

Human Evolution in Theological Context

BY GEORGE L. MURPHY

The God Revealed in the Cross

There have been a number of helpful discussions of biblical texts and scientific evidence relating to human origins. In the following essay I want to take both scripture and science into account in appropriate ways, but won't engage in detailed analysis of either. Instead, I want to set out an overall theological view of the issues. We need to consider the Christian tradition as a whole, and not just the ideas of the Christian communities in which we've grown up, for resources to help us deal with the questions evolution poses for us.

The approach that I have taken to relationships between Christian faith and scientific knowledge of the world is to view them in the context of a theology of the cross.¹ God's fundamental revelation is in the event of the cross, the crucifixion of Jesus of Nazareth and the resurrection of the crucified one. (These two aspects must be kept together.) This was not only the means God used to solve a problem but the most profound revelation of the true God's identity. It is a paradoxical revelation in hiddenness, for nothing is less like our expectations of God than a man dying the humiliating and God-forsaken death of a criminal.

If the event of the cross is God's self-revelation, we may expect it to be a clue to God's general *modus operandi* in the world. The incarnation and passion of Christ are marked by the "emptying" (kenosis), or self-limitation, of Philippians 2:7. In creation, where (to use an old image) God works with and through creatures as "instruments," God limits that action and works within the capacities of creatures, in accord with what we call the laws of physics. God *could* display absolute power and "violate" those laws, but our experience shows us that if such events happen at all, they are extremely rare.

Because what we observe scientifically is the behavior of God's instruments and not the one who uses them, they are also "masks" of God. Just as God is concealed from direct observation in his supreme work of salvation, he is hidden in his ongoing work in creation: "Truly, you are a God who hides himself, O God of Israel, the Savior" (Isaiah 45:15). The regularity of natural processes that results from this is a gift that makes it possible for us to understand our world on its own terms.

This also helps us to understand something that is disturbing to many Christians: the presence in scripture of statements about the world that scientific and historical studies have shown to be incorrect. There is, for example, no "dome" over the earth or cosmic ocean above it, as in Genesis 1:6-8 and Psalm 148:4.² In inspiring the biblical writers, the Holy Spirit was apparently willing for the witness to revelation to be limited by the state of knowledge about the world that existed in the cultures of those ancient writers. (Such ideas of "accommodation" go back to the early church and were used by Calvin.)³ We will see an important example of this when we consider the vexing issue of the relationship between sin and death.

The Problem Posed by Evolution

Biological evolution can then be understood as God's creative work exercised through the natural processes that scientists study. Scientists don't observe God in these processes any more than they do in the study of metabolism or nuclear reactions. If we've realized that the Genesis creation accounts need not be read as historical narratives or modern scientific accounts, theories of cosmic and biological evolution pose no real challenge to the Christian doctrine of creation. They can be understood within the context of the belief that the triune God is the ultimate source of all that is and active in all that happens in the world.

But biological—and specifically, human—evolution does present some tough questions for Christian beliefs about human nature, sin and salvation.

If humanity came into being as evolutionary theory suggests, there's a lot of bad behavior in our prehistory. It wasn't a bloody war of all against all, for cooperation as well as competition plays a role in evolution. But natural selection, the critical factor in evolution that Darwin and Wallace identified, means that some amount of selfish behavior in our ancestors would have been favored. There would have been deception, theft, sexual promiscuity, and violence, and those tendencies would have been passed on to us. Nor is this only theoretical: the behaviors of our closest surviving relatives among the great apes confirms the picture.

That poses a challenge to Christian ideas about the goodness of God's initial creation and human freedom. One traditional theological concept, humanity's "original righteousness," seems incompatible with that picture. The challenge is intensified by genetic evidence that the population of the first humans must have been considerably greater than two. With all this in view it's hard to maintain a picture of our descent from a literal Adam and Eve who were created in moral perfection but then freely chose to disobey God. And if there was not a unique primordial Fall, some traditional ways of understanding the saving work of Christ no longer make sense.

How are we to deal with these challenges as Christians? An adequate response requires honest study of scripture and willingness to rethink in a respectful way some of the interpretations of it that Christians through the centuries have worked out. It also demands that we take the results of scientific investigation seriously (always remembering their tentative character), for if God is the creator of the real world, we need to know what the real world is like. We should then try to understand scientific results in the light of the scriptural witness—the whole of scripture, and not just isolated texts.

Righteousness and Sin in the Christian Tradition

To begin with, there are two basic Christian claims about humanity that must be borne in mind when we attempt to understand evolution in a Christian context. First, sin is not essential to being human. We can see that most clearly if we remember that Jesus Christ, God Incarnate, is fully human, and indeed the pattern of genuine humanity. (See, e.g., Hebrews 2:6-9, where what is said about humanity in Psalm 8 is applied to Christ as the human *par excellence*.) And Paul tells us that while "for our sake" God "made him to be sin," he in fact "knew no sin" (2 Corinthians 5:21).

Secondly, all people (Christ excepted) in fact sin. In Romans 3 Paul cites several Old Testament passages to that effect and concludes by saying, "all have sinned and fall short of the glory of God" (Romans 3:23). The fundamental sin is failure to trust in the true God above all else: The First Commandment comes first. And the estrangement from God resulting from failure to have him first is the source of other sins (Romans 1:21-32). We all share in a general condition of sinfulness, something more than just the fact that lots of people happen to sin.

The whole human race is in this state—but it wouldn't have had to be that way. In order to make sense of both of those ideas together it's natural to look for some historical origin of our condition, and the early chapters of Genesis give us accounts of such a beginning. But the biblical stories of humanity's creation and sin have been read in two rather different ways within the Christian tradition, that of the (Latin) West and that of the (Greek) East.

The interpretation most familiar to those of us in the Western Church is that of Augustine, the bishop of Hippo in North Africa in the fourth and fifth centuries.⁴ He saw our sinful condition as so dire that we are unable to trust in God or love God without God's gift in Christ. This condition goes back to the very beginning of our lives. (If we could freely choose whether or not to trust when we reached some age of accountability, why does no one choose rightly?) The idea that all people start life in a sinful condition is one meaning of the term "original sin," the sin in which we originate. "Before sin is an act, it is a state," as Paul Tillich put it.⁵

Augustine traced this sinful condition to a sin that was "original" in another sense. This was the first human sin in history, the disobedience of Eve and (especially) Adam. A questionable Latin translation of Romans 5:12 led Augustine to argue that all Adam's descendants actually sinned *in* him, and thus that the guilt and effects of his sin were passed on to the whole human race.⁶ (Augustine thought this happened because of the lust involved in sexual intercourse.)

This understanding of the first human sin has generally been accompanied by the assumption that God had created Adam and Eve in a perfect condition, and was often elaborated with descriptions of their beauty, wisdom, etc. ("An Aristotle was but the rubbish of an Adam," is the way Anglican bishop Robert South expressed it.⁷) The result is an image of an abrupt fall from flawless heights to the depths of depravity.

Another picture, however, comes from the Eastern Church. Irenaeus (originally from Asia Minor but later a bishop in Gaul toward the end of the second century) is an important representative of this position. He thought that God had created Adam and Eve good but not perfect, in an *immature* condition, and expected them to grow. "The man was a young child, not yet having reached a perfect deliberation," he wrote, and "it was necessary for him to reach full-development by growing in this way." The sin of Adam, then, was a "childish" one, and this suggests that its effects weren't as serious as Augustine would later say. Humans still had some ability to cooperate with God, a view generally held in the Orthodox tradition.⁸

Both Irenaeus and Augustine thought that Genesis 2 and 3 gave a historical account of the beginning of humanity. The critical study of scripture as well as scientific knowledge now make that seem unlikely. It is important to realize that this is a conclusion about the type of literature that we have in those texts, not the authority that they have for Christians. They are important parts of scripture, the source and norm for Christian doctrine. These texts are true and authoritative theological statements about our relationships and those of the rest of the world with God. Adam and Eve can be seen as theological representations of the first hominids with whom God somehow communicated, even if we should not try to identify them with historical persons.

Though we will not find a historical account of the first humans in the early chapters of Genesis, interpretations like that of Irenaeus seem to provide the most helpful way of thinking about human origins. In the first place, they are actually truer to the text of Genesis than is the idea of an initially perfect creation. The Bible says that God's creation was "very good" (Genesis 1:31), not "perfect." A literally perfect world would have to be static, for any change from perfection could only be for the worse. The very fact that God commands creatures to "be fruitful and multiply" shows that that isn't what scripture means.

Time is part of creation, and this implies that from the beginning God intended for the world and humanity to have a history. The first creation account of Genesis ends with the Sabbath, which has been seen in the Jewish tradition as a sign and foretaste of the Kingdom of God as the culmination of history. Already in the first chapter of the Bible we have a hint of the goal God wants for creation.

We have then a picture of a divinely intended growth of humanity rather than the appearance of fully mature persons. But once sin comes into the world that growth is distorted. Another representative of the Eastern Church, the fourth century bishop Athanasius of Alexandria, spoke of the first humans as being presented with the choice between life and “corruption in death.” Jesus’ image of the two ways, one that leads to life and the other to destruction (Matthew 7:13-14), comes to mind. The picture that we get in the early chapters of Genesis is not so much one of a single abrupt “fall” from perfection in Genesis 3 but of a gradual “falling away” that begins there and worsens in succeeding chapters, which is the point made in Genesis 6:5-7 as it introduces the Flood story.

This sketch does not, of course, exactly match the picture of early humanity that we get from science. That is hardly surprising because the writers of Genesis didn’t have the observational data or theoretical concepts that we have. Nevertheless, the interpretation of the Genesis stories by Greek theologians like Irenaeus is a better match to the general idea of evolutionary development than is the picture drawn in the Latin tradition.

We noted at the outset the evolutionary implication that the first humans would not have been morally perfect, but would have had tendencies for selfish behaviors that injured their fellows. This in itself was not sin: We don’t consider chimpanzees “sinful” when they act like that. Sin has to do first with our relationship with God, so the category “sin” wasn’t appropriate before God had revealed some part of his will to creatures. But if God had somehow communicated to them that they shouldn’t injure their fellows, they would then have been tempted to ignore that call.

Humanity could, with difficulty, have followed the path of development that God intended, for we are not hardwired, either through genes or enculturation, to behave in particular ways. Temptations would, however, have been strong. Sin was, in words of Reinhold Niebuhr, not “necessary” but “inevitable.”¹⁰ Refusing to trust and obey God, humanity turned from the goal that God intended and chose another path. Soon we had gone astray. Moving away from God, we were lost in the woods and night was falling.

This is the kind of theological picture that we get from the early chapters of Genesis. The disobedience of Adam and Eve results in fracture of their relations with one another and with nature (Genesis 3:12-19). Cain murders his brother, the Earth becomes filled with violence, and after the flood God observes that “the inclination of the human heart is evil from youth” (Genesis 8:21). And while these chapters are not historical accounts of early humanity, they correspond rather well to Gibbon’s statement that human history is “little more than the register of the crimes, follies, and misfortunes of mankind.”¹¹ Evidence for prehistoric religious practices is often viewed positively but it may actually betray the sinful human condition. In Romans 1 Paul describes the human problem not as lack of religion but as false religion.

Later generations were born in this condition. Biologically, we have selfish tendencies that result from natural selection. In addition, we are born and nurtured as members of a tribe estranged from God. We take in a toxic atmosphere of idolatrous views and values with our first breaths. This is far more serious than just having some bad examples set for us. As it is almost “natural” for children born into a racist culture to be racists, those born into this culture of sin will be sinful and learn to sin.

Augustine was wrong about Adam and Eve but right about the seriousness of our sinful state and our inability to trust in God by ourselves. This separation from God, the source of our life, is, as Ephesians 2:1-2 and Colossians 2:13 put it, a deathlike condition from which we can’t escape by ourselves. We don’t even want to. In this condition people are, as the confessions of the Reformation insisted, unable to cooperate with God in conversion: The dead do not cooperate.

It's natural to want more precise information about the early development of humanity. When and where did the first humans live? How many of them were there? How was God's will communicated to them, and what was the nature of early human rebellion against God? Scientific investigation has shed light on some of these questions and we may expect more detailed understanding to come. We are, however, concerned here with a theological rather than a historical account, and for our purposes many of those details don't matter. Even if we read Genesis 3 as accurate history, the type of fruit that Adam and Eve ate would be both irrelevant and impossible to discover.

There is, however, a more significant question: Did the appearance of these first creatures to be considered human in a theological sense—'*adham* in biblical language—correspond to the emergence of the species *Homo sapiens* or "anatomically modern humans"? The tendency to assume that God's concern and salvation history have to do only with humans, and not other creatures, may tempt us to insist that that must have been the case. But God's interest is not so limited. The biblical hope is that "all things" are to be reconciled to God through the cross (Colossians 1:20). If that is the case, we need not feel required to determine whether God's earliest revelation was to members of *Homo sapiens* or to those of one of our ancestral species.

Sin and Death

It is easy enough to say that unregenerate sinners are in a state of spiritual death, but what about straightforward physical death, the stoppage of our biological machinery? Can this also be attributed to sin?

The fossil evidence shows that creatures were dying for millions of years before humans, or even primates in general, came into being. Nevertheless, some conservative Christians insist that there could have been no "death before the fall." This is a major reason for the popularity of "young earth creationism," the notion that the earth is only a few thousand, rather than a few billion, years old. If that were the case then significant evolution couldn't have occurred and humans could have been created and have sinned before any creature had died.¹²

There is overwhelming scientific evidence against such a view; there is also no scriptural warrant for it. Texts to which appeal is sometimes made -- Genesis 3:19, Romans 5:12, and I Corinthians 15: 21-22 -- have only humanity in view. The real reason for the intensity with which "no death before the fall" claims are made is the feeling that God *had* to create a perfect world in which there was no suffering or death. Beyond the impropriety of dictating to God, such a belief fails to appreciate the insights of a theology of the cross. If God is willing to share in the suffering and dying of creatures in order to bring about his purpose for creation, it should not surprise us that he created a world in which from the beginning death was part of the process that would lead creation to that goal.

But the question of pre-human death of other animals is only a preliminary to the real problem. What about human death? For Paul did indeed say that "all die in Adam" (I Corinthians 15:22). How are we to understand this in connection with the fossil evidence that our pre-human ancestors and early humans were, like other animals, mortal?

The early chapters of Genesis do not say explicitly whether or not Adam and Eve would have died if they had not sinned. Athanasius apparently thought that they would have died physically but would not have "remain[ed] forever in the corruption of death," while James Barr has argued that Genesis 3 is not about loss of immortality but of a lost *chance* for it (as Genesis 3:22 suggests).¹³ But the later Jewish

tradition in which Paul participated came to see sin as the cause of physical death. When Paul speaks of death coming through Adam, it seems clear that he meant physical as well as spiritual death.

We should remember, however, that death even as a purely biological end has powerful affects that we can hardly avoid. The suffering that may be involved in dying, the sense of loss, uncertainty about an afterlife, horror at the idea of bodies rotting, and regret for unfinished work may all be present. This is especially so when we consider our own death or that of people we love, but also when we try to think about death more objectively.

For those in the biblical tradition, the most serious threat is separation from God, which is the basic meaning of sin. It is finally sin that makes death terrible, “the last enemy.” Estrangement from God implies danger of final condemnation. And those who live biologically but without God in an important sense partake of death (Ephesians 2:1-5, Colossians 2:13). It is this latter condition that can be referred to as “spiritual death.”

But we can consider the possibility that death wouldn’t have to be that way—that biological death wouldn’t have had all those affects. Biological death might be seen as a transition to some future life, as Athanasius seems to have thought. Luther wrote that if Adam hadn’t sinned, he “would never have died,” but his suggestion about how Adam would then “have been translated to the spiritual life” could just as well be seen as a description of a truly blessed physical death.¹⁴

We look back over the history of life on earth from our standpoint as people who have lived our whole lives in an atmosphere pervaded by sin. From that perspective we see the dying that has taken place in evolution, and especially of human beings, as something more and worse than just physical death. It isn’t really possible, especially for those who have been confronted and convinced by God’s word, to see human death as a purely biological phenomenon, separated from spiritual death. Sin did not cause death initially, but gives new meaning to death that occurred even before humanity appeared.

Paul saw death as a totality—biological death together with all the fears we have of it and in light of the separation from God that is sin. His references are to biological plus spiritual death, although he didn’t separate the two concepts. From a scientific perspective, he was wrong about physical death itself having originated with the first humans, just as the writer of Genesis 1 was wrong about the dome of the sky, but the Holy Spirit accommodated revelation to Paul’s culturally conditioned idea. Paul was right in expressing the theological idea that it is sin that makes death an enemy, a threat that can be averted only by God.

Salvation as New Creation

The Christian claim is that God’s definitive solution of the problem of sin and its effects comes through the life, death and resurrection of Jesus Christ, the incarnate Word of God. There has not, however, been agreement on *how* Christ’s life, death and resurrection reconcile us to God. There have been a number of “theories of the atonement”—victory over the powers of evil, penal substitution, moral influence and others.¹⁵

It isn’t my purpose here to dismiss all those ideas and propose a different one as the definitive explanation of atonement. But I suggest that when we are concerned with relationships between Christian thought and scientific understanding of the world, the most helpful approach is to focus on the work of Christ as new creation, an idea that is one aspect of some of the other theories. Since the basic problem as I’ve sketched it is that sin has gotten human history off course, new creation can be spoken of as *reorientation* of the trajectory of creation.

In order to spell this out in greater detail, I have found the approach of Gerhard Forde helpful.¹⁶ He argued that we should focus on what actually brings about reconciliation between God and humanity, the event of the cross, and not on satisfaction of various theoretical requirements. And the result of focusing on the cross calls attention to what God does in Christ to bring about faith in himself, a point oddly neglected by other approaches.

The fundamental problem that got humanity going on the wrong road, moving away from God, is failure to put our trust in the true God. Instead, as Paul argues in Romans 1, people place their confidence in all kinds of idols. That is why humanity was estranged from God, and that is what God had to correct in order to turn the course of history back to his intended goal—that is, to reconcile humanity with himself. God must destroy our faith in idols and create faith in himself.

The beginning of that work is described in the Hebrew scriptures with God’s call of Abraham and his creation of Israel as his people out of a group of dispirited slaves in Egypt (Exodus 6:9). This is not a straightforward process, however, for people are always tempted to emulate Eve and Adam and wander off: “Mortal,” God told Ezekiel, “These men have taken their idols into their hearts” (Ezekiel 14:3). So the inspired prophets must continually urge them to “Return to the LORD, your God” (Joel 2:13).

Finally God himself becomes a participant in the evolutionary process and human history as a member of our species. Jesus makes it clear that his mission is “to bring good news to the poor ... to proclaim release to the captives and recovery of sight to the blind, to let the oppressed go free, to proclaim the year of the Lord’s favor” (Luke 4:18-21). He proclaims the nearness of God’s reign and in his words and deeds makes concrete God’s will for healing, peace and justice. While he criticizes injustice and failure to trust God, he welcomes those who are estranged from God and from their fellows and freely forgives sins.

And in our alienation from God, we can’t have that! Forgiving sinners freely and welcoming them into fellowship is a threat to established religion and conventional morality. Talking about the coming reign of God implies that Caesar won’t be king anymore. Good news to the poor can be bad news for those with economic power. In short, the call to trust first of all in the kind of God Jesus represents threatens our religious, moral, political and economic interests. We have to get rid of him, and through our representatives, Pilate and Caiaphas, we do just that. Jesus is executed in an agonizing and humiliating way, a warning to anyone else who might mess with our idols.

Then he comes back from the dead and says, “Peace be with you” (John 20:19).

If Jesus really is risen from death then his claim to speak for God is vindicated. More than that, he himself is God’s self-communication, the Word of God as one of us. That means first that our sin brought about the death of our creator, the source of our life. The false gods upon which we depended for life have been shown to lead instead to death. And if the idols in which we trusted have been discredited and shattered, in a very real sense we as sinners die.

But the event of the cross does not come only as condemnation. If the true God has been revealed to us in this event, if he comes to us offering peace and acceptance, then real faith in our creator becomes possible. When this happens, God and sinners are reconciled. Atonement has been made—for the fundamental meaning of atonement is not ritual sacrifice, paying of a debt or serving a sentence but literally “at-one-ment,” reconciliation. (Tyndale in fact coined this word in his translation of II Corinthians 5:19, where NRSV and NIV have “reconciliation.”¹⁷)

This understanding of the work of Christ should be distinguished from views that see the effect of the cross as “moral influence.” According to them, the significance of this event is that the love of Christ for us evokes from us corresponding love for God. But while this is true, it is not love or morality that saves us.

The point is rather that through the event of the cross, God creates faith. For this reason I have called this understanding of atonement “fiducial influence” because it emphasizes *fiducia*, trust, which is the essential aspect of faith.¹⁸

The word “influence” is also important. Christ is not merely a passive example: Jesus’ words in John 12:32 speak of the active drawing power of the cross. Faith in Christ is the work of the Holy Spirit (I Corinthians 12:3), not something we can develop by ourselves. This is an act of new creation, as Paul says in II Corinthians 5:17 and Galatians 6:15. Sinners don’t immediately become perfect, and in fact we continue to struggle with sin throughout our lives. But just as God’s initial creation of the universe “in the beginning” is followed by God’s ongoing creative activity in the world to bring it to its goal, God’s initial work of bringing sinners from spiritual death is followed by continual renewal of faith and sanctification throughout life. The lives of people are turned back toward God, part of the process in which God reorients the course of creation toward accomplishment of his plan spoken of in Ephesians 1:10, to unite all things in Christ.

This happens when people are actually confronted with the event of the cross, which happens today when the crucified one is proclaimed. (Cf. Galatians 3:1) Thus the work of reorientation of creation continually takes place in the course of history in and through the Christian community.

The Christ hymn of Colossians (1:15-20) tells us that the work of Christ has cosmic scope. We may see the beginning of that wider reconciliation in a renewed humanity taking seriously God’s call to care for the earth as God’s garden and to exercise responsible stewardship for creation (Genesis 2:15 and 1:28). Beyond that we can only speculate and there is not space here to do that in detail. But I hope that what has been said here will at least suggest a way to begin reflections on salvation that make contact with scientific understandings of the world.

Notes and References

1. George L. Murphy, [The Cosmos in the Light of the Cross](#) (Trinity Press International, 2003). The ideas in this essay will be dealt with in greater detail in a forthcoming book tentatively titled [Actual Atonement: Talking about Salvation in a Scientific World](#). For Luther’s theology of the cross see Gerhard O. Forde, [On Being a Theologian of the Cross](#) (William B. Eerdmans, 1997).
2. See, e.g., Denis O. Lamoureux, [Evolutionary Creation: A Christian Approach to Evolution](#) (Wipf and Stock, 2008), pp.120-125.
3. Bruce Vawter, [The Inspiration of Scripture](#) (Westminster, 1972); pp. 40-42; Ford Lewis Battles, [Interpretation](#) 31 (1977): 19-38.
4. Relevant writings of Augustine are collected as [Saint Augustin: Anti-Pelagian Writings](#) in [The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers](#) (Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1979 reprint), First Series, Volume V.
5. Paul Tillich, “You Are Accepted” in [The Shaking of the Foundations](#) (Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1948), p.155.
6. Romans 5:12 reads, “Therefore, just as sin came into the world through one man, and death came through sin, so death spread to all because all have sinned.” The Greek preposition “because” was translated in Latin as “in him [implying “Adam”]” which changes the sense of the verse entirely.
7. Quoted in Arthur S. Peake, [Christianity: Its Nature and Truth](#) (Duckworth, 1908), p.116.
8. Irenaeus of Lyons, [On the Apostolic Preaching](#) (St. Vladimir’s Seminary, 1997), p.47; Timothy Ware, [The Orthodox Church](#) (Penguin, 1963), pp.224-225.
9. St. Athanasius, “On the Incarnation of the Word” in [The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers](#) (Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1979 reprint) Second Series, Volume IV, p.38.
10. Reinhold Niebuhr, [The Nature and Destiny of Man](#) (Charles Scribner’s Son, 1964), Volume I, p.150.
11. Edward Gibbon, [The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire](#) (Random House, n.d.), Volume I, p.69.
12. Edward B. Davis, “The Word and the Works: Concordism and American Evangelicals” in Keith B. Miller (ed.), [Perspectives on an Evolving Creation](#) (William B. Eerdmans, 2003), p.43. An example of rejection of “death before the fall” is <http://www.sixdaycreation.com/facts/creation/general/nodeath.html> .

13. Athanasius, "On the Incarnation of the Word," p.38. (Page lxxi of the Prolegomena by Archibald Robertson is also of interest.); James Barr, The Garden of Eden and the Hope of Immortality (Fortress, 1992).
14. Martin Luther, "Lectures on Genesis" in Luther's Works, vol.1 (Concordia, 1958), pp.110-111.
15. A recent study is Peter Schmiechen, Saving Power: Theories of Atonement and Forms of the Church (Wm. B. Eerdmans, 2005).
16. Gerhard Forde, "The Work of Christ" in Carl E. Braaten and Robert W. Jenson (ed.), Christian Dogmatics, Vol.2 (Fortress, 1984).
17. Luther A. Weigle (ed.), The New Testament Octapla (Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1962), p.1016. Tyndale's spelling was "attonement."
18. George L. Murphy, Currents in Theology and Mission 37 (2010): 23-27.