

COVENANT ATONEMENT AS A WESLEYAN INTEGRATING MOTIF

R. LARRY SHELTON

A significant pastoral and theological concern exists in the church's proclamation of mission today. In spite of the fact that Christian theology has found legitimate expression of the biblical emphasis on the Atonement through a variety of theories, the Western Catholic and Protestant churches have tended to favor some form of a forensic penal view of the work of Christ. This has resulted in the replacement of the biblical interpersonal covenant understanding of a sacrifice as an obedient gift of love with an abstract forensic definition of a sacrifice as a justice-based penalty. This has resulted in a judgment/justice vision of the God of grace and holiness. The biblical view of reconciliation as a restoration of regenerative interpersonal fellowship with God, or covenant renewal, that is grounded in God's nature of holy love and which brings new vitality to the divine-human relationship is minimized. Particularly since the rise of Fundamentalism in the late 19th and early 20th century has the penal view risen to nearly exclusive prominence, so much so that Bill Hybels, pastor of the largest church in America can say, "The penal substitutionary view of the atonement that Christ died as the penalty for our sins is the evangelical position on this issue."¹

The Wesleyan theological tradition has increasingly been influenced by numerous Reformed concepts. An example of this shift is the exclusive emphasis on the penal substitutionary atonement theory developed by John Calvin that has become nearly universal among popular evangelical Christianity, both reformed and Wesleyan. Such views tend to interpret the work of Christ only as a punishment which assuages God's wrath against humanity, thus releasing it from its death sentence for the treachery of Adam and his race. The thesis of this paper is that the use of a biblical covenant interpersonal understanding of Christ's work of salvation as covenant renewal and restoration of the divine image is a more satisfactory

R. Larry Shelton is the Richard B. Parker Professor of Wesleyan Theology at George Fox Evangelical Seminary in Newberg, Ore.

THE ASBURY THEOLOGICAL JOURNAL

SPRING / FALL 2004
VOL 59 NO 1 & 2

hermeneutic for understanding the atonement, particularly from a Wesleyan perspective, than are any of the other historical theories taken in isolation. Wesley himself thought in terms compatible with covenant ideas, although he did not develop that perspective as the integrating motif of his theology. This author believes that the use of covenant interpersonal categories allows the constructive development of a Wesleyan theological perspective that overcomes the weaknesses of the Reformed penal substitution theory, the eclectic quasi-Anselmian atonement views of Wesley's satisfaction emphasis, as well as those in the Grotian governmental tradition. Furthermore, the pastoral problems of legalism, obsession with guilt, and spiritual disillusionment associated with the penal views call for different ways of presenting the Atonement.

I. INFLUENCES ON WESLEYAN ATONEMENT THEOLOGY

Wesley's associates tended to gravitate toward the Grotian governmental view. However, Wesley himself tended to become somewhat more eclectic in his approach, moving in the direction of a more Anselmian satisfaction position that views Christ's work as a payment of human indebtedness rather than as a penalty. The first concern faced by Wesley and others who sought to adapt some form of the penal view to an understanding of Christ's work of salvation was how to maintain the balance between divine initiative and human accountability in salvation. While the penal views focused almost exclusively on the objective work of propitiating God's wrath so that the sinner might be released from the guilt and punishment of sin, a full biblical understanding of salvation should include an emphasis on both sanctification and growth in grace. Furthermore, the penal views focused on Christ's role in being the substitute recipient of humanity's capital punishment for its treachery in its disobedience of God's clear commands in the Garden. This penal emphasis that deals only with the consequences of sin often results in what Dallas Willard calls "sin management,"² rather than growth in grace. A Wesleyan view of atonement must ask the questions, "Can God do nothing with sin but forgive it? Can God not break its power as well?" The biblical and theological resolution of this concern rests squarely in one's interpretation of the doctrine of the Atonement of Christ.

A number of Wesleyan theologians have expressed concern over whether Wesley's modified Anselmian view of penal satisfaction is, in fact, adequate to support the soteriology he proclaims. While his associate, John Fletcher, held a more Reformed penal substitutionary view,¹ many other Wesleyan theologians since the 18th century have sought other alternatives because of the Trinitarian and Christological implications of the penal view.⁴ H. Ray Dunning has argued convincingly that Wesley fought a continual battle against the implications of his atonement view.⁵ Other Wesleyans were drawn to some version of the Governmental view or the Christus Victor idea of Christ's cosmic victory over the spiritual forces of Satan, thus liberating humanity from its enslavement.⁶ However, these governmental views have tended to reflect some form of the penal interpretation of the Atonement, since the payment of a judicial penalty is necessary for the restoration of cosmic governmental order.⁷ Furthermore, a sobering number of Christians have chosen rather to abandon the idea of the sacrificial death of Jesus Christ as the foundation of the reconciliation between a lost humanity and a saving God. The

tendency has been to reject not only the penal theories of Atonement as some form of divine child or domestic abuse,⁸ but to identify the penal theory with the violence associated with Christ's death, and abandon the entire concept of the Atonement altogether, as Bishop Joseph Sprague and others, such as radical feminists Rita Nakashima Brock and Rebecca Parker, have done.⁹ Other non-Wesleyans in the pacifist tradition have attempted to develop, with problematic degrees of success, a non-violent concept of the Atonement in an attempt to maintain the orthodox foundation of the Atonement in the death of Christ, but avoid the elements of violence that are associated with it.¹⁰

The use of the forensic imagery of the law courts as a template for organizing the biblical data on atonement and salvation seems like a legitimate motif. And it is certainly true that somehow through the cross of Christ, God puts us in the right in relationship to himself. Whether this "putting right" through Christ's death can be most faithfully presented through Western Roman, or "Latin," forensic models of civil and penitential law or through the interpersonal categories of covenant Law is a critical issue.¹¹ Furthermore, making the theological and pastoral leap from the idea of the penal death of Christ to the spiritual formation and sanctification process in the Christian disciple has also required an effort that has often been considered too great. This tendency to find the theological foundation for salvation in the various penal interpretations of the Atonement is, I believe, in part responsible for the present sterility of holiness preaching in Wesleyan pulpits in America. It is not immediately apparent to the person in the pew (or the pulpit) that the death of Christ functioning to appease the divine wrath of God translates readily into living the Christlike life of love and peace and unconditional forgiveness. Instead, humanity's experience has been redeemed and transformed through its identification with Christ in his work of sacrificial covenant restoration of the image of God in the community of faith. In order to clarify the problems for Wesley's theology that may be created by reliance upon the forensic penal approaches to interpreting the Atonement and to suggest valuable resources for spiritual formation, a brief critical analysis of key atonement models is in order.¹²

A. CLASSICAL CHRISTIAN MODELS

RECAPITULATION—IRENAEUS

Writing scarcely a hundred years after the Apostolic Age, Irenaeus established the earliest framework for Christian theology through the exposition of the central ideas of the Christian faith. He understands Christ's work as identifying with and restoring humanity's relationship to God in Christ. In Latin, the term *recapitulatio* literally means "reheading," or "providing a new head," in the sense of providing a new source or origin.¹³ Through his identification with humanity in his incarnation, Christ recapitulated, or "summed up in himself," all of humanity, so that what humanity had lost in Adam (the image of God) could be recovered in himself.¹⁴ He says:

He entered into our death so that as he was raised from death, we would be alive in him (Rom. 6; Eph. 2:5)...He was identified with us in our death resulting from sin in order that we might become identified with him in his resurrection to new life. In other words, *he became like us that we might become like him.*¹⁵

In restoring humanity to the image of God, Christ recovers our destiny of the vision of God and communion with him.¹⁶ Irenaeus says the entire redemptive work is accomplished by the Word *through* the humanity of Christ as his instrument, for it could not be accomplished by any power other than God himself. The obedience of Christ is thus not a human offering made to God from man's side, because from beginning to end God Himself is the effective agent who, through the Word of God incarnate, enters into the world and human experience, in order to reconcile it to himself. Atonement and incarnation are inseparably linked, as are the Father and Son, in this process.¹⁷ There is much here that can enrich the foundations for Wesley's soteriology.

CHRISTUS VICTOR—GUSTAF AULÉN

Another prominent view of atonement that has more recently been attractive to some and which has its roots in ancient orthodox tradition is the dramatic, or classic, Christus Victory theory of Gustaf Aulén. Modifying the Latin ransom motif, he sees Christ in cosmic combat with the powers of darkness. Aulén sees the atonement not as a legal transaction or juristic sentence, as in the Latin and Swiss/German Reformed and Lutheran traditions, nor does he see Christ merely as an inspiring example of love, as in the Abelardian/Eastern Orthodox traditions. Instead, Christ is the cosmic champion who overcomes the evil forces that hold humanity in bondage. Christ has met the cosmic forces of evil on their own ground, in history where they were entrenched, in order to break their power. Through his work we may sing, "In all this we are more than conquerors... (Romans 8:37, KJV).¹⁸ In Christ, God "having disarmed the powers and authorities, he made a public spectacle of them, triumphing over them by the cross" (Col. 2:15 NASV). Church of the Nazarene theologian William M. Greathouse calls this theory "one of the most influential treatments of the atonement to appear in our time." He says further, "Aulén has done the church a service in rescuing the dramatic view of Christ's work and restoring it to its rightful place as a New Testament representation of the atonement."¹⁹

B. FORENSIC MODELS

The forensic models of the atonement grew out of the Latin theology of Tertullian, Cyprian and others who developed the theology of the penitential system of the transfer of merits that the Protestant Reformers such as Martin Luther and John Calvin objected to so strenuously.²⁰ It was from the categories of Roman law that Western theology, which boasted more than its share of lawyers, drew the conceptual categories and vocabulary of the sacrament of penance and the ideas of justice viewed in terms of punishment, merit, satisfaction, and absolution. Even though Christ alone, not the believer, presented those merits in the Protestant understanding, the satisfaction of a divine legal accounting process still underlies the penal substitutionary understanding of the atonement of Christ in the Protestant tradition. The idea that superfluous merit can be transferred from one person to another comes in Cyprian, and the way is now prepared for the Latin theory of atonement (penal theory).²¹

SATISFACTION—ANSELM

Working from this medieval understanding of “satisfaction,” Anselm of Canterbury (1033-1109) developed the first substantially different approach to the doctrine of the atonement after the first millennium of Christianity’s existence. God is presented as a feudal overlord with humanity as his vassals arranged in a socially stratified hierarchical system. Anselm saw the atonement as a restoration of God’s offended honor by the meritorious and supererogatory obedience offered by Christ on behalf of humanity. The obedience of Christ’s life had merit to make amends for the infinite dishonor brought upon God’s name by sinful humanity.²² Anselm defined sin in terms of a debt toward God, who is not free to leave sin unpunished because His justice requires its punishment. Humanity owes a satisfaction to restore God’s honor, but because of the greatness of the offense against God, there is no human ability to repay a debt that is greater than all humanity’s ability to satisfy. Furthermore, Anselm said that for God to forgive sins out of compassion without satisfaction or punishment is impossible:

It is not fitting for God to pass over anything in his kingdom undercharged...
It is therefore, not proper for God thus to pass over sin unpunished.²³

That honor, then, that has been taken away from God must be repaid, or punishment must follow in order for God to be just to himself.²⁴ Thus, the dishonor perpetrated upon God must be restored by the compensation of Christ’s obedience, which is propitiatory and meritorious.

Using the Roman legal ideas of satisfaction derived from Tertullian, Cyprian, and the legal sanctions of the penitential system that clearly have their basis in Roman juristic categories of justice, Anselm develops them into their fullest Scholastic forms. He attempts to preserve the unity between Christ and the Father by showing that Christ’s satisfaction is a freely given act of obedience, rather than a penalty that is coerced.²⁵ However, it is difficult to see how he avoids presenting the atonement as a legal, transactional event based on a *quid pro quo* exchange of merits, in which the life of the Son of God is of such value that it outweighs the accumulated debt of human sin.²⁶

In the focus on the objectivity of the honor of God, Anselm thus minimizes the subjectivity of the restoring of relationships between humanity and God.²⁷ His view tends to equate salvation with the remission of a debt, and minimizes the sense of participation in the experience of Christ and insufficiently emphasizes the love of God in forgiveness by treating it as a rational cause rather than a relationship.

Anselm thus allows the issues of legal satisfaction to overshadow the truth that the love of God is objective and “persists in spite of all that sin can do, and has for its end nothing less than the reconciliation of sinful men with God in the harmony of a restored mutual love,” says Vincent Taylor.²⁸ Instead, his rationalist approach deduces the rational necessity of the death of Christ, since logical necessity requires that God be reconciled with creation. It is a law-based theory, but the law is expressed in terms of the Latin forensic penitential system infused with the feudal perspective of power and hierarchy, rather than the biblical covenant understanding of Law based in the relationship between the covenant community and God. This Western view of law has continued

even after the Reformation, and as Driver says, "Protestantism has often preceded more in the spirit of Western law than in the gracious spirit of biblical covenant, which is revealed most fully in the saving work of Christ."²⁹

Even with these shortcomings, Anselm's satisfaction theory became immensely popular in the later medieval period, and with some modifications became the main theory advanced by the Protestant Reformers in the form of the penal substitution theory of atonement. With the rejection of rationalistic Scholasticism by the Reformers and their emphasis on salvation by faith alone, another articulation of the atonement was called for.³⁰

PENAL SUBSTITUTION—JOHN CALVIN

Apparently, the Western European legal tradition and Latin theological orientation of the Protestant theologians was so deeply rooted that they were unable to reconceive theology in any alternative way to the forensic understanding. The conception of merits of righteousness offsetting the demerits of sin in humankind made it necessary for the Reformers, and particularly the later Protestant orthodoxy, to formulate their conceptions of salvation around the economic idea of a substitutionary payment of penalties for transgressions against God based on the merits of Christ. Since justice is served only when the accounts balance, the doctrine of limited atonement was submitted to allow justice to quantify the amount of merit needed to balance the celestial books by using the merits of the death of Christ. The other alternative to a particular atonement doctrine was universalism, since Christ's merits were infinite, all of humanity's penalties would be paid.³¹

This seems radically out of step with the Old Testament system of sacrifice offered as a gift of obedience to make atonement to maintain the covenant community in relationship to God.³² The OT sacrifices were not construed as payments of penalty for sin, since an animal sacrifice was certainly not the equivalent in value of a transgression against the God of the covenant. Furthermore, it does not appear that the forensic tradition has based its interpretations of legal metaphors on the Hebrew covenant relationship foundations that were central to Paul's theology, but on the penitential system of forensic accountability that found its fullest expressions in the Latin medieval system of penitential merits. This overlooks the interpersonal covenant accountability that was present in the Hebrew covenant Law version of forensic expression found in the OT, the rabbinic tradition, and the theology of Paul.

GOVERNMENTAL THEORY—HUGO GROTIUS

In response to the penal substitutionary views of atonement, effective criticisms were made that shook the very foundation of the penal views. Critics pointed out that satisfaction and pardon are incompatible. Furthermore, the critics said, Christ's suffering does not meet the demand of satisfaction, because sinners deserve eternal death, and Christ did not suffer eternal death, but temporal death.³³ Anselm would have rejected the latter critique, because even temporal death for the divine Son of God more than compensates for the eternal death of all humanity. In the face of the increasingly effective attack on the penal theory by the Socinians, Hugo Grotius altered the penal theory by defining justice as a need for orderly government in a moral universe, rather than as the internal need for God to administer retributive penalties upon the offending parties. The governmental view thus reflects an Arminian concern to understand the atonement in a way that does

not necessitate a limited atonement, as in the penal substitutionary model of Calvin, nor require a penitential maintenance of spiritual graces, as in the Anselmian version. However, this view maintains the necessity of a previous satisfaction of God's wrath as a prerequisite for the forgiveness of sins.³⁴ However, for Grotius, Christ's suffering is penal, but voluntary, and the example of Christ's passion deters sinners from continuing in a path which disrupts moral order by the moral influence of fear.³⁵

Some Arminian theologians tended to follow Grotius' governmental theory with some changes. The Arminian Curcellaeus emphasized the idea of sacrifice rather than satisfaction of wrath through punishment, thus describing the priestly work of Christ as propitiatory, but not penal. He says, "Christ did not therefore . . . make satisfaction by suffering all the punishments which we had deserved for our sins." This modified the strict governmental approach and emphasized the priestly work of Christ as propitiatory, but in the sense of a sacrificial gift.³⁶

MODIFIED PENAL SATISFACTION—JOHN WESLEY

Christ is the Second Adam who represents all mankind, makes himself an offering for sin, bears the iniquities of the human race, and makes satisfaction for the sins of the whole world. His *Notes on the New Testament* also show that Wesley understood Christ's death as a punishment due to us because of our sins.³⁷ Death, the penalty of the old covenant (more or less) on all mankind. Wesley speaks of Christ purchasing humanity's redemption and that his life and death involve a "full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction" for the sins of all humanity. Furthermore, says Collins, Wesley interprets the *hilasterion* language in Romans 3:25 as "propitiation," rather than "expiation," and he took issue with William Law for the latter's use of "expiation" and claim that God does not have wrath or anger toward humanity that must be appeased.³⁸

Although Wesley did not equate divine anger with human wrath or vengeance, he did see God's anger as being motivated by love for the sinner and as a foil that enables humanity to more fully appreciate God's love.³⁹ And while Wesley did believe that humanity has contracted a debt to God that it is unable to pay, he rejected the implication that satisfaction was made to the divine law, because he objected to the personification of law as a "person injured and to be satisfied."⁴⁰ Christ is the Second Adam who represents all mankind, makes himself an offering for sin, bears the iniquities of the human race, and makes satisfaction for the sins of the whole world. The complete and ongoing nature of Christ's work is emphasized in Wesley's emphasis on the totality of salvation in Christ's roles as Prophet, Priest, and King.⁴¹

None of the penal models presented by Anselm, the Reformers, or the Governmental model provide adequate basis in the Atonement for the transformation of the image of God and growth in sanctification and holiness in this life. The concern of a forensic model is the removal of guilt, not the transformation of relationship and restoration of moral likeness to God. A.S. Wood is in agreement with William R. Cannon and Albert Outler in noting that while Wesley held a penal view of atonement, he did not set the atonement inside a legal framework "in which God is made subject to an eternal, unalterable order of justice."⁴² This is what makes Wesley's view problematic, for the penal theories by definition set the atonement within a legal framework of "unalterable justice."

Anselm's satisfaction model, as well, though it uses the medieval Code of Honor as its background, is built upon the Catholic penitential system that is inherently forensic and Latin at its core. That is why the satisfaction and substitutionary implications are incompatible with the biblical covenant understanding of the Law as the interpersonal, loving, framework of God's boundaries of covenant fellowship, reconciliation, and accountability. The Western abstract forensic justice views of the law, as has been shown, tend to obscure how God's wrath toward sin is based on his loving desire to protect the covenant community and to prevent his creatures from violating its divine expectations in the covenant Law. The forensic tradition with its substitutionary understanding of sacrifice, invariably expresses the outcome of Christ's saving sacrifice in imputational terms. This leads them, Wesley thinks, to ignore attention to holiness, which involves conformity to the law of God.⁴³ It is at this point that the imputational substitutionary and transference understanding of the sacrifice of Christ falls short of Wesley's soteriological goals. Wesley says: "Justification by no means implies that God regards us contrary to the actual nature of things, that he accounts us better than we really are, or believes us to be righteous when we are unrighteous."⁴⁴ A covenant-based understanding of the sacrifice of Christ as sacrificial *identification* with humanity absorbing the effects of the deadly results of sin avoids the liability of the imputational penal models which depict Christ as obeying the law as a substitute for humanity and imputing his own merits to them for their salvation. This provides a strong basis for a view of salvation that understands Christ's work as a sacrificial atonement of covenant renewal in which the entire Trinity participates, and which involves the believer in a vital union with Christ and restoration of the divine image that is grounded in the theology of the New Testament and recalls Irenaeus' "divine exchange."⁴⁵ This restored covenant relationship *is* righteousness. The imputation-impartment debate becomes irrelevant when the biblical model of salvation as renewed covenant relationship is restored and the Western Latin penitential forensic model is seen appropriately as a Western cultural contextualization. It tends to divorce salvation from the interpersonal relational ideas of the covenant community and replace them with Roman forensic language which evolves through the penitential system into an economic penitential and merit-based understanding of salvation *a la* Tertullian, Cyprian, Anselm, and Aquinas.⁴⁶

An atonement theology that is consistent with Wesley's biblical emphases on both justification and sanctification of heart and life by faith would provide a more adequate basis for these benefits of the work of Christ.

II. THE BIBLICAL CONCEPT OF ATONEMENT

Perhaps the most central theological integrating motif of Scripture is the concept of covenant.⁴⁷ Barth, for example, views the divine covenant with humanity to be the "internal basis of creation."⁴⁸ Some 300 times the word *berith* occurs in the context of relationships and expectations between God and Israel.⁴⁹ While specific covenants such as those with Moses, Abraham, and David are presented, it is in the generic context of covenant interpersonal relationships that God's fellowship with Israel is most clearly defined.⁵⁰ Israel's obedience to the ancestral covenant obligations enabled them to avoid the sense of arbitrariness often found elsewhere, and every breach of the covenant expectations was a personal offense against God.⁵¹ The covenant Law formula served in

the OT to give authenticity to the expectations God placed on Israel to enable them to maintain the covenant relationships.

While the case for "expiation" cannot be fully presented in this setting, the most consistent theological meaning of "atonement" seems to be an expiation that restores a right relationship to God through grace, as Hartley, Birch, Brueggemann and others affirm.⁵² At issue is whether there is a need to bribe or appease God in order to induce Him to forgive the sinner. The key to this interpretation is in the nature and meaning of the sacrifice in the OT cultic ritual. The Priestly theology presents God as the one who provides the sacrificial system and takes the initiative in reconciliation through the covenant formula at Sinai. The text does not say that God needs to be reconciled. It is the sinners who need to be!⁵³ Through *identification* with the sacrifice in laying on of hands and presenting it to the priest, the offerer changed in his attitude to God from disobedience to obedience and repentance. The animal is thus not a *substitute* penalty for the sinner, but the representative of him.⁵⁴ The sacrifice becomes the sinner in self-offering to God in repentance as a response to God's invitation. This forgiveness is thus not a positional righteousness, but it results in the actual righting of the interpersonal relationship between God and humanity. The real sacrifice the offerer brings is himself as the true self-offering, and the animal is accepted by God as the token of His reception of the offerer who has identified himself with it, and thus forgives the sinner of his offenses. The significance of this understanding of sacrifice and covenant renewal is seen in its application to the NT presentation of the cross as God's story of incarnational loving redemption in Christ.

The Atonement of Jesus Christ, as it is interpreted according to the biblical model of covenant sacrifice, therefore, involves a profound understanding of his Incarnation in becoming fully human to the point of taking upon himself all the experience of the fallen human race, even the perception of the death resulting from sin. He thus takes upon himself the identification of humanity and becomes its sacrificial offering to God. In this identification with humanity through his divine love and grace, Christ as the Second Adam is able to act for humanity and in participation with it in its destiny of death, sharing its sufferings (I Pet. 3:13-22). However, since he participates in humanity's death, humanity also participates in his resurrection (Rom 6; I Pet. 1 and 3). As the God-Man, he represents humanity in leading it back to repentance, obedience, and reconciliation with God, and through his sacrificial obedience to God's will (of which he is a part), humanity thus reflects the covenant obedience God desires and is brought back into covenant fellowship with God through its faith-union with Christ. Through its participation by faith in Christ's own covenant self-sacrifice, humanity is restored to its covenant relationship with God and is reconciled and restored to the divine image through the Holy Spirit's regenerating presence and activity. It is this Spirit-energized, covenant-based foundation for Christ's atonement that results in growth in grace and Christlikeness consistent with Wesley's vision of holiness of heart and life, while avoiding the spiritual and psychological problems often associated with the unresolved guilt and legalism of the penal model. And it is a concept that can be utilized as the redemptive narrative that communicates the redemptive interpersonal story of Christ to a relationship-oriented and experience-based postmodern community that is unfamiliar with and resistant to the traditional penalty-based understanding of salvation.

NOTES

1. Daniel Brunner, Report of Willow Creek Seminar program to George Fox Evangelical Seminary faculty, 2001.
2. Dallas Willard, *The Divine Conspiracy* (San Francisco: Harper, 1998), 36, 37.
3. John Fletcher, *Checks to Antinomianism* (New York: Soule and Mason, 1819).
4. Richard Watson, *Theological Institutes*, 2 vol. (New York: Carlton & Phillips, 1856), p. II, 139; see also pp. II, 87-102; 113; 149-151; William Burt Pope, *A Compendium of Christian Theology*, 2 vols. (London: Wesleyan Conference Office, 1880), 2:265, 313, 314; John Miley, *Systematic Theology*, 2 vols. (New York: Eaton and Mains, 1984), 2:186; see 123, 168; Miner Raymond, *Systematic Theology*, 2 vols. (New York: Phillips and Hurt, 1880), 2:257-258; Wilbur F. Tillett, *Personal Salvation* (Nashville: Cokesbury Press, 1930), 98-109.
5. Dunning, *Grace, Faith, and Holiness*, 334; note also his references to the unpublished Ph.D. dissertation on the topic by John Rutherford Renshaw, "The Atonement in the Theology of John and Charles Wesley (Ph.D. diss., Boston University, 1965).
6. William Greathouse, "Sanctification and the Christus Victor Motif," unpublished address, Nazarene Theological Seminary, n.d.
7. *Ibid.* Richard S. Taylor has attempted to revive a classical penal substitutionary position for Wesleyan in his book, *God's Integrity and the Cross* (Nappanee, IN: Francis Asbury Press, 1999). Randy Maddox, *Responsible Grace: John Wesley's Practical Theology* (Nashville: Kingswood Press, 1994), 108; Maddox argues that the Governmental concept is more moral influence in reverse, than it is forensic. Punishment is a deterrent that maintains moral order. However, it still requires punishment in order to normalize justice, and hence is forensic.
8. Joel B. Green and Mark D. Baker, *Recovering the Scandal of the Cross* (Downer's Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2000), 30; Green and Baker cite a significant list of articles and books by theologians who raise this issue, such as Joanne Carlson Brown and Carole R. Bohn, eds., *Christianity, Patriarchy, and Abuse: A Feminist Critique* (New York: Pilgrim, 1989). Green and Baker present a wide-ranging call for the recovery of appropriate models of the atonement that avoid the penal substitutionary liabilities.
9. C. Joseph Sprague, *Affirmations of a Dissenter* (Nashville: Abingdon, 2002); Rebecca Ann Parker and Rita Nakashima Brock, *Proverbs of Ashes: Violence, Redemptive Suffering, and the Search for What Saves Us* (Boston: Beacon Press, 2001).
10. J. Denny Weaver, *The Non-violent Atonement* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001); Phil Smith, "Atonement as Peacemaking," unpublished paper, George Fox University, 2002.
11. Paul Fiddes, *Past Event and Present Salvation* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1989), 61-82; R. Larry Shelton, "Initial Salvation," *A Contemporary Wesleyan Theology*, ed. Charles W. Carter (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1983). See the remarks on the contrasts between the Western forensic orientation around guilt vs. the Eastern focus on growth, sanctification and renewal of divine image in Veli-Matti Kärkkäinen, *An Introduction to Ecclesiology* (Downer's Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2002), 18.
12. Again, a much more comprehensive analysis is included in the author's unpublished manuscript, *Divine Expectations*, which is available by request.
13. Roger Olson, *The Story of Christian Theology* (Downer's Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1999), 74.
14. Olson, *Story of Christian Theology*, 74.
15. Irenaeus, *Against Heresies*, Book V, Preface Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson, ed. (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1956), 526.
16. H.F. Davis, "The Atonement," *The Theology of the Atonement*, ed. John R. Sheets, S.J. (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1967), 10-13; see Irenaeus, *Against Heresies*, 2,3, and 5, edited by Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson. The Ante-Nicene Fathers, vol. 1 (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1956).
17. Aulén, "Christus," 33; see Irenaeus, *Against Heresies*, III, 21.10; 22.4.

18. Gustaf Aulén, *The Faith of the Christian Church* (Philadelphia: The Muhlenberg Press, 1948), 228.
19. William M. Greathouse, "Sanctification and the Christus Victor Motif in Wesleyan Theology," *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 7, No. 1, Spring 1972, 47-59.
20. Aulén, *Christus*, 78, 81-100. See Gunton, *The Actuality of the Atonement*, 84-87.
21. Driver, *Understanding the Atonement*, 82.
22. Anselm of Canterbury, *Why God Became Man, A Scholastic Miscellany*, Library of Christian Classics, vol. X, ed. & trans. By Eugene Fairweather (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1956), pp. 1789-181.
23. Anselm, *Cur Deus Homo*, I, 12, *Saint Anselm: Basic Writings*, ed. S.N. Deane (LaSalle, IL: Open Court Publishing Co., 1962), 203.
24. Anselm, *Cur Deus Homo*, I, 12, 206.
25. Colin Gunton, *The Actuality of the Atonement* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989), 124, 125.
26. Gunton, *The Actuality of the Atonement*, 92; see Anselm, *Cur Deus Homo*, (I, 21; II, 4 and 16).
27. Fiddes, *Past Event*, 99.
28. Taylor, *Jesus and His Sacrifice*, 300.
29. John Driver, *Understanding the Atonement for the Mission of the Church* (Scottsdale, PA: Herald Press, 1986), 60-61.
30. See the extensive treatment of McDonald, *The Atonement*, 163-173; also, an excellent exegesis of Anselm's theory is provided by Arthur Pollard, "Anselm's Doctrine of the Atonement," *The Churchman*.
31. H.D. McDonald, *The Atonement of the Death of Christ: In Faith, Revelation, and History* (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1985), 192, 193, and "Appendix."
32. Vincent Taylor, *Jesus and His Sacrifice* (London: The Macmillan Co., 1959), 50.
33. Grensted, *Short History*, 284, 285; Shelton, "Initial Salvation," 502.
34. L. W. Grensted, *A Short History of the Doctrine of the Atonement* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, reprinted 1962), 291-297; Shelton, "Initial Salvation," 502, 503; Dunning, *Grace, Faith and Holiness*, 337.
35. Frank H. Foster, "A Brief Introductory Sketch of the History of the Grotian Theory of the Atonement," in Preface to Hugo Grotius, *A Defense of the Catholic Faith Concerning the Satisfaction of Christ, Against Faustus Socinus*, tr. Frank H. Foster (Andover: W.F. Draper, 1889).
36. R. Larry Shelton, "Initial Salvation," 503.
37. John Wesley, *Explanatory Notes on the New Testament* (London: The Epworth Press, reprinted 1966), 837.
38. Collins, *Scripture Way*, 81-83; he cites Wesley's use of the language of the Book of Common Prayer in his liturgical and preaching resources in n. 64 and 65 on p. 81.
39. Collins, *Scripture Way*, 84, 85.
40. Collins, *Scripture Way*, 85; he cites Wesley's "The Principles of a Methodist," see n. 83. In this section on "The Atonement," Collins has usefully cited numerous relevant quotations on the topic from Wesley's works.
41. John Deschner, *Wesley's Christology* (Dallas: Southern Methodist University Press, 1960), 74, 165; Maddox, *Responsible Grace*, 110-114; Collins, *Scripture Way*, 44ff.; Dunning, *Grace, Faith, and Holiness*, 367-390.
42. A.S. Wood, *The Burning Heart* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1967), 237f. See also William R. Cannon, *The Theology of John Wesley* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1956), 209-211; and Albert Outler, *John Wesley* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1964), 273, 276, 287-288.
43. Maddox, *Responsible Grace*, 104, see fn. 63; Maddox notes that Wesley rejected the imputation of Christ's active righteousness or obedience to believers because it discouraged the seeking

of holiness. He speaks to this in his sermon on "The Lord Our Righteousness," *Works*, 1:449-65.

44. John Wesley, "Justification by Faith," *John Wesley on Christian Beliefs: The Standard Sermons in Modern English*, 3 vols., Kenneth C. Kinghorn, ed. (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2002), 1:101.

45. This conclusion is thoroughly documented in the author's book manuscript, *Divine Expectations: Interpreting the Atonement for 21st Century Mission*. Documentation and manuscript are available upon request.

46. Aulén, 84-87.

47. R. Larry Shelton, "A Covenant Concept of the Atonement," *Wesleyan Theological Journal*, Vol. 19, Number 1 (Spring 1984); Jacob Jock, *The Covenant: A Theology of Human Destiny* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1968).

48. Barth, Karl. *Church Dogmatics*, III/1, trans. Harold Knight, G.W. Brimley, J. K. S. Reid, R. H. Fuller (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1960), 267.

49. A. B. Davidson, "Covenant," *A Dictionary of the Bible*, Vol. 1 (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1898), 509; G. E. Mendenhall, "Covenant," *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, Vol. 1 (Nashville: Abingdon, 1962), 715.

50. Francis Brown, S. R. Driver, and C. A. Briggs, *Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1952), 136; G.E. Mendenhall, "Covenant," *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, Vol. 1 (Nashville: Abingdon, 1962), p. 715; J. A. Thompson, "Covenant," *International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*, Vol. 1 (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Co., 1979), 790; Davidson, *Covenant*, 509.

51. Dwight Van Winkle, "Christianity and Zionism," *Journal of the Irish Christian Study Centre*, Vol. 2, 1984, 38-46. The Wesleyan tradition has consistently interpreted the covenantal language in conditional and interpersonal rather than in juristic and unconditional terms. As Van Winkle's exegesis shows, the covenant with Abraham and Moses in Gen. 15 and 17 and in Lev. 18:24-28 is conditioned upon Israel's obedient response to its conditions. In Exod. 19:5, the declaration is "if (emphasis mine) you obey my voice and keep my covenant, you shall be my own possession among all peoples; for all the earth is mine, and you shall be to me a kingdom of priests and a holy nation." Obedience is the condition of covenant maintenance (see Van Winkle, "Christianity and Zionism," 42-43); Bruce Birch, Walter Brueggemann, Terence Fretheim, and David Petersen, *A Theological Introduction to the Old Testament* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1999), 151.

52. Walter Eichrodt, *Theology of the Old Testament*, 2 vols. (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1961), 1:75; E. P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987), 92-97.

53. John E. Hartley, "Expiate, Expiation," *International Standard Biblical Encyclopedia*, Vol. 2 (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.: 1982), 246-247; C. L. Mitton, "Atonement," *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1962), 310; C. H. Dodd, *The Bible and the Greeks* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1935), 88-93; Leon Morris, *The Apostolic Preaching of the Cross* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1965), 149; Bernhard Anderson, *Contours of Old Testament Theology* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1999), 120.

54. H. H. Rowley, *The Meaning of Sacrifice in the Old Testament* (Manchester: John Rylands Library, 1950), 87; Walter Brueggemann, *Theology of the Old Testament: Testimony, Dispute, Advocacy*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1997), 666; see Lev. 6:30; 16:20; Matt. 5:24; Rom. 5:10; 2 Cor. 5:20.

55. Hartmut Gese, *Essays in Biblical Theology* Translated by Keith Crim (Minneapolis, 1981), 105, 106. The laying on of hands is thus not seen as a transfer of sins to the animal (as in the scapegoat in Lev. 16:21f.), but as an identification, or "inclusive substitution," of the offerer's life with that of the animal. It is the life of the animal, not its death that is offered to God (Lev. 17:11), and it is the life of Christ acting obediently on behalf of humanity that is offered to God.