

A LOOK AT THE LARGER VIEW OF CALVARY: AN EVALUATION OF THE DEBATE IN THE SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTIST CHURCH

By Norman R. Gulley

Southern College of Seventh-day Adventists

Introduction

Seventh-day Adventists have grappled with the meaning of Calvary for a long time. Two major emphases have developed, (1) The Substitutionary model (afterwards referred to as SM) in which Calvary is the substitutionary sacrifice of Christ to pay human debt and satisfy God's broken law (2 Cor 5:19). Some view this as the Penal, Forensic or Legal model. It also includes Christ as representative man (2 Cor 5:14, Rom 5:18-19).¹ (2) The Great Controversy Trust-Healing model (afterwards referred to as GCTHM) in which Calvary is viewed in the larger setting of the great controversy between Christ and Satan with Christ's death answering three basic questions: (1) Does sin bring death?, (2) Is it death at the hand of our gracious God? and (3) Is it important to understand that God does not kill any of His erring children? Some view this as a qualified type of Moral Influence theory. There are those who believe these two views are mutually exclusive.

Is one theory right and the other wrong? Or, is there room for aspects of both? Is one model really more restricted than the other, or are both informed by the great controversy paradigm? In other words, Is it correct to say that the GCTHM has a larger view than the SM? If it does, then how does one define "larger"? Is it "larger"

when compared to the classical atonement theories, such as the "Christus Victor," Socinian, Moral Influence, Governmental, Ransom and Satisfaction theories, for example?² Or, is it "larger" when compared to an understanding of the great controversy? Or, is it "larger" because it incorporates the total revelation of Scripture and the inspired insights of Ellen G. White? The GCTHM adherents believe theirs to be the larger view, because it looks at Calvary in the setting of the great controversy.

Exponents of both models are saying things that are to be found in inspired writings. Yet *selective use* of those writings as well as "straw men" are involved in the GCTHM.³ The purpose of this article is irenic. There is no desire to criticize those who have devoted much time to presenting the truth as they see it. Truth is bigger than any of us. Thus, references to the published works (books, video and audio tapes) of exponents of these two views are not cited although this presentation is the result of researching them in the light of inspired sources. We should remember that changing world views have contributed to new atonement theories.^{4, 5, 6}

Different biblical words accepted by the SM express Christ's atonement, such as "justification," "redemption," "propitiation," "reconciliation," and "victory." These have generated numerous theories. I have discussed these in my article "Toward Understanding the Atonement," in the *Journal of the Adventist Theological Society*, Vol. 1, #1, Spring 1990, pp. 57-89. This article will not review those theories, but will consider what must be included in "the larger view of Calvary." The fact that Nicea (A. D. 325) and Chalcedon (A. D. 461) pronounced on the nature of Christ, but no conciliar decree has done the same about His works (atonement), should serve as a caution against arriving at any simple model. Within space limitations, we will look at (1) twelve aspects of the larger view of the cross and (2) examine four areas of the content of redemption (SM) that Calvary reveals.

Thesis. Scripture and the writing of Ellen G. White must judge one's model of the atonement, rather than the reverse. That is to say, the model must not judge Scripture and inspired writing, selectively using them, and interpreting them from any preconceived ideas about Calvary and the great controversy issue, or

judging some parts of God's Word as more primitive than others.⁷ Although God invites us to use our reason (Isa 1:18), reason must not be the final court of appeal.⁸ Human reason must bow before divine revelation, or we are left with rationalism.⁹ It should be kept in mind that "those who are exalted in their own opinions will despise the blood of the Atoning Sacrifice, and will do despite to the Spirit of grace."¹⁰ Furthermore, we would have no idea of Calvary apart from divine revelation.

We should also recall that J. H. Kellogg's claim that his pantheistic view of God presented a larger view than only a personal being?¹¹ And A. T. Jones believed Kellogg's view to be "the larger and true idea" of God when compared to the God of Seventh-day Adventists,¹² a view supported by the non-Adventist press.¹³ Although different in many ways, nevertheless both Kellogg's view of God and that of the GCTHM deny the need of a substitutionary payment on Calvary and the need for the subsequent heavenly sanctuary intercession.¹⁴

The thesis before us involves the following three major premises:

1. The plan of salvation has eternal dimensions that dismiss any simple model of the cross as inadequate.

2. Calvary is more than a demonstration that sin brings death. Such is a restricted view for the following reasons: (a) The great controversy issues are far larger than the question "Is God or Satan right about sin resulting in death." The question of death is a subsequent issue arising after the controversy was launched. (b) The prior and larger issues of the great controversy have to do with the supremacy of Christ and God's eternal law. Inspiration is very clear on this.¹⁵ These two, together with ten other aspects, will form a truly larger view of Calvary that I will attempt to spell out in this article.

3. I define "the larger view" of the cross as the full revelation of Scripture and the writings of Ellen G. White, rather than a view of the great controversy representing less than all that is revealed (as in the GCTHM).

Illustration. While in my doctoral studies at the University of Edinburgh, I read systematically through Karl Barth's *Church Dogmatics* (13 volumes, 7, 946 pages) in seventy-nine and a half

days. It was a herculean task, but there is no better way to become emersed in the thinking and system of a theologian of the caliber of Karl Barth. Unlike most theologians, Barth has attempted to look at all theological topics from the perspective of Jesus Christ. At the outset this seemed refreshingly different. It had real appeal. There is a drawing power in a focus on the love of God as seen in Christ! But, as I grappled with Barth's system and reasoning, I became aware that he was presenting his own idea of Christ and holding that view above Scripture, judging Scripture in the light of that view. The result was that he rejected some biblical insights simply on the basis of their disagreement with his preconceived view of Christ.

Barth's view of Christ caused him to reject the existence of Satan and fallen angels! His idea of Christ made any final punishment, or God's wrath, meaningless as his system moves inexorably to universalism—despite his protestations to the contrary. What did he do with the texts that said otherwise? He simply dismissed them as irrelevant.

Could this happen in the Seventh-day Adventist church? Could it be done in the name of the great controversy, or in defense of a gracious God? Could ideas about either be taken and superimposed over Scripture to restrict it to preconceived views on such subjects as God's wrath? The only way to prevent such a possibility is to test one's ideas by submitting them to the judgment of *all* of God's divine revelation in Scripture and the writing of Ellen G. White. We will attempt to do this within the necessary limits of this article.

The Eternal Dimension. There are eternal dimensions to salvation's plan that stagger the mind. Concerning the eternity past Ellen White says, "The salvation of the human race has ever been the object of the councils of heaven. . . It has existed from all eternity. . . So surely as there never was a time when God was not, so surely there never was a moment when it was not the delight of the eternal mind to manifest His grace to humanity."¹⁶ Concerning the future eternity she says, "It will take all eternity to comprehend the science of redemption, to understand something of what it means that the Son of the infinite God gave his life for the life of

the world."¹⁷ So Calvary comes with an eternity behind it and an eternity before it!

No wonder Ellen White describes salvation's plan as "immeasurable,"¹⁸ that it "far exceeds the comprehension of the human mind,"¹⁹ that it "is too high to be fully reached by human thought,"²⁰ and "increases in greatness as we contemplate it."²¹ Do we realize what this means? It means that the more we study it the more opens up to be studied. It isn't a case of mastery. Rather, with the passing of eternity the magnitude of the content of Calvary will be ever unfolding without end! "It cost an infinite price to deliver the captives of Satan from the captivity of sin."²² Calvary is an infinite subject which will take an infinite eternity to understand!

Concerning the angels Ellen White says, "They saw the Redeemer take step after step down the path of humiliation. They saw him rejected, denied, insulted, abused, and crucified, and yet it was something beyond all finite intelligence to comprehend the full mystery of redemption."²³ So even angels, who watched Jesus die, could not comprehend the full mystery involved, and they were sinless beings of a higher order than humankind (Heb 2:7)! How much less can sinful mortals, who did not observe Calvary, comprehend (cf. Rom 11:33-34)! In fact Ellen White says that "the redeemed throng will range from world to world, and much of their time will be employed in searching out the mysteries of redemption. And throughout the whole stretch of eternity, this subject will be continually opening to their minds."²⁴ No wonder there are so many theories! It is a humbling fact that the sum total of all the theories fail to do justice to the eternal revelation of Calvary yet to come. This article included!

Twelve Major Components of the Larger View of Calvary

1. *The larger view does not confine itself to our gracious Heavenly Father, but sees also the centrality of Christ in the great controversy.*

Christ indicated how the Old Testament spoke of Himself (Luke 24:25-26; John 5:39). The last biblical book is a revelation of Christ (Rev 1:1) in the setting of the great controversy. In Revelation the Father sits on the throne in the background (e.g. Rev 5:6; 14:1-5, 14-20; 19:11-16). The war in heaven is between Michael

(Christ) and Satan (Rev 12:7-10), and Christ does not hand over the kingdom to the Father until after the destruction of "all his enemies" at the end (1 Cor 15:22-28).

Even though Christ came to reveal the Father (John 14:9), since the Father's character and government has been questioned by Satan, it is also true from sin's inception, that "to dispute the supremacy of the Son of God, thus impeaching the wisdom and love of the Creator, had become the purpose of this prince of angels."²⁵ To meet this issue, "the King of the universe summoned the heavenly hosts before Him, that in their presence He might set forth the true position of His Son. . ."²⁶ Note Satan's response. "The exaltation of the Son of God as equal with the Father was represented as an injustice to Lucifer."²⁷ "He would never again acknowledge the supremacy of Christ," nor "the authority of Christ."²⁸

At the end of the millennium Christ and His cross is central before the gaze of all humans who have ever lived. Satan recalls his "envy of Christ" and "his constant efforts to oppose the work of Christ."²⁹ Thus, throughout the millennia, as Ellen G. White rightly indicates in the naming of her book, it has been *The Great Controversy Between Christ and Satan*.

2. *The larger view involves the Trinity and not just the Father (We will develop this later).*

3. *The larger view involves the eternal mediation of Christ, and includes His priestly ministration in the heavenly sanctuary.*

From eternity Christ has been the Word of God (John 1:1-2). Called "Michael the Archangel" (Jude 9, Rev 12:7, cf. Dan 12:1), He mingled with the angels, as a mediator between the infinite God and the angel creation. With sin's inception, the Father announced to the angels "the true position of His Son."³⁰ After the fall of man, Christ pled three times with the Father to become man's Substitute-Saviour.³¹ Later in Gethsemane He would plead three times to "let this cup pass" if possible (Matt 26:39-44). "He was to stand between the sinner and the penalty of sin."³²

Though the Father is equally loving, the way to the Father is through Christ (John 14:6 cf. John 6:44), as man's Mediator (1 Tim 2:5; cf. Gal 3:19-20; Heb 8:6; 9:15; 12:24). Even though Christ does not pray to the Father to get Him to love mankind (John 16:26-27), yet even man's religious worship is unacceptable without Christ's

intercession.³³ The larger view of Calvary believes that “the intercession of Christ in man’s behalf in the sanctuary above is as essential to the plan of salvation as was His death upon the cross”³⁴ (cf. Rom 4:25).

4. *The larger view includes operation of all the divine attributes and not just that of love.*

“Righteousness and justice are the foundation” of God’s throne (Ps 89:14; 97:2; cf. Exod 34:6-7; Jer 9:24). As Ellen G. White notes, “When Adam fell, God’s attributes of holiness, justice and truth could not be changed.”³⁵ Calvary demonstrates God’s justice (Rom 3:25-26). Yet, by some, “love is dwelt upon as the chief attribute of God. . . God’s justice, His denunciations of sin, the requirements of His holy law, are all kept out of sight.”³⁶

5. *The larger view must include Satan’s attack against God’s law.*

“Those only who have a just regard for the law of God can rightly estimate the atonement of Christ which was made necessary by the violation of the Father’s law.”³⁷ The GCTHM focuses on the great controversy against God’s character and government. Basic to that government is His law. Ellen G. White can use “government” and “law” synonymously.³⁸

We must remember that “Satan has declared that men could not enter the kingdom of heaven unless the law was abolished and a way devised by which transgressors could be reinstated into the favor of God, and made heirs of heaven. He made the claim that the law must be changed, that the reins of government must be slackened in heaven, that sin must be tolerated, and sinners pitied and saved in their sins. But every such plea was cast aside when Christ died as a substitute for the sinner.”³⁹ For, the larger view of Calvary satisfies “the claims of the broken law.”⁴⁰ “Christ exhausted the penalty and provided a pardon.”⁴¹ The sinless One became “sin for us” (2 Cor 5:21). This involves far more than a mere disclosure to restore trust.

At sin’s inception in heaven⁴² Satan worked “to excite opposition to the law of God.”⁴³ “Satan represents God’s law of love as a law of selfishness. . . Jesus was to unveil this deception.”⁴⁴ His perfect life of law-keeping ended in His “It is finished on Calvary” (John 19:30), at which moment Satan was exposed as false. The

larger view of Calvary includes the Life of Christ as also necessary to the atonement. “Through Christ’s redeeming work the government of God stands justified.”⁴⁵ Subsequently, “for the good of the entire universe” God has allowed time, so that “the immutability of His law might be forever placed beyond all question.”⁴⁶

The eternal principles of the law, against which Satan revolted, must not be minimized by calling law-giving at Sinai an “emergency measure” as in the GCTHM.⁴⁷ For Sinai was actually a type of the end-time judgments, with eschatological escalation involved, in that the local will become global. God says, “The terrors of Sinai were to represent to the people the scenes of judgment. . . When the divine Presence was manifested upon Sinai, the glory of the Lord was like devouring fire in the sight of all Israel. But when Christ shall come in glory with His holy angels the whole earth shall be ablaze with the terrible light of His presence. . . A fiery stream shall issue and come forth from before Him, which shall cause the elements to melt with fervent heat, the earth also, and the works that are therein shall be burned up”⁴⁸ (cf. Heb 10:26-29; 12:22-29). No wonder that even “the child of God will be terror-stricken at the first sight of the majesty of Jesus Christ. He feels that he cannot live in His holy presence. But the word comes to him as to John, ‘Fear not’.”⁴⁹

At the close of the millennium the entire universe behold the coronation of Christ. “They see in His hands the tables of the divine law, the statutes which they have despised and transgressed.”⁵⁰ Just as Christ and the law are seen together with the cross in that final revelation to humankind, so they must be kept together at Calvary. At the close of the great controversy, “the fruits of setting aside the divine statutes” will have been “laid open to the view of all created intelligences.”⁵¹

Law is mentioned at least fifty times in three Ellen G. White chapters dealing with the beginning and end of the great controversy.⁵² These chapters are not preoccupied with the three questions of interest to the GCTHM. In fact, these three chapters and a reference in *Desire of Ages*⁵³ indicate that God did not destroy the fallen angels when banished from heaven because it would take time for the nature of sin to be understood. But with the lapse of sufficient time, His justice would be vindicated when He destroyed

them (a view contrary to the GCTHM).⁵⁴ Ellen White quotes Hebrews 2:14, to show that Christ's death enables Him to destroy "him that had the power of death, that is, the devil."⁵⁵ She even designates the larger view beyond man's redemption as magnifying the law (not questions about sin bringing death), and at Calvary "the penalty of the law fell upon" Christ (as in the SM).⁵⁶

6. *The larger view recognizes the seriousness of sin, and man's need of salvation, as well as his need to trust. Man needs a Substitute.*

The GCTHM is silent on human guilt needing atonement. It is a limited view of Calvary that overlooks the seriousness of sin as lawlessness (1 John 3:4). Sin is more than a breakdown of trust that only needs information (revelation), and more than a disease that just needs healing. Substitution is a major theme that runs throughout the Bible. It would take a separate article to elaborate on that truth.⁵⁷ Justification through Christ's substitutionary sacrifice (Isa 53: 1-12; Luke 22:37; Rom 4:25; 1 Cor 15:1-3; 1 Tim 2:6; 1 Pet 2:24; 3:18; 1 John 4:10) and imputed righteousness (1 Cor 1:30, cf. vs. 23) are essential components of salvation. In Gethsemane Satan tempted Christ with the thought that substitution would defile Him forever.⁵⁸ The death of the second Adam is the solution to the sin of the first Adam (Rom 5:18-19).

7. *The larger view is cosmic in scope, contributing to the understanding of unfallen beings as well as to man.*⁵⁹ *Whereas man unlike angels, needs redemption,⁶⁰ man also with unfallen beings needs revelation. To both classes Calvary is God's response to Satan's questioning of His Word.*

Satan "misrepresented God, attributing to Him the desire for self-exaltation. With his own evil characteristics he sought to invest the loving Creator. Thus he deceived angels. Thus he deceived men. He led them to doubt the word of God, and to distrust His goodness. Because God is a God of justice and terrible majesty, Satan caused them to look upon Him as severe and unforgiving."⁶¹ Note that in heaven Satan's thrust was against God's word, as it has been ever since, as well as against His character and government. Therefore the larger view of Calvary must be true to all of God's Word to properly defend Him.

8. *The larger view is more than a revelation of God. It is also an unmasking of Satan and an exposure of man.*

Because God is holy, and true to Himself, He did something about sin and Satan at the cross (John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11). The cross reveals the unholiness of Satan and man, that as sinners these created beings took the life of their own Creator. John Stott speaks to some of what we say here when he says, "All inadequate doctrines of the atonement are due to inadequate doctrines of God and man."⁶² Calvary is Christ's victory over Satan (Heb 2:14).

9. *The larger view must include all that Scripture says about Jesus. He is more than a Friend.*

Christ is more than a Friend (John 15:15). He is our God (John 1:1,14; 20:28), our Creator (Heb 1:1-3), our Lord (1 Cor 11:26), our Master (Col 4:1), our Teacher (John 13:13), our Mediator (1 Tim 2:5), our Saviour (Rev 5:9-12), our High priest (Heb 4:14-16), our Advocate (1 John 2:1) our judge (John 5:22) and our King (Rev 19:16). Calvary does demonstrate His love to us (John 12:32). It does reveal that He is our Friend. But, properly understood, Calvary shows Him doing for us that which we could never do for ourselves (Rom 5:8; Eph 2:8, 9).

Calvary is a gift of recreation, a new beginning, a new chance (cf. Eph 1:3-8). Calvary reveals that Christ took our place, carried our sin, died in our stead as our Substitute (Isa 53:4-10; 2 Cor 5:21). Calvary reveals our God at work for us and calls forth worship, adoration and praise which far transcends just friendship talk (cf. Rev 4:8-11; 5:9,12; 12:10-12). It will be our delight to serve Him as our Creator, Saviour and King as well as our Friend. The larger picture of Scripture must not be limited to friendship talk anymore than the multiple attributes of God must be restricted to just love, or the multiple biblical insights of Calvary confined to only disclosure.

The GCTHM proposes that we are God's friends, not His servants (identified with the SM, or legal model by the GCTHM). Yet the larger view of the cross also includes Christ as the "suffering Servant" (eg. Isa 42 and 53) and our response as "Christ's servants" (1 Cor 7:22; cf. Rom 1:1; Eph 6:6; Luke 17:10; Heb 3:5; James 1:1; 1 Pet. 2:16; Jude 1; Rev 1:1). Even Job, cited by the GCTHM as speaking well of God, is called by God His servant, Job 42:7. It is servants who will be ready for Christ's return (Matt 24:45-46) and receive Christ's commendation "Well done" (Luke 19:17).

10. *The larger view is not a disclosure that demands priority over the claims of Scripture.*

Scriptural revelation must have priority over any human insight into the significance of Calvary, for apart from Scripture the meaning of Calvary would be unknown. Any interpretation of the disclosure of Calvary must of necessity be in harmony with the rest of Biblical revelation (e.g. "The Lord has laid on Him the iniquity of us all" Isa 53:6, or substitution). The disclosure at Calvary must not be placed above, or in place of, revelation in Scripture. Any elevation of the disclosure at Calvary above biblical claims is the same as Brunner's "Truth as Encounter" or Barth's "Christomonism." The cross is placed above Scripture just like Brunner's encounter (or experience) is placed above the Bible, and Barth's "Christ" is placed above God's Word. All three, though different, share common ground in placing human reason as judge over divine revelation.⁶³

Seventh-day Adventists know Satan will come pretending to be Christ in the end-time. That disclosure can only be exposed as counterfeit by the judgment of God's Word—we will meet Christ in the air and not on the ground (1 Thess 4:16-18; Matt 24:23-28). Satan's disclosure in Eden, with alleged evidence concerning not dying by eating the forbidden fruit, was given to discredit God's Word (Gen 3:1-6). Satan's consistent strategy is to deny God's Word through disclosure. Therefore, God's Word, with its truth-claims, necessarily has priority even over alleged divine disclosure until after the Second Advent.⁶⁴

11. *The larger view must include all that Scripture says about the cross. This includes all the Biblical metaphors describing salvation.*⁶⁵

It follows, that the larger view of Calvary must include all that Scripture says about the cross, and not just disclosure. A selective use of Scripture (as in the GCTHM) is no different than Satan's questioning of God's Word as to whether death will come through sin (Gen 3:1-6; basic to the GCTHM). In both instances the reason of a created being is placed above a "thus saith the Lord."

Authentic trust in God is demonstrated by trusting in the totality of divine revelation. Disclosure alone (as in the GCTHM) is no different from the confined view of occult interpretations

found in channelled sources of the New Age Movement⁶⁶ and its precursor in the Theosophical Society.⁶⁷ All share common ground in rejecting substitution, for man is seen as only needing revelation and not redemption.

12. *The larger view includes redemption (SM) as well as revelation (GCTHM), and redemption necessarily has priority over revelation as its content.*

Relative to human salvation, the larger view of Calvary, as given throughout Scripture, involves redemption (e.g. Matt 20:28; Rom 3:24; 5:9; Eph 1:7) as well as revelation (John 12:32; Rom 2:4). Redemption is the objective side of atonement, and revelation is the subjective side. The objective side necessarily has priority over the subjective, otherwise the revelation would be without meaningful content. It follows that any preoccupation with the *affects* of revelation is a confinement to the results of the cross rather than its cause. Redemption and revelation are the two sides of what happened on Calvary, and must both be given their proper place.

Having briefly mentioned the twelve areas important to the larger setting of the cross, we come now to focus on four crucial factors involved in redemption. For in looking at the two models of the cross subscribed to by Seventh-day Adventists, we could legitimately view them as having to do with (1) primary focus on redemption (SM) and (2) sole focus on revelation (GCTHM). If the first concentrates on the content of Redemption, the second concentrates on its affects, without any attention to its content. These four major aspects of redemption found in inspired sources are missing in the GCTHM; hence, it must be considered a narrower view, even though wrongly called the larger view.

Redemption: Justice And Mercy

It is necessary to grasp what is involved in redemption before we ever move on to speak of its revelation. We must understand the function of God as Redeemer before we are able to understand what He reveals about that redemption. For it is redemption that is the proper content of Calvary's revelation. In other words, salvation has to do with what Christ did *in our place* (Mark 10:45; *anti*, "in place of," not just *huper*, "for us") at Calvary which in turn constitutes the revelation He makes to produce trust and healing *in us*.

It is not one without the other. If redemption is misunderstood, there is a truncated revelation.

Redemption includes justice as well as mercy (love). God is "a righteous God and a Saviour" (Isa 45:21, NIV; cf. Zeph 3:5). Christ is "righteous and having salvation" (Zech 9:9, NIV), "the Holy and Righteous One" (Acts 3:14, NIV; cf. 7:52), Whose "judgment is just" (John 5:30, NIV). Thus, Scripture reveals God and Jesus with more than the one attribute of love (1 John 4:8). Given that God does what He does because He is who He is, then the sum total of His attributes are in all that He does, including Calvary. That means Calvary must be more than a revelation of love. It must be also a revelation of righteousness, a revelation of justice, a revelation of the sum total of God's attributes. God has no such attribute as abstract love. His love is qualified by His justice, as well as His justice by His love. This means that God's love revealed at the cross is not neutral love, or love cut off from all the other attributes of God. It is "just love," and "loving justice." It is "holy love."

Ellen G. White speaks of the larger view of the atonement in the context of the great controversy. She says,

God's love has been expressed in His justice no less than in His mercy. Justice is the foundation of His throne, and the fruit of His love. It had been Satan's purpose to divorce mercy from truth and justice. . . . By His life and His death, Christ proved that God's justice did not destroy His mercy, but that sin could be forgiven, and that the law is righteous, and can be perfectly obeyed. Satan's charges were refuted. God had given man unmistakable evidence of His love.

Another deception was now to be brought forward. Satan declared that mercy destroyed justice, that the death of Christ abrogated the Father's law. Had it been possible for the law to be changed or abrogated, then Christ need not have died. But to abrogate the law would be to immortalize transgression, and place the world under Satan's control. It was because the law was changeless, because man could be saved only through obedience to its precepts, that Jesus was lifted up on the cross. Yet the very means by which Christ established the law Satan represented as destroying it. Here will come the last conflict of the great controversy between Christ and Satan."⁶⁸

Here we see that any great controversy view of Calvary must

discuss Satan's attempt to divide God's attributes, focusing on justice more than mercy before the cross, and upon mercy more than justice after the cross. A sole focus on God's love (as in the GCTHM) finds itself within the same focus of Satan's post-crucifixion strategy. This needs to be carefully considered.

Leon Morris believes that "throughout the Bible the central question is, 'How can sinful man ever be accepted by a holy God?'"⁶⁹ In commenting on the moral influence theory, he notes that "some form of the subjective or moral view is held widely today, especially among scholars of the liberal school. In all its variations this theory emphasizes the importance of the effect of Christ's cross on the sinner."⁷⁰ His evaluation is twofold. "It is when it is claimed that this is all that the atonement means that we must reject it. Taken in this way it is open to serious criticism. If Christ was not actually doing something by his death, then we are confronted with a piece of showmanship, nothing more."⁷¹ His second observation lays bare the emptiness of atonement as demonstration. He says that "unless the death of Christ really does something, it is not in fact a demonstration of love."⁷²

For example, if someone dives in to save you when you are drowning, you will be forever grateful for such love. But if he dives in while you are safely sitting on the bank you cannot help but wonder about his wisdom, and would have no clue how this reveals his love.⁷³ And it is doubtful that this act would increase any trust, or produce any healing. As Y. H. Hughes put it,

God must work in the Atonement itself, as well as in the life that follows. There must, therefore, be an "objective" source of power, and not merely a subjective change in man, before the Atonement can become effective. The degenerations and losses wrought by sin have to be met and conquered, and for this more than knowledge is necessary.⁷⁴

That "more than knowledge" content of Calvary addresses important issues in the great controversy. Ellen G. White says, "His death proved God's administration and government to be without a flaw. Satan's charge in regard to the conflicting attributes of justice and mercy was forever settled beyond question. Every voice in heaven and out of heaven will one day testify to the justice, mercy, and love of God."⁷⁶ In his final post-millennial attack against God's

government, Satan will attempt "to dethrone Christ" and in this act will be "fully unmasked." Then "his accusations against the mercy and justice of God" will be silenced.⁷⁶

Redemption Includes God's Wrath

The desire to present God in a good light is a commendable motive behind the GCTHM, because "the great deceiver endeavors to shift his own horrible cruelty of character upon our heavenly Father. . ." ⁷⁷ and "the appalling views of God which have spread over the world from the teachings of the pulpit have made thousands, yes, millions, of skeptics and infidels."⁷⁸ Yet, God's own revelation speaks of His wrath. It is all through the Bible, and God warns against a false security.⁷⁹ There is a close association between God's wrath and Christ's salvation (John 3:36; Rom 5:9; Eph 2:3-5; 1 Thess 1:10; 5:9-10).⁸⁰

Did not Christ twice overturn the tables in the temple as an act of righteous indignation? (John 2:12-22 and Matt 21:12-16, 23-46; Mark 11:15-19, 27-33; 12:1-12; Luke 19:45-48; 20:1-19).⁸¹ Do we not read of the "wrath of the Lamb" (Rev 6:16)? I am aware of the definition of wrath in Romans 1 (Rom 1:24, 26, 28), to which we will return shortly. However, it is necessary to look at all of divine revelation for guidance on this matter. We must allow revelation to inform us as to why God says so much about His wrath in Scripture. We must remind ourselves that the Bible is not a smorgasbord where we are free to pick and choose what we want and leave the rest. The Protestant principle of *sola scriptura*, where the Bible is its own interpreter and the whole Biblical view is sought, is still the only safe hermeneutic.

It should be emphasized that God's wrath is as far distanced from human wrath as is His love, or any other attribute. Any attribute of God, such as wrath, must be considered as compatible with His attribute of love. God's attributes are no more mutually exclusive than are the three members of the Godhead. These apparently opposite attributes (from a human perspective) belong naturally together within each member of the Godhead as do the three members themselves. Because of space limitations we must confine our attention to only a few illustrations and comments.

The children of Israel tented with the tabernacle in their midst.

"God with them" was one side of the truth about our gracious God. The other was that "the Levites. . . set up their tents around the tabernacle of the testimony so that wrath" would not fall on the Israelite community (Num 1:53, NIV; cf. 18:5). When Korah, Dathan and Abiram rebelled against Moses and Aaron, the earth swallowed them up (Num 16:31-34) and "fire came out from the Lord and consumed the 250" followers (Num 16:35, NIV). The next day the Israelites complained, blaming Moses and Aaron for killing the people (Num 16:41). The Lord said to Moses, "Get away from this assembly so I can put an end to them at once" (Num 16:45, NIV). Then Moses said to Aaron, "Take your censer and put incense in it, along with fire from the altar, and hurry to the assembly to make atonement for them. Wrath has come out from the Lord; the plague has started. . . Aaron offered the incense and made atonement for them. He stood between the living and the dead, and the plague stopped. But 14,700 people died from the plague" (Num 16:46-49, NIV).

In this incident atonement was clearly associated with God's wrath against rebellion, an insight into atonement at the cross, which in its larger view includes God's ultimate response to Satan's rebellion. The GCTHM claims that sin is self-destruction, that God's abandonment on Calvary gives insight into the final destruction of the wicked. There is truth in this (see next section, and also footnote).⁸² However, the larger view must include two causes for the destruction of the wicked: (1) God's wrath against sin (cf. Ps 11:6; Isa 9:5; 34:2)⁸³ and (2) sin as self-destruction. For example, the final plagues come when God actively intervenes and sends them,⁸⁴ as well as when His presence is "withdrawn," and He does not "prevent" Satan's work.⁸⁵ Ellen G. White's following insight calls in question the validity of the GCTHM view of sin as only self-destruction. She says,

God's love is represented in our day as being of such a character as would forbid His destroying the sinner. Men reason from their own low standard of right and justice. "Thou thoughtest that I was altogether such an one as thyself" (Ps 50:21). They measure God by themselves. They reason as to how they would act under the circumstances and decide God would do as they imagine they would do. . .

In no kingdom or government is it left to the lawbreakers to say what

punishment is to be executed against those who have broken the law. All we have, all the bounties of His grace which we possess, we owe to God. The aggravating character of sin against such a God cannot be estimated any more than the heavens can be measured with a span. *God is a moral governor as well as a Father.* He is the Lawgiver. He makes and executes His laws. Law that has no penalty is of no force.

The plea may be made that a *loving Father would not see His children suffering the punishment of God* by fire while He had the power to relieve them. But God would, for the good of His subjects and for their safety, punish the transgressor. *God does not work on the plan of man. He can do infinite justice that man has no right to do before his fellow man.* Noah would have displeased God to have drowned one of the scoffers and mockers that harassed him, but God drowned the vast world. Lot would have had no right to inflict punishment on his sons-in-law, but God would do it in strict justice.⁸⁶

In view of this statement, and the many biblical texts on God's wrath, we see that the larger setting of divine revelation presents God as more than a gracious friend. He is also the "moral governor" of the world, and does punish sinners with righteous wrath in harmony with His infinite justice. The God who is only gracious is too confined when compared with the larger view of divine revelation.

The Ellen G. White comment that "some are destroyed as in a moment, while others suffer many days,"⁸⁷ is dismissed by the GCTHM which interprets God's wrath as only abandonment. But on what basis can human reason overlook the larger definition of wrath in divine revelation, and then ignore the obvious meaning of this statement? But any placing of human reason above God's revelation, whether intentional or not, is the same strategy that has been employed from the inception of sin. Creaturely reason must bow before God's revelation, or it will promote Satan's attack against it.

Redemption and the Cry of Dereliction

A Seventh-day Adventist atonement theory of the cross must explain the meaning of Christ's cry, "My God, my God, why have you forsaken me" (Matt 27:46, NIV). Was He suffering from God's

wrath or not? To answer this question, some go to Romans 1, where "the wrath of God" (v. 18) is defined as "God gave them over," or abandonment (vs. 24, 26, 28). It is pointed out that the same Greek word *paradidomi* (hand over; give over) is used in Romans 4:25 just as it is used three times in Romans 1:24, 26, 28. In Romans 1 God gave sinners up (*paradidomi*) to the natural consequences of their sins, and so it is suggested that in Romans 4:25 God gave Christ up (*paradidomi*) to die from the natural consequences of sin (cf. Rom. 8:32, *paradidomi*).

But if abandonment is the *only* inspired definition of God's wrath, then why did God drive a third of the warring angels from heaven (Rev 12:8-9) and Adam and Eve from Eden (Gen 3:22-23)? Did abandonment cause the Flood? (Or was it sent by Satan? Hardly, when he feared for his own life.)⁸⁸ Will the final destruction of the wicked, including Satan, be simply God's abandonment? Not according to divine revelation.⁸⁹ How can the GCTHM say that even the wicked need not fear God when the Bible says they will call for the rocks to hide them from God's wrath (Rev 6:16, 17)?

God often used angels to bring judgment on cities and people,⁹⁰ and compare His "direct agency" in natural laws.⁹¹ If God can destroy in the first death, why not in the second? After all, the antediluvians were not safe to save.⁹² The world Flood was not God "putting His children to sleep." God sent the flood to destroy the wicked (Gen 6:7; 2 Pet 2:5; cf. Luke 17:27). His children were safe in the ark. If the world in the end-time is in the same condition as it was in the time of Noah (Matt 24:36-39), on what basis can one dismiss the destruction of the first world (Gen 6:3, 7; cf. 8:21) as not instructive of the coming destruction (Rev 19:11, 20-21)? In other words, the larger view of God's wrath involves more than the limited definition of Romans 1.

It is said that this "giving up" in Romans 4:25 is the meaning of "My God, my God, why have you forsaken me?" in Matthew 27:46 (NIV), and should be read: "Why have you "abandoned me?" Although a different Greek word is used in Matthew (*egkataleipo*), the root meaning is "to abandon." Relative to Romans 1 and 4:25, we must remember that the word *paradidomi* can mean "to betray" (Matt 10:4; cf. John 6:64, 71), or it can mean "to hand over" (Mark 10:33). It is also used of God not sparing His Son but giving Him

up for us all (Rom 8:32), and even of Christ giving Himself up to die (Gal 2:20).

Therefore, "giving up" has a number of connotations, depending upon who is doing the "giving up." They are all a part of the larger view of what happened at Calvary. Judas gave Christ up as the betrayer. Christ gave Himself up as our Substitute. The Father gave Christ up in both love and wrath—love because it was as difficult for God to part with Him as for Christ to part from the Father. The anguish of the Father is perhaps best seen typically in Abraham's test to sacrifice his son Isaac (Gen 22:16).

What about the "giving up" as wrath? There are two aspects. First, Satan had always wanted to displace Christ, to take His place. And the opportunity to crucify Him (only because Christ allowed it John 10:18; 19:11) climaxed the long process of Satanic hatred against Christ. Thousands of years of fury were about to be unleashed on the cross. "The pent-up fires of envy and malice, hatred and revenge, burst forth on Calvary against the Son of God, while all heaven gazed upon the scene in silent horror."⁹³ Jesus said to the chief priests, and others arresting Him in Gethsemane, "This is your hour—when darkness reigns" (Luke 22:53, NIV).

John Murray rightly says, "There may be also within the apostle's purview another aspect of this delivering up, namely, the giving up to all that the arch-enemy and his instruments could do against him."⁹⁴ In 1 Corinthians 5:5 and 1 Timothy 1:20 the same word "giving up" is used with reference to "giving up" individuals to Satan. Similarly, the Father gave Christ up to Satan. Calvary was the loving Father, with breaking heart, permitting His beloved Son to be murdered by His rival in the great controversy. We must remember that Calvary exposed Satan for what he really is,⁹⁵ as well as revealing the Father and the Son for Who they really are.

But there is another aspect of "giving up" as wrath. The GCTHM says God did not touch His Son on Calvary. Inspired sources express it differently, for "it was the Lord's will to crush him and cause him to suffer" as a "guilt offering" (Isa 53:10, cf. vs. 6).⁹⁶ "He was stricken of God and afflicted to save man from the blow which he deserved because of the transgression of God's law."⁹⁷ "The God of justice did not spare His Son. . . The whole debt for the transgression of God's law was demanded from our Media-

tor. A full atonement was required. How appropriate are the words of Isaiah, 'It pleased the Lord to bruise him; he hath put him to grief.' His soul was made 'an offering for sin.' 'He was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities' (Isa 53:10, 5)."⁹⁸ Christ "was now suffering under divine justice."⁹⁹ This was sacrificial substitution.¹⁰⁰

What is involved here is the Father, in giving up Christ in love, also gave Christ up with respect to His hatred of the sin-load He bore. In the Greek translation of Isaiah 53:6, 12 (LXX, Septuagint), we find the same Greek word used (*paradidomi*) "gave up" or "delivered" as we find in Romans 1:24, 26, 28; 4:25; and 8:32. The Hebrew text states that God "laid on him the iniquity of us all," and that Christ "bore" the guilt of mankind. It would seem that those translating the Hebrew text into the Greek, identified the "laying on" of sin upon Christ with God's "giving Him up."

As for God "giving up" Christ, in terms of His hatred of sin, we find further insights already in Gethsemane; for "so dreadful does sin appear to Him, so great is the weight of guilt which He must bear, that He is tempted to fear it will shut Him out forever from His Father's love. Feeling how terrible is the wrath of God against transgression, He exclaims, 'My soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death'."¹⁰¹ Christ "felt that by sin He was being separated from His Father. The gulf was so broad, so black, so deep, that His spirit shuddered before it. This agony He must not exert His divine power to escape. As man He must suffer the consequences of man's sin. As man He must endure the wrath of God against transgression"¹⁰² (cf. Zech 13:7). "The sins of men weighed heavily upon Christ, and the sense of God's wrath against sin was crushing out His life."¹⁰³

God's love for Christ and His hatred for sin must be held together as two of the several aspects of this "giving up," in Gethsemane¹⁰⁴ and on Calvary. Christ "feared that sin was so offensive to God that their separation was to be eternal. Christ felt the anguish which the sinner will feel when mercy shall no longer plead for the guilty race. It was the sense of sin, bringing the Father's wrath upon Him as man's substitute, that made the cup He drank so bitter, and broke the heart of the Son of God."¹⁰⁵

The same Greek word *paradidomi*, used in Romans 1:24, 26,

28; 4:25 and 8:32 is used in the Greek translation of Ezekiel 21:31. [LXX 21:36] "I will pour out my wrath upon you and breathe out my fiery anger against you; I will *hand you over* to brutal men, men skilled in destruction." Here God is apparently very active in the process of handing over. Again, the same word describes God's giving Israel over to their idolatry and His consequent banishment of them into exile beyond Babylon (Acts 7:42, 43). This abandonment involves an active sending into captivity. From the biblical and Ellen G. White data reviewed in these last two sections, we have seen that God's wrath is not confined to the abandonment definition of Romans 1.

God has given in His word decisive evidence that He will punish the transgressors of His law. Those who flatter themselves that He is too merciful to execute justice upon the sinner, have only to look to the cross of Calvary. The death of the spotless Son of God testifies that 'the wages of sin is death,' that every violation of God's law must receive its just retribution. Christ the sinless became sin for man. He bore the guilt of transgression, and the hiding of His Father's face, until His heart was broken and His life crushed out. All this sacrifice was made that sinners might be redeemed. In no other way could man be freed from the penalty of sin.¹⁰⁶

Notice that this abandonment of the sinless to become sin was to pay the penalty for law-breaking which is a larger view than mere revelation of love (as in the GCTHM). Do not the redeemed sing, "You are worthy to take the scroll and to open its seals, because you were slain, and with your blood you purchased (*agorazo*) men for God" (Rev 5:9)? Was He not a ransom (*lutron*, Matt 20:28; Mark 10:45; 1 Tim 2:5,6) for mankind? At the end of the great controversy, Christ says, "Behold the purchase of My blood!"¹⁰⁷ God's wrath involves both abandonment and active judgment. Thus, even while Christ hung on the cross God sent fierce lightnings of His wrath against Jerusalem, warning of its impending judgment.¹⁰⁸

If what we have discovered about the definition of God's wrath is true, then how was it exercised on Calvary? Are we driven back to a heathen view of God's wrath needing to be appeased by Christ's death? To answer this question, we need to look at the function of the Trinity in Redemption.

Redemption and the Trinity

To better understand what happened at the cross we must look at it from the context of the Trinity. First, we must emphasize that the Father so loved the world that He gave Jesus (John 3:16), and Jesus said of His intercessory work, "I am not saying that I will ask the Father on your behalf. No, the Father himself loves you. . ." (John 16:26-27).

Ellen G. White gives us a remarkable insight about the Father. "Had God the Father come to our world and dwelt among us, humbling Himself, veiling His glory, that humanity might look upon Him, the history that we have of the life of Christ would not have been changed. . . In every act of Jesus, in every lesson of His instruction, we are to see and hear and recognize God. In sight, in hearing, in effect, it is the voice and movement of the Father."¹⁰⁹ In fact, she says that "the heart of Christ is full of unutterable love toward every soul that comes to him. . . The love manifested in Christ reveals the parental character of the Father; for God suffered with Christ."¹¹⁰

As the Transactional theories of the Atonement see Christ making a death-payment for our sin to the Father, we need to be clear on the larger view of the Father's role at Calvary. Ellen G. White says "God Himself was crucified with Christ; for Christ was one with the Father."¹¹¹ "The Lord of glory was put to a most shameful death, and God himself was in Christ, suffering with his only-begotten Son, in order to reconcile the world unto himself,"¹¹² and "He loved Him most when the penalty for the transgression of His law fell on Him."¹¹³

These are powerful insights—the Father suffered *with* and *in* Christ. In fact, the Trinity has suffered from sin's inception.¹¹⁴ But note the balance between this shared suffering and the Father's wrath in the following statement:

There are many who have thought that the Father had no part in the sufferings of the Son; but this is a mistake. The Father suffered with the Son. . . The guilt of every descendant of Adam was pressing upon his heart; and the wrath of God, and the terrible manifestation of his displeasure of iniquity, filled the soul of his Son with consternation. The withdrawal of the divine countenance from the Saviour, in this hour of supreme anguish, pierced his heart with a sorrow that

can never be fully understood by man. Sin, so hateful to his sight, was heaped upon him till he groaned beneath its weight. The despairing agony of the Son of God was so much greater than his physical pain, that the latter was hardly felt by him. The hosts of Heaven veiled their faces from the fearful sight. They heard his despairing cry, 'My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?' They saw the divine Sufferer die beneath the sins of the world.¹¹⁵

Oh the depths of anguish in this statement! The Father suffering with His Son held together with the Father's wrath against human sin. The Father fully involved in the suffering beside His Son but distanced from Him through His wrath against sin. We must hold both of these seemingly opposite insights together in order to understand the depths of Christ's anguish.

All the Godhead suffered at Calvary as only perfect love can suffer. Theirs was an infinite suffering possible only by infinite Beings. How can finite beings comprehend? It is into this mystery that we will penetrate as eternity brings ever deeper meaning and wonder. We dare not arrive at a simple model of Calvary, for there is a profundity here that defies any shortcut. We are involved with the greatest mystery that will be an unfolding revelation throughout eternity, as it unfolds deeper dimensions of what was involved at the cross. We must not arrive at a tidy model that seems to honor one side of God's multifaceted attributes anymore than we should focus on one member of the Trinity without proper inclusion of the other two.

Here, at Calvary, God is being true to Himself in His wrath against sin. Here God is being true to Christ in His suffering with Him. Here God is being true to man in providing this incomparable Substitute. Here Jesus is being true to doing His Father's will and true to man as a sacrifice for sin. Here the Trinity remain true to each other in their eternal plan to save man at such infinite cost to themselves. Here God is true to His immutable law. Here is the self-giving of the Trinity to atone for human sin. This is the content revealed by the cross. Sin must be dealt with so as to confirm and produce trust.

"He became our substitute, our surety, before the Father and all the heavenly angels. By imputing the sins of the world to Jesus, he became the sinner in our stead, and the curse due to our sins

came upon him. It becomes us to contemplate Christ's life of humiliation and his agonizing death; for he was treated as the sinner deserves to be treated."¹¹⁶ It is precisely in His mission as our Substitute that "man has been given every opportunity of knowing God and the laws of His government."¹¹⁷ He took our place and suffered our sin-judgment—eternal separation from God. It was an unimaginable anguish to be plunged into separation after an eternity of union within the Trinity. Already in Gethsemane "Christ's soul was filled with dread of separation from God. Satan told Him that if He became the surety for a sinful world, the separation would be eternal. He would be identified with Satan's kingdom, and would nevermore be one with God."¹¹⁸ On Calvary:

Satan with his fierce temptations wrung the heart of Jesus. The Saviour could not see through the portals of the tomb. Hope did not present to Him His coming forth from the grave a conqueror, or tell Him of the Father's acceptance of the sacrifice. He feared that sin was so offensive to God that Their separation was to be eternal. Christ felt the anguish which the sinner will feel when mercy shall no longer plead for the guilty race. It was the sense of sin, bringing the Father's wrath upon Him as man's substitute, that made the cup He drank so bitter, and broke the heart of the Son of God.¹¹⁹

With that infinite sacrifice "the demands of justice were satisfied. The way to the throne of grace was opened to every sinner."¹²⁰

Here Ellen White holds several factors together. Christ is man's substitute and the Father suffered *with* and *in* His Son, and yet He also manifested wrath against sin, and Christ felt *separated from* Him. It was at this darkest hour for Christ that the Father loved Him the most. There is no simple formula here. It is complex and intricate because we are attempting to understand the inner-Trinitarian Being of God in the multitude of His attributes in a way that does justice to His "holy love," and also to the "sinfulness of sin," which cannot remain in His presence. It finds the members of the unchangeable Trinity consistently true to themselves, to the law, and to their eternal plan to save man at such an infinite cost. If the Father had to withdraw from His Son for the first time ever in eternity, think of what anguish it was for the Son, equally God, to have to remain and carry the combined load of human guilt till it crushed out His very life! Oh the infinite depths of His sacrifice

in our place! How the Father loved Him in this substitution for a rebel race! It is only as we penetrate to this level that we can begin to catch a glimmer of the content of the revelation made on Calvary to bring salvation, trust and healing to human lives.

What is involved is the self-satisfaction of God? As John Stott put it, God "was unwilling to act in love at the expense of his holiness or in holiness at the expense of his love. So we may say that he satisfied his holy love by himself dying the death and so bearing the judgment which sinners deserved. He both exacted and accepted the penalty of human sin. . . Thus the priority is neither 'man's demand on God' nor 'God's demand on men,' but supremely 'God's demand on God, God's meeting his own demand'."¹²¹ Calvary was "divine self-satisfaction through divine self-substitution."¹²²

On the cross God expressed "simultaneously his holiness in judgment and his love in pardon," by "providing a divine substitute for the sinner, so that the substitute would receive the judgment and the sinner the pardon."¹²³ Stott rightly says, "We must never make Christ the object of God's punishment or God the object of Christ's persuasion, for both God and Christ were subjects not objects, taking the initiative together to save sinners. . . The Father did not lay on the Son an ordeal he was reluctant to bear, nor did the Son extract from the Father a salvation he was reluctant to bestow."¹²⁴

This description of Christ's awful agony on the cross, carrying the guilt of humankind, experiencing the wrath of God, with no hope of ever living beyond that second death judgment is no mere revelation. This is redemption! Here Christ plunges into the abyss never to live again. Here God's holiness, man's sin, God's wrath, and divine justice are given their proper place. Any Seventh-day Adventist Atonement concept, if it is true to all the issues in the great controversy and to all that revelation presents, must either include all this content of redemption or suffer an emptied revelation.

Conclusion

Judged by inspired evidence the GCTHM cannot claim to represent all of Scripture, or present the full reality of Calvary. Substitution has been simply jettisoned, and with it a large segment

of inspired data on Christ's sacrifice for human sin. The larger view of Calvary holds together all biblical and other inspired data. It holds together all of God's attributes, including wrath, and all members of the Trinity in their freely given¹²⁵ self-substitution, self-satisfaction and self-reconciliation¹²⁶ to redeem a rebel race and meet the issues in the great controversy.

The larger view of Calvary sees God acting against sin in "holy love" as well as acknowledging its self-destructive nature. It maintains the inspired focus on Christ and God's law as central, and hence, substitution and a proper understanding of legal payment as central too. Christ "gave Himself, an atoning sacrifice, for the saving of a lost world. He was treated as we deserve, in order that we might be treated as He deserves. He was condemned for our sins, in which He had no share, that we might be justified by His righteousness, in which we had no share. He suffered the death which was ours, that we might receive the life which was His. 'With His stripes we are healed,' Isaiah 53:5."¹²⁷

In order to *change* us, Calvary must first be an *exchange* for us. For the larger view of Calvary includes redemption (SM) as the content of its revelation. Because the GCTHM omits this vital content, it can only present a partial and distorted revelation of Calvary.¹²⁸

Endnotes

1 J. D. G. Dunn says "As Adam represents man so that his fallenness is theirs, so Jesus represents fallen man so that his death is theirs." *Sacrifice and Redemption: Durham Essays in Theology*, ed. S. W. Sykes, (Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge: Cambridge, 1991), p. 51.

2 See Norman R. Gulley, "Towards Understanding the Atonement," *Journal of the Adventist Theological Society*, Vol. 1, #1, Spring, 1990, pp. 57-89.

3 Selective use to be documented in article. An example of a straw man is claiming that the Legal model results in legalism. Cf. Rev 12:17; 14:12.

4 See Sydney Cave, *The Doctrine of the Work of Christ* (Nashville, TN: Cokesbury Press, 1937). So today, with its fragmentation and alienation "the image of healing has become predominant among concepts of atonement."

5 Paul S. Fiddes, *Past Event and Present Salvation: The Christian Idea of Atonement* (Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1989). Fiddes presents a healing model of the atonement that produces trust.

6 *Ibid.*, p. 58. Fiddes expresses a number of views held by the GCTHM. See chapter 5. What is the unchanging world view of inspired sources? This is the fundamental question before us.

7 Cf. "Satan is making the world believe that the Bible is a mere fiction, or at least a book suited to the infancy of the race," Ellen G. White, *Great Controversy*, p. 555.

8 In the great controversy creaturely reason does consider the evidence for God's justice, which evaluates everything He has done including His acts of revelation in Scripture. This would require a separate article to explore, but all creaturely reason will eventually admit the justice of divine revelation, (Ellen G. White, *Great Controversy* pp. 668-669).

9 "The tattered shreds of human reasoning will be found to be only as ropes of sand in the great day of God." Ellen G. White, *SDA Bible Commentary*, Vol. 6, p. 1069. Satan's strategy in the end-time is to use "intelligent" decoys in the church, *Testimonies to Ministers*, p. 474.

10 Ellen G. White, *The Signs of the Times*, April 21, 1890, p. 242 (Vol. 2, p. 378).

11 J. H. Kellogg, *The Living Temple*, Good Health Publishing Co., Battle Creek, Michigan, 1903, pp. 29-33.

12 W. A. Spicer, *How the Spirit of Prophecy Met a Crisis, Memories and Notes of the "Living Temple" Controversy*, 1938, p. 52.

13 W. A. Spicer, *How the Spirit of Prophecy Met a Crisis*, p. 56.

14 See footnote 128 and #3 component of Larger view.

15 Ellen G. White, *Patriarchs and Prophets*, pp. 33-43; *Great Controversy*, pp. 492-504; 662-673.

16 Ellen G. White, *The Signs of the Times*, June 12, 1901, p. 371 (Vol. 4, p. 185).

17 Ellen G. White, *The Signs of the Times*, Jan. 16, 1893, p. 166 (Vol. 3, p. 13).

18 Ellen G. White, *The Advent Review and Sabbath Herald*, Oct. 13, 1896, p. 645 (vol. 3, p. 401).

19 Ellen G. White, *The Advent Review and Sabbath Herald*, Oct. 22, 1895, p. 674 (vol. 3, p. 302)

20 Ellen G. White, *The Signs of the Times*, Dec. 30, 1889, p. 786 (Vol. 2, p. 345).

21 Ellen G. White, *The Advent Review and Sabbath Herald*, March 10, 1891, p. 145 (vol. 2, p. 469).

22 Ellen G. White, *The Signs of the Times*, April 16, 1894, p. 372 (Vol. 3, p. 109).

23 Ellen G. White, *The Review and Herald*, Nov. 21, 1912, (vol. 6, p. 294).

24 Ellen G. White, *Advent Review and Sabbath Herald*, March 9, 1886, p. 146 (Vol. 2, p. 26).

25 Ellen G. White, *Patriarchs and Prophets*, p. 36.

26 Ibid.

27 Ellen G. White, *Patriarchs and Prophets*, p. 37.

28 Ellen G. White, *Patriarchs and Prophets*, pp. 40-41.

29 Ellen G. White, *Great Controversy*, p. 669.

30 Ellen G. White, *Patriarchs and Prophets*, p. 36.

31 Ellen G. White, *Early Writings*, p. 149-152; *Patriarchs and Prophets*, pp. 63, 64.

32 Ellen G. White, *Patriarchs and Prophets*, p. 64.

33 Ellen G. White, *Selected Messages*, Vol. 1, p. 344.

34 Ellen G. White, *Great Controversy*, p. 489.

35 Ellen G. White, *The Signs of the Times*, May 14, 1902, p. 306 (Vol. 4, p. 238).

36 Ellen G. White, *Great Controversy*, p. 558.

37 Ellen G. White, *Selected Messages*, Vol. 1, p. 232.

38 E.g. Ellen G. White, *Patriarchs and Prophets*, p. 43 and *Great Controversy*, p. 671.

39 Ellen G. White, *The Signs of the Times*, Feb. 5, 1894, p. 212 (Vol. 3, p. 97).

40 Ellen G. White, *Selected Messages*, Vol. 1, p. 341.

41 Ellen G. White, *Questions on Doctrines*, p. 674.

42 See *Patriarch's and Prophets*, pp. 33-43, 63-70; and *Great Controversy*, pp. 492-504, where Satan's attack against God's law in heaven, and his quest for freedom apart from law, place law as central to Satan's attack, rather than relegated to some emergency measure introduced by God much later in human history, as is taught in the GCTHM.

43 Ellen G. White, *Patriarchs and Prophets*, p. 38.

44 Ellen G. White, *Desire of Ages*, p. 24.

45 Ellen G. White, *Desire of Ages*, p. 26.

46 Ellen G. White, *Patriarchs and Prophets*, p. 42.

47 The GCTHM considers the great controversy as an "emergency" in which the law giving at Sinai was an "emergency measure."

48 Ellen G. White, *Patriarchs and Prophets*, p. 339

49 Ellen G. White, *Last Day Events*, Pacific Press Pub. Assn., Boise, Idaho, 1922, p. 277; cf. *Great Controversy*, pp. 640-645.

50 Ellen G. White, *Great Controversy*, pp. 668-669.

51 Ellen G. White, *Great Controversy*, p. 670.

52 Ellen G. White, *Great Controversy*, pp. 492-504; 662-673; *Patriarchs and Prophets*, pp. 33-43. Cf. *Patriarchs and Prophets*, pp. 63-70 where Law is mentioned 16 times in the chapter "The Plan of Redemption."

53 Pages 763-764.

54 See section below on God's wrath.

55 Ellen G. White, *Great Controversy*, p. 503.

56 Ibid.

57 See Norman R. Gulley, *Christ Our Substitute*, Review and Herald Publishing Assn., Takoma Park, Washington, D.C., 1982.

58 Ellen G. White, *The Signs of the Times*, Dec. 2, 1897, p. 740 (Vol. 3, p. 435).

59 Ellen G. White, *Desire of Ages*, pp. 19-20.

60 The GCTHM equates man's need with that of unfallen angels—the sole need of revelation. But Scripture makes a distinction (Heb 2:14-18).

61 Ellen G. White, *Desire of Ages*, pp. 21-22.

62 John R. W. Stott, *The Cross of Christ*, IVP, Downer's Grove, Illinois, 1986, p. 109.

63 See footnote # 8.

64 See footnote # 8.

65 See footnote # 1.

66 See Norman R. Gulley, "The New Age Attack on Jesus Christ," *Adventist Perspectives*, Vol. 3, #2, 1989, pp. 48-56.

67 For example, H. P. Blavatsky, *Collected Writings 1877: Isis Unveiled*, The Theosophical Publishing House, Wheaton, Ill., 1972, p. 171.

- 68 Ellen G. White, *The Desire of Ages*, Pacific Press Publishing Assn., Mountain View, California, 1940, pp. 762-763.
- 69 Leon Morris, *Evangelical Dictionary of Theology* W. A. Elwell, ed., Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1987, p. 100.
- 70 Ibid.
- 71 Leon Morris, *Evangelical Dictionary of Theology*, p. 101.
- 72 Ibid.
- 73 This is an adaptation of an analogy used by Leon Morris in *The Cross of Christ*, Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1988, p. 21.
- 74 T. H. Hughes, *The Atonement*, George Allen and Unwin and Co., London, 1949, pp. 205-206.
- 75 Ellen G. White, *The Signs of the Times*, July 12, 1899, p. 453 (Vol. 4, p. 44).
- 76 Ellen G. White, *The Great Controversy*, p. 670.
- 77 Ellen G. White, *Great Controversy*, p. 534.
- 78 Ellen G. White, *Great Controversy*, p. 536.
- 79 Ellen G. White, *Great Controversy*, pp. 560-562.
- 80 See John Driver, *Understanding the Atonement for the Mission of the Church* (Scottsdale, PA: Herald Press, 1986), pp. 155-162, where wrath is considered in the context of His covenant love.
- 81 Ellen G. White, *Desire of Ages*, pp. 157-166; 589-600.
- 82 Ellen G. White, *Desire of Ages*, p. 764.
- 83 Ellen G. White, *Great Controversy*, pp. 672-673.
- 84 Ellen G. White, *Last Day Events*, p. 243.
- 85 Ellen G. White, *Last Day Events*, p. 242.
- 86 Ellen G. White, *Last Day Events*, pp. 240-241 (emphasis added).
- 87 Ellen G. White, *Great Controversy*, p. 67.
- 88 Ellen G. White, *Patriarchs and Prophets*, p. 99.
- 89 Ellen G. White, *Great Controversy*, pp. 641-644; 657; 672-673.
- 90 For example, see the *Comprehensive Index to the Writings of Ellen G. White*, Pacific Press Publishing Assn., 1962, Vol. 1, p. 232, where referencing for the "destroying angels" is given.
- 91 Ellen G. White, *Testimonies to the Church*, Vol. 8, 259-261.
- 92 Ellen G. White, *Patriarchs and Prophets*, p. 92.
- 93 Ellen G. White, *Great Controversy*, p. 501.
- 94 John Murray, *The New International Commentary on the N. T., Romans*, Vol. 1, Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1965, p. 324.
- 95 Calvary tore away Satan's disguise, and uprooted sympathy for him from heavenly beings. See Ellen G. White, *Desire of Ages*, p. 761.
- 96 Cf. Ellen G. White, *SDA Bible Commentary*, Vol. 5, p. 1103.
- 97 Ellen G. White, *Testimonies to the Church*, Vol. 4, p. 418.
- 98 Ellen G. White, *In Heavenly Places*, p. 15.
- 99 Ellen G. White, *The Signs of the Times*, Dec. 2, 1897, p. 740 (Vol. 3, p. 435).
- 100 See Ellen G. White, *Selected Messages*, Vol. 1, p. 215.
- 101 Ellen G. White, *Desire of Ages*, p. 685.
- 102 Ellen G. White, *Desire of Ages*, p. 686.
- 103 Ellen G. White, *Desire of Ages*, p. 687.
- 104 Ellen G. White, *Desire of Ages*, p. 693.
- 105 Ellen G. White, *Desire of Ages*, p. 753.

- 106 Ellen G. White, *Great Controversy*, pp. 539-540.
- 107 Ellen G. White, *Great Controversy*, p. 671.
- 108 Ellen G. White, *Desire of Ages*, p. 756.
- 109 Ellen G. White, *That I May Know Him*, p. 338.
- 110 Ellen G. White, *The Advent Review and Sabbath Herald*, March 17, 1896, p. 162, (Vol. 3, p. 342).
- 111 Ellen G. White, *The Faith I Live By*, Review and Herald Publishing Assn., 1958, p. 50.
- 112 Ellen G. White, *The Signs of the Times*, June 18, 1896, p. 374 (Vol. 3, p. 301).
- 113 Ellen G. White, *The Signs of the Times*, July 12, 1899, p. 453 (Vol. 4, p. 44).
- 114 Cf. Ellen G. White, *Education*, p. 263.
- 115 Ellen G. White, *The Signs of the Times*, Nov. 25, 1889, p. 706 (Vol. 2, p. 339).
- 116 Ellen G. White, *The Signs of the Times*, April 24, 1893, p. 391 (Vol. 3, p. 35).
- 117 "When there was no heart to pity, His arm brought salvation. God laid help on One that was mighty, saying, 'Save man from destruction.' The Son of God accepted the work joyfully, becoming man's substitute and surety, that He might save man from his sin, and call him from transgression to obedience. He pledged Himself to take man's nature, and stand at the head of the human race, to satisfy every claim made against them as a people bound in the slavery of sin. Through this gift of God to the world man has been given every opportunity of knowing God and the laws of His government" Ellen G. White, *The Signs of the Times*, Nov. 15, 1899, p. 738 (Vol. 4, p. 75).
- 118 Ellen G. White, *Desire of Ages*, p. 687.
- 119 Ellen G. White, *Desire of Ages*, p. 753.
- 120 Ellen G. White, *The Signs of the Times*, July 31, 1901, p. 482 (Vol. 4, p. 192).
- 121 John R. W. Stott, *The Cross of Christ*, InterVarsity Press, Downers Grove, Illinois, 1986, p. 152.
- 122 John R. W. Stott, *The Cross of Christ*, p. 159.
- 123 John R. W. Stott, *The Cross of Christ*, p. 134. The first phrase is in the interrogative form in Stott.
- 124 John R. W. Stott, *The Cross of Christ*, p. 151.
- 125 Christ freely gave Himself (John 10:17-18), answering Bozo's famous question (see Ellen G. White, *The Signs of the Times*, August 22, 1900, p. 530; Vol 4, p. 140, *Desire of Ages*, p. 22; Bozo's question in Anselm's *Cur Deus Homo*, The Library of Christian Classics, Westminster Press, Philadelphia, Chicago, 1949, p. 731; cf. Jack Provonsa, *You Can Go Home Again*, Review and Herald Publishing Assn., Washington, D.C., 1982, pp. 27-32).
- 126 See Ellen G. White, *Desire of Ages*, p. 113, "God desired to teach them that from His own love comes the gift which reconciles them to Himself," cf. Lev 17:11; Heb 9:14; 1 John 2:2; 4:10.
- 127 Ellen G. White, *Testimonies to the Church*, Vol. 8, pp. 208, 209. Cf. *Desire of Ages*, p. 25.
- 128 This so-called larger view (GCTHM) focuses on only three major questions, and dismisses the need of others. It suggests that the legal model is only for the immature, and the Bible is only an emergency measure (what do you do with

the Bible after you grow up?). In the end-time the translated group are to be mature enough to stand on their own, although Matt 20:28; John 15:5; Heb 13:5 and Rev 3:10 suggest otherwise. When the word "truth" in Scripture is always interpreted as "the truth about God," this seems to violate the context at times. For example, the sealing (Rev 7:1-4), is said to be a settling into "the truth about God." But this is too confined a definition, for the larger view (SM) also includes *all biblical truths* (*Great Controversy*, pp. 593, 594). Could this confinement of the GCTHM view rob people of being sealed? "God says it, and I believe it" is jettisoned, along with biblical and Ellen G. White insights into the end-time crisis.

Journal of the Adventist Theological Society, 3/1 (1992):97-104.
Article copyright © 1992 by George W. Reid.

Salvation and the Sanctuary

By George W. Reid

Biblical Research Institute

General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists

Introduction

It is hardly a secret that some among us regard the two elements of our title as at the least limiting one another or at worst flatly in conflict. How could two teachings, so clearly presented in the Scriptures, be incompatible when set adjacent to one another? The answer to that question is, Are we truly looking at two incompatibles, or do we only think we are?

Before coming to several observations, we had best explore what we mean by salvation in the setting of the sanctuary. If as Adventists we find ourselves in the untenable position of promoting two beliefs at war with each other, we should be eager to discover it and set our house in order.

The Critics' Challenge. In brief, the problem posed by critics is this: If salvation is subsumed in the act of Christ at Calvary, what significance can rest in a functioning sanctuary, whether on earth or in heaven? Walter Martin's charge that disappointed Adventists of 1844 produced the sanctuary idea to cover their gross error in proclaiming the return of Christ seems to assume some credibility. Of course Martin is simply mouthing Dudley Canright's explanation. But Canright's obsessive intent to demolish the Adventist message renders any judgment he might advance as suspect.

Heavenly Sanctuary: A Reality

When God told Moses, "Let them make me a sanctuary; that I may dwell among them" (Exod 25:8), He introduced the idea that