

QUOTES ON THE ATONEMENT

Compiled by Jesse Morrell

SUPPORTING QUOTES FOR THE GOVERNMENTAL ATONEMENT

THE MORAL GOVERNMENT OF GOD

“That creation and moral government, including both law and gospel, together with the penal sanctions are only efforts of benevolence, to secure the highest good.” Charles G. Finney (1851 Edition of Systematic Theology, p. 60)

“That God’s ultimate end, in all he does, or omits, is the highest well-being of himself, and of the universe, and that in all his acts and dispensations, his ultimate object is the promotion of this end.” Charles G. Finney (1851 Edition of Systematic Theology, p. 59)

“God acts, not from any contracted, selfish motives, but from the most noble benevolence and regard to the public good. It hath often and long since been made a matter of objection to the doctrines of future punishment of the wicked, and the atonement of Christ, that they represent the Deity as having regard merely to his own honor and dignity, and not to the good of his creatures, and therefore represents him as deficient in goodness.” Jonathon Edwards Jr. (Inferences and Reflections on Atonement, p. 6)

"God legislates, not arbitrarily or oppressively, but wisely and equitably." John Miley (Theory and Scripture Interpretation, p. 2)

THE PURPOSE OF LAWS

"Let it be distinctly understood that the divine law originates in God's benevolence, and has no other than a benevolent end in view. It has revealed only and solely to promote the greatest possible good, by means of obedience. Charles Finney (The Oberlin Evangelist; July 30, 1856; On the Atonement, p. 3)

“Moral Law is thus the expression of the principles of moral government. While the expression of moral law proceeds from the divine will, the action prescribed originates in the divine intelligence. Moral law is not something which may be altered or changed in our present circumstances. It is that precise prescription of action in the relation of moral beings that shall result in the happiness of all. The absolutely intelligent God, in a state of love or voluntary benevolence, views objectively what is the only conduct in His moral creatures that can result in happiness to Himself and to them.” Gordon Olson (The Moral Government of God, Published by Revival Theology Promotions, p. 12)

“The moral law is like a fence on a farm. It not only shows ownership but provides protection.” Harry Conn (Four Trojan Horses, Published by Mott Media, p. 79)

“Isaiah 9:6-7.... As government increases, peace increases... government is meant to increase peace. This is the basic reason for government. Without government there is chaos. Government brings order, and as a result, peace.” Michael Saia (Understanding the Cross, Published by Xulon, p. 59).

THE PURPOSE OF PUNISHMENT

“But in order to a moral law, there must be a penalty; otherwise it would be mere advice, but no law.” Jonathon Edwards Jr. (The Necessity of the Atonement, p. 4)

“Consequences” are “the enforcement of moral government... The idea of sanctions, therefore, is unavoidably associated with moral government and moral law. It is the method of enforcing moral government.” Gordon Olson (The Moral Government of God, Published by Revival Theology Promotions, p. 36)

“The purpose of punishment is to prevent sin, in the individual and in the society. It is not primarily to reform the guilty. A moral government seeks to evaluate properly the seriousness of a given crime against society and prevent its repetition by exhibiting an appropriate punishment. Punishment is a public declaration of the fact that disobedience and rebellion against God will not be tolerated, and thus becomes a barrier to all who are considering the ways of lawlessness and incompliance.” Gordon Olson (The Kindness of God Our Savior, Published by Revival Theology Promotions, p. 70-71)

"The penalty was designed as a testimony to God's regard for the precept and his law, and to his purpose to sustain it." Charles Finney (The Oberlin Evangelist; July 30, 1856; On the Atonement, p. 3)

“There can be no law without sanctions. Precept without sanction is only counsel or advice, and no law... Sanctions are to be regarded as an expression of the benevolent regard of the Law-giver to His subjects; the motives which He exhibits to induce in the subjects the course of conduct that will secure their highest well-being.” Charles Finney (Skeletons of a Course of Theological Lectures, 1840, p. 202-203)

“The suffering of a sinner, of one who transgresses the law, are right and good for the ends of the government which we are members. The penalty is inflicted, not for the mere sake of putting the delinquent to pain, nor of gratifying the private revenge of a ruler, but to secure and promote the public ends of good government. These ends are to prevent others from transgressing; by giving, to all the subjects, a decided and clear demonstration of the dignity of the law, and a tangible proof of the evil of crime.” Thomas W. Jenkyn (The Extent of the Atonement, p. 144)

WHAT THE PURPOSE OF PUNISHMENT IS NOT

“God has the same natural reaction to personal injury that we do, but has a complete conquest of love so that governmental expediency, and not personal vindictiveness, dictates every manifestation of righteous indignation and judgment.”

Gordon Olson (The Kindness of God Our Savior, published by Revival Theology Promotion, p. 46)

Vengeance is “The infliction of pain on another, in return for an injury or offense. Such infliction, when it proceeds from malice or mere resentment, and is not necessary for the purposes of justice, is revenge, and a most heinous crime. When such infliction proceeds from a mere love of justice, and the necessity of punishing offenders for the support of the laws, it is vengeance, and is warrantable and just. In this case, vengeance is a just retribution, recompense or punishment. In this latter sense the word is used in Scripture, and frequently applied to the punishment inflicted by God on sinners.” The 1828 Noah Webster Dictionary

“The design of punishment is not revenge or vengeance; for it is not to gratify private feelings or to redress private wrong, - which is the true notion of revenge or vengeance. It is not the infliction of pain for an offence committed against an individual. It is always, though it may be for a wrong done to an individual, inflicted for the offence regarded as perpetrated against the peace of a community; against the lawgiver; against the law itself. When a man is punished for assault and battery, it is not pain inflicted considered as a recompense to the individual who has been injured or wronged: it is as a just retribution for a crime against the peace of the society and the honour of the law... When a man is punished for murder, it is not as an act of recompense to the murdered man, - for he is beyond the reach of all such recompense,- but it is for an offence against the law and the peace of the community... The crime is punished, not as a matter of private vengeance or satisfaction, but as due to public justice... the affair is no longer one of a private character, but becomes one pertaining wholly to the public.” Albert Barnes (The Atonement, Published by Bethany Fellowship, p. 191-192)

WHAT FORGIVENESS IS

“Forgiving is defined as the act of forgiving; the act of granting pardon, as for a wrong, offense, or sin; the remission of an obligation, debt, or penalty; pardon. Forgiveness is basically the disposition or willingness to forgive or pardon. To forgive means to give or to give up, to give over, to resign, to grant free pardon for or remission of a wrongful act or an obligation. It is to give up all claims for or on account of an injury, all forms of compensation, benefit, or return. It is to give up all forms of retribution or retaliation for wrongs committed. It is to abandon all resentment in a spirit of cheerful leniency and a restoration of the subject deserving displeasure to good will and friendship.” Gordon Olson (The Kindness of God Our Savior, Published by Revival Theology Promotions, p. 2-3)

"Will not impute sin. On whom the Lord will not charge his sins; or who shall not be reckoned or regarded as guilty. This shows clearly what the apostle meant by imputing faith without works. It is to pardon sin, and to treat with favour; not to reckon or charge a man's sin to him; but to treat him, though personally undeserving and ungodly (ver. 5), as though the sin had not been committed." Albert Barnes (Commentary on the Romans, p. 106)

Regarding Matthew 18:23-27, "The sole reason for the slave's reason was his lord's compassion. Forgiveness in this parable is certainly the relaxation of a legitimate claim. No third party intervened, no bargain was made, the debtor was simply released from his debt. It is possible to receive payment on a claim, and it is permissible to forgive a claim, but you cannot do both! The Bible portrays a God who is completely desirous and willing to forgive sin without receiving any payment to satisfy a vindictive urge." George Otis Jr. (The God They Never Knew, Published by Mott Media, p. 88)

"For forgiveness to mean anything, it must mean that no one pays the penalty. If forgiveness is real, then God simply releases us from the penalty of our sin..." Michael Saia, "Understanding the Cross, Published by Xulon, p. 147)

WHAT ARE THE PROBLEMS OF FORGIVENESS?

"Whenever sin is forgiven, its consequences are eliminated, thus weakening the enforcement of moral government." Gordon Olson (The Kindness of God Our Savior, Published by Revival Theology Promotions, p. 71)

"Every just penalty the lawbreaker pays strengthens moral government; almost every mercy he receives weakens justice, unless government finds a method of blending mercy and justice... His problem was to find a way to: 1) uphold His law, 2) show His hatred for sin, 3) set the man free without encouraging others to sin." George Otis Jr. (The God They Never Knew, Published by Mott Media, p. 81, 82)

WHAT THE PROBLEMS OF FORGIVENESS ARE NOT

"A voluntary disposition of mercy and forgiveness prevails equally among all the Members of the Godhead. The Godhead are without personal vindictiveness. The problems of forgiveness are not personal but government. God does not require an exact payment for sin to satisfy retributive justice, but only requires that an atonement shall satisfy public justice and all the problems of a full and free reconciliation in His government of moral beings." Gordon C. Olson (The Truth Shall Make You Free, Published by Bible Research Corp, p. 89)

"Is it not plain that the Father received the ransom, not because He himself required or needed it, but for the sake of the Divine government of the universe, and because man must be sanctified through the incarnation of the son of God?" Gregory of Nazianzus (yr 330-390) (The Truth Shall Make You Free by Gordon Olson, Published by Bible Research Corp, p. 99)

"The atonement does not change God. It does not make him in any sense a different Being from what he was before the atonement was made. It is not held, and it cannot be held, that God was, before the atonement was made, severe, stern, and inexorable, and that he has been made mild and forgiving by the death of the Redeemer. It is not held, and cannot be held, that he was indisposed originally to show mercy and

that he has been bought over to mercy, or that such an influence has been exerted on him by the atonement as to make him now willing to do what he was indisposed to do before." Albert Barnes (The Atonement, Published by Bethany Fellowship, p. 219)

"The simple statements of the Bible seem to be, that sin is such a dreadful tragedy in the kingdom of God that it cannot be disposed of in any simple manner. Some equivalently terrible event must be brought to pass to deal honorably with the matter. God may be ever so ready to forgive freely man's sin out of His great bounty of love, but cannot do so simply because there are other conditions and problems involved." Gordon Olson (The Truth Shall Make You Free, Published by Bible Research Corp, p. 108)

"The unchangeable God may consistently offer pardon to a sinner now that an atonement has been made, though there would be insuperable difficulties in such an offer if no atonement had been provided." Albert Barnes (The Atonement, Published by Bethany Fellowship, p. 223)

"An atonement was needed, not to render God merciful, but to reconcile pardon with a due administration of justice." Charles G. Finney (1851 Systematic Theology, p. 288)

"God is love, and prefers mercy when it is safely exercised. The Bible represents him as delighting in mercy, and affirms that judgment is his strange work." Charles G. Finney (1851 Systematic Theology, p. 289)

"The government bearings of this scheme are perfectly apparent. The whole transaction tends powerfully to sustain God's law, and reveal his love and even mercy to sinners. It shows that he is personally ready to forgive, and needs only to have such an arrangement made that he can do it safely as to his government. What could show his readiness to forgive sin so strikingly as this? See how carefully he guards against the abuse of pardon! Always ready to pardon, yet ever watchful over the great interest of obedience and happiness, lest they be imperiled by its freeness and fullness!" Charles G. Finney (The Oberlin Evangelist; July 30: 1856; On the Atonement, p. 5)

"The problem was not with God as an offended party requiring vindictive satisfaction, but with God as a loving Moral Governor who desires to do justice to all His subjects." Gordon Olson (The Kindness of God Our Savior, Published by Revival Theology Promotions, p. 68)

"No appeasement of Divine wrath is necessary as a prelude to mercy; no vindictive reactions need to be satisfied; no inner antagonism needs to be subdued; no unwillingness must be overcome; no payment in the absolute sense needs to be made for every sin that is to be passed over. The problems of forgiveness do not relate to God considered as an isolated Being, but to God in relationship to His moral creatures as a Moral Governor. The problems are not personal, but governmental." Gordon Olson (The Kindness of God Our Savior, Published by Revival Theology Promotions, p. 38)

Some theologians “insist on presenting a vindictive God who demands a payment before He will forgive. Surely this is an obvious contradiction of Jesus’ parable on forgiveness, where the man was forgiven his debt solely on the basis of compassion – without payment of any kind! Certainly there were governmental considerations for God to weigh. There was the necessity to uphold the law and justify the Lawgiver in the issuance of a pardon in opposition to His words, ‘the soul that sinneth, it shall die.’ However, to in any way confuse God’s governmental role with His personal feelings is gross error. God always wanted to forgive... He needed only to find a way to do it wisely. George Otis, Jr. (The God They Never Knew, Published by Mott Media, p. 24)

THE NECESSITY OF THE ATONEMENT FOR PARDON

“Atonement...is necessary that it should confirm, and not set aside, law; that it should carry out, and not set aside, the real purpose of the penalty of the law as expressing the sense entertained by the lawgiver of the value of law and the evil of violating it; that it should secure the reformation and future good conduct of him who is pardoned; that it should preserve a community from harm if any number of offenders should be forgiven; and that it should furnish in it’s own nature a proper representation of the character of him who has appointed the atonement.” Albert Barnes (The Atonement, Published by Bethany Fellowship, p. 156-157)

“God could not have been just in justifying the believer, had not Christ been made a propitiation...If his death were not necessary, he died in vain...if it had been possible that the designs of God in the salvation of sinners should be accomplished without the death of Christ, Christ’s prayer, in this instance, would have been answered, and he would have been exempted from death. And since he was not exempted, we have clear evidence that his death was a matter of absolute necessity...Why is an atonement necessary in order to pardon the sinner? I answer, it is necessary on the same ground, and for the same reasons, as punishment would have been necessary, if there had been no atonement made. The ground of both is the same...to maintain the authority of the divine law. If that be not maintained, but the law fall into contempt, the contempt will fall equally on the legislator himself; his authority will be despised and his government weakened. And as the contempt shall increase, which may be expected to increase, in proportion to the neglect of executing the law, the divine government will approach nearer and nearer dissolution, till at length it will be totally annihilated.” Jonathon Edwards Jr. (The Necessity of the Atonement, p. 2-3)

“An atonement is necessary because there is nothing else that will remove the difficulties in the way of pardon, or because there is no other way by which it can be consistent for God to forgive an offender and to restore him to favour.” Albert Barnes (The Atonement, Published by Bethany Fellowship, p. 157)

“The atonement is a governmental expedient to sustain law without the execution of its penalty to the sinner.” Charles G. Finney (The Oberlin Evangelist; July 30, 1856; On the Atonement, p. 2)

"The atonement of Christ was necessary to demonstrate His righteousness in the free pardon of repentant sinners. The word demonstrate signifies a manifestation, a public declaration, a showing forth or a proof of God's righteous method in the administration of forgiveness." Gordon C. Olson (The Truth Shall Make You Free, Published by Bible Research Corp, p. 94)

"The sacrifice made on Calvary is to be understood as God's offering to public justice--God himself giving up his Son to death, and this Son pouring forth his life's blood in expiation for sin--thus throwing open the folding gates of mercy to a sinning, lost race. This must be regarded as manifesting his love to sinners. This is God's ransom provided for them." Charles G. Finney (The Oberlin Evangelist; July 30, 1856; On the Atonement, p. 5)

"Sin deserves eternal penalty, and the penalty may not be remitted, except on rectorally sufficient ground." John Miley (The Governmental Theory of the Atonement, p. 6)

ATONEMENT SUBSTITUTES PUNISHMENT

"The very idea of atonement is something done, which, to the purpose of supporting the authority of the law, the dignity and consistency of divine government and conduct, is fully equivalent to the curse of the law, and on the ground of which, the sinner may be saved from that curse...a less degree or duration of suffering endured by Christ the Son of God, may, on account of the infinite dignity and glory of his person, be an equivalent to the curse of the law endured by the sinner." Jonathon Edwards Jr. (The Necessity of the Atonement, p. 7)

"His sufferings were in the place of the penalty, not the penalty itself. They were a substitution for the penalty, and were, therefore, strictly and properly vicarious, and were not the identical sufferings which the sinner would himself have endured. There are some things in the penalty of the Law, which the Lord Jesus did not endure, and which a substitute or a vicarious victim could not endure. Remorse of conscience is a part of the inflicted penalty of the Law, and will be a vital part of the sufferings of the sinner in hell - but the Lord Jesus did not endure that. Eternity of sufferings is an essential part of the penalty of the Law - but the Lord Jesus did not suffer forever. Thus, there are numerous sorrows connected with the consciousness of personal guilt, which the Lord Jesus did not and cannot endure." Albert Barnes (Commentary on Galatians 3:13)

"He did not endure eternal death....eternal death was the penalty of the law...No man can possibly hold that the Redeemer endured eternal sorrow; and no man, therefore, who believes that the penalty of the law is eternal death, can consistently maintain that he endured the literal penalty of the law." Albert Barnes (The Atonement, Published by Bethany Fellowship, p. 236-237)

"The atonement is something substituted in the place of the penalty of the law, which will answer the same ends as the punishment of the offender himself would. It is

instead of punishment. It is something which will make it proper for the lawgiver to suspend or remit the literal execution of the penalty of the law, because the object or end of that penalty has been secured, or because something has been substituted for that which will answer the same purpose. In other words, there are certain ends proposed by the appointment of the penalty in case of violation of the law; and if these ends are secured, then the punishment may be remitted and the offender may be pardoned. That which will secure these ends is an atonement." Albert Barnes (The Atonement, Published by Bethany Fellowship, p. 244-145.)

"The atonement is the substitute for the punishment threatened in the law; and was designed to answer the same ends of supporting the authority of the law, the dignity of the divine moral government, and the consistency of the divine conduct in legislation and execution. By the atonement it appears to God is determined that his law shall be supported; that it shall not be despised or transgressed with impunity; and that it is an evil and a bitter thing to sin against God. The very idea of an atonement or satisfaction for sin, is something which, to the purposes of supporting the authority of the divine law, and the dignity and consistency of the divine government, is equivalent to the punishment of the sinner, according to the literal threatening of the law. That which answers these purposes being done, whatever it be, atonement is made, and the way is prepared for the dispensation of pardon." Jonathon Edwards Jr. (The Necessity of the Atonement, p. 5-6)

"The death of Christ manifests God's hatred of sin and love of holiness in the same sense as the damnation of the wicked manifests these, namely, on the supposition that the divine law is just and holy. If it be allowed the divine law is just and holy, then every thing done to support and execute that law, is a declaration in favor of holiness and against sin; or a declaration of God's love of holiness and his hatred of iniquity...By atonement I mean that which, as a substitute for the punishment which is threatened in the law, supports the authority of that law, and the dignity of the divine government." Jonathon Edwards Jr. (Inferences and Reflections on Atonement, p. 3)

"If free pardon is to be extended to penitent sinners, some great measure must be substituted for the punishment of sinners that will uphold the moral government of God at least equally as well as the pronounced consequences would have done." Gordon C. Olson (The Truth Shall Make You Free, Published by Bible Research Corp, p. 95)

"In his undertaking the work of redemption; in his manifested character on earth; in his teaching; in the spirit with which he bore his trials; in his readiness to meet death, and in the manner in which he actually met it; in the offers of salvation which he made to mankind on the ground of the sacrifice which he made for human guilt, no one who believes the Saviour at all can doubt that he was in all respects pleasing to God. Whatever were the sufferings which were brought upon him, they were not of the nature of punishment for his own offences; whatever was the reason why he was left in darkness and gloom on the cross, it was not because he had incurred for himself the wrath of God. In the very midst of those sufferings he was performing a work which, of all the works ever performed on the earth, was most acceptable to a pure and holy God." Albert Barnes (The Atonement, Published by Bethany Fellowship, p. 292-293)

“An atonement is, properly, an arrangement by which the literal infliction of the penalty due to sin may be avoided; it is something which may be substituted in the place of punishment; it is that which will answer the same end which would be secured by the literal infliction of the penalty of the law. It is not a commercial transaction, - a matter of debt and payment, of profit and loss. It pertains to law, to government, to holiness; not to literal debt and payment.” Albert Barnes (The Atonement, Published by Bethany Fellowship, p. 230)

“Retributive justice, therefore, is not at all satisfied by the death of Christ. But the general justice to the Deity and to the universe is satisfied. That is done by the death of Christ which supports the authority of the law, and renders it consistent with the glory of God, and the good of the whole system, to pardon the sinner.” Jonathon Edwards Jr. (Inferences and Reflections on Atonement, p. 8)

"The sufferings and especially the death of Christ were sacrificial, were not the punishment of the law but were equivalent to the meaning to it, were representative of it and substituted for it. The demands of the law were not satisfied, but the honor of the law was promoted by it as much as this honor would have been promoted by the infliction of the legal penalty upon all sinners." Gordon C. Olson (The Truth Shall Make You Free, Published by Bible Research Corp, p. 100)

"The death of Christ is not a substituted penalty, but a substitute for a penalty. The necessity of an atonement is not found in the fact that the justice of God requires an invariable execution of deserved penalty, but in the fact that the honor and glory of God, and the welfare of his creatures, require that his essential and rectoral righteousness be adequately declared. The death of Christ is exponential of divine justice, and is a satisfaction in that sense, and not in the sense that it is, as of a debt, the full and complete payment of all its demands." John Miley (The Governmental Theory of the Atonement, p. 9)

“Atonement is, properly, an arrangement by which the literal infliction of the penalty due to sin may be avoided; it is something which may be substituted in the place of punishment. It is that which will answer the same end secured by the literal infliction of the penalty of the law... The atonement is the governmental provision for the forgiveness of sins, providing man meets the conditions of repentance and faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ.” Harry Conn (Four Trojan Horses, Published by Mott Media, p. 80-81)

“It [the atonement] provides a substitute for the penalty of the law”. Winkie Pratney (Youth Aflame, The Nature of Sin, Published by Communication Foundation Publishers)

WHAT KILLED JESUS? JESUS DIED OF A BROKEN HEART

“The atonement of Christ was to consist in our blessed Lord taking the sins of the whole world into His holy heart and reliving the awfulness in His mind until His human strength overcome in unspeakable agony... He died of a broken or ruptured heart and not from the crucifixion, as evidenced by the blood and water which came from His side when pierced by the soldier (Jn. 19. 32-35).” Gordon Olson (The Kindness of God Our Savior, Published by Revival Theology Promotions, p. 94, 96)

“Jesus took the sins of the whole world deep into His heart and mind, the anguish of His soul reached unbearable proportions...He did not die of crucifixion, but rather from internal agony of His soul... He died as a result of a voluntary identification, the sin of the world crushing out His life.” George Otis Jr. (The God They Never Knew, Published by Mott Media, p. 124, 126)

THE ATONEMENT RECONCILES JUSTICE AND MERCY

“Through the shedding of blood, God was just by discouraging sin, and merciful by forgiving freely... The fact that God sent Jesus Christ to the Cross is an awesome revelation of two aspects of His character. It shows us His love while it upholds His justice because sin is discouraged. We can now understand why God instituted the practice of shedding blood to illustrate that sin is horrible... The Cross also demonstrates God’s determination to find a way to be merciful.” Ross Tooley (We Cannot But Tell, Published by OMF Literature Inc, p. 99-100)

“The Cross reconnects the smashed relationship of man and God. He can now forgive because His only begotten Son provided the great Substitute. The agony of the worst torture in history wrote God's grief and hatred for sin in letters of blood. To see the cross both upholds the law and forgives the repentant sinner.” Winkie Pratney (Youth Aflame, The Nature of Sin, Published by Communication Foundation Publishers)

“The Divine law has been broken; the interests of the universe demanded that its righteousness should be maintained, therefore, its penalty must be endured by the transgressor, or, in lieu of this, such compensation must be rendered as would satisfy the claims of justice, and render it expedient for God to pardon the guilty... Christ made such a sacrifice as to render it possible for God to be just, and yet to pardon the sinner.” Catherine Booth (Popular Christianity, Published by Convention Bookstore, p. 30)

CHRIST WAS IMPUTED, CONSIDERED, OR TREATED AS A SINNER

“Though innocent, he was treated in his death as if he had been guilty; that is, he was put to death as if he had personally deserved it...He was suspended on a cross, as if he had been a malefactor. He was numbered with malefactors; he was crucified between them; he was given up by God and man to death as if he had himself been such a malefactor.” Albert Barnes (The Atonement, Published by Bethany Fellowship, p. 296)

“Standing for the sinner, he must, in an important sense, bear the curse of the law—not the literal penalty, but a vast amount of suffering, sufficient, in view of his relations to God and the universe, to make the needed demonstration of God’s displeasure against sin, and yet of his love for both the sinner and all his moral subjects. On the one hand, Jesus represents the race; on the other, he represented God.” Charles G. Finney (The Oberlin Evangelist; July 30, 1856; On the Atonement, p. 4)

“On the supposition of his dying as a Savior for sinners, all is plain. He dies for the government of God, and must needs suffer these things to make a just expression of God’s abhorrence of sin. While he stands in the place of guilty sinners, God must frown on him and hide his face. This reveals both the spirit of God’s government and his own infinite wisdom.” Charles G. Finney (The Oberlin Evangelist; July 30, 1856; On the Atonement, p. 6)

“Cursed. It conveys the idea of being given over to destruction, or left without those influences which would protect and save, -as a land that is given over to the curse of sterility or barrenness...it would mean that all saving influences were withdrawn” Albert Barnes (The Atonement, Published by Bethany Fellowship; p. 295)

“The Savior identifies Himself with sinners so intimately that He is treated as if their sins were His, if the seemingly insurmountable problems of reconciliation were to be solved. He must be the great High Priest who voluntarily places the sin of mankind, not upon the head of an innocent animal, but upon Himself, with dreadful heart-broken solemnity, until it crushes out His holy and spotless life.” Gordon C. Olson (The Truth Shall Make You Free, Published by Bible Research Corp, p. 33)

“Christ was treated as though he had been a sinner – and as his sufferings answered the purpose of the sinner’s punishment, and are the ground of his pardon, it may be said with respect to all believers, that their sins were imputed or reckoned to Christ, and his righteousness imputed or reckoned to them. That is, Christ was treated as sinners deserve, and sinners are treated as Christ deserves.” Nathan Beman (Four Sermons on the Doctrine of the Atonement, p. 39)

“Jesus was not sinful, or a sinner, in any sense. He did not so take human guilt upon him, that the words sinful and sinner could with any propriety be applied to him. They are not applied to him any way in the Bible; but there the language is undeviating. It is that in all senses he was holy and undefiled. And yet language is often used on this subject which is horrible and only a little short of blasphemy, as if he was guilty, and as if he was even the greatest sinner in the universe. I have heard language used which sent a chill of horror to my heart; and language may be found in the writings of those who hold the doctrine of imputation in the strictest sense, which is only a little short of blasphemy. I have hesitated whether I should copy expressions here on this subject from one of the greatest and best of men (I mean Luther) to show the nature of the views which people sometimes entertain on the subject of the imputation of sin to Christ. But as Luther deliberately published them to the world... and since similar views are sometimes entertained now; and as it is important that such views should be held up to universal

abhorrence, no matter how respectable the source from which they emanate, I will copy a few of his expressions on this subject...“If thou wilt deny him to be a sinner and accursed, deny, also, that he was crucified and dead.” “But if it is not absurd to confess and believe that Christ was crucified between two thieves, then it is not absurd to say that he was accursed, and of all sinners, the greatest.” “God, our most merciful Father, sent His only Son into the world, and laid upon him all the sins of all people, saying, be thou Peter, that denier; Paul, that persecutor, blasphemer, and cruel oppressor; David, that adulterer; that sinner which did eat the fruit in Paradise; that thief who hung upon the cross; and, briefly, be thou the person who has committed the sins of all people; see, therefore, that thou pay and satisfy for them” – Luther on the Galatians, Gal_3:13. (pp. 213-215. London edition, 1838).

“Luther was a great and holy man. He held, as firmly as anyone can, to the personal holiness of the Redeemer. But this language shows how imperfect and erroneous views may warp the language of holy people; and how those sentiments led him to use language which is little less than blasphemy. Indeed, we cannot doubt that in Luther had heard this very language used by one of the numerous enemies of the gospel in his time, as applicable to the Saviour, he would have poured out the full torrent of his burning wrath, and all the stern denunciations of his most impassioned eloquence, on the head of the scoffer and the blasphemer. It is singular, it is one of the remarkable facts in the history of mind, that a man with the New Testament before him, and accustomed to contemplate daily its language, could ever have allowed himself to use expressions like these of the holy and unspotted Saviour. But what is the meaning of the language of Paul, it will be asked, when he says that he was “made a curse for us?”

“In reply, I answer, that the meaning must be ascertained from the passage which Paul quotes in support of his assertion, that Christ was “made a curse for us.” That passage is, “Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree.” This passage is found in Deu_21:23. It occurs in a law respecting one who was hanged for a “sin worthy of death,” Deu_21:22. The Law was, that he should be buried the same day, and that the body should not remain suspended over the night, and it is added, as a reason for this, that “he that is hanged is accursed of God;” or, as it is in the margin, “the curse of God.” The meaning is, that when one was executed for crime in this manner, he was the object of the divine displeasure and malediction. Regarded thus as an object accursed of God, there was a propriety that the man who was executed for crime should be buried as soon as possible, that the offensive object should be hidden from the view. In quoting this passage, Paul leaves out the words “of God,” and simply says, that the one who was hanged on a tree was held accursed.

“The sense of the passage before us is, therefore, that Jesus was subjected to what was regarded as an accursed death. He was treated in his death as if he had been a criminal. He was put to death in the same manner as he would have been if he had himself been guilty of the violation of the Law. If he had been a thief or a murderer; if he had committed the grossest and the blackest crimes, this would have been the punishment to which he would have been subjected. This was the mode of punishment adapted to those crimes, and he was treated as if all these had been committed by him. Or, in other

words, if he had been guilty of all these, or any of these, he could not have been treated in a more shameful and ignominious manner than he was; nor could he have been subjected to a more cruel death. Since it has already been intimated, it does not mean that Jesus was guilty, nor that he was not the object of the approbation and love of God, but that Jesus' death was the same that it would have been if he had been the vilest of malefactors, and that that death was regarded by the Law as accursed.

“It was by such substituted sorrows that we are saved; and he consented to die the most shameful and painful death, as if he were the vilest criminal, in order that the most guilty and vile of the human race might be saved. With regard to the way in which Jesus' death is connected with our justification, see the note at Gal_2:16. It may be observed, also, that the punishment of the cross was unknown to the Hebrews in the time of Moses, and that the passage in Deu_21:23 did not refer originally to that. Nor is it known that hanging criminals alive was practiced among the Hebrews. Those who were guilty of great crimes were first stoned or otherwise put to death, and then their bodies were suspended for a few hours on a gibbet. In many cases, however, merely the head was suspended after it had been severed from the body. Gen_40:17-19; Num_25:4-5. Crucifixion was not known in the time of the giving of the Law, but the Jews gave such an extent to the Law in Deu_21:23 as to include this mode of punishment (see Joh_19:31 ff).

“The force of the argument here, as used by the apostle Paul, is, that if to be suspended on a gibbet after having been put to death was regarded as a curse, it should not be regarded as a curse in a less degree to be suspended Alive on a cross, and to be put to death in this manner. If this interpretation of the passage is correct, then it follows that this should never be used as implying, in any sense, that Christ was guilty, or that he was ill-deserving, or that he was an object of the divine displeasure, or that he poured out on him all his wrath. He was, throughout, an object of the divine love and approbation. God never loved Jesus more, or approved what he did more, than when he gave himself to death on the cross. God had no hatred toward him; He had no displeasure to express toward him. And it is this which makes the atonement so wonderful and so glorious. If God had been displeased with Jesus; if the Redeemer had been properly an object of God's wrath; if Jesus, in any sense, deserved those sorrows, there would have been no merit in Jesus' sufferings; there would have been no atonement. What merit can there be when one suffers only what he deserves? But what made the atonement so wonderful, so glorious, so benevolent; what made it an atonement at all, was that innocence was treated as if it were guilt; that the most pure, and holy, and benevolent, and lovely being on earth should consent to be treated, and should be treated by God and man, as if Jesus were the most vile and ill-deserving. This is the mystery of the atonement; this shows the wonders of the divine benevolence; this is the nature of substituted sorrow; and this lays the foundation for the offer of pardon, and for the hope of eternal salvation. Albert Barnes (Commentary on Galatians 3:13)

EXAMPLES OF ATONEMENT

“There was once a King called Zeleukas who forbade adultery. To reinforce his law, he declared a harsh penalty for disobedience: the gouging out of both eyes. All went well for a while. Then one day, the first to break his law was brought before him. Imagine his horror when he saw it was his own son!

“What could the King do? If he forgave his son, he would weaken his own law. People would no longer respect the king. And he would be doing nothing to dissuade the son from this sin in the future.

“After careful deliberations, the King came to his decision; he would pluck only one eye from his son. The other eye would come from the King! It was probably the talk of the country for years. But people could not escape the King’s logic. He managed to uphold the rightness of his law and yet extend partial forgiveness to his son. Out of gratitude, the son probably resolved to never be immoral again.

“The problem King Zeleukas faced was similar to the one God had. Although God loved mankind and was committed to doing the best for His creatures, He still had to uphold his laws – all of which are based on what is best for everyone. God knew that sin could never be encouraged, for sin hurts everyone. So what could He do?

“His answer was the shedding of blood...” Ross Tooley (We Cannot But Tell, OMF Literature Inc, p. 97)

“In the time of Oliver Cromwell, “the iron man of England,” an officer of his army was found to be a traitor, and Oliver Cromwell signed the death-warrant for him. An order was given that the next morning when the bell from a nearby church should ring at six o’clock that officer should be shot

“The wife of the officer came into the room where Oliver Cromwell was and fell upon her knees and said, “Sir, won’t you pardon my husband?” “No,” he said. “He has proved himself a traitor to the country and to the commonwealth. Tomorrow when the bell from the church steeple will ring at six o’clock, then he will be shot.”

“Heartbroken, this woman of love went out of his presence. Oh, what she experienced! She did not sleep that night, of course. Early in the dawn long before sunrise the form of the wretched woman torn by grief in her heart, was seen hurrying toward the church steeple.

“Up she went, step by step until she reached where the large bell was hanging. A man perhaps ninety years of age both deaf and blind, received a few shillings a month for ringing the bell. The officer’s wife hid herself in the belfry and when that blind and deaf man began to take hold of the bell rope and pull the wife placed her hand between the brass tongue of the bell and the side and instead of striking the side of the bell, it struck the soft hand of the loving wife of that officer and no sound was heard.

“Then the man swung it the other way and the woman put her left hand upon the other side of the bell and it struck her left hand. For about five minutes it kept on striking against her hands until instead of fingers there were only shreds of flesh and blood left. Tears were flowing down the face of that woman in her suffering but she never made a sound, because she was suffering for a loved one. When the old man had finished she went down, the blood dripping to the floor, and she went to Cromwell, the man who had said her husband must die. She stretched forth her bleeding hands and said, “for the sake of these hands won’t you forgive my husband?”

“Cromwell weakened and said, “Woman great is your love. Go in peace.” Thus her husband was freed through an act of grace on the part of their Governor and in recognition of the love and the suffering of another.” M. L. Dye (Exactly What Our Savior Taught About Sin)

THE ATONEMENT WAS MADE FOR ALL SINS OF ALL MANKIND

The atonement “must be of universal application, since there is no partiality with God. God can have no selected favorites as long as He is love and universally benevolent...Thus whatever God makes possible, He will make equally possible for all men.” Gordon C. Olson (The Truth Shall Make You Free, Published by Bible Research Corp, p. 97)

THE MORAL INFLUENCE OF THE ATONEMENT

“The fact, that the execution of the law of God on rebel angels had not arrested, and could not arrest, the progress of rebellion in the universe, proves that something more needed to be done, in support of the authority of the law, than would be done in the execution of its penalty upon rebels. While the execution of law may have a strong tendency to prevent from the beginning of rebellion among loyal subjects, and to restrain rebels themselves, yet penal infliction do not, in fact, subdue the heart, under any government human or divine.” Charles G. Finney (1851 Systematic Theology, p. 291)

“Let it be distinctly understood that the divine law originates in God’s benevolence, and has no other than a benevolent end in view. It has revealed only and solely to promote the greatest possible good, by means of obedience. Now, such a law can allow of pardon, provided an expression can be given which will equally secure obedience—making an equal revelation of the lawgiver’s firmness, integrity, and love. The law being perfect, and being most essential to the good of his creatures, God must not set aside its penalty without some equivalent influence to induce obedience. The penalty was designed as a testimony to God’s regard for the precept and his law, and to his purpose to sustain it. An atonement, therefore, which should answer as a substitute for the infliction of this penalty, must be of such sort as to show God’s regard for both the precept and penalty of his law. It must be adapted to enforce obedience. Its moral power must be in this respect equal to that of the infliction of the penalty on the sinner.” Charles G. Finney (The Oberlin Evangelist; July 30, 1856; On the Atonement, p. 3)

“The Lord Jesus by His life and suffering for the sins of the whole world...rendered satisfaction to public justice (a demonstration before all that rebellion against authority will be punished), as distinguished from retributive or vindictive justice, thus removing the governmental barrier to the free pardon of repentant sinners – the governmental of sin-prevention problem. The advent and sufferings of Christ has provided a moral force of far greater proportions to confront the minds of moral beings as they contemplate sin, than the threatened eternal punishment of sinners had provided. The great mass of unrepentant sinners have a public testimony of the awfulness of the Moral Governor’s hatred of sin and the dreadful certainty that no sin will go unpunished. If such an ordeal of suffering was endured by the Godhead to make the forgiveness of sin possible, sinful rebellion must be viewed as a colossal tragedy in the moral government of God, to be feared by all.” Gordon C. Olson (The Truth Shall Make You Free, Published by Bible Research Corp, p. 106)

“The only means in all the universe to subdue the rebellious heart and uphold the moral government of God is the love shown for us on Calvary. It was the greatest and most profound event of all history. The death of the Lord Jesus did not render God merciful but was an expression of his mercy... It seeks to bring back wanderers by expressing God’s love and forgiveness, and that salvation is free for all men if they choose to avail themselves of it.” Harry Conn (Four Trojan Horses, Published by Mott Media, p. 81)

“Although God loved mankind and was committed to doing the best for His creatures, He still had to uphold his laws – all of which are based on what is best for everyone. God knew that sin could never be encouraged, for sin hurts everyone. So what could He do? His answer was the shedding of blood... If the sacrifice produced the necessary brokenness of heart, and persuaded the offerer not to sin again, God’s purposes were fulfilled... God chose the awful cross. Why? God wanted to inspire brokenness of heart in the people, in an even greater way than through offering animal sacrifices. He deliberately made it horrible so it would humble the heart of man over sin, and deter him from sinning again.” Ross Tooley (We Cannot But Tell, Published by OMF Literature Inc, p. 97-98)

WHAT IS JUSTIFICATION

‘By these words [Romans 4:6-7] we are taught that justification with Paul is nothing else but pardon of sin’ John Calvin, (Albert Barnes Commentary on the Romans, p. 106)

"In response to heart faith a marvelous thing happens. In heaven, we are justified... our standing before God has changed. Justified means it is as though I had never sinned." Paris Reidhead (Finding the Reality of God, pg 111)

“What is gospel justification? It consists not in the law pronouncing the sinner just, but in his being ultimately governmentally treated as if he were just; that is, it consists in a governmental decree of pardon or amnesty – in arresting and setting aside

the execution of the incurred penalty of law – in pardoning and restoring to favor those who have sinned, and those whom the law pronounced guilty, and upon whom it had passed the sentence of eternal death, and rewarding them as if they had been righteous... (Romans 4:6-7). This quotation from David shows both what David and what Paul understood by justification, to wit, the pardon and acceptance of the penitent sinner.” Charles Finney (Finney’s Systematic Theology, Published by Bethany House, p. 360).

“In response to heart faith a marvelous thing happens. In heaven, we are justified: The record against us has been changed; that is to say, our standing before God has changed. Justified means it is as though I had never sinned.” Paris Reidhead (Finding the Reality of God, Published by Bible Teaching Ministries, p. 111)

“It is very evident that in this text [Acts 13:38-39] forgiveness and justification are used interchangeably, as synonymous terms... In this rich passage [Rom. 3:25-26], which presents the fundamental elements of redemption, to remit sins and to justify, on the basis of the atonement, through the instrumentality of faith, are treated as precisely the same thing, and signify a release from the guilt and punishment of past sin, through the forbearance of God.” Asbury Lowrey, (Positive Theology, Published by R. P. Thompson, 1854, p. 211-212)

“What is justification then? To be justified is to have our sin forgiven, such that the penalty of that sin will not be carried out on us as the guilty parties. We remain guilty for the sin, but because of the atonement of Christ, and our meeting the conditions (repentance, faith), God is free to release us from the punishment we deserve to receive, He can treat us governmentally as if we were righteous, even though we are guilty of breaking his law. It is this governmental treatment as righteous, even though we are guilty, that constitutes justification.” Michael Saia (Understanding the Cross, Published by Xulon, p. 133).

IMPUTED RIGHTEOUSNESS

“This is, if I understand it, the true doctrine of ‘imputation;’ not that there is any transfer of moral character from us to the Redeemer, or from him to us, and not that God literally ‘reckons’ or imputes our sins to him as his, or his righteousness to us as ours, but that his work may be estimated as performed in the place and on the account of sinful men, and that in virtue of that we may be regarded and treated as if it had been performed by ourselves.” Albert Barnes (The Atonement, Published by Bethany House, p. 315)

“God imputeth righteousness. Whom God treats as righteous... forgiven, and whose sins are not charged on him, but who is freed from the punishment due to his sins. Being thus pardoned, he is treated as a righteous man. And it is evidently in this sense that the apostle uses the expression ‘imputed righteousness’ i.e. he does not impute, or charge on the man his sins; he reckons and treats him as a pardoned and righteous man.” Albert Barnes (Commentary on the Romans, p. 105)

“This passage [Rom. 4:5-8] deserves special attention, as it explains all those text that seem to favor, and have been construed to support the theory of the imputation of Christ’s active and passive righteousness to the sinner. Here it is manifest that justification, imputation of righteousness, forgiving iniquities, covering sins, and the non-imputation of sin, are phrases substantially of the same import, and decide positively that the Scripture view of the great doctrine under consideration, is an actual deliverance from the guilt and penalty of sin: from which it follows, that the phrases so often occurring in the writings of Paul – the righteousness of God and of Christ – must mean God’s righteous method of justifying the ungodly, through the atonement and by the instrumentality of faith – a method that upholds the rectitude of the Divine character, at the same time that it offers a full and free pardon to the sinner.” Asbury Lowrey, (Positive Theology, Published by R. P. Thompson, 1854, pg. 211-212)

“In theology, the remission of sin, and absolution from guilt and punishment; or an act of free grace by which God pardons the sinner, and accepts him as righteous, on account of the atonement of Christ.” Noah Webster’s 1828 Dictionary

“Holiness isn’t something you can borrow – you either have it or you don’t. The theological doctrine of ‘imputed righteousness’ has been grossly distorted in our day. We are told that God looks at us through the blood of Christ and see’s us as righteous, regardless of our actual state... Let’s stop kidding ourselves. God sees us exactly the way we are. If we are living in obedience, He sees it. If we are living selfish, unholy lives, we can be sure he sees that too.” George Otis Jr. (The God They Never Knew, Published by Mott Media, p. 40)

“As one ‘made under the law’ (Ga. 4:4-5), Christ was obliged to obey and keep the law. Since He had to obey for Himself, He could not obey for others in the sense that His obedience could be literally imputed to them... while Christ could not obey for us, He could die entirely in our behalf since there was not the least guilt charged against Him for which He must die.” Gordon Olson (The Kindness of God Our Savior, Published by Revival Theology Promotions, p. 91)

“Forgiveness of sin, such that the penalty is not carried out, is sufficient to qualify as a definition of ‘imputed righteousness.... How could the Holy Spirit convict us of sin if he did not know we were sinning? How could we grieve the Spirit of God if he never saw us as anything other than righteous? God has a very good sense of reality, he knows when we sin, and he sees us exactly as we are.” Michael Saia (Understanding the Cross, Published by Xulon, p. 132).

PROBLEMS WITH THE RETRIBUTIVE SATISFACTION VIEW

LIMITED ATONEMENT, UNIVERSALISM, OR INJUSTICE

“Two persons cannot be held responsible for the same offense. If a debt has been paid by a friend, it cannot be demanded of him who originally contracted it. If one could be substituted in the place of another in a penitentiary, and serve out the term of punishment assigned to the original offender, the offender could not be again imprisoned for the crime.” Albert Barnes (The Atonement, Published by Bethany Fellowship, p. 298)

“No man can be held accountable for a debt that has already been paid for on his behalf to the satisfaction of the offended party. But a double jeopardy, a duplication of indebtedness, is indeed involved if the non-elect are to be punished for sins which the Lord Jesus Christ has already endured punishment.” Custance (Sovereignty of Grace, p. 156)

“For God to have laid the sins of all men on Christ would mean that as regards to the lost He would be punishing their sins twice, once in Christ, and then again in them.” Boettner (The Reformed Faith, p. 98)

“Reformed people argue that if Christ’s death actually paid for the sins of every person who ever lived, then there is no penalty left for anyone to pay, and it necessarily follows that all people will be saved, without exception. For God could not condemn to eternal punishment anyone whose sins are already paid for: that would be demanding double payment, and it would therefore be unjust.” Wayne Grudem (Systematic Theology, p. 595)

“If Christ died for everyone, everyone would be saved.” Joshua Williamson (Open Air Outreach message board, Doctrine and Theology section)

“That if, as their substitute, Christ suffered for them the full amount deserved by them, then justice has no claim upon them, since their debt is fully paid by the surety, and of course the principal is, in justice, discharged. And since it is undeniable that the atonement was made for the whole posterity of Adam, it must follow that the salvation of all men is secured upon the ground of “exact justice.” This, as has been said, is the conclusion to which Huntington and his followers came. This doctrine of literal imputation, is one of the strongholds of universalism, and while this view of atonement and justification is held they cannot be driven from it.” Charles Finney (Lectures on Systematic Theology, 1851, Lecture on Justification)

“If Jesus literally paid for our sins with his blood (a paid debt is no longer a debt), and He died for the sins of the entire world, then we can come to only one conclusion, universalism, which means the whole world will be saved. If salvation is basically a legal

transaction, then I have no debt or obligation remaining, and my ignorance of this situation would not alter the fact.” George Otis Jr. (*The God They Never Knew*, Published by Mott Media, p. 40)

AUTOMATIC AND UNCONDITIONAL SALVATION

“Every elect vessel, *from the first instance of his being*, is as pure in the eyes of God from the charge of sin as he shall be in glory. Though such persons do act rebellion, yet the loathsomeness and hatefulness of his rebellion is laid on the back of Christ; he bears the sin, as well as the blame and shame: and God can dwell with persons that act the thing, because all the filthiness of it is translated from them upon the back of Christ.” Dr. Crisp [one who held to the automatic and unconditional salvation view] (*Checks to Antinomianism* by John Fletcher, Published by Carlton & Porter, p. 116)

“With equal clearness it would follow that they [those for whom Christ died] could not be required to repent of the sin which they had committed [if the atonement was payment of a debt]. If the whole matter is transferred and cancelled, then it is clear that there can be no reason why they should repent, or, indeed, why there should be any repentance in the case.” Albert Barnes (*The Atonement*, Published by Bethany Fellowship, p. 299)

“If a third person pay a debt, there would be no grace exercised by the creditor in the discharging of the debtor; yet when a third person atones for a crime, by suffering in the stead of a criminal, there is entire grace in the discharge of the criminal, and retributive justice still allows him to be punished in his own person.” Jonathon Edwards Jr. (*Grace Consistent with Atonement*, p. 7)

“Forgiveness of sins is not automatic in the Christian life but requires repentance, confession, and the exercise of a humbled faith in the atoning death of Christ... before forgiveness and cleansing can take place.” Gordon Olson (*The Truth Shall Make You Free*, page 160. Published by Bible Research Corp)

“If A owes B \$100, and C pays B \$100 in behalf of A, then A owes B nothing.” Gordon C. Olson (*The Truth Shall Make You Free*, Published by Bible Research Corp, p. 93)

SALVATION BY LAW (JUSTICE), NOT GRACE AND MERCY

“When a debt is paid, there is no forgiveness; when a penalty is endured, there is no mercy.” Albert Barnes (*The Atonement*, Published by Bethany Fellowship, p. 231)

“If our forgiveness be purchased, and the price of it be already paid, it seems to be a matter of debt, and not of grace.” Jonathon Edwards Jr. (*The Necessity of the Atonement*, p. 1)

“If the atonement of Christ be considered as the payment of a debt, the release of

the sinner seems not to be an act of grace, although the payment be made by Christ, and not by the sinner personally. Suppose any one of you, my auditors, owes a certain sum; he goes and pays the full sum himself personally. Doubtless all will agree, that the creditor, in this case, when he gives up the obligation, performs a mere act of justice, in which there is no grace at all....this...places the whole grace of the gospel in providing the Savior, not in the pardon of sin.” Jonathon Edwards Jr. (Grace Consistent with Atonement, p. 2)

“If Christ have, in the proper sense of the words, paid the debt which we owed to God, whether by a delegation from us or not; there can be no more grace in our discharge, than if we had paid it ourselves. But the fact is, that Christ has not, in the literal and proper sense, paid the debt for us...Payment of debt equally precludes grace, when made by a third person, as when made by the debtor himself...Grace is ever so opposed to justice, that they mutually limit each other. Wherever grace begins, justice ends; and wherever justice begins, grace ends.” Jonathon Edwards Jr. (Grace Consistent with Atonement, p. 3-4, 6)

“If, in the obligation of an absolute retributive justice the Father must inflict merited punishment upon sin and if in the atonement he inflicted such punishment upon his Son as the substitute for sinners-then he does not remit the penalty. No dialectics can identify such an infliction with remission. And where there is no remission of penalty there can be no grace of forgiveness. Hence, the doctrine of Satisfaction does not admit the grace of the Father in forgiveness; which fact of grace, however, is clearly given in the Scriptures.” John Miley (Theory and Scripture Interpretation, p. 6)

“That if, as their substitute, Christ suffered for them the full amount deserved by them, then justice has no claim upon them, since their debt is fully paid by the surety, and of course the principal is, in justice, discharged. And since it is undeniable that the atonement was made for the whole posterity of Adam, it must follow that the salvation of all men is secured upon the ground of ‘exact justice.’” Charles Finney (Lectures on Systematic Theology, 1851, Lecture on Justification)

ANTINOMIANISM OR LAWLESSNESS ONCE SAVED, ALWAYS SAVED

“There is as much ground to be confident of the pardon of sin to a believer, *as soon as he committed it*, as to believe it after he has performed all the humiliation in the world. A believer may be assured of pardon as soon as he commits any sin, even adultery and murder...God does no longer stand displeased though a believer do sin often. There is no sin that ever believer commit that can possibly do them any harm. Therefore, as their sins cannot hurt them, so there is no cause of fear in their sins committed. Sins are but scarecrows and bugbears to fright ignorant children.” Dr Crisp [A teacher of antinomianism] (Checks to Antinomianism by John Fletcher, p. 116. Published by Carlton & Porter)

A DISTORTED VIEW OF THE FATHER

“His sacrifice is never represented in the Bible as having purchased or begotten the love of the Father, but only as having opened up a channel through which the love could flow out to His rebellious and prodigal children. The doctrine of the New Testament on this point is not that ‘God so hated the world that His own Son was compelled to die in order to appease His vengeance,’ as we fear has been too often represented, but that ‘God so LOVED the world, that He gave His only begotten Son.’ Catherine Booth (Popular Christianity, p. 30, published by Convention Bookstore