

# **Dr. Robert A. Peterson, Christ's Saving Work, Session 4, Introduction, Part 4, The History of the Doctrine of the Atonement**

© 2024 Robert Peterson and Ted Hildebrandt

This is Dr. Robert Peterson in his teaching on Christ's Saving Work. This is session 4, Introduction, Part 4, The History of the Doctrine of the Atonement.

We're continuing our study of the history of the Doctrine of the Atonement.

We move to Gregory of Nyssa. As I said, the dominant motif in the West was ransom to Satan. Gregory of Nyssa did many good things.

This is not especially one of them. He is an Eastern father, however, best known for his notorious analogy of redemption with a baited fish hook in his great catechism. Gregory writes, in order to ensure that the ransom on our behalf might be easily accepted by him who required it, the deity of Christ was hidden under the veil of our nature, that is, Jesus' humanity, that so, as with ravenous fish, the hook of the deity might be gulped down along with the bait of the flesh, and thus light might vanish.

God's purpose was that Christ was transfused throughout our nature in order that our nature might become itself divine, rescued as it was from death. Gregory's starting point was that corrupted humankind needed a physician. Gregory regarded humankind as legally purchased, as a slave.

On this basis, Gregory questionably infers that the ransom price must be paid by Christ to the devil while the devil sought Christ's divine power. The devil had deceived humankind, so God deceived the devil. But scripture does not imply, never says, that the ransom is paid to anyone, not even to God.

One could say that that is the case, but I would say it this way: scripture doesn't say, but we imply like that. Certainly, it wasn't paid to the devil. The ransom is from bondage by the blood of Christ to new creation and life in Christ.

I actually find some good in that. There's obviously bad in it, and I am using an Eastern father to present a Western motif because it was. It's just so clear in Gregory of Nyssa, although he went way beyond the bounds with this deception idea. What is good about it? Christ's death is a ransom.

Mark 10:45, the famous ransom saying that even the Son of Man did not come to be served, but to serve and to give his life as a ransom for many. Paul likewise refers to Christ in the pastorals as giving his life as a ransom. So that is correct.

Paid to the devil? No. Deliberately deceiving the devil? No. Is the devil deceived? Sure, because of his own blindness and sin, but that's not what's going on here.

Gregory and the Western tradition of the ransom to Satan is correct in regarding the cross as directed towards Satan. Not to pay him off, okay, but the scripture in John 12:31, in John 12:31 Jesus said, it's the main chapter discussing the pictures of the atonement in John, now is the judgment of this world. Now will the ruler of this world be cast out, and I, when I'm lifted from the earth, up from the earth, will draw all people to myself.

He said this to show by what kind of death he was going to die. The ruler of this world is the devil, of course, under God, but in Jesus' death, he would be cast out. So the cross is directed toward Satan and demons, but not as a ransom or something owed them, but rather as a destruction of them, as a judgment toward them.

Colossians 2:15, as we'll study later on, God mocked the principalities and powers, made a public show over them, and Hebrews 2:14, since the children shared in flesh and blood, Christ too partook of the same things, that through death he might destroy him who holds the power of death, that is the devil. So surely, we reject the grotesque picture of, you know, Gregory's grotesque picture of God luring the devil with Jesus' humanity as one would try to catch a fish and underneath the golden hook of the deity of Christ, the devil gets caught on that and God reels him in, that is outrageous. And even ransom to Satan is not accurate or clear, although parts of it touch biblical themes.

Origen, around 185 to around 254, taught a number of themes, including this one. The atonement is a victory, notably over evil powers. Origen wrote, Christ, the eternal word and wisdom, suffered as one who was wise and perfect, whatever it behooved them to suffer, who did all for the good of the human race.

There's nothing absurd in a man having died for the sake of piety, to overthrow the power of that evil spirit, the devil, who had obtained dominion over the whole world. That's a common theme in the Fathers, and it helps us understand the ransom to Satan. The devil had obtained dominion in the fall.

You know, he fooled our first parents, he deceived them, and in their sin, then they became obligated to him in this inaccurate understanding of things. If the West predominantly had a ransom to Satan-idea and not the grotesque deception that goes with it, the East had a notion of deification predominantly. Athanasius was an Eastern Father who had multiple themes, one of which was deification.

Athanasius, around 296 to 373, wrote on the incarnation of the word, a theological classic. When he was around 20 years of age, my saying was that God gave gifts. Wow.

One major theme of this book is the victory and triumph of Christ over evil, the Christus victor theme. He followed the Genesis account of the fall, concluding that as an effect, we were not to die only but to remain in the state of death and corruption. That is distinctively Eastern.

The Western tradition follows Saint Augustine, who said we were condemned. It was legal language. As a matter of fact, Tertullian gets in here, contributing some of the terminology for Saint Augustine and later for Anselm.

But in the West, the emphasis was on condemnation of the fall, sin, and condemnation. In the East, it was on corruption and death, and deification overcomes that, you see. Quoting Athanasius again, the great defender of the deity of Christ, who was exiled five times for holding to the deity of Christ.

He used different arguments, some better, some worse, from the Bible. But his most powerful argument was the soteriological argument. For the word, for the son to save us, he had to be God.

Only God can save us. If he is not God, we are not saved. He wrote the word perceived that corruption could not be got rid of otherwise than through death.

It was by surrendering to the death as an offering and sacrifice, free from every stain, that he forthwith abolished death for his human brethren by the offering of the equivalent. The Eastern tradition, of which Athanasius is a wonderful representative, if the West emphasized the cross, right? Again, from Augustine. He believed in the incarnation.

He believed in the resurrection. The East believed in the crucifixion. But the West decidedly emphasized the cross, the sufferings, what is sometimes called the realist ideas, the terrible sufferings of Christ.

The East emphasized the incarnation and the resurrection. Athanasius said the resurrection constitutes, quote, a very strong proof of the destruction of death and its conquest by the cross. Athanasius also fully stressed God's grace and kindness and Christ's substitutionary sacrifice.

In a memorable sentence, it has become famous. Used regularly to explain deification in the Eastern Orthodox Church, Athanasius wrote that he indeed, the word, assumed humanity that we might become God. And he manifested himself by a body that we might receive the idea of the unseen father.

Is he saying we become God's? No. He is saying we participate in God's nature, not God's invisible essence, but in what the East called God's energies. That is, his attributes manifested in time and space.

2 Peter 1:4 was a proof text for the whole Eastern Orthodox tradition, and it continues to be so to this day. God's divine power has granted to us all things that pertain to life and godliness through the knowledge of him who called us to his own glory and excellence, by which he has granted to us his precious and very great promises, so that through them you might become partakers of the divine nature, having escaped from the corruption that is in the world because of sinful desire. Here, you see corruption again, and here, you see the very words, partakers of a divine nature.

It does seem to me that Tom Schreiner is right in this context, Schreiner's commentary on the Petrine Epistles I'm referring to, that it's not talking about participation in the Eastern sense as of mysteries and sacramental participation, but rather a God building his attributes in an creaturely sense into his people as they bow to his word and rely on his spirit. Ann Selman Abelard Ann Selman Abelard emphasized, respectively, the objective view of the atonement, Ann Selman, and the subjective moral influence theory. Objective satisfaction view, subjective moral influence view.

What do we mean by objective and subjective views of the atonement? Objective views of the atonement speak of what Christ did for us outside of us, all right? Subjective views of the atonement emphasize what Christ did, does within us, what his cross did to move us inwardly. Now, what is the truth of the matter? The truth of the matter is they're both true, but to make the cross chiefly or solely interior like that, subjective, is so weak, and we'll see it again and again. This appears to be the root of it. Abelard appears to give the roots of it, and he knew of Ann Selman and rejected what he did.

It gets complicated, so let me just take a piece apart at a time. Ann Selman taught the objective satisfaction view, and Abelard taught the subjective moral influence view. Ann Selman saw how clearly the atonement was bound up with Christology.

That's a wonderful point. The person and work of Christ go together. Only Christ, who is both man and God, could atone for the sin of the world.

To dismiss Ann Selman because he also drew on the feudal imagery of his time would be a mistake. Every theologian, Thistleton reminds us, has to consider hermeneutical bridges to the readers of his day. Ann Selman became an archbishop.

He trained monks. He was a teacher, and in his most famous book, *Cur Deus Homo*, *Why God Became a Man*, he used a dialectical method. That word has different meanings than theology.

In this regard, it involves him asking questions and eliciting answers from his pupils. Now, the argument meanders between Ann Selman and Bozo, the representative pupil, which may reflect actual discussions they had; again, the name could be fictitious of the pupil, but in the monastery. It meanders, and it's corny because Bozo will say, oh master, now I see the light, like that kind of stuff.

It gets a little corny like that. It's too much, but it's good, and at times, they'll go down a wrong turn, take a wrong turn, and Ann Selman will bring the student back, but you know, call me a convicted historical theologian. It's interesting stuff, and it has endured.

Ann Selman was criticized mightily for all this feudal stuff, making satisfaction, because the origins of that are in the feudal life. There was the lord of the manor, and there were the serfs, all right, and if you dishonored, you walked up and smacked the lord in the face, you're in serious trouble, all right, because you dishonored him, and that ought not to be, and that is exactly what Ann Selman says we did to God. He used the imagery of his own life.

I mean, should we rely on biblical imagery? Of course, but it's not wrong to use other imagery as long as you designate it as such. Anyway, that's what he did, and he regarded the major result as the dishonor of God. Now, that is a major improvement in the doctrine of the atonement, right, because the major thing is not us, but God again, and the work of Christ is going to influence God.

Yes, it has repercussions for human beings, right, but he has a Godward sense of the atonement that is incredible because up until now, it largely had a Satan-ward direction, Are you with me? So, instead of ransom to Satan, which he rejected out of hand, God judges Satan. He doesn't buy him off. He owes Satan nothing.

Instead, the work of Christ is directed toward God himself, a major accomplishment, and furthermore, *Cur Deus Homo*, with its back-and-forth question-and-answer method, was criticized as being just purely scholastic, and Anselm doesn't have a spiritual bone in his body. Oh yeah? Benedicta Ward, a Roman Catholic scholar, *Benedicta Ward, the prayers and meditations of Saint Anselm*. Read those, you will weep.

That's because the criticism of this *Cur Deus Homo*, it misses the mark. It's a genre, a faulty genre criticism. This is scholastic question-and-answer time.

Q&A, we would say. Prayers and meditations. Oh Lord Jesus Christ, who loved us and gave himself for us, I bow before you and worship you.

Oh my gosh, like that, page after page after page. A man loved. He loved Christ. He loved his atonement.

He loved his Savior. So, well, we can make dumb mistakes sometimes, and Anselm doesn't have it all right, but he was a major influence and wrote one of the most important documents in the history of the Christian church. I'll tell you two places where the Reformers improved on his work.

But first, let me say Anselm's major work, as I've said, on the atonement, was why God became man. *Cur Deus Homo*. Anselm rejected the recapitulation approach of Irenaeus.

That was sad because it's true in many ways. Christ is the second Adam and the author of the new creation. But that's okay.

He rejected the approach of redemption from the devil of Gregory of Nyssa and others, and an account of the atonement was only an expression of the love of God. Anselm Abelard, pardon me, gets close to that, see. The reason for the incarnation and death of Christ is much deeper.

James Denny wrote a good book on the atonement, *The Atonement and the Modern Mind*, which is called Anselm's work. It is the truest and greatest book on the atonement that has ever been written. I don't know about that, but in its time frame, it brought us forward leaps and bounds, combining person and work of Christ, showing Jesus deity and humanity were essential for salvation, emphasizing the Godward direction of the cross, and more. Anselm seeks to combine a stress on God's grace with an equal stress on God's justice.

God cannot let an offense against his honor go unpunished, his honor, without reparation. See, that's what would happen in the medieval situation. You had to repair the offended honor of the Lord, make reparations, or you're in serious trouble.

But in his grace, God provided for this very reparation. Anselm argues that only God could put the damage that sin has done right. If someone other than God were to try to redeem humankind, Anselm writes, in that case, man would in no sense have been restored to the dignity he would have had if he had not sinned.

But there are at least two reasons why Christ alone can redeem us because it is God's will. Anselm puts the atonement in the context of the plan of God, and God loves us. And because Christ is one with God, just as he is one with humankind, Anselm calls him, get a load of this, the God-man.

Wow. That is exactly right. He stresses that Christ freely underwent death.

Remember, I said, Isaiah 53, the voluntary nature of Christ's atonement. God did not, quote, compel Christ to die when there was no sin in him, but Christ freely, himself freely underwent death. The atonement depends on Christ being both God and man, being sinless, and dying voluntarily for the sins of others.

To sin, Anselm says, is the same thing as not to render God his due. Then he takes mostly from feudal law this principle, quote, it is not enough for someone who violates another's honor to restore that honor unless he makes some kind of restitution that will please him who was dishonored, according to the extent of the injuring and dishonor.

Hence, sinners needed to give satisfaction to God. Actually, Anselm posed it as a dilemma. He said in Latin, *out satisfactio, out poena*, either satisfaction or punishment.

And God graciously, rather than choosing to punish humankind, accepted the satisfaction that his son provided. Anselm introduces the phrase, it is fitting. He writes that if it is not fitting for God to do anything unjustly or without due order, it does not belong to his freedom or kindness to forgive unpunished a sinner who does not repay to God what he took away.

Often, traditional or conservative Christians may be heard to say, God must punish sin. Those who follow a subjective approach to the atonement, where it basically affects us chiefly, say, why? Anselm has a good answer. It's because God must, a logical must, remain consistent with his own nature, his own promise, and his governance of the world.

Must does not denote external compulsion. We'll see in reaction to the reformers' emphasis on law and Christ paying the penalty of the law to forgive his people, they, some of the socinus, says God jettisons the law. And Grotius says God adjusts, he lessens the law.

No, I don't think so. Well, see, aren't you making the law an external principle to which God must? No, the law is a revelation of God's own character. He is merely being true to himself.

Must does not denote external compulsion. It is internal and logical, like the statement God cannot lie. The phrase it is fitting excludes any idea of external compulsion.

God remains sovereign. He also remains faithful to his word and character. I'm taking so much time with Anselm because he deserves it.

No one, quote, but God can make the satisfaction. Man cannot redeem man. No one ought to make it except man.

That's beautiful. It is necessary for a God-man to make it. Only God can save us.

God has to save us. The incarnation is necessary. It's not a frill.

It's not an alternate approach to God clicking his finger. No, God had to become a man, not for his sake, but for our sake to save us. Given the, we call it the, I don't have the right term, philosophical terminology, given the fact that God willed to save, absolute consequent necessity or something like that, God willed to say he didn't have to will to save, but giving his will to save, then this is a necessity.

There's no compulsion on God to become a human being, but in the good Lord, the Trinity, has a holy huddle and decides to save humankind or many human beings. This is the way it had to happen because only God could make atonement and only could, must, and only was it fitting; there it is, that language again, for a human being to make it. I say it this way: only God can save us, and atonement was made by God in human flesh, not just flesh, but a true, genuine humanity that is one of our own race paid the penalty for our sins, and his humanity is as important as his deity for our salvation.

Jesus Christ as man took his place in Adam's race but born of a virgin. Anselm insists on the unity of the person of God and man in a single, as a single person. He is sinless and therefore not obligated to die, but does so voluntarily for God's honor freely to make satisfaction for man's sin.

His death, the death of God, the God-man, outweighs all sins. The death of Christ, quote, benefited not only those who were alive at the time but also others. That is exactly Hebrews 9:13. Oh my goodness.

Like so many approaches to atonement, Thistleton wisely says, it adds insight and hermeneutical riches to the New Testament as long as it is not treated as the exclusive and comprehensive model. It remains one of the most important expositions of the subject in the history of Christian theology. Amen, and amen.

Perfect? No. Major accomplishment? Yes. Again, I'll say it.

In the West, ransom to Satan was a major idea. No, Anselm said, most profoundly, the work of Christ is directed toward God himself. That is my own hard-won conclusion.



And he had it here in the year 1100. Stunned, wonderful. But his work could be improved, and the Reformers did.

They correctly said it is not God's offended honor that is repaired or satisfied. It is his justice that is satisfied. The text, Romans 3:25-26. Furthermore, it is not a dilemma, either satisfaction or punishment, but it is exactly satisfaction of God's justice through the punishment of the Son on the cross.

Not either satisfaction or punishment, but divine satisfaction through punishment of the Son of God. Abelard, sadly, took a virtually opposite approach to Saint Anselm, whose work he criticized. Oh, Abelard was a genius, no doubt.

Anselm was a smart cookie, but Abelard, in that day, was a lecturer. Thankfully, it's not this way anymore today, but on that day, a lecturer would gather students around him until a better lecturer came along. And Abelard saw William of Champeaux lecturing and said, I can do better than that. And he did and took his students away.

Furthermore, he was an inventive teacher, but he was always on the edge. And sometimes over the edge. And let's put it this way.

You didn't incur the wrath of Saint Bernard and get away with it. Bernard of Clairvaux. And he did.

In his own life, he committed some hanky-panky with Heloise and that became infamous. Tutoring the uncle's niece and anyway, the man had him castrated. Oh, it's a terrible story.

Anyway, in his teaching, in order to provoke the students to think and think about this, they would be provoked to think the quotations of the fathers were not regarded as the Bible, but they were regarded as six significant authorities, right? He has a famous word called *sic est et non*. Yes and no. He put in two different columns, quotations of the fathers against one another.

And then he had the utter audacity to put quotations of Saint Augustine against Saint Augustine. Ah, Bernard lost it at that point. Oh, poor Abelard.

He is often regarded as the main representative of the subjective exemplarist or moral influence theory of atonement. He has much more than that, but sadly, I believe it's true.

I had to write a paper for doctoral studies comparing Anselm and Abelard, or I chose to do so. And he has many other images, but I'll tell you why I say he is the daddy.

Not only do conservatives so label him, but advocates of the moral influence theory of the atonement cite him as their great-granddaddy.

Oh boy. He was later followed with some modifications by Faustus Socinus, a terrible heretic, Friedrich Schleiermacher, the father of modern theology, and Albrecht Ritschel, also a destructive modern theologian. I'm sorry to speak French, but my goodness.

On the other hand, Abelard was a sophisticated philosopher and theologian who wrote on the Trinity, undertook exposition and exegesis of biblical passages, and expounded ethics as well as the atonement. Further, his work on atonement was largely confined to short comments in his commentary on Romans. Here's where he just strings himself up on the gallows, in my estimation, especially in Romans 3:19 to 26.

And it is inconceivable that this short passage conveys his comprehensive view of the subject. I agree. I found in his writings that most of his stuff has never been translated. That's a huge problem.

Romans commentary, at least sections of it, have been. So, he has other motifs. He mentioned sacrifice.

He mentions redemption. Well then, shouldn't they show up in Romans 3, which mentioned both redemption and propitiation or at least expiation? Sadly, in his exposition of Romans 3:19 and 26, he certainly is correct sometimes to say justified means not having any previous merits. Good.

God first loved us. Yes. Grace is a free and spiritual gift of God.

Amen. And his blood means his death. So far, four for four.

But his fifth definition is more questionable. Namely, that shows that God has demonstrated his justice at the present time. That means his love.

No, it doesn't. God demonstrated his love so as to be just and the justifier of the one who believes in Jesus.

I don't think so. It does show his love, but he shows his love in setting forth the sun as a propitiation. He's reducing helasmos, or helasterion, excuse me, propitiation to love.

It flows from God's love, but it isn't mere love. Similarly, he is right to question how far we should press the price of blood paid for our redemption. But his description of

the demand for the blood of an innocent person as cruel and wicked, the innocent person is Jesus, remains sadly open to question.

Again, Abelard is right to say he has more fully bound us to himself by love. Amen. He made a covenant with us with the result that our hearts should be rekindled by such a gift of divine grace.

But this is open to question when he seems to imply that this is all we need to say about the atonement of the son of God. That's why Leon Morris and others quote this well-known saying: theories of the atonement are right in what they affirm but wrong in what they deny. For Abelard, the main thing was our fear and distrust of God.

The main function of the cross is to work as a moral influence, a demonstration of God's love to break down our fear and distrust of God. Do we have fear and distrust of God? Sure. Is that the main thing of the atonement? Changing that? No.

Does it change that? Yes. Ah, the main thing is Jesus died to put away sins by his own blood, and he died to propitiate God so that we might be forgiven. Sad story.

Anselm is known as the father of the objective theories of atonement, rightly, perfectly, no, but rightly. Having made major advances in the area, Abelard is known as the father of modern, moral influence or exemplarist theory. Jesus is only an example, or chiefly an example.

Is Jesus an example? Yes. I count 10 places in the New Testament where he's an example for Christians in his death alone. Is he ever the example of how to become a Christian? No.

We'll see that in one of the aberrant responses to the Reformers. No. Jesus, every single time, all 10 times, Jesus' example is in the context, not of how you become a Christian, but how you live the Christian life.

We follow his example. Is that the main thing of the atonement? No. It is not atoning at all.

It's sanctifying. It's promoting the Christian life for those who have partaken of his atonement by grace through faith. Reformation, Luther, Calvin, and then the deviant Socinus, you'll see, he denied original sin and the deity of Christ.

What kind of a view of the atonement are you going to have after that? A very defective one. Grotius is not as bad, but the governmental theory of atonement is not good. I've got a funny story to tell you about that, but not yet.

There's Luther, 1483 to 1546. He has a huge quantity of material related to the cross. But it's difficult to offer a coherent interpretation.

Calvin was a systematizer in the Institutes. Luther was a great preacher. Calvin was a preacher all the time, too, but Luther was not as systematic as Calvin.

And that is both a strength and a weakness. I love them both. In Luther, the work of Christ is always intimately bound up with justification by grace through faith.

Galatians 3:13 says, Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law by becoming a curse for us. He wrote, Christ has freed us from the curse of the law. Grace is not a response of love but a cause of it.

The love of God creates the object of its love. The grace of God initiated the atoning work of Christ. That's exactly right.

Calvin teaches the exact same thing. Many times, in dependence on Luther, it was not customary at the time of the Reformation to give credit to your contemporaries. In Luther's large catechism, he wrote that as Redeemer, he brought us from Satan to God, from death to life, and from sin to righteousness.

He suffered, died, and was buried that he might make satisfaction for me and pay what I owe. Notice the personal dimension. Not with silver and gold, 1 Peter 1.18.19, but with his own precious blood, in order to become my Lord.

Gustav Aulen wrote the book, *Christus Victor*, was right to urge that Luther emphasize victory and defeat, victory for Jesus and his people, and defeat for the devil and his demons in his theology of the atonement, but wrong in underrating Luther's emphasis on sacrifice, expiation, and substitution. As a matter of fact, in the book *The Theology of Martin Luther*, Paul Althaus, a famous German scholar, Paul Althaus says correctly that Luther has two dominant views of the work of Christ, and it is hard to decide which one is major, more major, which one predominates. *Christus Victor*, penal substitution.

That is exactly right. He's got them even interfaced, the way the Bible does. The Bible combines its own themes, and we can pull them out to examine them, but then we should put them back together.

I was just anticipating part of the critique of my own discipline, systematic theology, which will have to wait till tomorrow now, but it is true. Systematics is a great virtue in that it takes things apart and sets them before us, and helps them look at and examine them. So, who could possibly comprehend all the details of the study of the person of Christ and the work of Christ at once? So, we take, we study the person of Christ, and we study his pre-existence, and his incarnation, and his deity, and his

humanity, and his unipersonality, and his two states, and we study the work of Christ, his events, the pictures that interpret those events, his three offices, and so forth, but then we better put those things back together again, because the same passages that teach the person of Christ, teach the work of Christ.

So, systematics can be helpful, but it's dangerous. It is not an end in itself. So, Tony Thistleton is correct in criticizing Gustav Aulen in his epic-making book, *Christus Victor*, for saying Luther only taught Christus Victor.

No. He equally taught legal penal substitution. Listen to Luther's writings, sermon on Good Friday, on Luke 24:36 to 47.

Good Friday sermon, Luke 24:36 to 47. Quote: if God's wrath is to be taken away, and I am to obtain grace and forgiveness, someone must merit this, for God cannot remit the punishment and wrath unless payment and sacrifice are made by the Son of God himself. That ain't merely Christus Victor, my friends.

That is Christus Victor, and legal theology, where Christ pays the penalty for our sins. John Calvin, 1509 to 1564, the main difference between Luther and Calvin was not one of substance, but one of coherence and system. Chapters 12 to 17 of the book of Calvin's Institutes expound Christ's work as a mediator, a prophet, priest, and king.

Those are the chapters of my doctoral dissertation. Book two, 12 to 16, or in this case, he's saying including 17. Christ is a mediator.

That is a biblical and Calvinian way of saying person and work. Christ is mediator, and he's prophet, priest, and king. And Calvin emphasizes Jesus' participation in human nature.

Calvin clearly stressed the necessity of incarnation and clearly taught penal substitution. He wrote, quote, that a man who, by his disobedience, had become lost should pay the penalties for sin. Accordingly, our Lord came forth as true man and took the person and nature of Adam in order to take Adam's place in obeying the Father, to present our flesh as the price of satisfaction to God's righteous judgment, and in the same flesh to pay the penalty that we deserved.

In the same section, Calvin argued that, quote, since neither God alone could he feel death nor man alone could he overcome it, he coupled human nature with the divine to atone for sin. Echoes of Saint Anselm, you bet, you bet, and really of the Apostle Paul. Calvin discussed the offices of prophet, priest, and king in separate sections, but always in relation to Christ's atonement.

As priest, Jesus Christ opens access to God, a Pauline theme, because God's righteous curse draws our access to him. But Christ to perform his office has come forward

with a sacrifice. By this sacrifice, he wiped away our guilt and, quote, made satisfaction for our sins.

Quote, the guilt that made us liable to punish for punishment has been transferred to the head of the Son of God. We must, above all, remember his substitution, lest we tremble and remain anxious throughout life. Among Calvin's reasons for expounding penal substitution lies the wonderful assurance of reconciliation with God, which this doctrine brings.

He said, he wrote, quote, if the effect of his shedding of blood is not, is that, excuse me, is that our sins are not imputed to us, it follows that God's judgment was satisfied by that price. There's no contradiction for Calvin between God's mercy and his justice. Christ, quote, took the punishment upon himself and with his own blood expiated the sins of those which rendered humankind hateful to God, and duly propitiated God the Father.

On this basis, Christ founded peace between God and man. Calvin, following Paul stresses that God's grace and love initiated the process of redemption and atonement. We'll continue, Lord willing, our study of the history of the doctrine of atonement as a prelude to studying the biblical events of Christ and the biblical pictures in our next hour by looking at the heretics, Socinus, it's the only word I can use, and the Dutch theologian who is better but still not completely kosher, shall we say, Grotius.

And then, we'll move on to the modern period. Thank you for your good attention and God bless you.

This is Dr. Robert Peterson in his teaching on Christ's Saving Work. This is session 4, Introduction, Part 4, The History of the Doctrine of the Atonement.