a little beyond {them,} and fell to the ground and {began} to pray that if it were possible, the hour might pass Him by. And He was saying, ‘Abba! Father! All things are possible for You; remove this cup from Me; yet not what I will, but what You will.’” (Mark 14:34-36)*

Ransom/substitution comments were to come from Christ's own mouth, such as the one in Matthew.

*“...just as the Son of Man did not come to be served, but to serve, and to give His life a ransom for many.” (Matt 20:28)*

Colossians 2 has been often misquoted by evangelical Protestants in their attempt to do away with the Sabbath by referring to the KJV “hand writing of ordinances that was against us” as being the Ten Commandments. Adventists has also missed the meaning

the text by saying that the text refers to the ceremonial law. Both interpretations fail to understand the Greek χείρογράφον τοις δογμασίβ. (These are the Greek words from which we get the English words graphics, grammar, document, dogmatic, etc.) When Paul wanted to refer to any type of Jewish law, he always used the appropriate words such as νόμος. However, when writing to the Colossians, Paul uses a new term from the Greek courts, a term now used in the Roman courts. It literally means, “the hand written document”. When a person was taken into a court and found guilty, the judge would take a “dogmasin” (document) and write on it four things: a) the criminals name, b) the offense, c) the punishment, d) the judges name. The dogmasin was then given to the court guards who took the person and document to the public square where the dogmasin was nailed to a designated post and the person tied to the same and the designated punishment was carried out. This is the key that unlocks the meaning of the text.

*“When you were dead in your transgressions and the uncircumcision of your flesh, He made you alive together with Him, having forgiven us all our transgressions, having canceled out the certificate of debt consisting of decrees against us, which was hostile to us; and He has taken it out of the way, having nailed it to the cross. When He had disarmed the rulers and authorities, He made a public display of them, having triumphed over them through Him. Therefore no one is to act as your judge in regard to food or drink or in respect to a festival or a new moon or a Sabbath day. (Col 2:13-16)*

The text now proclaims that we were dead in our sins, and what Christ took out of the way was the certificate of our sin debt. And He did it by taking our dogmasin and nailing to his own cross. The text now becomes a powerful passage in support of the substitutionary blood of the cross. It also supports the continued keeping of the Sabbath rather than its abolishment.

Wherever sin abounded, grace did much more abound; wherever God’s wrath abounded, God’s love much more abounded. One of the hardest passages for the moral influence people to deal with is Romans 3. A number of interesting postulates have been set forth, such as one suggesting that biblical justification is the same as when you align the margins on your computer, you justify them. It seems quite a jump of reason as to how someone could bring a new, modern term and retro-introduce it to the biblical writers who knew nothing of such a definition. Romans 3, was the bulwark of the Protestant Reformation. It is interesting that modern evangelicals now side with the Counsel of Trent on their understanding of this passage. It is simple: if we are not justified by the blood of Christ, then we are saved by our works, and both good and evil actions must come into judgment. This is the new legalism. Moral influence people have tried to do away with one type of legalism and introduced a new legalism.

*“Now we know that whatever the Law says, it speaks to those who are under the Law, so that every mouth may be closed and all the world may become accountable to God; because by the works of the Law no flesh will be justified in His sight; for through the Law {comes} the knowledge of sin. But now apart from the Law {the} righteousness of God has been manifested, being witnessed by the Law and the Prophets, even {the} righteousness of God through faith in Jesus Christ for all those who believe; for there is no distinction; for all have sinned and fall short of the glory of God, being justified as a gift by His grace through the redemption which is in Christ Jesus; whom God displayed publicly as a*

*propitiation in His blood through faith. {This was} to demonstrate His righteousness, because in the forbearance of God He passed over the sins previously committed; for the demonstration, {I say,} of His righteousness at the present time, so that He would be just and the justifier of the one who has faith in Jesus. (Rom 3:19-26)*

In Galatians 3, Paul brings forward Levitical law and outlines that we cannot be saved by the performance of any type of righteous activity. We are either saved by faith in the one who took our curse and nailed it to the tree, or we are saved by our works, and our works have to be perfect.

*“For as many as are of the works of the Law are under a curse; for it is written, ‘CURSED IS EVERYONE WHO DOES NOT ABIDE BY ALL THINGS WRITTEN IN THE BOOK OF THE LAW, TO PERFORM THEM.’ Now that no one is justified by the Law before God is evident; for, ‘THE RIGHTEOUS MAN SHALL LIVE BY FAITH.’ However, the Law is not of faith; on the contrary, ‘HE WHO PRACTICES THEM SHALL LIVE BY THEM.’ Christ redeemed us from the curse of the Law, having become a curse for us--for it is written, “CURSED IS EVERYONE WHO HANGS ON A TREE”. (Gal 3:10-13)*

One cannot escape Paul’s use of wording in Ephesians.

*“...and walk in love, just as Christ also loved you and gave Himself up for us, an offering and a sacrifice to God as a fragrant aroma. (Eph 5:2)*

## **K. Personal Conclusion by the Paper’s Author**

Few study quests in the years of my ministry have been more rewarding than that of this topic. I have appreciated the passion of the various writers who have voiced their opinions on this matter. This is an ages old study and will continue until the return of Christ. It is not my intent to judge the personal spiritual experience of those of whom in the end I choose to disagree. Some might argue that this paper did not give equal space to all viewpoints. It was not the intent of the paper to do so. In my personal study I spent countless hours reading and re-reading various materials and ideas set forth. I set upon this project with what I believe was an open mind giving each presented an unbiased hearing. This paper is more a presentation of my final verdict on this discussion rather than an exhaustive reprinting of the various viewpoints.

In the end, I have been drawn closer and ever closer to what I believe to be the substitutionary blood of Christ’s death for me on the cross. I have come to believe that those who say that this view presents an unloving God in the Bible in fact fail to understand that godly justice is not in any way an unloving act of God. I have come to believe that those who suggest that God cannot be the God of love and a God of wrath at the same time, are guilty of imposing upon God the fallen qualities of human wrath. I have come to believe that God’s wrath, as defined in scripture, is always motivated by His love. I do not find scripture teaching that the Father needed to see His Son’s blood and death to be motivated to forgive us. In fact, I find that all forms of such thinking to be lacking of biblical proof.

Often advocates of the various forms of moral influence theory state that they have the “broader view”, in that they emphasize more of the love of God. I have found their

arguments quite lacking in biblical proof. When I weighed the final evidence, I felt like I was left with less, not more, that it was in fact a more narrow view of the plan of salvation rather than a broader view. Perhaps my greatest worry is that those who advocate that Jesus did not have to die for legal reasons to save us, but only to show us that God loved us, are in fact getting dangerously close to adopting a mere historical Jesus. They are one step away from being where any type of messiah could show us God's love. If the mere act of forgiveness was all that was required to save us, they the Father could have been just in opening the Book of Life without the presence of the Lamb's blood. God could forgive us, but this would have never quieted the accusations of Satan. To him they were still guilty. I believe that the blood of the Lamb declared me more than forgiven; it declared me innocent, and thereby forever hushes Satan's complaint against me. Now, I am truly free.

For me, the final verdict is, "for God so love the world that He gave His only begotten Son", and that with His blood He did "purchase" for me my salvation and guaranteed my redemption. And for this, I will ever be compelled to bow my knee.

## L. BIBLIOGRAPHY

All biblical references are from the *New American Standard Bible*, La Habra, CA: Foundation Press Publications, 1973.

Berkouwer, G. C., *Faith and Justification*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1954.

Berkouwer, G. C., *Sin*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1971.

Golinger, Liam, *The Jesus Gospel*. London: Authentic, 2006.

Hill, Charles E., and James III, Frank A., editors, *The Glory of the Atonement*. Downers Grove, Ill.: IVP Academic, 2004.

Jennings, Timothy R., M.D., *Could It Be This Simple?*. Hagerstown, MD: Autumn House, 2007.

Maxwell, Graham, *Can God Be Trusted?* Redlands, CA: Pineknoll Publications, 1977.

Maxwell, Graham, *Servants or Friends? Another Look at God*. Redlands, CA: Pineknoll Publications, 1992.

Maxwell, Graham, taped interview with Jonathan Gallagher, *What's All This about the Moral Influence Theory*. Redlands, CA: Pineknoll Publications, 1997.

Maxwell, Graham, transcribed interview with Jonathan Gallagher, *Why Did Jesus Have to Die*. Redlands, CA: Pineknoll Publications, undated.

Piper, John, *Fifty Reasons Why Jesus Came to Die*. Wheaton, Ill: Crossway Books, 2006.

Jeffery, Steve; Ovey, Michael; Sach, Andrew, *Pierced for Our Transgressions: Rediscovering the Glory of Penal Substitution*. Wheaton, Ill: Crossway Books, 2007

White, Ellen G., *The Desire of Ages*. Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press Publishing Association, 1898.

White, Ellen G., *Danger of False Ideas on Justification by Faith*, MS - 36 – 1890. Silver Spring, MD: White Estate, Ellen G. Incorporated.

Unnamed author, *The Legal and Moral Aspects of Salvation*. Present Truth Magazine, vol. 26, art. 4, <[www.presenttruthmag.com](http://www.presenttruthmag.com)>.