

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis

Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

Bachelor of Divinity

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

6-1-1935

The Scriptural Doctrine of the Atonement with Special Reference to the False Theories of Atonement

Arnold V. Kuster

Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, ir_kustera@csl.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/bdiv>



Part of the [Religious Thought, Theology and Philosophy of Religion Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Kuster, Arnold V., "The Scriptural Doctrine of the Atonement with Special Reference to the False Theories of Atonement" (1935). *Bachelor of Divinity*. 690.

<https://scholar.csl.edu/bdiv/690>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Concordia Seminary Scholarship at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Bachelor of Divinity by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact seitzw@csl.edu.

CONCORDIA SEMINARY

THE SCRIPTURAL DOCTRINE OF THE ATONEMENT

WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO

THE FALSE THEORIES OF ATONEMENT

by

Arnold V. Kuster.

A Dissertation

Presented to the Faculty of Concordia Seminary

in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements

for the Degree of Bachelor of Divinity.

June, 1935.

St. Louis, Mo.

Approved :
W. Arnold.
J. i. Mueller.

PREFATORY NOTE

It is a well known fact that the Lutheran, that is, the scriptural, doctrine of the atonement is being denied and even ridiculed throughout the theological world. Substitute theories have been set up, about whose banners theologians have rallied and continue to rally. Such is the situation which calls forth this study of the scriptural doctrine of the atonement, with special reference to the false theories of atonement.

Our intention is to proceed on the principle set down in the following words by Remensnyder ("The Atonement and Modern Thought," 36-7): "Christianity is not an evolved, but a revealed religion. It is not a full-blown flower of the ethical faculty, but the appearance in the fulness of time of the divine scheme of redemption. It is superhistorical, having been intervened by a supernatural series of events upon the course of history. These events constitute a revelation. The record of them is given in the Holy Scriptures. To these alone then can we go to ascertain the doctrines of the Christian religion. There is no other source or norm of Christian theology. Friend and foe alike admit these premises. And in the interpretation of Holy Scriptures we must be guided by sound and sane canons of critical exegesis. We cannot reject a text as uninspired or interpolated merely because it refuses to fit our preconceived theory. Nor can we rear a mountain of conclusion on a single text presenting an incidental phase of a doctrine, and then reject a hundred texts which give the primary and larger sense of the doctrine. Following these axiomatic principles, there is but one way for the Christian to ascertain the Christian doctrine of the atonement, and that is to go to the Scriptures."

The writer hereby acknowledges a debt of gratitude and expresses hearty appreciation for the kind and ready assistance of Dr. William Arndt in the preparation of this thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Part I. The Scriptural Doctrine of the Atonement. (Sections 1-32)

The scriptural doctrine of the atonement stated and proved briefly.

(Sections 1-3)

The nouns which are used in expressing the doctrine of atonement.

(Sections 4-14)

μειότης (Section 4)

θυσία (Section 5)

προσφορά (Section 6)

ἱλασμός (Section 7)

ἱλαστήριον (Section 8)

λύτρον (Section 9)

ἀντίλυτρον (Section 10)

λύτρωσις (Section 11)

ἀπολύτρωσις (Section 12)

καταλλαγή (Section 13)

ῥῶσις (Section 14)

The verbs which are used in expressing the doctrine of the atonement.

(Sections 15-22)

ἱλάσκεσθαι (Section 15)

λυτροῦν (Section 16)

ἀγοράζειν (Section 17)

ἐξαγοράζειν (Section 18)

ἀπαλλάσσειν (Section 19)

καταλλάσσειν (Section 20)

ῥῶναι (Section 21)

ῥῶσθαι (Section 22)

The prepositions which are used in expressing the doctrine of the atonement.

(Sections 23-24)

ἀντί (Section 23)

ὑπέρ (Section 24)

The concept of the vicarious atonement, in the Old Testament and
as seen in the New Testament. (Sections 25-27)

The atonement the central and most important of Christian doctrines.
(Section 28)

The confession of the doctrine of the atonement by the church since
the apostles. (Sections 29-32)

Part II. Objections to the Scriptural Doctrine of the Atonement.
(Sections 33-51)

The Scriptural doctrine of the atonement is unnecessary. (Section 33)

The scriptural doctrine of the atonement is unjust. (Section 34)

It is impossible to transfer guilt or righteousness from one person to
another. (Section 35)

Death, being natural, cannot expiate sin. (Section 36)

Punishment does not destroy sin. (Section 37)

The gratuitous remission of sins excludes any satisfaction. (Section 38)

Only the love of God, and not His wrath, is revealed in the sufferings
and death of Christ. (Section 39)

Christ's suffering was not fully adequate for the atonement. (Section 40)

Reconciliation is in Christ, not through Him (as another). (Section 41)

Christ did not suffer for us, but for His own benefit. (Section 42)

Our doctrine of the atonement is a peculiar notion of Paul. (Section 43)

The Epistle to the Hebrews has not the doctrine of the atonement.
(Section 44)

To predicate wrath of God is to disparage Him. (Section 45)

The scriptural doctrine of the atonement is too juridical, not
ethical. (Section 46)

If Christ fulfilled the Law, then we do not have to keep it.
(Section 47)

Did God suffer and die for us? (Section 48)

The doctrine of the vicarious atonement is capable of great abuse.
(Section 49)

The problem of the heathen.	(Section 50)
The rationalistic-scientific objection.	(Section 51)
Part III. The False Theories of the Atonement.	(Sections 52-72)
The Triumphantorial theory.	(Section 52)
The theory of Restitution (Apokatastasis).	(Section 53)
The acceptilation theory.	(Section 54)
The "Sacrificial theory".	(Section 55)
The denial of the active obedience of Christ.	(Section 56)
Christ atoned for us according to one nature only.	(Section 57)
The various forms of work-righteousness, involving a denial of Christ's work intensively.	(Section 58)
The papistic sacrifice of the Mass.	(Section 59)
Atonement for the elect only, a denial of Christ's work extensively.	(Section 60)
The theory of Jehovah's Witnesses.	(Section 61)
The governmental theory.	(Section 62)
The accident and martyr theories.	(Section 63)
The guarantee theory.	(Section 64)
Ihmels' compromise.	(Section 65)
The theory of blood efficacy.	(Section 66)
The declaratory theory.	(Section 67)
The moral-influence theory.	(Section 68)
The theory of Christ as the penitent.	(Section 69)
The theory of Eddyism.	(Section 71)
General characteristics of the false theories of atonement.	(Section 72)
Conclusion.	(Section 73)
Bibliography.	

PART I. THE SCRIPTURAL DOCTRINE OF THE ATONEMENT.

1. THE SCRIPTURAL DOCTRINE OF THE ATONEMENT STATED AND PROVED BRIEFLY.

Three questions which have always been asked in discussing Christ's atonement, and which we shall consider by way of introduction, are: Is it necessary? Is it accomplished? Is it effective for all men? Scripture has a decidedly affirmative answer for these questions. Along lines suggested by them, we set forth the scriptural doctrine of the atonement in three points, as follows:

I. God, who is perfectly just, demands that all men perfectly obey His Law (justitia legislativa, normativa), and His wrath and threat of eternal punishment are upon all who do not fulfill it (justitia vindicativa, punitiva). One of God's essential attributes is justice. Ps. 92,15. God is the supreme judge. He is exlex, that is, under no law. He is Himself the perfect norm of justice. Accordingly He requires man to live also righteously, according to the standard of justice He sets up for man. Lev. 11,44; 1 Pet. 1,16. He put His Law in the heart of man at creation, though since the Fall it is found only dimly written there (Rom. 2,15), He gave it to the Jews through Moses (Ex. 20), and His Son incarnate reiterated it Mt. 22, 37,39: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart - - Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." (Justitia legislativa) The justitia vindicativa in case of transgression of this Law is expressed Gal. 3,10: "Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them." Also see Isa. 59,2; Ezek. 18,20,26. It applies to every man, "for all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God" (Objective genitive- "glory before God") (Rom. 3,23). The curse of God is not merely a general one, covering the world in general, but it is also definitely individual, applying to every man: "Cursed is every one," etc. The punishment involved in the curse of God is eternal, unending. It is "everlasting punishment" (Mt. 25,46). The wicked "shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the

presence of the Lord", (2 Thess. 1,9) "where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched" (Mk. 9,48), "and shall be tormented day and night for ever and ever (εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰῶνων)" (Rev. 20,10). Thus every man of the human race stands guilty before God, and the wrath of God abides on him. Rom. 1,18: "For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men." Rom. 3,9-18: Both Jews and gentiles under sin. Rom. 3,19: All the world is guilty before God (ἐπὶ δίκῃς , under condemnation). See also Rom. 2,8.9.12; Ps. 5,4. Therefore the Apology states correctly: "The Law always accuses us, always shows that God is angry." (III,7) Rom. 5,10: Men God's enemies (ἐχθροί , passive, "hated by God". See Rom. 1,18-32). Eph. 2,3: Children of wrath by nature (τὴ ἐκ νεφύσεσι ἕνεκα τῆς φύσεως). All men are "dead in sins" (Eph. 2,1) "because the carnal mind is enmity against God: for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be." (Rom. 8,7) And there is no help for lost and condemned men in all the world, for "none of them can by any means redeem his brother, nor give to God a ransom for him." (Ps. 49,7) It was absolutely necessary that Jesus Christ should accomplish the atonement in order that men should be saved.

Thus the Christian can countenance no such statement as that of H. M. Smith, in his book "Atonement": "To start an imaginary into the mystery of the Atonement by postulating the total depravity of the human race is, of course, absurd. If men were altogether worthless, it would be irrational to save them." As Dr. Dau remarks, "this is exactly what the Scriptures declare man in his natural state is: worthless. 1 Cor. 1,26-28; Eph. 2,1ff." From the standpoint of the worthlessness of man the scriptural doctrine is unfolded. Lk. 1,68.69. "Blessed be the Lord God - - , for he hath - - redeemed his people."

2. II. God has put Christ, and Christ has put Himself, in place of man, as well under the fulfillment as under the punishment of the Law which was given to man, and by His perfect fulfillment of the Law

(obedientia activa) and His innocent suffering and death (obedientia passiva) Christ has satisfied the demands of the divine justice. The obedientia activa is shown clearly in Gal. 4,4.5: "God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the Law (*γενόμενον ὑπὸ νόμου*), to redeem them that were under the Law." Jesus Himself says that He came to fulfill the Law (Mt. 5,17) and did fulfill it (Jn. 13,1;14,31) even in detail (Lk. 2,51). His obedience to the Law is applied to us as righteousness (Rom. 5,19). Christ's substitutionary suffering of the punishment which men incurred through their disobedience of the Law is shown 1 Pet. 3,18: "For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust." (On the substitutionary meaning of *ὑπέρ*, see section 24) 2 Cor. 5,14: "One died for all." Gal. 3,13: "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the Law, being made a curse for us; for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree." 2 Cor. 5,21: "He was made to be sin for us, who knew no sin." See also 1 Tim. 2,6; Isa. 53,4-7. He took upon Himself all the woes which should have been ours, had He not suffered in our stead- all our suffering (scourging, Lk. 18,33; wounds, stripes, bruises, chastisement, Isa.53,5), ignominy (mocking, spiteful treatment, and spitting, Lk. 18,32; 23,35-39; Mt. 27,27-30), death ("Christ died for the ungodly," Rom. 5,6; 5,8; Heb. 2,9; 1 Jn. 3,16; Isa. 53, 12.) and damnation (being forsaken of God, Mt. 27,46). These facts come to warm expression in Luther (12,236): "Christ suffers death, malediction, and damnation, just as though He Himself had broken the whole law and deserved every sentence pronounced by the law on the criminals."

3. III. Through Christ's substitutionary obedience, suffering, and death, God's wrath and sentence of damnation against man is turned into grace and forgiveness of sins. This is an accomplished fact, and the effects of the atonement are beneficial for all man. In Rom. 5, where it is shown that sin and death are by Adam, and life through

- Christ, this phase of the atonement stands out. V.18: "By the righteousness" (δικαίωμα, the ὑπακοή of v.19) "of one" (Christ) "the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life." Rom. 5,10: "For if, when we were enemies" (ἐχθροί, "hated by God," passive) "we were reconciled to God by the death of His Son, much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life." 1 Jn. 2,2: "And he is the propitiation" (ἱλασμός, see section 7) "for our sins, and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world." So then the atonement is effective for all men. It effects a perfect redemption from the bondage of the Law ("Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage." Gal. 5,1. See also Gal.4,7), from the curse of the Law (Gal. 3,13), and from the penalty of the Law (Isa. 53,5: "He was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities: the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes are we healed." See Col. 2,14: δόγματα, writings of indebtedness.), as well as from sin ("The blood of Jesus Christ, his Son, cleanseth us from all sin," 1 Jn. 1,7. See also 1 Pet. 1,18.19; Heb. 1,3; 9,28), from death (Hos. 13,14: "I will ransom them from the power of the grave; I will redeem them from death." See also Heb. 2,9.15; 2 Cor. 5,15), and from the power of the devil (Heb. 2,14.15: "That through death he might destroy him that hath the power of death, that is, the devil, and deliver them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to death."). It procures for us perfect righteousness (2 Cor. 5,21: "For he hath made him to be sin for us who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him." Jer. 23,6: "The Lord, our righteousness." See also Rom. 3,25; 5,19; 1 Cor. 1,30), life and eternal bliss (Jn. 3,15.16; Rev. 7,16; 21,4; Ps. 16,11; Lk. 23,43).

Luthardt remarks correctly that Rom. 5,10 involves a change of disposition on the part of God. Also 2 Cor. 5,19 says plainly that God

reconciled the world unto Himself by (modifying clause) "not imputing their trespasses unto them." Thus God does not reckon with men according to their sins, not because of a relaxing of His essential righteousness, but because Christ, as the Mediator, has satisfied God's justice, expiated our sins (1 Tim. 2,5: *μεσίτης Θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπων*; Heb. 9,14.15).

Naturally it is not expected that the modern schools of theology will accept even this plenary Scripture proof for the atonement doctrine, since they reject all "proof text" methods, asserting that these prove very little in view of the "occasional" character of the New Testament writings. Therefore we shall go into the words of Scriptures and through the whole of Scriptures to show that the atonement is not an "occasional" concept, but an essential, fundamental doctrine, unmistakably imbedded in its context when mentioned in Scripture, and perfectly in harmony with the other doctrines of Scripture. This, in the main, will be covered by the remainder of the first part of this thesis.

4. THE NOUNS WHICH ARE USED IN EXPRESSING THE DOCTRINE OF ATONEMENT.

In discussing the words which come into play in the scriptural expression of the doctrine of the atonement, we shall attempt not only to assert their meanings in general, or merely to state their root meanings, but also to show their relation to the context and the meaning of the Scripture portions in which they stand.

Μεσίτης - This word will serve, in a measure, as a proper introduction to the section on nouns. Bauer-Goettingen says on *μεσίτης* (sub voce): "Mittler, Mittlerperson, die zwischen zwei Parteien bei einem Streit oder zur Erreichung eines Zweckes vermittelt. Von Christus mit Gen. der Personen, zwischen denen er vermittelt *Μεθ' Θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπων* Vermittler zwischen Gott und Menschen 1 Ti 2,5; mit Gen. der Sache, die er vermittelt: *κεζιτρονος*

Heb. 8,6, καθινης 9,15 νεας διαθηκης 12,24." 1 Tim. 2,4 reads:

"Who will have all men to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth." This is the antecedent will of God. God wanted men to be reconciled to Him. So He sent His Son (Gal. 4,4.5) into the world as a man, to mediate between man and Himself. As a sinless man Christ lived, suffered, and died in the place of man, and thus became the one Mediator between God and man, the one mediating person through whom all men can come to the one true God and live before Him(v.5). How did the man Christ become a successful Mediator? This we find in v.6: "Who gave himself a ransom for all." (On "ransom" see section 10) He paid the price of Himself, all that He had, even His precious life, being the Son of God, to buy us, redeem us into a state of acceptability before the holy God. Heb. 8,6: "But now hath he obtained a more excellent ministry, by how much also he is the mediator of a better covenant, which was established upon better promises." In this chapter the advantages of Christ's mediatorship over that of the High-priests (Mediators prefigurative of Christ) of the Old Testament is brought out. The new covenant or testament is based not upon Law, but upon the Gospel promises of forgiveness and life. These things we have through our Mediator and Advocate with God, Jesus Christ. Heb.9,15 ("and for this cause he is the mediator of the new covenant, that by means of death, for the redemption of the transgressors that were under the first testament, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance.") brings out that the new promises of redemption were gained "by means of death", through Christ's offering of Himself, sinless, to God. By this sacrifice He is a superior Mediator to the Old Testament priests, in fact the only effectual Mediator.

5. *Θυσια* - We quote Remensnyder(Op. cit.,p.39): "Sacrifice, the thing sacrificed, the victim. 'Jesus offered up once for all himself a sacrifice for sin'(Heb.7,27). 'But now once in the end of the world hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself'(Heb.9,26)

literally *διὰ τῆς θυσίας αὐτοῦ* , i.e., by means of his sacrifice.
 'For even Christ our passover (i.e., our paschal lamb, with whose
 sacrificial killing the passover began) is sacrificed for us' (1 Cor.5,7).

"The idea in this term sacrifice is that of Jesus Christ the
 great High Priest of the human race, submitting Himself to suffering
 and death as an atonement for sin, and as an acceptable substitute to
 God the Judge, that guilty man might escape."

In Heb. 10 the proceedings on the day of atonement are shown to
 be types of ~~Christ's~~ Jesus' sacrifice of Himself in atoning for all men
 and His work of redemption. The high point of the chapter is v.12, in
 which the sacrifice of Christ is shown to be all-sufficient and final:
 "But this man, after he had offered one sacrifice (*θυσία*) for sins
 for ever, sat down on the right hand of God." Finally, also Paul
 (Eph. 5,2) in his exhortation to holiness, points to the source of a
 Christian's love, namely that "Christ hath loved us, and hath given
 himself for us an offering and a sacrifice (*θυσία*) to God for a
 sweet-smelling savor"(Cf. Numb.28,13). Could language better express the
 work of Christ as the Expiator of sin?

6. *Προσφορά* - This is the "general term of which *θυσία* is
 the specific." It is found in connection with the passages in section
 5 (Heb. 10,10,14; Eph. 5,2) and has the same significance. It is rendered
 "offering". It leaves no doubt that the "occasional" character of
 atonement in Scriptures is a dream.

7. *Ἰλασμός* - Propitiation. "Jesus Christ the righteous is the
 propitiation for our sins"(1 Jn. 2,2). "God loved us, and sent his
 Son to be the propitiation for our sins"(1 Jn. 4,10). Remensnyder
 (Op. cit.,p.40): "The idea involved in propitiation is a sacrifice
 offered to the divinity displeased and offended by sin, which avert
 His displeasure and disposes Him to graciousness toward the offender.
 How could that be called propitiatory offering which did not
 propitiate, which did not ascend as a sweet-smelling savor, which

MEMORIAL LIBRARY
 CONCORDIA SEMINARY,
 ST. LOUIS, MO.

produced no impression, effected no change in the attitude of the eternal Judge toward the sinner?"

8. *Ἰλαστήριον* - The final strictly Old Testament concept in the New Testament which brings out the doctrine of the atonement is found in the third chapter of Romans in a very strategic position, so to speak. Paul has explained at length (Rom. 1,18- 3,20) that all men are "guilty before God". Then follows the sentence (vv.21- 26) in which justification by faith in the redeeming blood of Christ is so explicitly set forth (See section 12). The redemption is in Christ Jesus, "whom God has set forth a mercy seat (*ἰλαστήριον*)" (v.25). "This word should not be rendered here with the abstract 'propitiation' as in the Authorized Version; for the use of the word in the LXX shows us that it is the translation of the Hebrew סִיּוֹן , which means the cover of the ark of the covenant, the mercy seat of the Old Testament. The expression is therefore taken from the sacrificial cultus of the Israelites. Just as in the Old Testament the people were propitiated through the sprinkling of the mercy seat on the great day of the atonement, so the whole world is propitiated through the blood of Christ, which He Himself so generously poured forth from His holy body, so that now the objective reconciliation, the atonement, lies ready before all men and requires only acceptance in faith." (Tr. from Dr. Kretzmann in C.T.M., VI, 122)

See also the reference to the mercy seat in Heb. 9,5. Cf. also section 22.

9. *λύτρον* - This is the word upon which *ἀντίλυτρον*, *λύτρωσις* and *ἀπολύτρωσις* are built. There is, therefore, much affinity in the meaning of the four words. Bauer-Goettingen says on *λύτρον*: "Das Loesegeld, besond. auch die Loskaufung fuer freizulassende Sklaven." Luther translates, in the two instances in which it is found, "Erloesung" (Mt. 20,28) and "Bezahlung" (Mk. 10,45). The Authorized Version is therefore entirely correct in translating, both times:

"The Son of man is come - - to give his life a ransom for many."

Ylvesaker says (The Gospels, 530): "The symbolism is that of prisoners of war or bondmen who are liberated upon the payment of a price." Thus the idea of Christ's death ransoming us from our sins, buying us back into the favor of God, has scriptural basis. Meyer remarks that "the use of ἀντί before it clearly marks the sense of λύσεων to be that of substitution and not of compensation only." (Quoted by Remensnyder, Op. cit., 40)

10. Ἀντίλυσεων is found only in 1 Tim. 2,6. After bringing out in v.5 that Christ is the Mediator between God and man, Paul goes on to say how Christ brought about, or accomplished that redemption (v.6): "Who gave himself a ransom (ἀντίλυσεων) for all." Christ freely and willingly gave Himself even unto death (Gal. 1,4; Tit. 2,14). He Himself, in His life and death, became a ransom for us. Thus He laid down the price which God because of His righteousness demanded of all men. And because Christ laid down this price as our substitute, God cannot now demand any further payment from us.
11. λύσεως is found Heb. 9,12, and has the same sense here as ἀπολύσεως has in v.15. (Section 12) V. 12 dwells on the sufficiency and finality of the sacrifice of Christ: "By his own blood he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption (λύσεως) for us." The meaning of λύσεως is also clear from Lk. 1,68; 2,36, as well as from 1 Clement 12,7: *διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ κυρίου ἡ ἕσται πᾶσιν τοῖς πιστεύουσιν.* (Bauer: "Wird eine Erlösung zuteil werden") See also Ep. Barn. 19,10.
12. Ἀπολύσεως - A complete payment or "deliverance effected by purchase. Redemption from judgment entailed. Satisfaction made for our sin" (Remensnyder, Op. cit., 40). Bauer-Goettingen: "Ursprgl. . . . Loskaufung e. Gefangenen oder Sklaven, seine Freimachung durch Erlegung des Loesegelds." Heb. 9,15 reads: *καὶ διὰ τοῦτο διαθήκης καινῆς μερίτης ἔστιν, ὅπως θανάτου γενομένου*

εἰς ἀπολύτρωσιν τῶν ἐπὶ τῇ πρώτῃ διαθήκῃ
 παραβάσεων τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν λάβωσιν οἱ κεκλημένοι τῆς αἰωνίου
 κληρονομίας . Literally: "And for this cause he is the Mediator
 of the New Testament, that, since death took place for the redemption
 of the transgressions of the first testament, they which are called
 might receive the promise of eternal inheritance." Death is the
 punishment for sin, and these wages of sin must be expiated. Christ
 gave Himself into death, and that was εἰς ἀπολύτρωσιν, for
 redemption, for paying the price. Dr. Kretzmann: "Weil die Menschen
 unter dem ersten Bund sich Uebertretung schuldig gemacht hatten, weil
 sie allzumal Suender waren und sind, weil das Gesetz sie alle zu
 Suendern machte, deswegen hat Christus sie durch seinen selbstvertretenden
 Tod befreit, erloest." (C.T.M., V, 931) Turning again to the classic
 passage in Rom. 3, we read, verse 24: "Being justified freely by his
 grace through the redemption (ἀπολύτρωσις) that is in Christ
 Jesus." To this Dr. Kretzmann remarks: "Das Nomen ἀπολύτρωσις wird
 besonders von dem Apostel Paulus mit Hinsicht auf die Erloesung
 von Suende, Strafe, Tod konstant in seiner etymologischen Bedeutung
 gebraucht, so dass es heisst 'Loskaufung'. Vgl. Matth. 20,28; Mark.
 10,45; 1 Tim. 2,6; Tit. 2,14. Wir sind durch den Schriftgebrauch
genoetigt, die strikte Bedeutung des Erkaufens, Erwerbens, Loskaufens
 durch Bezahlung des Kaufpreises beizubehalten. - Und was ist der Preis,
 der bei dieser Loskaufung erlegt worden ist? Nichts anders als Jesus
 Christus selbst, sein eigenes Leben. Er hat sich selber hingegeben,
 er hat sich selbst geopfert. Und dabei ist 'durch Christum Jesum'
 soviel wie 'durch Christi Blut'. Eph. 1,7; Kol. 1,14; 1 Pet. 1,18,19."
 Col. 1,14: "In whom we have redemption through his blood, even the for-
 giveness of sins."

13. *Καταλλαγή* - reconciliation or atonement. Luther regularly:
 Versoehnung. The sense of this word, as well as its verbal equivalent,
 is often misunderstood. In extra- New Testament literature it has a

general meaning, but Paul in 2 Cor. 5 and Rom. 5 attaches special significance to it, which is gathered from the context. Buechsel, in Kittel's "Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament", proceeds as follows: "Paulus stellt die Bedeutung seines (Gottes) Wortes und seiner Arbeit dadurch dar, dass er sie Wort der Versöhnung und Dienst der Versöhnung nennt 2 K 5,18.19. Sie bringen Gottes Handeln, durch das er die Menschen in seine Gemeinschaft wieder aufnimmt, zu diesen(vgl.v.20). Die dies Handeln Gottes an sich haben zum Ziel kommen lassen, die sich ihm erschlossen haben, haben die Versöhnung empfangen R 5,11." The latter sentence involves synergism. The context may give the relative meaning of a word, but cannot change its meaning. The reconciliation (καταλλαγή) of 2 Cor. 5,18.19 is a fact accomplished 1900 years ago in Christ (διὰ Χριστοῦ v.18, and ἐν Χριστῷ v.19). The διακονία (body of preachers) and the λόγον (Gospel) are the means of communicating the objective, completed, καταλλαγή (atonement or reconciliation) to the world. Man is offered this salvation in the word of reconciliation, and needs only to accept it in faith, as is shown by the Gospel admonition at the end of v.20. As to Rom. 5,11, Bauer: "Da die Menschen in keiner Weise aktiv beteiligt sind, wird von ihnen ausgesagt ein τ. καταλλαγήν λαμβάνειν 'Die-Versöhnung- Empfangen'." To this passage Philippi also remarks correctly (Quoted in Pieper, Dogm., II, 413): "Die καταλλαγή ist vorhanden; wir empfangen sie durch den Glauben, so dass καταλλαγήν λαμβάνειν = δικαιούσθαι; vgl. 2 Kor.5,20: καταλλάγητε τῷ Θεῷ." Thus καταλλαγή is the entire atoning work of Christ. It is all that men need to reconcile them to God. They need to add nothing, it is for them simply to accept it. But when Ritschl, who identifies the righteousness and grace of God, says (R. u. V.,II,230, as quoted in Luthardt, Komp.,250): " καταλλαγή bezeichnet die veraenderte Richtung der Suender auf Gott", he is even more subjective. In view of what has been set forth in sections 3, 5, 7, 9, 10, and in

view of the fact that ~~1~~ 2 Cor. 5,19 clearly shows a change (Umstimmung) in the heart of God ("not imputing their trespasses unto them"), we conclude that he is one-sided and unscriptural in this matter. For a further discussion of the change in the heart of God see section 20.

14. $\gamma\delta\iota\delta$ is the first of the Hebrew words we discuss. (See also the noun derivative of $\gamma\delta\delta$, treated in section 22) We find this word in Isa.53, the chapter treating of the humiliation and sufferings of Christ, in v.5. The King James Version has "chastisement", and Luther has "Strafe". Delitzsch (Hebrews, vol.2,427-8): $\gamma\delta\delta$ $\gamma\delta\delta$ $\gamma\delta\delta$, the punishment which was for our salvation was to be upon Him. . . . And he on whom $\gamma\delta\delta$ lies, is to the simple understanding not one on whom that lies which chastises another, but one who himself has to bear and suffer the chastisement. The idea of poena vicaria cannot be more exactly expressed in Hebrew than is the case in the above named word."

THE VERBS WHICH ARE USED IN EXPRESSING THE DOCTRINE OF THE ATONEMENT.

15. $\gamma\lambda\alpha\sigma\kappa\epsilon\epsilon\theta\alpha\iota$ - Remensnyder describes the concept of reconciliation in this word thus: "To expiate the sin, and thereby make God propitious to the sinner. Christ was 'the high priest to make reconciliation for the sins of the people'(Heb.2,7). That is, the high priest, by sprinkling the mercy-seat with the blood of the sacrifices, made expiation for the guilt of the people."(Op. cit.,40) The blood of Christ is the sacrifice (cf. section 5) which expiates our guilt before God. (Cf. also the discussion of the noun cognate, section 8)
16. $\lambda\upsilon\tau\epsilon\omicron\upsilon\nu$ - (Cf. sections 9-12 for the noun concept) To free through the payment of a ransom, to ransom, or in general to set free. The particular meaning is found in 1 Pet. 1,18 and Tit.2,14, where the price of redemption, the blood, the life, of Christ, is mentioned. 1 Pet. 1,18.19: "Forasmuch as ye know that ye were not redeemed

(ἐλυτεώθητε) with corruptible things, as silver and gold, from your vain conversation received by tradition from your fathers, but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot." Tit. 2,14: "Who gave himself for us, that he might redeem (λυτεώσῃται) us from all iniquity." When the Emmaus disciples said (Lk. 24,21): "But we trusted that it had been that he should have redeemed (λυτεοῦσθαι) Israel," they evidently had Mk. 10,45 and Mt. 20,28 in mind. The meaning of this word is further established by the fact that the LXX, in Hos. 13,14, uses this root in translating דָּוָן (דָּוָן - to buy out of slavery). "I will redeem them from death." This root is also used for דָּוָן in Ps. 119,134: "Deliver me from the power of man." There is no doubt then that our deliverance is through the atoning blood of Christ.

17. Ἀγοράζειν This word has much the same meaning in the apostolic writings as we found for λυτεοῦν. Its origin is traced to ἀγορά, market place. It played a part in the language of slavery in the hellenistic age. Thus we find it used of the work of Christ in connection with the gen. pretii in two interjected clauses in 1 Cor. 6,20: ἡγορεύθητε γὰρ τιμῆς and 7,23: τιμῆς ἡγορεύθητε. They are both translated: "Ye are bought with a price." The highest incentive for sanctification in a Christian is his remembrance that he is redeemed by the great price of the blood of Christ. A Christian feels obligated to serve Christ, who freed him from sin, and in his willingness to serve, becomes actually a slave for Christ (1 Cor. 6,19.20; 7,23). 2 Pet. 2,1: "There shall be false prophets among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought (ἀγορεύσαντα αὐτοὺς) them, and bring upon themselves swift destruction." Peter, in realization that Christ died for all man, here interjects a sad feature in the damnation of those who blaspheme Christ- He bought them with His precious blood, but they spurned a salvation so great and free. Rev.5,9: "And they sung a new song, saying,

Thou art worthy to take the book, and to open the seals thereof: for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed ($\eta\rho\acute{o}\epsilon\alpha\sigma\alpha\varsigma$) us to God by thy blood out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation; and hast made us unto our God kings and priests: and we shall reign on the earth." Buechsel, in Kittel's Woerterbuch, remarks rightly: "Apk 5,9 (vgl 14,3.4) wird mit dem Worte die Grösse der Leistung des Lammes gefeiert. Deshalb wird auch angegeben, womit, woher, fuer wen das Lamm die Menschen erkauf hat," and then strangely enough goes on: "Doch ist in dem Hymnus keine christliche Heilslehre zu suchen." Anyone reading the passage can find a surprisingly complete statement of the atoning work of Christ there.

18. $\epsilon\xi\alpha\gamma\omicron\sigma\epsilon\acute{\alpha}\zeta\epsilon\iota\nu$. This word is used in Gal.3,13: "Christ hath redeemed ($\epsilon\xi\eta\rho\acute{o}\sigma\alpha\sigma\epsilon\nu$) us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us: for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree." Also Gal. 4,5: "To redeem ($\epsilon\xi\alpha\gamma\omicron\sigma\epsilon\acute{\alpha}\sigma\eta$) them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons." Buechsel (Kittel, sub voce) says on $\epsilon\xi\alpha\gamma\omicron\sigma\epsilon\acute{\alpha}\zeta\epsilon\iota\nu$: "Im NT von Christi loskaufender, freikaufender Tat Gl 3,13; 4,5. Die Vorstellung ist aehnlich wie bei $\alpha\gamma\omicron\sigma\epsilon\acute{\alpha}\zeta\epsilon\iota\nu$, nur dass hier der Kauf nicht in das Eigentum Gottes oder Christi uebergehen laesst, sondern in die Freiheit. Das Stehen unter dem Gesetz und seinem Fluch ist als Sklaverei gedacht 4,1.3.7. Die Vorstellung entspricht soweit dem damaligen Gebrauche der sakralen Sklavenbefreiung. . . . Wesentlich ist bei dieser Befreiung vom Fluch des Gesetzes, dass er (nicht nur eine) tatsaechliche, sondern rechtmæssig begruendete Freiheit gibt, die deshalb gegen Erneuerung der Sklaverei sichert." Rightly also: "Dabei ist die orthodoxe Form der Verobjektivierung (die Losgekauften alle Menschen), die ua bei Lietzmann nachwirkt, noch immer besser als die Hofmannsche (die Losgekauften die Juden), wie sie bei Sieffert, Zahn, Kartan vorliegt. Denn die orthodoxe Form gestattet wenigstens eine lebendige Beziehung auf die einstigen und heutigen Leser, die

Hofmannsche dagegen schliesst sie aus und entleert dadurch die Stelle."

See Rom. 1,16; 2,9; 3,19;20.29.

19. *Ἀπαλλάσσειν* is defined by Buechsel "befreien, entsprechend weit verbreiteten Sprachgebrauch." The substitutionary atonement of Christ is well expressed in Heb. 2, 14.15: "Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil; and deliver (*ἀπαλλάξῃ*) them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage." (Cf. here also the noun from this root, section 13)
20. *Καταλλάσσειν* is found 2 Cor. 5,20 and Rom. 5,10 (twice). Buechsel (Kittel's Woerterbuch, s.v.): "Die Versoehnung kommt zustande durch den Tod Jesu R 5,10, der hier deutlich nicht nur uns zugute geschieht, Offenbarung der Liebe Gottes R 5,8, sondern Stellvertretung fuer uns ist 2 K 5,20.14f." But as in the case of *καταλλαγῆ* (see section 13) he has some misconceptions which have no basis in the text. P.255: "Auf das Verhaeltnis Gottes und der Menschen wendet das Wort im NT nur Paulus an, und zwar kommt *καταλλάσσειν* nur von Gott, *καταλλαγῆναι* nur vom Menschen vor. Gott versoehnt uns bzw die Welt mit ~~σὺν~~ ihm 2 K 5,20. Gott und die Menschen stehen also bei der Versoehnung durchaus nicht gleich. Die Versoehnung ist nicht wechselseitig in dem Sinne, dass beide in gleicher Weise aus Feinden zu Freunden wuerden, sondern grade in der Versoehnung ist die Ueberordnung Gottes ueber die Menschen in jeder Beziehung gewahrt. . . . Dass Gott seinen Sinn geaendert haette, darf - - - nicht behauptet werden, schon darum nicht, weil der Gnadenwille Gottes in der at.lichen Weissagung laengst offenbart ist." The last sentence shows that Buechsel has not rightly observed the relation of Law and Gospel. The Law and the Gospel were preached side by side in the Old Testament, both His wrath and love being exhibited at all times. His forgiving love was shown always with the atonement of the Messiah in mind as its

meritorious cause. Jer. 31,31-4. It is unscriptural indeed to say that God's will and decrees change and it is unscriptural to say that man reconciles God, but at the same time Scriptures tell us that God changes His mind about justified sinners. He does not impute their sins to them, 2 Cor. 5,19. But Buechsel invades this passage with the following intricacies: "Indem er fuer uns zur Suende gemacht wurde, wurden wir goettliche Gerechtigkeit 2 K 5,21. Versoehnung ist insofern genau parallel zu Rechtfertigung (vgl auch R 5,10 im Verhaeltnis zu 5,9). Deshalb kehrt auch das λογίζεσθαι, das fuer den Rechtfertigungsgedanken des Paulus wesentlich ist (R 4,3.4.5.6.8.9.10. 11.23.24) in 2 K 5,19: μή λογίζομενος αὐτοῖς τὰ παραπτώματα αὐτῶν wieder." But there is no grammatical reason for denying that God does not impute sins to the justified, that He forgives them, changes His heart toward them. There is a failure to distinguish between the justification appropriated to the sinner by faith (subjective) and the justification prepared by God in Christ and offered to the sinner because of Christ's atonement (objective). 2 Cor. 5,21b is a subordinate clause of result, giving no license to put any kind of justification parallel with the atonement. Buechsel, after he has opened the door to synergism by the above stated manner of exegesis, proceeds (p.256): "Dadurch, dass Paulus das Wort der Versoehnung als Bitte bezeichnet, ist es voellig ausgeschlossen, dass er den Menschen in der Versoehnung sich mere Passive verhandelnd denkt." But the words καταλλάγητε τῷ Θεῷ do not say that man has the ability to accept the atonement. That power is given by God only. God invites and works the acceptance of reconciliation in man. Phil.2,13: "For it is God that worketh in you both to will and to do of his good pleasure." 1,29: "Unto you it is given - - - to believe." Also cf. Buechsel himself in the first quotation in this section. Furthermore Buechsel believes that the work of reconciliation is not yet complete, because there is a διακονία τῆς καταλλαγῆς (But cf. section 13 on

these words), and because Paul admonishes: "Be ye reconciled to God." Here again there is no distinction between the completed reconciliation in Christ, which God offers to men, and the subjective reconciliation of the individual through faith in the atonement of Christ. Neither will it do to point to *καταλλάξεων* and argue that the present participle denotes an action not yet finished. The *κόσμον καταλλάξεων ἑαυτῶ* took place when *θεὸς ἦν ἐν Χριστῶ* (objective reconciliation). Christ completed the atonement here on earth, 1900 years ago. Thus a statement like "Paulus nennt die Welt nicht versöhnt (*καταλλαγεῖς*)" has no standing. Buechsel makes a grammatical attempt to mix subjective into objective reconciliation (p.257n.): "*θέμενος* in 2 K 5,19 ist nicht mit *μὴ λογιζόμενος τὰ παραπτώματα αὐτῶν* zusammen dem *ἦν* ----- *καταλλάξεων* unterzuordnen, wogegen schon der Wechsel des Tempus spricht. Es ist grammatisch Fortsetzung des Verbum *ἄκρινον* durch ein Participium. . . . Sachlich bezeichnet das *θέμενος ἐν ἡμῖν τὸν λόγον τῆς καταλλαγῆς* noch ein Stueck der Versöhnung, da das Wort *ὁ λόγος τῆς καταλλαγῆς* heisst." But *θέμενος* also has a different tense (second aor.). It signifies that God has ordained, once for all, the means of appropriating the *καταλλαγή* . completed in Christ (*ἐν Χριστῶ*). "*ὁ λόγος τῆς καταλλαγῆς* is the Gospel which works subjective reconciliation in men. Neither will it do to distinguish between "us"(v.19,19b) and "world"(v.19a) and say that we are reconciled, but not yet the whole world, and so conclude that reconciliation is not yet completed. The whole world, including us, was reconciled in Christ. In summary, when Paul writes that God reconciled us, that refers to the reconciliation complete in Christ's work; when he writes of the ministry and the word of reconciliation, he is describing the means of communicating the Gospel of reconciliation to man; when he urges that we be reconciled to God,

he is speaking of our appropriating Christ's righteousness to ourselves through faith, through the power of God's Spirit. In Rom. 5,10 we have the objective reconciliation again: "For if, when we were enemies (that is, even before God brought us to faith, while we because of sin were under wrath, v.9) we were reconciled to God by his Son(i.e., in the sufferings and death of Christ), much more, being reconciled (i.e., claimed by God as His own through Christ), we shall be saved (eternally) by his life" (His glorious life at the right hand of God).

21. כִּפֶּר (כִּפֶּר) The piel form means "to cover over" sin or guilt, i.e., to expiate them. Modern theologians who minimize sin must necessarily empty this word of its meaning in the ritual language of the Old Testament. Thus Franks (A History of the Doctrine of the Work of Christ, II, 338) says of Ritschl: "The protecting covering of the offerers, by the priestly actions, from the face of God, includes in general no reference to their sins, but has respect only to the fact that they are perishable men ('Rechtfertigung und Versöhnung,' II², p.204). To translate the Hebrew word Kipper (to cover) in the sense of propitiate is a mistake (ibid. pp.187,200-3)." But, according to Gesenius, we find the word used chiefly in two ways: (1) In the sense of (God as subject) covering, i.e., forgiving sin. Ps. 65,3: "As for our transgressions, thou wilt purge them away." Ps. 78,38: "But he, being full of compassion, forgave their iniquity." Ps. 79,9; Jer.18,23; Ezek.16,63; Dt. 21,8b. (2) In the sense of appropriating the forgiveness of sins (man, specifically the priest or high-priest, as subject). Ex. 30,10.16 (כִּפֶּר in connection); 32,30 (cf. also v.32); Lev. 1,4. Not only these and dozens of other references in the sacrificial ordinances of Moses, but also many references in the prophets (Ezek.45,15.17) show the prefiguration of the atonement of Christ. Of this they were types and every Jew should have known them to be types. "The blood of the animal symbolized man's atonement with God" (Moenckmoeller). "For the life of the flesh is in the blood, and I have

given it to you upon the altar to make atonement for your souls;
for it is the blood that maketh an atonement for the soul." (Lev.11,17)

22. $\aleph \eta \zeta \delta$. The use of $\eta \zeta \delta$ and the idea of expiating God is strengthened by $\aleph \eta \zeta \delta$ -"the cover of the ark of the covenant (Ex. 25,17ff.; 30,6; 31,7) in regard to the atonement the most important part of the temple (LXX *ἱλαστήριον* . Vulg. propitiatorium. Luther: Gnadenstuhl) since the blood of the sin offering on the great day of atonement, once a year, was sprinkled on the cover of the ark of the covenant. Lev. 16,14ff. Therefore the Holy of Holies is called $\aleph \eta \zeta \delta \aleph \eta \zeta \delta$ - 1 Chr.28,11."(Gesenius, s.v.) The two tables of the Law were in the ark, and since the Law had been broken and God made justly wroth, the high-priest sprinkled the cover of the ark with the blood of the sacrifice to signify the expiation of all Israel's sins. All this, as will be shown in section 26 more fully, was in anticipation of the real, final sacrificial work of the Messiah.

THE PREPOSITIONS WHICH ARE USED IN EXPRESSING THE DOCTRINE OF ATONEMENT.

23. ἄντι Since the time when F. Socinus ("De Jesu Christo Salvatore" Part II,8) set down his sweeping arguments against orthodoxy, the meaning of this word has been contested. But in recent years development has been such that Dana and Mantey ("A Manual Grammar of the Greek NT" p.100) can write: "There is conclusive proof now that the dominant meaning for ἄντι in the first century was 'instead of'. 'By far the commonest meaning of ἄντι is the simple 'instead of'."(Moulton-Milligan: Voc. of the Gr. NT). This statement refers to the papyri usage. Professor Whitesell (Chicago) made a study of ἄντι in the Septuagint and found thirty-eight passages where it is rightly translated 'instead of' in the RV. Since ἄντι is used in two atonement passages in the New Testament, such a translation needs careful consideration. Notice the following: Gen. 22,13, and offered him up for a burnt offering instead of (ἄντι)

his son: Gen.44:33, Let thy servant, I pray thee, abide instead of (ἀντί) the lad a bondman to my Lord; Num.3:12, - - . These three sentences unmistakably deal with substitution. This translation applies especially to the following: Matt.2:22, - - - ; Luk.11:11, and he instead of (ἀντί) a fish give him a serpent; 1 Cor.11:15; Heb.12:2; But does it mean instead of in Matt. 20:28 and Mark 10:45, δούραι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν ?

Either that, or else it means 'in exchange for', and each implies substitution. The obscurity of this passage is not the result of linguistic ambiguity, but of theological controversy." Buechsel

(Kittel's Woerterbuch): "In Mk 10,45 par: δούραι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν ist ἀντὶ πολλῶν der Stellung wegen von λύτρον, nicht von δούραι abhaengig.

Deshalb hat ἀντί die Bedeutung anstatt, nicht zugunsten im Sinne von Mt17,27. Das dahingebene Leben Jesu ist der hingaengliche Preis zur Loskaufung der vielen. Aber auch wenn man ἀντὶ πολλῶν zu δούραι zoege und im Sinne zugunsten verstuende, erhalte das Wort der Sache nach den Selbstvertretungsgedanken. Denn das, womit die πολλοί verfallen sind, ist nicht ein beliebiges Gut, sondern ihr Leben, sie selbst; und was Jesus gibt, ist sein Leben, er selbst. Zu ihren Gunsten tut er nichts anderes, als dass er an ihre Stelle tritt." Also its use in connection with nominal roots shows its predominant meaning to be substitutional. Cf. 1 Tim. 2,6 ἀντιλυτρον ὑπὲρ πάντων, Mt. 16,26 ἀντάλλαγμα.

24. Ὑπέρ From A. T. Robertson ("The Minister and His Greek New Testament," Ch.III, pp.35-9: "The Use of ὙΠΕΡ in Business Documents in the Papyri") we cull the following: "Once quite an argument was made against the substitutionary theory of the atonement on the ground that Paul in the great passages(2 Cor. 5 and Rom. 5) employs ὕπερ rather than ἀντί. In this criticism it was admitted that in Mt. 20:28

and Mark 10:45 (*λύσειον ἀντί πολλῶν*) substitution is clearly taught. But it was argued that Paul's careful preference for *ὑπέρ* proved that he did not conceive of Christ's death as vicarious. This antithesis between *ἀντί* and *ὑπέρ* was imaginary as a matter of fact. Neither word in itself means substitution. It is a secondary idea in each instance. *Ἀντί* literally means 'at the end of' and so suggests contrast, succession, substitution, opposition, as the case may be. *ὑπέρ* means literally 'over' and the context alone can decide the resultant meaning which may be 'concerning,' 'beyond,' 'in behalf of,' 'instead of,' The ancient Greek writers employed *ἀντί*, *περό*, or *ὑπέρ* for substitution as they wished. In the *Alcestis* of Euripides, where the substitutionary death of Alcestis for her husband is the point of the story, we find *ὑπέρ* seven times, while *ἀντί* and *περό* together have fewer uses." (Numerous other examples follow) "In the Epistle to Diognetus (p.84) we actually see *λύσειον ὑπέρ ἡμῶν*. So then it was never fair to say that the Greek idiom required *ἀντί* for the idea of substitution."

"But the papyri, particularly the business documents, show that Paul is following current usage when he prefers *ὑπέρ* for the idea of substitution." Numerous instances from contracts, deeds, leases, and loans are cited, in which the construction *ἔγραψεν ὑπέρ αὐτοῦ* shows that scribes were hired by unlettered people to do their writing, the scribes always adding that they were writing in place of the person who hired them. "When we turn to the New Testament from the papyri there can, of course, be no grammatical reluctance to allowing the same usage for *ὑπέρ* if the context calls for it."

In Jn. 11,50 Caiaphas' unwitting words show the substitutionary meaning of *ὑπέρ*: "That one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation perish not." Cf. also Philem.13: *ὑπέρ σου*. "Instead of" is the only possible rendering of *ὑπέρ* in Gal.3,13:

"Being made a curse for (ὑπέρ) us," 1 Tim. 2,6: "Who gave himself a ransom for (ὑπέρ) all." Cf. also Tit. 2,14; 1 Jn. 3,16; 2 Cor. 5,21: "Made him to be sin for (ὑπέρ) us, who knew no sin;" 5,14: εἰς ὑπέρ πάντων ; 1 Pet. 3,18: δίκαιος ὑπέρ ἀδίκων (here Steiger sees only "Personenwechsel").

THE CONCEPT OF THE VICARIOUS ATONEMENT, IN THE OLD TESTAMENT AND AS SEEN IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

25. The statement of Quenstedt (II, 1014) holds: Evangelium in Vetere Testamento sufficienter clare est propositum, sed non in eo Perspicuitatis gradu, quo in Novo Testamento refulget.

Since the first postulate of the doctrine of the atonement is the damnable nature of sin, we shall point out this teaching in the Old Testament. The curse of sin was pain to the very first sinners (Gen. 3,3,19). Cf. also Isa. 59,2 and Ezek. 18,20,26, as well as Paul's treatment of this fact, Rom. 5.

Likewise the redemption from the curse of sin was told the first sinners. Gen. 3,15: "Thou shalt bruise ($\text{ך} \text{ } \text{שׁוּב} \text{ } \text{נְהַלְכֵךְ}$) his heel." The coming Savior was to suffer in order to redeem sinners. Eve's understanding of this promise and faith in it is expressed in her mistaken idea that her first-born was the Savior (Gen. 4,1): "I have gotten a man, the Lord" ($\text{וְיָהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ שׂוֹמֵר אֶת הַבְּרִית$). Witness further the sufferings of the Messiah in the "Gospel according to David", Ps. 22.

Isaiah presents the complete obedience of Christ, whereby He is the vicarious substitute for sinners. The doctrine of the obedientia Passiva is found throughout ch. 53. V.4: "Surely he hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows." וְיָשׁוּב - the carrying away of sins (Lev. 16,22). V.5: "But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities: the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes are we healed." As to the obedientia activa, the Messiah was to live a holy and sinless life for sinners. That is

pointed out (7,14) in the name Immanuel, "God with us." The child that was promised was to be perfect and sinless, God incarnate.

Jer. 23,6 also supports this substitutionary interpretation. This prophet mentions the Messiah as the Savior of Judah, "whereby he shall be called, The Lord our righteousness."

We have adduced only the chief passages showing this point, but we believe them to be sufficient, considering the scope of this treatise.

26. Now as to the OT sacrificial rites. Of them Dr. Mueller writes (Dogm.,306): "In the Old Testament the priests offered lambs and goats for the sins of the people, Heb.10,4; Christ, however, the great High Priest, Heb. 7,26.27, sacrificed Himself, He being both priest and sacrifice in one person, Heb.9,12-14; Eph. 5,2. This is the golden theme of the whole Bible: The astounding message of reconciliation through the holy blood of the divine victim Jesus Christ, Acts 10,43; Luke 24,25-27." Cf. also Apology, XXIV, 22-24; Luther St. Louis Ed. XIV, 15.

A few references as to the atonement ritual follow. Ordinances concerning *atonement* sacrifice: Ex. 29,10-4, with Heb.13,11-3; Lev. 4,5; 6,1-7, 26-30; 9,1-21; 12,6-8; 14,19.22.31; 15,30; 16,30; 23,19; Num. 6,10.11.14.16; 8,8.12; 15, 17; 28,15.22-4.30; 29,5.6.11.16-38. Atonement made for the High Priest: Lev.16,11; Heb.9,7. For the whole congregation: Lev. 16,17.24; 23,28. The sins of the people borne by the scapegoat: Lev. 16,21. Atonement necessary for propitiating God: Ex. 32,30; Lev.23,27.28; 2 Sam.31,3.

The OT sacrifices were not propitiatory in themselves, but prefigured the work of the Messiah, who would perfectly atone for sins once for all. Heb.10,1; Lev.17,11. They also were to remind Israel of the penalty of sin, which is death. Heb. 10,3.

But the people of the OT were sure of the atonement. The sins of the people were symbolically laid on the scapegoat, which was then sent into the wilderness, to take them away and lose them. In this

striking way the Jews saw that "the atonement symbolized by the death of the sacrificial victims was recognized and accepted by God as full and complete." (Moenckmoeller, Festivals, etc., p.22)

Did the Israelites always realize the value of these sacrifices? Perhaps not. "Indeed, their whole worship degenerated at times, especially during the latter years of their history, as also in the days of Christ, into a dead formalism. Therefore the prophets inveigh so vehemently against the sacrifices of the people as an abomination to Jehovah. But that is no argument against the real purpose and intent of the worship divinely instituted. That purpose and intent is as clear as it can be made to every one who contemplates the oft recurring expressions 'for atonement,' 'sin offering,' 'trespass offering,' etc., not to speak of the very nature of the sacrifices themselves." (Moenckmoeller, Op. cit., p.,39)

Now we may look at some views of modern scholars as to the nature of the sacrifices. They are stated by Delitzsch (Com. on Hebr., II, 453-4);

" 1. Baehr.- According to his fundamental principle, the sacrifice of a beast is the surrender of the life of the beast with its blood to God, as a type of the surrender of the sinful soul of man himself to God, with the aim of attaining life from and in God: it typifies, therefore, the circumstance of man's self-sacrifice, which begins in repentance, and by means of justification, is perfected in sanctification. 2. Kurtz.- The animal and its sinless life stand instead of man: instead of him it suffers the punishment of death, and makes atonement for him with its blood poured out in death, thus making void the guilt imputed to it. This is the so-called juridical view, because it look upon the slaying of the beast as an act of punishment, and upon that which the beast effects by suffering for man as a satisfactio vicaria. 3. Von Hofmann.- The sacrifice of the beast is a payment to or reckoning with God, which makes compensation for sin, for the accomplishment of which God has empowered man to employ the life

of the beast. And He has given him this power, inasmuch as He has slain beasts in order to cover the sinful nakedness of man. This view has the peculiarity about it of doing away with any substitutive connection between sacrificer and sacrifice, and of looking upon the sacrifice as a means of atonement suggested to man, by which it is intended he should recognize that God will not forgive sin as a matter of course, without anything being done as a compensation for it." So Ritschl: "It is unbiblical to assume that the sacrificial offering includes in itself a penal act, executed not upon the guilty person, but upon the victim who takes his place." (Translated by Franks, Op. cit., II, 338) #4. Keil.- The slaying of the beast is not satisfactory per se, although the sinner may of course recognize what he would have merited if God had dealt with him according to His divine justice. The atonement does not consist in the slaying of the beast laden with the sins of the sacrificer, but in the presentation of the blood upon the altar, which presentation typifies the acceptance of the sacrifice into a participation of God's mercy. This surrender to Jehovah, the Holy One, is a death which in this way becomes life. The burning on the altar typifies the effect of the mercy, which consumes that which is sinful, and transforms the sinner." We must take exception to all four views, though Delitzsch favors #2. #1 and #3 can be seen from the foregoing discussion to be forced upon the situation because of the peculiar atonement views of their authors. #2 makes the animal itself the atoning entity, whereas it should be only a type of Christ, as shown above. Assuming that Delitzsch's report of #4 is correct, it must be criticized in that it leaves out the concept of the shedding of the animal's blood being the typification of the shedding of Christ's blood for the sins of the world.

Coming to the NT, we notice first the Savior's own words as to His atoning work in Mt. 20,28 and Mk. 10,45, as well as the words of the institution of the Last Supper: "This is my body given, my blood

shed for the remission of sins."

W. Adams Brown (Hastings' Encyclopedia) finds five apparently different conceptions of Jesus' death in the NT. As number one he lists: "In fulfillment of the Old Testament prophecy. Act.3,18; Luke 24,25f." Certainly the fact that Christ fulfilled the Old Testament prophecies is not out of harmony with the fact that He atoned for sin. Number two reads: Matt.26,28 suggests a covenant-sacrifice sealing the relation between the disciples and God under the new dispensation, as the Paschal lamb marked the union between the Israelites and God under the old." But here is an unnecessarily discovered distinction. The benefits of the whole atoning work of Christ (active and passive obedience) gained perfectly, once for all, are offered us in the sacraments. Numbers three and four are two ways of expressing the same transaction. They read: "Ransom or purchase price. Mark 10,45," etc., and "bloody expiation for sin exacted by the Justice of God. 1 Kings 2,31," etc. Number five reads: "St. Paul: Not only the death, but the whole identification with humanity, and conquest of sin for it." But His atoning death was the conquest of sin (Rom.3,25;5,8-10; 1 Pet.1.18.19; 1 Jn. 1,7; Heb.9,28). The latter, therefore, is no different concept. And His "whole identification with humanity" is not a part of the doctrine of the atonement, but of that of the person of Christ. The statements of the Bible on atonement are in no part contradictory.

Therefore we must reject the unwarranted allowance in the following from the Lutheran Cyclopedia,p.27: "Since the apostles confine their statements of this truth to figurative illustrations, and do not offer a uniform conception or an authoritative theory, theology has from the beginning wrestled with the problem, and has developed several widely accepted theories." The vicarious atonement by Christ's complete obedience is considered the best, but not the only, tenable"theory". In like strain, the opinion of Shailer Mathews (A Dictionary of Religion and Ethics, Mathews and Smith,p.35),

who, it ought to be added, uses the same argument which was advanced long ago by S. T. Coleridge (*Aids to Reflection*, p.284), reads as follows: "The world in which Christianity took its rise was everywhere marked by the practice of sacrifice as a part of the process of establishing reconciliation between God and man. It was natural, therefore, ~~that~~ some form of sacrificial value should be given to the death of Christ, since all Christians believed that reconciliation had been accomplished by faith in him. The absence of sacrifice in the new religion after its separation from the temple worship at Jerusalem led to the rise of sacrificial terms as means of evaluating the death of Jesus. Thus he is represented by Paul as the sacrificial gift (Rom.3;21), presented by God himself, and not by man. This analogy of sacrifice became frequently used in the Bible, and the reconciliation which was already a matter of experience because men had cried 'Abba, Father,' was declared to have been made possible because of the death of Jesus Christ. Strictly speaking, the death of Jesus does not meet the requirements of actual sacrifice, as he has not suffered on the altar and there was no priest to receive the gift, nor was there an offering of his life by any worshiper since his death was the outgrowth of enmity rather than faith. The Epistle to the Hebrews undertakes to meet these difficulties by showing that Jesus offered himself, and was a high-priest superior in importance to those of the Aaronic order." This from a man who accuses orthodox theologians of being "dogmatic". He proceeds from the premise of impossibility of the supernatural and of inspiration. We appeal to the scriptural presentation in the foregoing part of this section, as well as in sections 27 and 43. Cheyne (*Encyclopedia Biblica*, p.4232) holds views similar to Mathews'. Long ago Steinbart, Locke, Chubb, and others called the Epistle to the Hebrews an accommodation to the Jews.

But the passages we have handled are not the only ones treating of the atonement. The following list of passages, although incomplete, will give some idea of how the NT is literally saturated with the atonement of Christ through His sacrifice, death, blood, and cross: Mt. 20,28; 26,28; Mk. 10,45; Lk. 22,20; Act. 20,28; Rom.3,25; 5,9; 8,3; 1 Cor.5,7; 6,20; 10,16; Gal.3,13; Eph. 1,7; 2,13; 5,2; Col. 1,14;20; 1 Pet. 1,2.18.19; 1 Jn. 1,7; 2,2; 5,6-8; Tit. 2,14; Heb. 2,17; 9,12;14.20; 10,19.29; 12,24; 13,12; Rev. 1,5; 5,9; 7,14; 12,11; As Dr. Kretzmann says (C.T.M.,III,p.117): "Wem diese Wolke von Zeugen fuer die 'Theologie des Blutes Christi' noch nicht genuegt, der zeigt klar, dass er sich gegen die Wahrheit verschliesst. In Summa, wie Luther zu 1 Pet. 1,19 schreibt: 'Wer nicht durch das Blut von Gott will Gnade erlangen, dem ist besser, dass er nimmer vor Gottes Augen trete, denn er erzuernt nur die Majestaet je mehr und mehr damit.' (IX,996)"

THE ATONEMENT THE CENTRAL AND MOST IMPORTANT OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINES.

28. "It occupies the chief place. It is the burden of the New Testament. It is the heart of the Gospel. It is the keystone of the Christian system. It is the central truth of Christian theology. It is the cornerstone of redemption. Remove this foundation, and the whole edifice crumbles to ruin. There is no Scripture truth or doctrine of Christian theology which does not bear more or less a relation of dependency upon it."(Remensnyder, Op. cit.,76) With the elaboration of this is view we shall study several doctrines.

With those who cast out the atonement as center of their theology, sin is stripped of all its real meaning. For instance, Franks (Op. cit.,II,237) shows how Schleiermacher ignored the fact of sin: "Evils remain for him"(the believer in Schleiermacher's system) "only as an indication of the direction of his action, and occasion no unhappiness. They do not belong to his new life in Christ." A further explanation (Ibid.,259): "It is noteworthy that Schleiermacher's

idea of reconciliation turns, not as we should expect on the removal of the consciousness of guilt (or the experience of the forgiveness of sins), but rather upon the removal of the sense of evils. What he thinks of is, as Ritschl has pointed out, rather reconciliation with the evils of the world than reconciliation with God." Thus is the true doctrine of sin cast out when the atonement is eliminated (Cf. sections 64 and 72). Franks (Op. cit., II, 341) quotes the following result of the declaratory theory from Ritschl (Justification and Reconciliation, III. E.T., 384): "Insofar as men, regarded as sinners both in their individual capacity and as a whole, are objects of the redemption and reconciliation made possible by the love of God, sin is estimated by God, not as the final purpose of opposition to the known will of God, but as ignorance." That's all. Ignorance, which may be overlooked. Personal sin needs not to be impressed, and heaven is shut by this theology which forbids true penitence. "Derjenige hat leicht argumentieren wider den Versoehner, der die Groesse seiner Schuld nicht erwog." (Hase, "Hutterus red."⁶ p. 251, quoted from Pieper, Dogm., II, 433n.)

The atonement is "inseparably interwoven with the incarnation. When it is written: 'Forasmuch as ye know that ye were redeemed with the precious blood of Christ, who verily was foreordained before the foundation of the world,' (1 Pet. 1, 20) we learn that the purposes of incarnation and redemption were contemporaneous in the divine thought. Evidently 'Christ was made in the likeness of man, that he might become obedient unto death, even the death of the cross.' (Phil. 2, 7. 8.) In all probability the Son of God would never have become incarnate had it not been for the purpose of the atonement." (Remensnyder, Op. cit., pp. 76. 77)

Regarding the Prophetic Office of Christ, Dr. Mueller says (Christian Dogm., 305): "The grace of God which He proclaimed as the divine Prophet He Himself secured as the divine Priest of men.

Hence those who deny, or pervert the biblical doctrine of, the sacerdotal office of our Savior, must deny and pervert also His prophetic office. Rationalists of every type who reject the vicarious atonement of Christ cannot regard Him as the true Prophet of grace and forgiveness, but must consider Him merely a Teacher of morality, who came into the world to induce man to secure salvation by their own works and righteousness. In short, if Christ is not the divine Priest, neither is He the divine Prophet in the Biblical sense."

For example, in much of the Latin and Greek theology, as well as that of Socinus (the "Prophetic" office being Christ's completion of His work in the citadel of heaven) the prophetic office is absent.

On holding the atonement in its proper place as the meritorious cause of justification, that is, in objective reconciliation, and distinguishing from this the mode of appropriating reconciliation to the sinner, namely through faith (subjective reconciliation), see sections 8, 13, and 20.

In denying the atonement Schwenkfeld, the Enthusiast (Schwaermer), arrived at the following idea of justification by faith (Quoted from Baur, "Lehre von der Versoehnung", p.46ln., by Franks, Op. cit.,II, 235n.): "Justifying faith comes not from preaching, but from God in heaven, it does not rest in the fact that Christ has shed His blood for us and paid for our sins, for such faith is an historical, powerless faith, but true faith rests in Christ in God Himself, it stands upon essential Being, and holds to the eternal Truth." This, of course, is an unjustified antithesis. Our faith rests in Christ, that is true, but it could not rest in Him if He had not died for us. Other similar views will be found in section 64. Apology, III, 44: "If anyone think that he is righteous and accepted on account of his own fulfillment of the Law, and not on account of Christ's promise, he dishonors this High Priest. Neither can it be understood how one could imagine that man is righteous before God when Christ is

excluded as Propitiator and Mediator."

"The deniers of the Vicarious Satisfaction have no use for the means of grace which transmit the grace gained by the Vicarious Satisfaction of Christ, the forgiveness of sins. They rather operate with whatever agencies may serve to stimulate such moral activities in man as are supposed to reconcile him with God or supplement the reconciliation effected by Christ. Holding that man must reconcile God through sanctification and good works, they know of no other means of grace than the Law." (Dr. Engelder's Dogmatics Notes, Means of Grace, # 21.)

Deniers of the atonement of the Bible, according to Dr. Engelder, either ignore or only casually refer to the distinction between the Law and the Gospel. They turn from the Gospel to the Law as the way of salvation. "The denial of the Vicarious Satisfaction is a gross repudiation of the Gospel. It denies its essence, the Atonement, and substitutes salvation by works. And in denying the need of an Atonement, it repudiates an essential feature of the Law, its threats and curse." (Dr. Engelder's Dogm. Notes, Law and Gospel, # 22)

"All those and only those who believe the Gospel of Christ's vicarious satisfaction are members of the Church. Acts 5,14. Eph.1,1." (Dr. Engelder, Notes, Christian Church, # 1) How do we determine whether congregations of heterodox sects are really Christian Churches? If enough of the Gospel is preached in their midst to lead the sinner to put his trust in the vicarious atonement of Christ, in other words, if ^{there} ~~their~~ are believers in Christ in their midst, they are churches. Jn. 4,22; Lk. 17,16; 10,33.

Finally, the doctrine of eternal life is dependent upon the atonement of Christ. Jn. 3,15.16.

But we find that there can be an unreasonable and unscriptural overstress of the sufferings and death of Christ, namely that of the Antinomianism of Agricola and the Moravians. Popular Symbolics

(p.279-80): "They 'make the bloody merit of Jesus the beginning, middle and end of their sermons, their hymns, their liturgy,' etc. Corpus Confessionum, s.v. Moravians, IV, 9. In other words, the preaching of Christ's death is said to work contrition, conversion and sanctification; and thus, with Agricola, they practically relegate the Law to the court-house and expect, to give only one example, their missionaries to convince the heathen of the damnable-ness of idolatry by proclaiming the bloody sacrifice of Jesus. Ib. 55."

This doctrine, the vicarious satisfaction, is attacked more by the enemies of Christianity than any other doctrine. It is only to be expected. They know ~~where~~ the center and core of Christianity is. The "offence of the cross" (Gal. 5, 11) has not ceased.

It has been the fad of the German theologians of the past century to condemn the old Biblical orthodox doctrine as being too complicated and decentralized, and to attempt to substitute "systems" of theology which are unified under single concepts, such as the "Fatherhood of God" or the "Kingdom of God". But we find that in trying to fit their distorted Christ into these schemes they have become almost incomprehensibly complicated, as Machen says (Christianity and Liberalism, pp. 117, 118): "And this Bible doctrine is not intricate or subtle. On the contrary, though it involves mysteries, it is itself so simple that a child can understand it. 'We deserved eternal death, but the Lord Jesus, because he loved us, died instead of us on the cross'- surely there is nothing so very intricate about that. It is not the Bible doctrine of the atonement which is so hard to understand- what are really incomprehensible are the elaborate modern efforts to get rid of the Bible doctrine in the interests of modern pride."

THE CONFESSION OF THE DOCTRINE OF THE ATONEMENT BY THE CHURCH SINCE
THE APOSTLES.

29. The expression "satisfactio vicariæ" is not found in the Scriptures, being a purely ecclesiastical term, but that which is signified by the expression is nothing else than the scriptural doctrine of redemption through Christ. The English word "atonement" is a combination of the three short syllables: at-one-ment. It signifies that through Christ's work man is made "at one" with God.

The doctrine of the vicarious atonement has not been reached through a process of evolution or ingenious development, "but from the very beginning, on the basis of apostolic Christianity, the redeeming element was put chiefly in the sufferings and death of Christ. The first teachers of the church regarded this death as a sacrifice and ransom (λύτρον), and therefore ascribed to the blood of Jesus the power of cleansing from sin and guilt." (Hagenbach, History of Doctrines, I, 179) "Yet the claim has been put forth that the doctrine of the vicarious atonement is a 'changeling', appearing at a later date as a substitute for the primitive belief. And the ground alleged for this is that the Scriptural facts were first marshalled into a definite theory by Anselm. But, in reaching this precise definition, it simply followed the natural processes of thought. None of the great doctrines of the church appeared at once in theological form. They lay like loose stones in the quarry, not as yet cut and fitted into the edifice. Even the Deity of Christ was not formally defined until the time of the Nicene Symbol, They were set in a theological system and correlated with the other Christian doctrines, so as to form a scientific unity. To style this a change of substance is incorrect." (Remensnyder, Op. cit., 160f.)

30. The conception of the atonement is very vague in many of the early church fathers, being alloyed with the idea that Christ paid the ransom price for redemption to Satan (Cf. section 52), and with

various mystical and gnostic errors. But through the maze of doctrinal history a golden thread can be traced to show that at all times people were being saved by the teaching of Christ's substitutionary death. We quote Hagenbach (Op. cit., I, 182): "Barnabas, c.5: Propter hoc Dominus sustinuit tradere corpus suum in exterminium, ut remissione peccatorum sanctificemur, quod est sparsione sanguinis illius, etc.,

comp. c. 7, 11 and 12. Clemens Rom. ad Cor. i. c. 7: Ἀτενίσωμεν εἰς τὸ αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ ἴδωμεν, ὡς ἔστιν τίμιον τῷ Θεῷ (αἷμα) αὐτοῦ, ὅτι διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν ἐκχύθη ἐν πατρὶ τῷ κόσμῳ μετανοίας χάριν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν,

comp. i. c. 2, where the παθήματα αὐτοῦ grammatically refer to Θεός. (Moehler, Patrologie, i. p. 61.) (Comp. also Clem. Rom. c. 49:

Διὰ τὴν ἀγάπην, ἣν ἔσχεν πρὸς ἡμᾶς, τὸ αἷμα αὐτοῦ ἔδωκεν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ὁ Χριστός ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν ἐν θελήματι Θεοῦ, καὶ τὴν σάκεα ὑπὲρ τῆς σαρκὸς ἡμῶν καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν ὑπὲρ τῶν ^{ψυχῶν ἡμῶν} ἡμῶν.) Dorner, in his Christology, i. 138, says:

'Every interpretation of these passages is forced which does not find in them the idea of substitution.'" Remensnyder (Op. cit., 157f.):

"Of the apostolic fathers, Clement, the co-laborer of St. Paul, whose name he tells us (Phil. 4, 3) 'is written in the book of life,' writes:

'Christ bore our iniquities and suffered for our sakes. He was wounded for our transgressions and bruised for our sins.' (First Epistle of

Clement, chapter 16) Ignatius (A.D. 70)- 'Jesus in His resurrection.'

died for us, in order that, by believing in His death, we might be made partakers (Epistle to the Trallians, chapter 2) Justin Martyr (A.D. 130)-

'Christ endured the passion of the cross, cleansing by His blood those who believe in Him. For this blood was not of human seed, but of divine power.' (First Apology, chapter 32) Irenaeus (A.D. 160)-

'The death of Christ was the crown of His redemptive work.'" "

Fisher (History of the Christian Church, 83) gives the characteristic

of Irenaeus' doctrine, that he "founds his view on the idea of Christ as the representative of the race, as the second Adam, who renounces sin and Satan and makes good the loss incurred through Adam's weakness and guilt. The death of Christ was made to be the most prominent factor in his atoning work:" Remensnyder(Loc. cit.): "The great representative Fathers of the Greek and Latin Primitive Churches write respectively: Chrysostom (380 A.D.)- 'There is but one sacrifice. The blood of Christ has cleansed all men. This blood flowed not, as in the Old Testament, from the bodies of irrational animals, but from the body of Christ, prepared by the Spirit.' (Homilies on Hebrews) Augustine (400 A.D.)- 'Christ assumed our flesh that He might offer a sacrifice for our justification. Death itself, although the punishment of sin, was submitted to by Him for our sakes, who was without sin. For He was able to expiate our sins by dying for us.' (City of God, chapter 25)"

31. As to the Middle Ages, the outstanding figure which we consider is Anselm of Canterbury (d.1109), who, in his "Cur Deus Homo" established his theory with an amount of ingenuity, and a completeness of reasoning, hitherto unattained." He begins his work by rejecting as unsatisfactory various great theories of antiquity:
- (1) The recapitulation theory of Irenaeus, in the form in which it came down to him through Augustine, (2) the theory of redemption from the devil, (3) and the theory according to which the purpose of the death of Christ was to show how much God loved us (sections ~~II~~,39,67).
- Hagenbach (Op. cit.,II,41) gives the substance of Anselm's theory as follows: "In order to restore the honor of which God was deprived by sin, it was necessary that God should become man; that, by voluntary submission to the penalty of death, he might thus, as God-man, cancel the debt, which, beside him, no other being, whether a heavenly one or an earthly one, could have paid. And He not only satisfied the requirements of divine justice, but, by so doing, of his own free

will, he did more than was needed, and was rewarded by obtaining the deliverance of man from the penalty pronounced upon him. Thus the apparent contradiction between divine love on the one hand, and divine justice and benevolence on the other, was adjusted." In the Greek Church Nicolas of Methone arrived at similar conclusions with Anselm, though independently of him. Though Anselm's theory is not ^Sscriptural *en toto* (Cf. sections 54 and 56), and was not accepted *en toto*, yet it was a landmark, and set forth a basis on which all later forms of orthodox theology were elaborated.

32. Coming down to the period of the Reformation, we find that the "Protestant theologians, further developing the theory of Anselm, carried their definitions sharply out in two points. On the one hand, they so extended the idea of vicarious suffering, as to make it include the divine curse (*mors aeterna*) - an opinion which was combat~~ted~~ed by the divines of the Romish Church. On the other hand, they insisted upon the active obedience of Christ, together with the passive, referring the former to the complete obedience which he rendered to the law. Both opinions were intimately connected with the Protestant doctrine of justification" (Hagenbach, *Op. cit.*, 354).
- "No one before Luther had spoken with the clarity, depth, or breadth which characterize his references to Christ as our deliverer, first from the guilt of sin, and then because from the guilt of sin, also from all that is evil, since all that is evil springs from sin." (Benj. Warfield in the *New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*, s.v. *Atonement*) We quote a part of Luther's comment on Gal. 3,13(As found in *Lutheran Witness*, 1885,p.109):
- "The dearest and most comforting Gospel doctrine, does not speak of works commanded in either the law of God or men; it does only preach and teach of the incomprehensible and ineffable mercy and love of God, revealed to us unworthy and condemned sinners; to wit: As He, the all-benign and most merciful Father did see, that we were so

deplorably depressed by the curse of the law, and were kept so powerfully under it, so that it was impossible for us in all eternity, to disentangle ourselves by our own strength, nor to redeem nor free ourselves from it: He, therefore, sent His only begotten Son in the world, cast the sins of all men upon Him, and thus said to Him, 'Be thou Paul, who does persecute, blaspheme, and oppress; David, who committed adultery, &c. Also, the sinner who ate the apple in the paradise; the murderer, who hung on the cross; in short, thou shalt be what all men are, as though thou hadst committed alone the sins of all men; think about it, therefore, how you are going to pay and do satisfaction for them.'" Also: "If you want to deny that He is a sinner and cursed, deny also that He was crucified and died. If it is not absurd to confess that He was crucified before malefactors, it is neither absurd to call Him the curse and punishment of sinners. To be sure, these are no vain words with Paul: 'being made a curse for us.'" Surely here is the doctrine that all men need. John Bunyan said: "I do prefer this book of 'Martin Luther on the Galatians', excepting the Holy Bible, before all the books that ever I have seen as most fit for a wounded conscience."

This scriptural doctrine of the atonement was then set down in the Lutheran confessions. Remensnyder (Op. cit.,169): "Thus says the Augsburg Confession: 'Christ truly suffered and was crucified that He might reconcile the Father to us and be a sacrifice, not only for original sin, but also for all actual sins of men;' and the Form of Concord completes the statement: 'So that on account of His complete obedience, which by deed and in suffering, in life and in death, He rendered His heavenly Father for us, God forgives our sins, regards us godly and righteous, and eternally loves us.' (Jacobs's Lutheran Confessions,p.572)" Cf. also references and quotations from the confessions in sections 56-60. Having been laid down in the confessions, the doctrine of the vicarious atonement has ever since been

meticulously preserved by the Lutheran church generally, but particularly in America since the middle of the last century by the Synodical Conference. The rich Lutheran heritage of dogmatical works and hymns have given abundant and beautiful expression to this doctrine in all its fulness.

PART II. OBJECTIONS TO THE SCRIPTURAL DOCTRINE OF THE ATONEMENT.

33. "Es ist Tauschung zu glauben, dass die Wahrheit ohne Weiteres Beifall finden, dass sie je die Massen fuer sich gewinnen werde in dieser suendigen Welt."(Luthardt, Apologetische Vortraege,97)

Therefore the necessity of defending this central doctrine of true religion has always been with us. In fact, the situation is none too strongly put thus by Warfield: "If hard words broke bones, the doctrine of the substitutional sacrifice of the Son of God for the sin of the world would long ago have been ground to powder."

(Remensnyder, The Atonement and Modern Thought,p.xvi) We seek in the following sections to enumerate and treat convincingly the chief attacks which have been and are still lauched against the heart of Christianity. There are charges that the atonement is unnecessary, impossible according to principles of justice and law, unethical, and scientifically untenable.

THE SCRIPTURAL DOCTRINE OF THE ATONEMENT IS UNNECESSARY.

The assertion that the atonement for the sins of the world by Christ was unnecessary, since God can forgive sins by a simple fiat of His sovereign power, was raised by the Arians, Socinians, and even Aquinas. The latter granted the validity of the assertion only in order to show that God could not have a superior in the form of any binding law (Summa III,question 46, article 2). It is for this reason that the scholastics distinguished between the absolute power of God and His power with order. Quenstedt, in his Systema, took up this thread against Socinus, and argued that God is to be thought of in this connection, scripturally, not so much as a private person who is the supreme Lord of the world, but as the just Judge of the world. It will be noticed that a number of these objections are based on a weakening of the justice of God. But this whole objection is based on mere philosophical speculation. After all, God must determine what is

necessary, and He has done so in the matter of atonement. He has revealed to us that the forgiveness of sins was gained solely and entirely *διὰ τῆς ἀπολυτέσεως τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ* Rom.3,24. And the *ἀπολύτρωσις*, as we saw in section 12, is not a simple liberation or forgiveness by divine fiat, but a redemption through the paying of a ransom price. The ransom price is conceived as Christ's blood, Rom. 3,25; 1 Pet. 1,18,19; Christ's life, Mt. 20,28; Christ Himself, 1 Tim.2,6. The revealed will of God is our foundation, Luther, St. L. Ed.,XX,882f.; Quenstedt, Syst.,II,436.

34. THE SCRIPTURAL DOCTRINE OF THE ATONEMENT IS UNJUST.

The innocent one cannot justly be punished for the sin of the guilty one. This argument, which is prominent in Socinus' writings, we present as it is expressed by two modern writers. Keyes, a Swedenborgian(Vicarious Atonement, p.4): "Our first inquiry is, what is the spontaneous judgment of men upon him who, on being injured or offended, avenges his wrong by afflicting punishment on an innocent party? To this inquiry there can be but one answer. All men at once condemn the act as wrong. Penalty ought not to follow innocence, but guilt, and as the guilt of the offender cannot be transferred to a substitute, neither can the penalty incurred by him be rightly inflicted upon another. Justice requires that the transgressor himself shall suffer, and not that a certain amount of suffering shall be endured by anyone who may offer to undergo it. To transfer the guilt and penalty incurred by the offender to an innocent party is to repeat with shocking aggravations the original wrong, and confuse and pervert all true ideas of justice in the human mind. Had the father in the parable of the Prodigal Son required the older son to submit his back to the scourge as a satisfaction for the injury inflicted upon the order of the house and the honor of the family by the prodigal, and made this the condition of forgiveness, the divine

beauty of the parable would have been fatally marred, and the conduct of the father would have failed to represent truly God's treatment of offenders and his disposition toward them. The spectacle of the innocent son suffering the penalty due to his brother's guilt would have excited our sympathy in his behalf, but we should have felt only indignation toward the unnatural father who could so violate all justice as to punish the innocent for the guilty. In like manner, when God is represented as discharging his wrath upon his sinless Son in order to satisfy the claims of his justice against sinners, every heart instinctively revolts at the representation. Sympathy and love are excited toward the suffering Savior, but the rigid compulsions of theology are not sufficient to awaken genuine love and affectionate reverence for the Being who is made the author of such injustice." Graves (Bapt. Qu. Rev., 1883, p. 207): "Justice" (human) "demands inexorably that only the guilty shall be punished. And the Atonement, in dealing with realities, must fit into justice, into the eternal equities. Christ cannot be merely accounted guilty while really innocent." This argument, says Dr. Engelder (Notes) "applies with full force in human courts of justice, but becomes blasphemy when applied to the dealings of God with men. It accuses the just God of dealing unjustly with his own Son in imputing the world's sins to him, and the most holy Savior of sinning against justice in submitting to it." Delitzsch (Ep. to the Hebr., II, 434): "The sufferings of Christ as a divine decree in the last resort, and the whole guilt of mankind which Christ took upon Himself with the aim of atonement, should be placed in causative connection, and - - they should not be degraded to a means of approving the Mediator of salvation, necessitated merely by the enmity of the world and its prince." (This vs. the modern theories). "The whole of the New Testament Scriptures strives and contends against this view,

and throughout (e.g. Heb.9,15) makes the death of Christ, on the side of God as well as men, a conditio sine qua non of the redemption." Scripture clearly teaches (a) that God imputed the sins of men to the sinless and innocent Christ, Isa.53,6; 2 Cor.5,21; Jn. 1,29; Ps. 69,6; (b) that God let the innocent Christ suffer for sinful men, 1 Pet. 3,18 (*δικαιος υπιε & δικωρ*); Gal.3,13.

There are many examples from nature and the social order upon which we can draw to show that this action of God is not unjust even from the human standpoint, but instead a really noble action. (Codrus, Decius, Zaleucus, mothers suffering for their babies, fathers representing and suffering for their families). But these proofs lead to endless arguments, for human reason balks at any proof of God's justice, since it is too hard to bear. Even the argument which is still raised by Lutheran apologists (as Jacobs in his "Summary of Christian Faith",1905), that Christ suffered willingly (Jn. 10,17.18; Eph.5,2; Jn. 18,4-7), and that therefore His suffering was rendered perfectly just, is not invulnerable, for reason immediately draws a parallel with an earthly judge, and says that it would still be unjust for such an earthly judge to allow an innocent person to suffer for a criminal, even if the former were willing to undergo the penalty. God's order in redemption is really different, as Barnes shows in his "Atonement": "The course of history shows that it is a rule that the sinner suffers for his sin. Atonement changes the natural order of things, an order so essential to the stability of the moral administration of the world." When we add also this statement of Barnes, we conclude that it is safer to abide by the scriptural declarations, which have more than human power behind them: "Such a system of justice never has been put into practise among civil governments and could not be introduced. Why should not God, like the civil governments, punish only the transgressors and grant free pardon? He, a perfect judge, could make our system of justice work perfectly in divine matters. But He could make any system work

perfectly, which He chooses to use." We say with Paul, "Let God be true, but every man a liar"(Rom.3,4). "Luther, um vorstellig zu machen, dass wir Menschen uns nicht unterstehen sollen, Gottes Thun nach den unter Menschen geltenden Gesetzen zu beurteilen, nennt Gott den Herrn 'exlex', und bemerkt in demselbigen Zusammenhange (zum 9. Kapitel des 2. Buches Mose): 'So ist nun dies die Summa dieses Kapitels, dass man Gott in seinen Werken nicht messen, urteilen noch richten soll; sondern Er soll alles messen und urteilen, und sein Messen und sein Urteilen ist sein Sinn. Er mache es, wie er wolle. . . .(E.A.35,167)'"

35. IT IS IMPOSSIBLE TO TRANSFER GUILT OR RIGHTEOUSNESS FROM ONE PERSON
TO ANOTHER.

This objection is closely related to the foregoing, but in the question of injustice is more concerned with the invalidity of the legal process of the redemption through Christ. Bushnell spread it widely in this country: "No governmental reasons can justify even the admission of innocence into a participation of frowns and penal distributions. The eternal, unmitigable distinction between innocence and sin makes it impossible to suffer any commutation, or any the least substitution of places between the righteous and the guilty." (quoted in Remensnyder, Op. cit.,99) F. Socinus stressed this objection in many ways. Luthardt quotes him (Komp.,244): "Alius pro alio poenas istas dare nequaquam potest; denn poenae de quibus hic loquimur- sunt quoddam personale, et propter eiusmodi, quae illi ipsi qui eas dat perpetuo adhaereant, nec in alium queant transferri (Christ. rel.,etc,p.661)." Furthermore, we read in Socinus' De Jesu Christo Salvatore (pars III, cap.3) that eternal death, the penalty of sin, is not transferable like a debt of money. Hegel says: "In the field of finitude the fixed rule is, that every one remains what he is: if he has done what is evil, then he is evil: the evil is in him as his quality. But already in the sphere of morality, still more

in that of religion, the spirit is recognized as free, as affirmative in itself, so that this limitation in it, which proceeds even to that which is evil, is for the infinity of the spirit a non-entity: the spirit can make the done undone, ~~the~~ deed remains indeed in the memory, but the spirit disowns it. Imputation, therefore, does not reach up to this sphere"(Translated in Franks, Op. cit.,II,221-2 from Vorlesungen ueber die Philosophie der Religion, ed. Bolland, 1901,p.661).

But what do these men do? First, they ignore the fact that *an act of* one person can become the act of another, not indeed physically, but certainly legally. Agents in business, substitutes in war, representatives in a democratic government- all these act for other people or groups of people, and their actions stand as the actions of those who authorize them. So the objection of the critics has no basis even in ordinary human experience.

Secondly let us draw out the issue to its logical results. If the guilt of man is not transferable, as Socinus maintains, and if ~~man is to be saved in spite of the justice of God, as he also~~ maintains, then there is a relaxing of the perfect justice of God presupposed. If Christ's righteousness cannot be imputed to man, then we must conclude that man is saved by some form of righteousness which he contrives for himself. But how this lacerates God's perfect righteousness! God demands a perfect righteousness of man (Lk. 10,28; 1 Pet.1,16), and we can have that perfect righteousness before God only in the atonement of Christ (1 Pet.1,18f.; Rom.3,21ff.). Thus it is plain that in drawing out these strict principles laid down by the Socinians and there ilk, the inevitable result is ~~the~~ weakening of the one or the other of the essential attributes of God.

Hegel's position is more subjective, but not subtle. He makes free use of whatever philosophical distinction is necessary to fit the case. There is the problem of sin- he makes the distinction of the free spirit of man, which ignores sin, which rids itself of responsibility

for sin. Mere fabrication.

After these philosophical escapades, we feel happy to get back to the ground of Scripture, as it is expressed in Popular Symbolics (p.64): "While Modernism vehemently insists that the righteousness of one cannot be transferred to another, Scripture plainly teaches just this, that God imputes Christ's righteousness to us, not imputing to us our sins, but forgiving them for Christ's sake, Jer.23,6; Luke 24,47; Acts 10,43; Rom. 4,6-8; 5,18f.; 2 Cor. 5,19-21; Eph.1,7: And when Scripture says that 'faith is counted for righteousness,' Rom.4,5, it expresses the same truth: the righteousness of Christ, appropriated by faith, constitutes our righteousness, Phil.3,9."

36. DEATH, BEING NATURAL, CANNOT EXPIATE SIN.

Emerton, the Unitarian, says that " death cannot expiate sin, for the alternation of life and death is continual and NATURAL." (Quoted in Popular Symbolics,404, from "Unitarian Thought", New York, 1925). But this view entirely ignores the relation which God's word and man's conscience tell him exists between sin and its punishment. The fact is that death has become natural only through the Fall, that death is the result of sin (Rom. 6,23), that God is angry with sin, the outrage of His justice (Section 1). Then the Bible points us to the true comfort in the death of Christ for our sins (Sections 2 and 32). Practically the same logical conclusions can be drawn here as were brought out in the previous objection, section 35, in the discussion on the relaxation of the righteousness of God.

37. PUNISHMENT DOES NOT DESTROY SIN.

This objection, like the foregoing, is designed to prove the vicarious atonement impossible. Leander S. Keyser, the Lutheran apologist, treats this thus (The Lutheran View of the Atonement,p.35): "Sometimes the changes are rung on the statement that punishment does

not destroy sin; then the conclusion is sought to be drawn from this premise that, if Christ endured the penal consequences of man's sin, it was a useless work, because, after all, it does not annihilate sin. We have done some specializing in ethics, and so we desire to say that sin is not an entity, not a substance, as matter and mind are. It is a quality. In theology we say it is not substantial, but 'accidental', though we are not sure the word 'accidental' is the best word that might be chosen. Sin is not a foreign substance added to the original human nature that God created, as Flacius held, but a derangement, an impairment of its functioning powers, just as when a fine piece of mechanism, like a watch, gets out of repair, not by the insertion of a foreign element, but by a derangement of some of its parts. So sin impaired the human personality, causing it to function abnormally instead of normally. To use another figure, as long as man made God his center of life, his whole being revolved in a perfect circle and with perfect smoothness and rhythm; but when he chose his own gratification and the world as his chief good, he became uncentered, and so began to whirl around in a jarring, clashing, ruinous eccentric. Therefore, since sin is not something substantial, but qualitative and functional, we do not see why anyone should speak of its destruction in the sense of annihilation. No substance, material or spiritual, is ever destroyed, but its quality and its method of functioning are often changed.

"Again, we do not know that any event or fact can ever be utterly wiped out or cancelled. It can never per se be regarded by God or man as if it had never been. The fact that man has sinned will never be removed. According to Revelation, the saints in heaven are ever praising the lamb who has washed them and made them white in His blood. So sin cannot be destroyed in this sense either. In the very fact of praising Christ for redemption, the saints made perfect must recall ^{their sins} their sins.

"Then what can be done with sin? Its guilt can be atoned for, satisfaction can be made to justice for it; then it can be forgiven; then by God's Spirit the deranged moral and spiritual mechanism can be repaired, and its normal functioning can be restored."

Isa. 53,4-7; Gal.3,13; 2 Cor 5,21 tell us that Christ, through His punishment even unto death took our sins upon Himself and bore them away, thus accounting us sinless before God.

Furthermore, the question is not whether the atonement destroyed sin, but whether it effectually removed the guilt and punishment of it. If it did not do this, then how can a man possibly stand before God? A relaxation or compromise of the justice of God is inevitable.

38. THE GRATUITOUS REMISSION OF SINS EXCLUDES ANY SATISFACTION.

Hagenbach (History of Doctrines, II, 359) summarizes this objection of F. Socinus as follows: "He endeavors to show that the terms satisfactio and remissio peccatorum contradict each other. Where satisfaction has been made, forgiveness is no longer required, and where sin must be remitted, no satisfaction has been made (for to forgive implies that grace takes the place of justice.) Debts are either remitted or claimed. If another make the payment, it has the same value as if it had been paid by the debtor himself, and a gift is out of the question."

But the figure of debts in the matter of remission and satisfaction of sins is out of place, as Gerhardt shows: "Nor was God a mere creditor, but also a most just judge and avenger of sins; nor were sins mere debts, but they conflict with the immutable justice of God revealed in the Law." (Quoted by Keyser, Op. cit., p.9)

"The objection that Scripture itself, in stating that the forgiveness of sins is free, gratuitous, denies that it was gained by the vicarious satisfaction of Christ, amounts to a gross perversion of Scripture. Scripture teaches that, while the forgiveness is free, it is not gratuitous. Scripture teaches that, while the forgiveness is free, it is not gratuitous."

of sins does not cost us anything, it cost Christ His life. 'Freely'-
because of the redemption of Christ, Rom.3,24; Ps. 69,4. 'The
"gratuitous" excludes our merit. . . ; the merits of Christ are the
price.' Ap.,IV, 53.43.86.89; III, 58; F.C.,III, Ep.,4; Th.D.,9,17.32."
(pop. Symbölics, 64)

39. ONLY THE LOVE OF GOD, AND NOT HIS WRATH, IS REVEALED IN THE SUFFERINGS
AND DEATH OF CHRIST.

Keyes, the Swedenborgian, (Vicarious Atonement, pp.2.3.): "On the
other hand, we hold that love is the primal element in the nature
of God; that the good is the root principle of all morality,
both human and divine; that infinite love guided by infinite wisdom
is the regulative principle of the divine administration over men;
and that divine justice is simply and mode of the divine love and the
rule by which it acts in dealing with offenders." To this speculation
we add that of Ritschl (Quoted by Franks, "A History of the Doctrine
of the Work of Christ",II, 338, from "Rechtfertigung und Versöhnung,"
III, p.473.474): "God's righteousness is His self-consistent and
undeviating action in behalf of the salvation of members of His
community; in essence it is identical with His grace. Between the
two, therefore, there is no contradiction to be solved." These opinions,
inherited from the Socinians and maintained to this day by the Modernists
(Cadman, cf. Pop. Symb., 363), are contrary not only to the Bible,
but also to reason.

Barnes shows from a reasonable basis why we cannot hold that only
the love of God is operative toward men, and not His wrath. Of several
reasons given we pick three ("Atonement," pp.165-76): "1. Mercy
cannot be safely relied on by an offender in any human administration.
2. It is to be borne in mind, in regard to dependence on the mercy of
God for salvation, that there are other attributes in the divine
character than mercy, and that, so far as appears, they are as essential

to that character as mercy is, and that it is as important for the good of the universe that they should be displayed as it is that the attribute of mercy should be exhibited. 'A God all mercy is a God unjust.' 4. There is no such evidence that men are saved by mere mercy without an atonement as will make it safe to rely on that alone."

If we deny the revelation of God in the Scriptures, as the objectors most certainly do, then there is no basis for any hope of forgiveness. All is speculation.

But here again there is a compromise on the justice of God, as revealed in the Scriptures, for when Rom.5,8 is quoted to show that Christ's death is to reveal God's love, it is overlooked that two verses later Paul says Christ's death is to reconcile us with regard to God's wrath. Dr. Pieper remarks aptly on Rom.5,10: " ἐχθροὶ ὄντες (- Deo invisī, unter Gottes Zorn liegend) καὶ ἀλλήλων ἐν τῷ θανάτῳ. Die Liebe bewegt Gott, uns durch den Tod seines Sohnes mit sich selber zu versöhnen, das heisst, seiner Strafgerechtigkeit genugzutun. Nach der Schrift steht es so: der Liebeswille Gottes schliesst die Auseinandersetzung mit der Gerechtigkeit Gottes nicht aus, sondern ein." (Dogm.,II,418)

This objection is championed by modern religion in its publications on practical theology, as when Stolz (Pastoral Psychology, 150-1) warns against fear of eternal torment or the end of the world as dangerous psychologically. Evidently these people do not care for the comfort and assurance that every sinner can have through the scriptural doctrine of the atonement.

We quote an oft-repeated argumentum ad hominam of the objectors, as found in Keyes (Op. cit.,14): "God requires us to be merciful and forgiving. If our brother sins against us, and after each offense sincerely repents and asks forgiveness, we are required to forgive him freely 'until seventy times seven.' And is God at liberty to be vindictive while He requires us to be merciful? Is divine love less

generous than human love? Is it entirely different in its nature, and governed by different laws?" Bard (Das Blut Jesu Christi, 17) makes the proper scriptural distinction: "Aber man uebersieht, dass Gott mit seiner an den Menschen gerichteten Forderung des bedingungslosen Vergebens gegenueber erlittener Kraenkung keineswegs den Erlass der Genugtuung fordert, sondern nur ihm die Zustaendigkeit zur Forderung einer Genugtuung abspricht. Darum wird die Forderung vergebender Liebe seitens des gekraenkten Menschen mit dem Hinweis auf die Tatsache begruedet, dass nicht der Mensch zur Wahrnehmung der Genugtuung zustaendig ist, sondern allein Gott. 'Raechet euch selber nicht,' sondern gebt Raum dem Zorn Gottes, denn 'die Rache ist mein, ich will vergelten,' spricht der Herr (Rom.12,19). Der Mensch ist auch gar nicht in der Lage, Schuld vergeben zu koennen, weil jede Suende letztlich Kraenkung Gottes ist (Ps. 51,6: 'an dir allein habe ich gesuendigt'; Luk. 15,18.21: 'in dem Himmel habe ich gesuendigt'); der Mensch kann nur die Kraenkung vergeben, welche die Suende des Naechsten ihm bereitet."

40. CHRIST'S SUFFERING WAS NOT FULLY ADEQUATE FOR THE ATONEMENT.

Various modes of attack have been used to advance this argument. These will be taken up one at a time.

"Long ago the Photinians raised this objection: 'The curse of the Law was eternal death; but now, since Christ did not endure eternal death, He has not undergone or borne for us the curse of the Law.' To this Hutter replied: 'The reasoning deceives through the sophism of non causa pro causa. For it is not true that the merit of Christ is not of infinite value for the reason that Christ met a death that was not eternal; for as the sins of our obedience are actually finite, yet in guilt are infinite, since they are committed against the infinite justice of God; so the obedience and death of Christ were indeed finite in act, so far as they were circumscribed by a fixed period of time,

namely, the days of humiliation; but they are infinite with respect to merit, inasmuch as they proceed from an infinite person, namely, the only begotten Son of God Himself." (L. Keyser, The Lutheran View, etc., 10.11)

F. Socinus emphasized this objection very elaborately. Franks (Op. cit., II, 22-23) summarizes the objections which he finds in Socinus' De Jesu Christo Salvatore. Socinus summarized by Franks: "Christ's suffering could not have constituted a satisfaction, for the penalty of sin was eternal death, and He rose from the dead. . . The quality was different: Christ did not suffer, as Calvin says, the pains of the damned." Similarly the Arminians. Franks' (Op. cit., 44) summary of Limborch (According to the presentation in "Theologia Christiana"): "Christ suffered eternal death, neither extensively in time, nor intensively, since He never despaired under the Divine wrath. But eternal death was the penalty due to our sins." This view has been carried down to modern times, its exponents being forced to garble Scripture texts in order to make their objection seem plausible. Thus McLeod Campbell explains the cry on the Cross, "Why hast thou forsaken me?" as merely an exclamation in accordance with the general idea of Ps. 22, which he says is, "Why hast thou left me in the hands of the wicked?" (Franks, Op. cit., 397)

A scriptural scholar does not have to refute this with elaborate argument. When Christ, on the cross, cried to His Father with a loud voice, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" we understand this to mean simply that for a moment Christ was left to Himself, just as natural man is "without God in the world" (Eph. 2, 12). That is nothing but suffering what man should have suffered. Dr. Pieper's words (Dogm., II, 419-20) are conclusive: "Die Schrift lehrt klar und deutlich, dass Christum genau die Strafe traf, welche die Menschen ihrer Sünden wegen treffen sollte. Die Menschen liegen ihrer Sünden wegen unter dem Fluch Gottes, nach Gal. 3, 10: 'Verflucht sei jedermann, der nicht bleibt' usw. Und dieser Fluch hat nicht zum Teil, sondern ganz Christum getroffen, wenn die Schrift weiter sagt: 'Christus hat uns erlöst vom' getroffen, wenn die Schrift weiter sagt: 'Christus hat uns erlöst vom

Fluch des Gesetzes, d a e r w a r d e i n F l u c h f u e r
u n s', V. 13." Also Socinians argue that there is not the proper
proportion in Christ's sufferings, for they were too short to correspond
to what men should have suffered (Franks, Op. cit.,23). But here again
Scripture is too strong to resist with mere verbiage. It states that
Christ's sufferings were the sufferings of the Son of God, and therefore
of sufficient value to balance the account of God against men. 1 Jn. 1,7:
The blood of Jesus Christ, His Son, cleanseth us from all sin. Acts 20,28;
God's own blood.

Then from a different angle Socinus argues, according to the summary
of Franks (Op. cit.,22-23): "One death cannot satisfy for many (here
again Socinus follows Duns). . . If, again, an infinite time were
converted into an infinite extent of punishment, Christ should have
suffered infinitely for each and every man." But again. Scripture is
firmly opposed. Rom.5,18-19: "Therefore as by the offence of one
judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the
righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification
of life. For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so
by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous." 1 Jn. 2,2:
"And he is the propitiation for our sins: and not for ours only, but
also for the sins of the whole world." Thus both actively and passively
considered, Christ's work is sufficient to save all men.

Also technicalities concerning the person of Christ are raised in
like objection. We quote Franks' summary (Op.cit.,23) of Socinus:
"Christ suffered as man, for God is impassible. Hence His sufferings
cannot possess infinite value. Even to admit the doctrine of the
communicatio idiomatum could only yield them a verbal, not a real
salvation." But whatever is verbally attested in Scripture, as the
Personal union and the communicatio idiomatum are (Cf. Piper, Dogm..

II, 92-309), is to be accepted as reality by Christians (2 Tim. 3,16).

Jonathan Edwards followed Socinus here in a novel way. Franks Op. cit. ., 189)
Jonathan Edwards followed Socinus here in a novel way. Franks (Op. cit.,189)

summarizes his argument as presented in "Concerning the Necessity and Reasonableness of the Christian Doctrine of Satisfaction for Sin" as follows: "Christ's sufferings in bearing the Divine wrath and the burden of human sin are to be understood psychologically through His sympathy with, and pity for, man. It is not, however, possible for Him, as an infinitely holy person, to bear the very pains of hell to be endured by the damned. (Cf. Thomas, 'Summa Theol.' III.qu.46, art.6)" But that is the very reason for which Christ became man, assuming the human nature, so that He could endure complete satisfaction for our sins "in the body of his flesh"(Col.1,22), and not merely psychologically. Again, Franks' summary (Op. cit.,23) of a kindred point of Socinus: "There can be no satisfaction unless He who satisfies and those for whom satisfaction is made are of one nature and race. It is said indeed that Christ is true man, but this is not enough. He must satisfy as man. Is, however, the capacity to satisfy depends on the Divine nature, He cannot do so." Why distinguish the two natures of Christ in these matters? Jesus, the God-man (Jn. 1,14; Phil.2,7.8), the Son of God who assumed the human nature in the incarnation, says: "The Son of man came to give himself a ransom for many"(Mt. 20,28). Cf. also Col. 1,13-22. There is no distinction of natures causing a conflict in Scripture; human reason constructs such objections without warrant.

Socinus combines also his Antitrinitarianism with his objection to the satisfaction of Christ. Summary from Franks(Op. cit.,23): "It is said that satisfaction is paid to the Divine nature"(Sic!). "Here is an absurdity: one cannot satisfy oneself. Nor does the doctrine of the persons in the Trinity help. If the Son satisfies the Father, who satisfies the Son? Besides, what has He to give which is not the Father's? He cannot give His own incommunicable properties; there is left only what He has in common with the Father.

Hence, if Christ be everlasting God, He cannot satisfy. "Scripture has no such
 Hence, if Christ be everlasting God, He cannot satisfy." Scripture has no such

difficulty, and does not countenance it. Cf. Rom.3,23-25: Christ satisfied God through the ἀπολύτωσησιs which He merited for men. Cf. also 1 Jn. 1,7; Eph.5,2. "Gerhard is indeed right when, commenting on 1 John 3,8, he remarks: 'The Son of God assumed human nature for the very purpose that in, with, and through it He might accomplish the work of redemption and the several functions of His mediatorial office.'" (Mueller, Christian Dogmatics, 286)

Socinus attempts to show us that we prove too much, for "he repeats the scholastic objection, that if Christ's Deity gives an infinite value to His sufferings, so much need not have been required. (Cf. Thomas, 'Summa Theol.' III.46,6,6)" But Scripture does not enter into the matter of whether Christ suffered too little or too much. It says that Christ's work was sufficient to save all men and that it was pleasing to God. (Col.1,13-22; Jn. 2,18.19 with Mk. 16,6; Lk. 3,23)

Franks, in commenting on Schleiermacher and Ritschl, says that since them, "modern theology, even where it continues to maintain the doctrine of a satisfaction of the Divine justice on the work of Christ, can only maintain a satisfaction in principle, not in strict equivalence." (Cp. cit.,368) Luthardt bears this out: "Was Christus fuer uns getan und gelitten hat, sich nicht im Sinne gegenseitiger Abrechnung voellig mit dem deckt, was wir zu thun und zu leiden haben wuerden; denn er hat nicht die ewige Verdammnis im eigentl. Sinne erlitten; denn die Gemeinschaft mit dem Vater war nicht so aufgehoben wie bei dem Verdammten die Gemescht. mit Gott aufgehoben ist (vgl. Frank II,181: 'und war eine Verfurrung, wenn man Chr. die Strafe erdulden haben liess, welche der gefallene Mensch als unerloester zu erdulden gehabt haben wuerde' e. 'schriftloses Theologumenen')." (Komp.,243) To which Pieper answers (Dogm.,II,410): "Christus ist mitdem, was er getan und gelitten hat, fuer die Welt, fuer alle Menschen, eingetreten. Die Abrechnung ist also *extensiv* vollkommen. Durch Christi Tun und Leiden ist die Welt *extensiv* vollkommen. Durch Christi Tun und Leiden ist die Welt

mit Gott tatsaechlich versoeht worden, das heisst, ist Gottes Zorn gegen die Welt aufgehoben, μή λογίζομενος αὐτοῖς τὰ πικρατέρωματα αὐτῶν. Die Abrechnung ist also i n t e n s i v vollkommen. Endlich hat Gott die Rechnung im Sinne voelliger 'gegenseitige Abrechnung' selbst quitiert durch die Auferweckung Chrsti von den Toten. Denn wie Christus um unsrer Suende willen dahingegeben wurde, so wurde er auch διὰ τῆς δικαίωσιν ἡμῶν auferweckt. Es liegt also nach der goettlichen, in der Heilige Schrift geoffenbarten Rechnung durch das, was Christus getan und gelitten hat, eine voellige 'gegenseitige Abrechnung' zwischen Gott und der suendigen Menschenwelt vor." Hodge(Systematic Theology,II,47), following Calvin (Inst.,II,17,1), who in turn followed the Scotists, writes: "He did not suffer either in kind or degree what sinners would have suffered." But the Calvinistic view will be treated more thoroughly in connection with Acceptilation, section 54. Then there are the hair-splitting unscriptural distinctions of Hofmann which Delitzsch (Com. on Hebr.,II,425) thus enumerates: "1. He views the wrath which Jesus experienced only as a cosmical after-operation exterior to God, and not as the energy of the divine holiness, which (energy) operated continuously on account of the nature of the case; so that although the expremity of the wrath came upon Jesus, He did not become the object of that wrath. 2- - he makes Jesus to have been affected by this wrath only as regards the natural side of His person, and not in respect to His inward personality; so that He experienced it without feeling it to be such. 3.- - he looks upon the wrath which affected Jesus only as the result of His incorporation into sinful humanity, and not as the consequence of His taking upon Himself all the sins of man; so that the only aim of the pressure of the wrath upon Jesus was, that He might approve Himself as the Holy One, and not that He should endure it as the Guiltless One who appeared for the guilty." This is all necessary for Hofmann's view of the atonement, but is unscriptural(Cf. sections 1-3).

41. RECONCILIATION IS IN CHRIST, NOT THROUGH HIM (AS ANOTHER).

This is a theological objection of Hofmann. First we shall quote his general premise, to obtain a foundation for the understanding of the objection. "Jesus did not give up His life in the place of many who must have surrendered their lives for the sake of remission, either by dying in their stead, or by dying in order that they should not die; by He gave His life as a recompense for the release of many, and His death is to be the action by which they are freed from their liability." (Quoted in Delitzsch, Com. on Hebr., II, 447, from Hofmann, Schriftbeweis, II, 1. 197) Delitzsch quotes Hofmann further (Op. cit., 446): "I do not call Christ's *action* a vicarious satisfaction, because . . . the expression 'vicarious representation' does not seem to me a fitting description of Christ's relation to man. It is not one alien from man who has accomplished that which man ought to have accomplished, but could not: we must not regard Him in an aspect so apart from man, but as One in whom man was created, who also in this world has united Himself to humanity. As the eternal Son, He is not 'another' as regards mankind, any more than it would be right so to speak of Him as regards the Father; neither as the man Jesus is He 'another' in respect to mankind, but that Son of man in whom humanity finds its second Adam. That action by which He has reconciled us to God is not therefore of a merely vicarious nature, and we are reconciled not only through Him, but in Him." But, Mt. 20, 28: "The Son of man came to give his life a ransom *ἀντι τοῦ κόσμου* ." Delitzsch (Op. cit., 448): "The real state of the case is, that He is not our Atoner because He is the second Adam, but that He has become the second Adam by the completion of the atonement." Enough has been said on the sufficiency of Christ's sufferings and death for our reconciliation in sections 2, 3, 10 and 40 to constitute a scriptural reply to Hofmann.

42. CHRIST DID NOT SUFFER FOR US, BUT FOR HIS OWN BENEFIT.

This objection is a part of the discussion under the denial of the active obedience, and will be found treated in section 56.

43. OUR DOCTRINE OF THE ATONEMENT IS A PECULIAR NOTION OF PAUL (PAULINISM).

This objection was also raised first by Socinus, but spread widely in modern theology mainly through the influence of John Locke, the English philosopher. Locke as a theologian was vague, but his foundation was a thoroughgoing subjective work-righteousness. He said ("The Reasonableness of Christianity as Delivered in the Scriptures," 224-5, as quoted by Franks, Op. cit., 164): "It is not in the Epistles we are to learn what are the fundamental articles of faith, where they are promiscuously and without distinction mixed with other truth in discourses that are (though for edification indeed, yet) only occasional. We shall find and observe these great and necessary points best in the preaching of our Savior and the apostles, to those who were strangers, and ignorant of the faith, to bring them in and convert them to it. And what that was, we have seen already out of the history of the Evangelists, and the Acts, where they are plainly laid down, so that nobody can mistake them." Franks remarks thereto: "Though present (the distinction) here as yet only in an elementary form, it contains the principle of the modern science of Biblical theology, which, instead of treating the whole New Testament, and to a considerable extent indeed the whole Bible, as upon the same level, as did the traditional theology of the Church, notes everywhere advance and development, differences and shades of doctrinal apprehension of Christianity, and furnishes dogmatic theology with an entirely remodelled Scriptural "(Sic!)" basis from which to operate." Thus the situation obtaining at present is that Paul presents only his narrow theological construction of Jesus, Paulinism. This theory, being accepted, it would seem that the scriptural doctrine of the

atonement would have to be modified, since Paul presents it most fully. But let us make a few comparisons.

Jesus Himself presents sin as an inherited, damnable, perversion in man. Jn. 3,6: "That which is born of the flesh is flesh." The natural man must be "born again", v.3.7. Cf. Paul's doctrine of the rebirth in baptism, Tit.3,5. Further, cf. Mt. 15,19.20; 12,34. Jesus taught the same doctrine of sin that Paul did.

Now as to the connection between Paul and Jesus, and especially as to Jesus' teaching of the grace of God in Himself, we quote Machen (The Origin of Paul's Religion, 154-8): "Thus if Paul be compared to the Jesus of the Gospels, there is full agreement between the two. The Jesus of all the Gospels is a supernatural person; the Jesus of all the Gospels is a Redeemer. 'The Son of Man,' according to the shortest and if modern criticism be accepted the earliest of the Gospels, 'came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many' (Mk 10,45). But it is not necessary to depend on details. The very choice of material in the Gospels points to the same conclusion; the Gospels like the Epistles of Paul are more interested in the death of Jesus than in the details of His life. And for the same reason. The Gospels, like the Epistles of Paul, are interested in the death of Jesus because it was a ransom for sin.

"But this similarity of the Jesus of the Gospels to the Christ of the Pauline Epistles has led sometimes, not to the recognition of Paul as a disciple of Jesus, but to the hypothesis that the Gospels are dependent upon Paul.

"It is certainly no easy matter to separate natural and supernatural in the Gospel picture of Jesus, for the two are inextricably intertwined. . . . The Jesus of the Gospels is certainly not the product of invention or of myth; He is rooted too deep in historical conditions; He towers too high above those who by any possibility could have produced Him.

"But suppose the separation has been completed; suppose the historical Jesus has been discovered beneath the gaudy colors which have almost hopelessly defaced His portrait. Even then the troubles of the historian are not at an end. For this historical Jesus, this human Jesus of modern liberalism, is a monstrosity; there is a contradiction at the very center of His being. The contradiction is produced by His Messianic consciousness.

"Two difficulties, therefore face the reconstruction of the liberal Jesus. In the first place, it is difficult to separate the natural from the supernatural in the Gospel picture of Jesus; and in the second place, after the separation has been accomplished, the human Jesus who is left is found to be a monstrosity, with a contradiction at the very center of His being. Such a Jesus, it may fairly be maintained, could never have existed on earth.

"But suppose He did exist, suppose the psychological impossibilities of His character be ignored. Even then the difficulties of the historian are not overcome. Another question remains. How did this human Jesus ever come to give place to the superhuman Jesus of the New Testament? The transition evidently occurred at a very early time. It is complete in the Epistles of Paul. And within Paul's experience it was certainly no late development; on the contrary, it was evidently complete at the very beginning of His Christian life; the Jesus whom he trusted at the time of his conversion was certainly the heavenly Christ of the Epistles. But the conversion occurred only a very few years, at the most, after the crucifixion of Jesus. Moreover, there is in the Pauline Epistles not the slightest trace of a conflict between the heavenly Christ of Paul and any 'other Jesus' of the primitive Jerusalem church; apparently the Christ of Paul was also the Christ of those who had walked and talked with Jesus of Nazareth."

Further (p.169): "Paulinism was not based upon a Galilean prophet.

It was based either upon the Son of God who came to earth for men's salvation and still holds communion with those who trust Him, or else it was based upon a colossal error. But if the latter alternative be adopted, the error was not only colossal, but also unaccountable. It is made more *unaccountable* by all that has been said above, all that the liberal theologians have helped to establish, about the nearness of Paul to Jesus. If Paul really stood so near to Jesus, if he really came under Jesus' influence, if he really was intimate with Jesus' friends, how could he have misinterpreted so completely the significance of Jesus' person; how could he have substituted for the teacher of righteousness who had really lived in Palestine the heavenly Redeemer of the Epistles? No satisfactory answer has yet been given."

A few comparisons of atonement statements from the writers of the other epistles are in place. The apostle Peter, in his first epistle, ch.1,vv.18,19, presents beautifully a summary of what we find in Rom. 1-3. Both Paul and Peter show that all men are under sin, received by transmission from their fathers, and both show that all men are saved by the shed blood of Jesus. The apostle John, in presenting Jesus who shed His blood for us as our "propitiation" and redeemer from our sins (1 Jn. 1,7; 2,2), expresses exactly the same truth as Paul does in Rom.3,25; 5,9,10. Furthermore, cf. Rev. 5,9 (redemption through the blood of Christ) with 1 Cor. 6,20; 7,23;^{Rev.} 7,14 with 1 Cor.6,11 ("washed"), and Rev. 12,11 with Rom. 8,33-4. Also the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews teaches redemption through the active (Hebr.2,17) and the passive (Heb.10,19) obedience, agreeing with Paul in Gal.4,4,5; Eph. 2,18; Rom.3,25. Both also ascribe our entire redemption and sanctification to Christ's work, Heb.9,14; Tit. 2,14. Both teach that Christ is the only Mediator of salvation, Heb.12,24; 1 Tim.2,5. Furthermore the Pauline doctrine of the active and passive obedience of Christ is nothing more than a clear presentation of Isaiah's doctrine of Christ, cf. section 25. *As to the intercession of Christ, Paul, in Rom. 8,34 teaches* section 25. As to the intercession of Christ, Paul, in Rom. 8,34 teaches

the same thing which we find written in 1 Jn. 2,1.2; Jn. 17,9.20;
Heb.7,25; 9,24.

44. THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS HAS NOT THE DOCTRINE OF THE ATONEMENT.

Here is the master stroke by which Hofmann (Schriftbeweis, ii, 1.320) thought to put an end to the orthodox atonement doctrine. Would it not be conclusive if it could be shown that this great epistle, which depicts nothing but Christ our High Priest, actually contains nothing of the vicarious atonement? But the attempt, although nicely worded with orthodox terms, falls short. Delitzsch (Com. on Heb., II, 419) enumerates the points which are absolutely negatived by Hofmann: "1. The death of Jesus was not the punishment of the sin of man; 2. Satisfaction is not made thereby to the wrath of God; 3. Christ did not suffer in the place of man." To this Delitzsch says (Ibid., 420): "1. If death is confessedly the penal recompense of sin, and if the Son of man assumed flesh and blood in order to be able to experience the death which prevailed among mankind; and if, according to Heb. 2,9, He tasted it for every man, then His death, notwithstanding all that logic may urge, is a penal recompense of sin, assuredly not a punishment ~~not~~ incurred by His own guilt, but taken upon Himself for the salvation of all of us. Therefore in a certain sense that must be true which v. Hofmann absolutely denies, that His death was a punishment of the sin of man. 2. If death, taken in its ultimate causality, is a decree of God's wrath, and if Christ surrendered Himself up to death in order to overcome the Prince of death, and to deliver us from death and the fear of death (Heb. 2,14.15), then must we be able to say, in a certain sense, what v. Hofmann absolutely denies, that Christ made Himself the object of the divine wrath, and that He, by His death becoming the death of death, satisfied the divine wrath." As to the third point Delitzsch stresses the substitutionary quality of the *imie* in ch. 2,9. Finally, cf. the previous section on the agreement of Hebrews with the other epistles.

45. TO PREDICATE WRATH OF GOD IS TO DISPARAGE HIM.

This objection is of Socinian ancestry, and of rationalistic and Ritschlian nourishment. It is voiced widely today by liberals of all stripe. From the Unitarians we have the following: "A Creator who needs propitiation - - - is a monster." (Pop. Symb., 403) From Mary Baker Eddy we have the following: "That God's wrath should be vented upon His beloved Son is divinely unnatural. Such a theory is man-made." (Science and Health, 349th thousand, 1905, p.23) (Also cf. "Principles of Quakerism," Phila., 1909, 56-7). To show how this most sarcastic of the objections has been put at times, we quote a ^{representa-} representation of the "broad church" views, in Blackwood's Magazine (July, 1855, quoted in Barnes, "Atonement," p.21): "On one side is an offended God, a somewhat grander Jupiter, with all his thunderbolts suspended over us, and his arm raised to exterminate the world. On the other side, sullen, gloomy, half terrified, half defiant, trying hard to buy him off, are we, his revolted subjects; and midway between stands a grand, inexplicable Personage, whom we by some inexplicable means, have persuaded to conspire with us to buy a reluctant pardon from an angry Jove above." But God is the judge of His own actions. Dr. Engelder says (Notes, II): "The objection that it is a disparagement of the perfection of the divine Being to predicate anger, wrath, enmity of God, denies the plain statement of Scripture, Rom. 1, 18; 5, 10; Gal. 3, 10; Eph. 2, 3, ignores the testimony of conscience, and is a disparagement of the perfection, the perfect holiness and justice of God." And this wrath of God has come over Christ in our stead, Gal. 3, 13.

46. THE SCRIPTURAL DOCTRINE OF THE ATONEMENT IS TOO JURIDICAL, NOT ETHICAL.

The doctrine of the vicarious atonement is charged with being too juridical, the sinner not being effected enough, and lacking in ethical value, not effecting the morality of a person.

As to the atonement being too juridical, we quote Dr. Engelder (Notes, II): "As the case stands it cannot well be otherwise than juridical. The just judge is dealing with mankind and its substitute on the basis of the law, the gracious Lord has issued a pardon to mankind by virtue of the substitute's work. Gal.3,10.13; 2 Cor.5,21.19." Bard says (Das Blut, usw.,7): "Selbst Harnack gesteht: Keine vernuenftige Reflexion, keine verstandige Erwaegung wird aus den sittlichen Ideen der Menschheit die Ueberzeugung tilgen koennen, dass Suende Strafe verlangt. Es ist ein unabweisliches Postulat des Menschenherzens und Gewissens, dass die Schuld bezahlt werden muss." Keyser says (The Lutheran View of the Atonement, 35): "Now, we should like to ask the would-be theorist how sin can be punished except through suffering? Could a criminal against the ^{CIVIL} ~~criminal~~ law be punished in any other way than by punishment of some kind? Do you know of any other way of which the sinner against God's law could be punished? No; the only mode of imposing punishment known to the human family is by suffering. Not all suffering is penal, but all *penalty* must mean suffering. It need not always be ~~physical~~ suffering; it may also be psychical; but it is suffering nevertheless. So we say, if Christ was our substitute at all, He could only have stood in our stead for that which was visited upon us by God's unalterable justice, namely, the penal sufferings of our iniquities." This juridical atonement is the one we want. Delitzsch (Com. on Hebr.,II, 462) insists on this, "that the severity even unto death of the divine justice, which severity is evident amid the work of the atonement, is not to be frittered away in the idea of the divine love in which in this work of ~~the~~ atonement mediates with the divine justice, and only in this way obtains the mastery." The same inconsistency in God is implied, as we have shown ^{as is the case} before, in most of the objections to the atonement of the Bible.

As to the ethical value of the atonement, Dr. Engelder says (Notes, II): "This forensic act of God, the gracious forgiveness of sins, (Notes, II): "This forensic act of God, the gracious forgiveness of sins,

is the basis of all morality, all godliness. Rom.6,14; Gal.2,20." Keyser has the following sound comparison ("The Lutheran View of the A" p. 32.33): "At once we must make protest against the modern vogue of calling the so-called "moral influence" and "mystical" theories ethical as over against the satisfaction view as if the latter were unethical. The fact is, the moral influence theory is not ethical; it would better be called the spectacular or emotional theory. Let us see why. This theory holds that Christ's sufferings did not make a real ethical adjustment in the moral government of the universe, but was only an expedient which God devised to exhibit His love for sinners. Such suffering was not really necessary in the nature of a moral economy; it was simply God's way of showing how much He loves the sinner. It was, so to speak, "gotten up" for that purpose. Then we say in reply, it was spectacular; it was done for the sake of an exhibition, simply to make an impression on the sinner's feelings. Are we not correct in saying, therefore, that this theory is not truly a moral adjustment, but merely an emotional appeal through a spectacle gotten up for the very and sole purpose of exciting emotion? Just think soberly for a moment. If there was no moral need for the Son of God to come to earth and suffer, how could the atonement be called an ethical transaction? Moreover, a spectacular exhibition of love is not winsome; it fails in its appeal; it is rather repellant. Suppose a husband should devise some mechanical scheme by which to display his love for his wife, do you think she would be greatly impressed by it? But if he would suffer some real affliction for her to save her from sorrow, then, if she had a true wifely heart in her, she would be deeply touched and won by it. So with the sacrifice of Christ; if He died to make a real expiation for sin, such as men could not make without suffering eternal retribution, then the display of love was indeed winsome and appealing. The divine love is real love, in that it really gave men a Savior to take their place. So we say that the satisfaction theory is the only really

and profoundly ethical view".

Reme'snyder adds an argumentum ad hominem ("The Atonement," etc. p. 105): "If the atonement be immoral, then the holding of such a false ideal would have lowered and debased the morals of those persons and peoples receiving it. But will the objector contend that such has been the case? He would not dare to maintain that the doctrine of a substitutionary atonement has produced immorality wherever it has been proclaimed. He does not venture to test his charge by an appeal to history. The appeal would be fatal. For nineteen hundred years the only great moral advances of the human race have been brought about by the preaching of a substitutionary atonement. A spring is known by its waters. It is impossible that a doctrine essentially immoral should be the cause of the purest morality among men."

IF CHRIST FULFILLED THE LAW, THEN WE DO NOT HAVE TO KEEP IT.

47. This moral objection is closely connected with the foregoing, treating a special point as it would seem in practice. It is a fact that Libertines in the Middle Ages and among the Anabaptists considered personal fulfillment of the Law unnecessary because they held Christ's fulfillment of the Law to be substitutionary for even willful sins. Thus Socius (and Schleiermacher after him) has made a great point of the possible^{IMMORAL} consequences of the doctrine of the vicarious atonement, stating that God can no longer demand works or even faith, if Christ fulfilled the Law perfectly for us (Luthardt, Kompendium, p.245). Here the same refutation must be used as we laid down in the second half of section 46. Luthardt (*loc. cit.*) calls this simply "eine voellige Verkennung der sittl. Natur unsres Verhaeltnisses zu Gott".

DID GOD SUFFER AND DIE FOR US?

48. Channing asked: Do you mean that the great God really bore the penalty of my sins, really suffered and died?". Then he ridiculed the

doctrine of the two natures in Christ (Quoted Remensnyder, Op. cit. p. 108-109). But see the similar arguments of Socinus and their refutations in section 40, paragraphs 5-7, especially paragraph 6.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE VICARIOUS ATONEMENT IS CAPABLE OF GREAT ABUSES

49. Here we refer back to the Moravian error in section 28.

Furthermore, "in the Middle Ages, when deep ignorance was the rule, very crass ideas of the atoning work of Christ prevailed. An ignorant and immoral priesthood accentuated this condition, and took advantage of it for selfish purposes. Especially was it claimed that the Church possessed an exclusive right to the excessive merits of Christ's sufferings, and the supposed store of His cleansing blood was battered out as a thing of exchange for moeny needed to prosecute hierarchical purposes" (Remensnyder, Op. cit. p.114-115). We call to mind Tetzal's abuse of the indulgence on this point.

"When General Booth in his addresses employs such utterances as: 'Friends, Jesus shed His blood to pay the price, and He bought from God enough salvation to go around' we feel that sacred things are so coarsely handled as to wound Christians and repel thinking unbelievers" (Ibid .pg.116).

"The cross, too, as the natural and appropriate symbol of our Lord's passion, has, doubtless, at times been made an object of superstitious reverence, amounting to practical idolatry--".(Ibid.pg.116).

"But suppose such injudicious methods and grotesque figures are at times resorted to? Is that a legitimate argument against the thing itself? What cause is not liable to abuse in the hands of intemperate advocates? What truth has not been perverted by champions either not able to grasp it, or employing it for self-seeking ends?"(Ibid. p.117).

Also it must be admitted that not many Christians have erred greatly in this direction. One who is satisfied simply to do as God tells him, that is, preach Law and Gospel, objective and subjective reconci-

liation, with the object of saving souls, with no respect to his own person, is not likely to err in this respect.

50. THE PROBLEM OF THE HEATHEN.

Remensnyder states another difficulty (Op. cit. p.134): "If the atonement be grounded upon an eternal divine necessity, in that God cannot overlook sin with impunity, and that He cannot be the justifier of the sinner without a just regard to the broken law, what then are we going to do with the heathen? In what sort of dilemma does this leave them, since they cannot be saved without the one all-atoning sacrifice, and yet have had no opportunity to know of it?" This is strictly not a matter of the atonement, but rather of the divine decree of election. However, it is a part of the atonement insofar as men are graciously elected for the sake of the suffering and death of Christ. The justice of God seems to be called into question; it seems to be unethical for Him to leave some without a chance to grasp salvation. A brief review of parts of Romans will suffice to vindicate God's justice. In Rom. 1, 18-32 the inspired writer shows that the damnation of the heathen peoples is nobody's fault but their own. Rom. 9-11 shows that we are not to inquire into the matter of God's choice of the saints, but we are to consider it a matter of His grace and praise Him for our election (8, 28-39). Rom. 9, 33-36 is the guide for the Christian's state of mind in this matter. It is an attitude of awe, not of criticism.

Remensnyder (Op. cit. p.135f) makes too many concessions. He allows that God may save some after death, misapplying I Pet. 3, 20, which describes Christ's preaching of His triumph (Law, not Gospel) to the lost spirits, and I Pet. 4,6, which does not say that the Gospel was preached to the damned after they died. Heb. 9,27 precludes any idea of salvation for the damned after death, or a second chance.

51. THE RATIONALISTIC - SCIENTIFIC OBJECTION.

Of this nature is the objection, that our world occupies too insignificant
"Of this nature is the objection, that our world occupies too insignificant

nificant a place among the mighty and countless worlds of the universe for the Creator of all to stoop so low as to give His Son to die for the souls inhabiting it" (Op. cit. p.105-106). First of all there is a logical fallacy here, as pointed out by Storr: "Where this difficulty is felt imagination has got the better of reason. We have allowed ourselves to fall into the error of making material magnitude our standard of judgment, forgetting that man as a spiritual being must be appraised by spiritual categories". (Quoted from "Christianity and Immortality", pg. 12, by Th. Graebner in "God and the Cosmos", p.71)

Furthermore, even in the scientific realm Wallace has shown that the earth is at the center of the universe, as far as can be determined, and that it is the only inhabitable planet. He is followed by modern scientists (See Dr. Graebner, Ibid.). He believes it is perfectly reasonable to assume that God could have chosen the earth as the scene of the mighty drama of Christ's suffering and death for the salvation of sinners (Remensnyder, Op. cit. p.106-107).

PART III. THE FALSE THEORIES OF THE ATONEMENT.

52. THE TRIUMPHANTORIAL THEORY (THE RANSOM PAID TO THE DEVIL).

Origen, the chief exponent of this earliest of the false theories of the atonement, is treated as follows by Franks (Op. cit. I, p.56-57): "Cf. 'In Rom. ii.13: 'If therefore we were bought with a price, as Paul also agrees, without doubt we were bought from someone, whose slaves we were, who also demanded what price he would, to let go from his power those whom he held. Now it was the devil who held us, to whom we had been sold by our sins. He demanded therefore as our price, the blood of Christ.'

"So far the doctrine agrees with Irenaeus. But Origen has developed further the conception of which we have hints in I Cor. 2,8 (a text continually upon his lips), and again in Ignatius and Marcion, viz., that the devil was deceived in the transaction.

" 'But to whom did He give his soul as a ransom for many? Certainly not to God: why not then to the devil? For he had possession of us until there should be given to him the ransom for us, the soul of Jesus; though he was deceived by thinking that he could have dominion over it and did not see that he could not bear the torture caused by holding it'. ('In Matt'. xvi, 8).

"And again on Psalm xxxv.(xxxiv) 8, Origen says of the words, 'Let him fall into his own snare' as follows: 'I think that he speaks of the cross, into which the devil in ignorance fell. For if he had known, he would have not crucified the Lord of glory'.

"In another passage ('In Matt'.xiii. 4), the deceit is directly ascribed to God, that the demons 'might be laughed at by Him who dwells in the heavens, and might be ridiculed by the Lord, having received the Son from the Father unto the destruction of their own kingdom and rule contrary to their expectation' "

Thus Luthardt concludes (Komp. p.236): "Die Erloesung vom Satan

wird bes. von Orig. so ausgeführt, dass Jesus dem Satan s. Seele als Loesegeld gab, der sie aber nicht zu halten vermochte." He goes on: "Noch mehr Greg. v. Nyssa: die goettl. Natur Chr., durch die Menschl. verhueilt, ward zum Angelhaken, an welchem Satan zu s. Verderben anbiss."

"Irenaeus teaches that, though the devil had at the first unjustly acquired dominion over the human race, yet it befitted God to deal with him by persuasion rather than by force" (Franks, Op. cit. p.41). This is in harmony, it is to be noted, with his theory of "anakephalaiosis" (see section 30).

Warfield (Schaff-Herzog, s.v. Atonement) adds the following to the list of those who held this view in one form or another: Hippolytus, Clement of Alexandria, Basil, Cyril of Alexandria, Nicholas of Methone, Rufinus, Jerome, and Bernard. Of course, in some of these, and in others not mentioned, the theory is greatly modified from Origen.

Gregory of Nazianzum and John of Damascus must be noted as chief among those who opposed this view, and held that the ransom was paid to God and not to the devil.

Among the Scripture passages which were used to support the Triumphatorial theory, we shall treat four. That these passages were misinterpreted so flagrantly is probably partly to be explained by the prevalence of allegorical and loose interpretations in those days. Hebr. 2,14 ("That through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil") certainly does not say that Christ paid the ransom of His life to the devil. The passage, in its context, is in full agreement with, and is indeed a proof text for, the Scriptural doctrine as set forth in sections 1-3. Christ, the Son of God, took upon Himself the human nature, and in our place died, thus destroying the power of the devil, and releasing us from that power, so that we now have eternal life in Him. Also Col. 2,15, considered with the foregoing verses, contains practically the same thoughts. Christ destroyed and triumphed over the satanic powers. Not a word of His giving Himself over to Sa-

tan as a ransom. As to I Cor. 2,8, the context shows that the subject under consideration is human wisdom, not redemption in the strict sense. Again there is no mention of the payment of a ransom to the devil. On Matt. 20,28 Ylvisaker (The Gospels, p.530) says: "This ransom was not paid to Satan -- for he had despoiled us and kept us without the least semblance of any right - but to God". Those who held this theory labored under a philosophical difficulty: We were in bondage to Satan, therefore Christ should have paid the ransom to Satan. But the real state of affairs is: God's justice, outraged by sin, had to be expiated, and the debt of our penalty for our sins was paid to divine justice by Christ when He suffered and died in our place.

John 14,30.31 is a complete denial of the Triumphatorial theory. V. 30b: "For the prince of this world cometh, and hath nothing in me." V. 31b: "As the Father gave me commandment, even so I do." Heb. 9,14 and Eph. 5,2 state expressly that Christ offered Himself to God.

Augustine does not properly come in among those who maintain the paying of the ransom to Satan. His doctrine is much like that of Luther after him. It is often claimed, however, that Luther held these views. But such claims are based on a misconception. Luther maintained, with Scripture, that Christ redeemed us from the bondage of Satan. Satan holds us in his power by sin. But Christ, through His atoning work, releases us from the power of sin (I Pet. 1,18f.) and thus from the power of Satan (Col. 2,15; Heb. 2,14). Thus the power of Satan was destroyed. This is Bible doctrine, and not the Triumphatorial theory.

53. THE THEORY OF RESTITUTION (APOKATASTASIS)

Restitution is the doctrine that all men and angels will finally be saved. This ancient error was based on a false interpretation of Acts 3,21; Rom. 5,18; and similar passages. "Origen did not despair of the redemption of Satan, and of all other fallen spirits"(Fischer,

Op. cit. p.86). The doctrine can be found today only among the Swedenborgians (Pop. Symb. p. 391), Jehovah's Witnesses (Pop. Symb. p. 415-416), and the Jehovah's Witnesses (Pop. Symb. p. 415-416).

Section 61), and the Universalists (Pop. Symb. p. 405ff.), but in a modified form. The Universalists, the Unitarians, ^(1810., p. 404) the Old Catholics (Ibid. p. 207), and Liberal Catholics (Ibid. p. 208) teach the salvation of all men, with a distinctive touch of Pelagianism.

Modern restorationists deny the substitutionary atonement of Christ, and teach instead various kinds of work-righteousness (Pop. Symb. p. 408).

Popular Symbolics has a crushing refutation of Restorationism (pp. 134-135), which contains among other things, this statement: "The Restorationists indeed appeal to Scripture. But Acts 3, 21 ('restoration of all things') speaks of the establishment of the kingdom of God according to God's purpose and prophecy; cp. Matt. 17, 11; I Cor. 15, 28: The enemies will be subjugated, not converted, to Christ. Rom. 5, 18: 'All men' have been justified, objectively". And as to the angels that sinned, God has given them no redeemer: 2 Pet. 2, 4; Matt. 25, 41-46.

54. THE ACCEPTILATION THEORY.

It is not surprising to us that this view, which maintains that Christ's work of atonement was not sufficient of itself (ex interna sua perfectione), but was accepted as sufficient by God (per liberam Dei acceptationem, per gratuitam Dei acceptationem), came to prominence in the early days of scholasticism. In the midst of medieval theological speculations there was no definite opinion current stating that Christ's complete work was of itself a full payment for the sins of all men. Even Anselm's view is vulnerable in this respect, as Dau shows: ^(TH. QUART. XX. p. 3) "--- In Anselm's view 'that which gives value to the death of Christ is not its penal quality as suffering, but its moral quality as obedience'. This creates, for Anselm's view 'close points of contact with the later ethical satisfaction theories'. 'Christ is not punished for our sins, as in the later Penal Theory; His death is rather a precious gift brought to God, having its value in the spirit of self-sacrifice by which it is inspired'. (W. Adams Brown in Hastings. ERE, V, 650). The modification

which is thought to have been put on the view of Anselm by later theologians of the Latin Church, such as Thomas Aquinas and Duns Scotus and the so-called Acceptilation Theory, is really very slight. By that theory it is held that the value of Christ's death rests not on that death or on any quality inherent in Christ's suffering, but merely on the good pleasure of God. In other words, the death of Christ has as much value as God is pleased to put on it. If the penal quality in Christ's death is suppressed, -- and that was done also by Anselm, -- whom did His "satisfaction" really satisfy?" (Theo. Quat. XX. p.3).

We are constrained to concede this as true, since, although Anselm claimed that Christ was the only Savior, who did all that was necessary (see Pieper, II, p.424, n.1009) for our salvation, yet the loophole for acceptilationism is left wide open.

Scotus and his followers regarded Christ's work as of finite worth, but it is valued as infinite "a Deo Acceptatum. Siquidem divina acceptatio est potissima causa et ratio omnis meriti" (Scotus, Sent. III, d. 19. Quoted in Pieper Dogm. II, 425n).

Pieper adds Thomas and his followers to the list also (Dogm. II, p. 425): "Zu dieser Akzeptationstheorie hatte freilich schon Thomas selbst -- trotz seiner 'satisfactio superabundans' den Grund gelegt, wenn er lehrte, dass Gott, weil er der Allerhoechste sei, auch ohne Genugtuung die Suende vergeben koenne".

The Nominalist idea of Occam followed Scotus. Biel, Occam's disciple, is quoted (Franks, Op. cit. ^{Vol. I} p.336): "Although the merit of Christ was in itself simply finite, nevertheless it was accepted as sufficient for an infinite posterity of Adam". Biel admits that the "merit of Christ" was finite because Christ's passion was one of the human nature only, which is finite, being a creature. As we shall see presently, the Reformed Acceptilation follows along these lines with the same premises.

The Roman Church, following her ancient scholastic teachers, still limits the value of the work of Christ in itself. In connection with

the person of Christ, it "distinguishes a higher and lower part of the soul of Christ, the latter, inferior part, alone experiencing the sufferings of the passion; it also maintains that our Lord did not suffer the pains of eternal damnation"(Pop. Symb. p.159).

Arminians maintain that God accepts Christ's work of atonement on account of the great dignity of Christ's Person, and on account of His innocence, but they deny a strict equivalence in what we would have had to suffer and in what Christ suffered. Again it is a case of God's acceptance and not of intrinsic value. See. Pieper Dogm. II, p.425. Thus the Arminians of today, principally the Methodists and the Winebrennerians (Pop. Symb. p.311). As pointed out in section 40, Luthardt and other compromising Lutherans hold this view also.

As to Calvin, Pieper says (Dogm. II, p.425):"Auch Calvin wird durch seine falsche Lehre von der Praedestination auf die Akzeptionstheorie zurueckgeworfen. Calvin naemlich laesst Christi Verdienst, als das Verdienst eines Menschen, erst durch die Praedestination hinreichenden Wert bekommen". Cf. the Nestorian premises of Calvin in Inst. II, 17,1.

As was pointed out in section 40, most modern dogmatics theorists do not see an equivalence in the penalties threatened us and the sufferings of Christ. All such dogmaticians from the nature of the case become ipso facto Acceptilationists.

The Scriptural refutation of the Acceptilation Theory is to be found in section ⁴⁰41, where the negative statement of this very theory was pointed out to be one of the objections to the Scriptural doctrine of the atonement. The same refutation suffices here.

55. THE "SACRIFICIAL THEORY".

"Basing on the conception of sacrifices which looks upon them as merely gifts to secure the good will of the King, the advocates of this theory regard the work of Christ as consisting in the offering to God of Christ's perfect obedience even to death, and by it purchasing God's

favor and the right to do as he would with those whom God gave him as a reward" (Warfield in Schaff-Herzog, s.v. Atonement). Warfield mentions John Balgny ("Essay on Redemption", London. 1741), H. Taylor ("Apology of Ben Mordecai", London. 1784), and Richard Price ("Sermons on Christian Doctrine", London. 1737) as proponents of this view. It bears great similarity on the face of it, to the acceptilation theory. There is combined with this the idea that Christ gained certain rights to deal with men as He pleased, which idea is found in many presentations of the Triumphantorial theory. We need merely point to our Scriptural presentation of the doctrine in general in order to show that this theory is only a half-truth. It presents a sacrifice of Christ, but not a vicarious atonement.

56. DENIAL OF THE ACTIVE OBEDIENCE OF CHRIST.

The finest comprehensive discussion of this error is to be found in an article by Dr. Engelder, based on Pieper Dogm. II, p.446-453, in the Concordia Theological Monthly, Vol.I, pp.810ff; 888ff. This section then, will comprise a bare summary of Dr. Engelder's article, with historical additions which we think necessary.

Those who hold this error do not wish to deny the vicarious atonement, but they do insist that Christ's active obedience does not form a part of that atonement, and that Christ's perfect obedience was not for the purpose of atoning vicariously for our sinful lives.

"Anselm (Cur Deus Homo, II, 11) excluded it on the ground that Christ was bound to yield this obedience for His own sake" (Dr. Engelder, Op. cit. p.810). Similarly the Beghards and other pre-Reformation sects (Hagenbach, II, p.53). "The Lutheran superintendent George Karg (Parsimonius), misapplying the proposition (which indeed lends itself to misapplication) that 'the Law obligates either to obedience or to punishment, not to both at once', argued that, 'since Christ bore the punishment, for us, He rendered the obedience for Himself'. (His thesis

aroused a general protest; he was brought to see his error and retracted in 1570.)" (Engelder, Op. cit. p.810-811). Then a number of Reformed theologians, following John Piscator (d. 1625), who was influenced by the arguments of Parsimonius, insisted that Christ, as a human being, was required to render the active obedience. Also "according to Roman Catholic theologians, Christ by His suffering obtained merit for Himself", this in agreement with Piscator (Hagenbach, II, p.357). Of course, all those who deny the vicarious satisfaction altogether, as Socinus and all rationalists, also wield the arguments of these errorists with force. Modern theologians in general deny the substitutionary character of the active obedience, holding that Christ's obedience consisted only in His willing assumption of the Saviorship, His "vocational obedience" (Engelder, Op. cit. p.811; Lehre u. Wehre, 1896,137; Nitzsch-Stephan, pp.357ff.). "The *πρωτον ψευδος* of this position lies in placing the 'vocational obedience' and the obedience which Christ rendered the Law given to man, in place of man, in opposition" (Engelder, Op. cit. p.811).

A significant observation from Engelder (Ibid. p.812): "Modern theologians" (and, we may say, practically all who deny the active obedience) "are guilty of a flagrant *petitio principii* in this matter. They assume that the fulfillment of the Law by Christ does not belong to His execution of the divine 'counsel of salvation'. But first of all it must be ascertained from Scripture what the 'counsel of salvation' comprises. And according to Scripture the execution of the 'counsel of salvation' required not only the obedience of Christ exhibited in assuming the suffering, but also the vicarious obedience of life, the fulfillment of the positive demands of the Law in place of man. The righteousness of Christ's life is therefore not merely exemplary (it is indeed that, too, I Pet. 2,21), not merely a prerequisite for the passive obedience (it is that too, inasmuch as only the death of a perfectly holy one has expiatory value, I Pet. 1,19), but it is also an essential part of the

payment which Christ vicariously rendered unto the just God for the reconciliation of mankind".

True Lutherans always held, in the words of the Formula of Concord (Thor. Decl. III. Triglot. p.919): "Since Christ is not man alone, but God and man in one undivided person, He was as little subject to the Law" (i.e., obligated to keep the Law), "because He is the Lord of the Law, as He had to suffer and die, as far as His person is concerned. For this reason, then, His obedience, not only in suffering and dying, but also in this, that He in our stead was voluntarily made under the Law and fulfilled it by His obedience, is imputed to us for righteousness, so that on account of this complete obedience, which He rendered His heavenly Father for us by doing and suffering, in living and dying, God forgives our sins, regards us as godly and righteous, and eternally saves us". Also see F. C., Sol. Decl., Art. III, 4.22.56.58; Art. VI, 7. On the practical bearing of this article of faith, see. Luther, Erl. Ed., 15, 61.63. It is necessary for full Christian comfort. Even Anselm practiced in his life of faith what he denied in theory (Engelder, Op. cit. p.810).

Some of the arguments advanced by these errorists follow.

I. Christ, being a true man, was obliged to observe the Law like any other man and thus could not, in this respect, act for others.

Answer: First of all, this assertion involves the denial of the personal union in Christ. Because the human nature was assumed by the Son of God in the incarnation into His nature, the human nature by virtue of this union was made to share in the lordship of the divine person over the Law, Matt. 12,8. This being postulated, "God made His son, and His Son put Himself, under the Law for man and for man's redemption, Gal. 4,4.5; Ps. 40,7-9. In this manner an obedience to the Law ($\delta\epsilon\upsilon\kappa\alpha\iota\omega\mu\alpha$, $\upsilon\pi\alpha\kappa\omicron\sigma\eta$, Rom. 5,18.19) has been achieved by Christ which is available for man" (Ibid. p.813).

II. According to Scripture redemption was effected by the death of Christ, 7 Pet. 1,19; Col. 1,14.
of Christ, I Pet. 1,19; Col. 1,14.

Answer: But the passages referred to are not to be taken exclusive, but inclusive. "According to Scripture redemption was effected also by the obedience of Christ, Ps. 40,7-9; Rom. 5,18.19, therefore by the passive and active obedience together" (Engelder, Mimeographed Dogmatics Notes). See C.T.M., I, pp.816-817; 888ff. for an excellent discussion of the Scriptural proofs of this answer.

III. "It is further objected that full satisfaction was rendered the divine justice by means of the obedientia passiva; God would be demanding too much if He exacted not only the payment, on the part of Christ, of the penalty for the transgression of the Law, but also the positive fulfillment of the Law; lex obligat vel ad obedientiam vel ad poenam"(Engelder, C.T.M., I. p.814). This involves that we predicate an injustice of God. Answer: "The intent of the proposition: Lex obligat vel ad obedientiam vel ad poenam is to enforce the truth that man cannot with impunity refuse obedience to the Law. This canon does not cover the case where the Law has been transgressed. In this case, in the case of fallen man, the rule applies: Lex obligat et ad poenam et ad obedientiam. (See Quenstedt, II, 407 sq.)"(Loc. cit.). Dr. Engelder shows that this objection does not hold even in temporal matters, with criminals.

IV. A moral objection: Christ's fulfillment of the Law for us would destroy our zeal for keeping the Law. Answer: "On the contrary, it produces this zeal, Rom. 6,1ff" (Engelder, Mim. Dogm. Notes, II). Furthermore, "the same argument would apply to the obedientia passiva with equal force. We would have to deny that Christ in His suffering paid the penalty of our sins, because men under that teaching would no longer fear hell and repent" (Engelder, C.T.M., I, p.814).

V. "The charge made by modern theologians that the old theologians overlooked the intimate connection of the obedientia activa and passiva, disrupting them through a mechanical juxtaposition, is but another of the current misrepresentations of the teaching of the old theologians.

Compare Gerhard's statement . . . : 'Quid? Quod plane ἀδύνατον est, activam obedientiam a passiva in hoc merito separare'. And see particularly Quenstedt, II, p.407. Thus, in substance, Dr. Pieper, l.c^o.(Loc. cit.).

VI. This and the following objection were raised by Piscator.

"Since the imputation of righteousness and the forgiveness of sins are the same, if we are justified by the imputation of Christ's active righteousness, then our sins are forgiven because of it, which is contrary to Heb. ix.22"(Franks, Op. cit. p.11). Here again we have a separation of the two obediences of Christ, whereas, as shown under objection V and the quotation from the Formula of Concord, they are always to be considered jointly. The one obedience never excludes the other. Both are required according to Scripture. Passages like Heb. 9,22 are not to be understood exclusive.

VII. "If both Christ's active and passive obedience were necessary to complete the satisfaction made for us, then His holiness only obtained part of our redemption, and was therefore imperfect" (Loc. cit.). Here Quenstedt (Op. cit. p.89) says that the fallacy is one of division, and that the two obediences are two distinct parts of one whole obedience, which is destroyed if either is taken away. It must be admitted that this objection is unscriptural and simply philosophical.

VIII. There is finally the charge of Hagenbach (Hist. of Doctr., II. p.359) that orthodox theology weakened the theory of Anselm "by adding the obedientia activa, since the redeeming element was then no longer exclusively connected with the pouring out of the blood, and the agony endured, but diffused through the whole life and only concentrated in the sacrificial death". Again a philosophical objection. Scripture has settled the matter otherwise. As intimated above, any theory that eliminates the active obedience takes away an abundant source of comfort from the Christian, and because of this really weakens the doctrine of the vicarious atonement.

57. CHRIST ATONED FOR US ACCORDING TO ONE NATURE ONLY.

Here we discuss one of the theological controversies of the period after Luther's life, which the Formula of Concord settled, namely the "Osiandristic and Stancarian controversy, from 1549 to 1566, in which Andrew Osiander denied the forensic character of justification, and taught that Christ is our righteousness only according to His divine nature, while Stancarus contended that Christ is our righteousness according to His human nature only. Both, Osiander as well as Stancarus, were opposed by Melancton, Flacius, and practically all other Lutherans, the Philippists included. This controversy was settled by Article III." (Bente, Concordia Triglotta, Introduction, p.103) These errors corrupt the article of justification specifically, but at the core of the matter is also the article of the complete satisfaction, as we shall attempt to elucidate.

"By His suffering and death, said, Osiander, Christ made satisfaction and acquired forgiveness for us, but He did not thereby effect our justification. His obedience as such does not constitute our righteousness before God, but merely serves to restore it". (Op. cit. p.155).

Really then, the human nature of Christ served only as a kind of channel or conveyance, so that the divine nature of Christ could come into the heart of man by divine infusion. "Not the Christ for us, but rather the Christ in us, is the basis both of our justification and assurance" (Ibid.) (Note that this principle is identical with the first principle of Schleiermacher's theology, which is discussed in section 64). Thus the vicarious atonement of Christ is completely discounted. The arbitrary separation of the two natures in Christ, as well as complete disregard of the clear passages of Scripture stating that the life, suffering, and death of Christ give us forgiveness of sins because they were rendered in our stead, is accountable ^{FOR} to the error.

Stancarus is quoted by Bente (Op. cit. p.160) thus: "Men are reconciled by Christ's death on the cross; but the blood shed on the cross

and death are peculiar to the human nature, not to the divine nature; hence we ~~w~~re reconciled by the human nature of Christ only, and not by His divine nature (Schluesselburg 9, 216ff)". Bente goes on: "Consistently, the Stancarian doctrine destroys both the unity of the person of Christ and the sufficiency of His atonement. It not only corrupts the doctrine of the infinite and truly redeeming value of the obedience of the God-man, but also denies the personal union of the divine and human natures in Christ. For if the divine nature is excluded from the work of Christ, then it must be excluded also from His person, since works are always acts of a person. And if it was a mere human nature that died for us, then the price of our redemption is altogether inadequate, and we are not redeemed, as Luther so earnestly emphasized against Zwingli. (Conc. Trigl. 1026, 44.) True, Stancarus protested: "Christ is Mediator according to the human nature only; this 'only' exclusive does not exclude the divine nature from the person of Christ, but from His office as Mediator". (Frank 2,111) However, just this was Luther's contention, that Christ is our Mediator also according to His divine nature, and that the denial of this truth both invalidates His satisfaction and divides His person". I Cor. 2,8 ("Crucified the Lord of glory") and Acts 3,15 ("killed the Prince of Life") proves that also the divine nature of the God-man participated in the death, and therefore also the mediating work of Christ.

Among modern sects the Moravians (Pop. Symb. p.279) and the Irvingites (Op. cit., p.326) are Stancarian in their denial of the participation of the divine nature in the death and work of Christ.

F. C. Thor. Decl., III, 56: "For even though Christ had been conceived and born without sin by the Holy Ghost, and had fulfilled all-righteousness in His human nature alone, and yet had not been true and eternal God, this obedience and suffering of His human nature could not be imputed to us for righteousness. As also, if the Son of God had not become man, the divine nature ^{ALONE} could not be our righteousness. Therefore,

we believe, teach, and confes that the entire obedience of the entire person of Christ, which He has rendered the Father for us even to His most ignominious death upon the cross, is imputed to us for righteousness. For the human nature alone, without the divine, could neither by obedience nor suffering render satisfaction to eternal almighty God for the sins of all the world; however, the divinity alone, without the humanity, could not mediate between God and us". Furthermore, paragraph 58: "Thus neither the divine nor the human nature of Christ by itself is imputed to us for righteousness, but only the obedience of the person who is at the same time God and man. And faith thus regards the person of Christ as it was made under the Law for us, bore our sins, and in His going to the Father offered to His heavenly Father for us poor sinners His entire, complete obedience, from His holy birth even unto death, and has thereby covered all our disobedience which inheres in our nature, and its thoughts, words, and works, so that it is not imputed to us for condemnation, but is pardoned and forgiven out of pure grace, alone for Christ's sake".

58. THE VARIOUS FORMS OF WORK-RIGHTEOUSNESS, INVOLVING A DENIAL OF CHRIST'S WORK INTENSIVELY.

Of the spirit of Anti-christ, denying the sole efficacy and sufficiency of Christ as the Savior, the Apostle John, in his day, said, "even now is it in the world" (I Jn. 4,3). And very soon it developed into a theological system which partly eliminated the sufficiency of Christ's work and merit as the sole confidence of the Christian, substituting a partial confidence in personal human merit. This we see when Franks (Op. cit. vol. I, 102) remarks on Tertullian: "Not only does he agree with the Apostolic Fathers, the Greek Apologists, and Irenaeus in regarding Christianity as a new law of Christ; but, as was natural for one who before his conversion had been a Roman juris peritus, he has made the idea of the new law more strictly legal and also more dominant than it was

among the Greeks". Also p. 103: "Here first we touch the beginnings of the great Western systematization of the doctrine of grace and merit." Down through the ages the spirit of Anti-christ gathered strength till Biel (Ibid. p. 338) "brings at last to clear statement what of course is the implicit doctrine of all the schoolmen, viz., that the merit of Christ requires to be supplemented by further merit in order to salvation. No one of the great schoolmen had, however, ventured to say roundly, like Biel, that the merit of Christ is never the only and whole meritorious cause of salvation".

Today this spirit of antichrist is essentially embodied in the doctrines of the Romish Church. True, the Roman Catechism (Part I, chapt. V, 2) (Quoted in the Lutheran Witness, 1885, p.107) states: "Even the price He paid for us, was not on a par only and equivalent to our debts, it also goes beyond them. Furthermore, it was also the most acceptable sacrifice, which His Son offered up on the altar of the cross, to mitigate the wrath and indignation of the Father". But the meaning of these fine words is, in the Romish system, that "because of the passion of Christ the sinner is permitted to save himself from sin through penance and sanctification" (Engelder, Notes, Saving Grace, # 11). "The Catholic teaching is that the vicarious satisfaction expiated only original sin, the sins committed prior to baptism, and the eternal punishment of sin; that man is required to render satisfaction for the sins committed after baptism and for their temporal punishment; and that God is fully reconciled through the merits of the saints and the propitiation of the Mass" (Pop. Symb. p.53). (The propitiation of the Mass will be discussed in the next section — 59). Cf. Hagenbach, Op. cit. II, p. 357. For definite proof that the Papists teach that works are meritorious, and that penance, with its requirements, contrition or attrition, full confession, and works of satisfaction or indulgences, is required "for the entire and perfect remission of sins", see Pop. Symb., pp. 167-168; 179-183. Here we have systematized work-righteousness. "Scripture teaches

-54-

that the vicarious satisfaction covers all sin, all guilt, all punishment, all wrath. Christ redeemed us 'from all iniquities'. Tit. 2,14; John 1,29; 19,30; Rom. 5,10; 2 Cor. 5,19; Heb. 10,14; I Pet. 2,24; 3,18. A.C. III; XXIV, 25. 28f. Ap. III, 85f; XXI, 14f. 19.22.29; XXVII, 17. S.A. P. II, II,1.24.26. Small Cat. Art. II. Large Cat. Art. II. F.C., Th. Decl. V, 20." (Pop. Symb.) ^{page 53} "Remission of sin carries with it the remission of the punishment of sin, Rom. 8,1 ('no condemnation'); 5,1. Rome teaches that God remits only the guilt and eternal punishment, but not the temporal punishment of sin. That involves a monstrous conception that God at the same time pardons and punishes the sinner. It denies that God has actually 'forgiven you all trespasses', Col. 2,13; denies, further, that Christ actually reconciled the world unto God, Rom. 5,10; 2 Cor. 5,19, and, requiring the penitent himself to clear the debt of temporal punishment partly through his own satisfactions, rendered here and in purgatory; partly through the satisfaction of others, obtained through indulgences, denies the sole Saviorship of Jesus, Acts 4,12; I Tim. 2,5, who bore our punishment, Is. 53,4f., fully completing the work of redemption, Heb. 10,14. Where indulgences are granted in a more or less open way for cash Acts 8,21 applies. A.C. XXV,4. Ap., XII, 13; VI, 21.79; XXI,22. S.A. p.II, II.24; p. III, III, 22f. F.C. Th. Decl. ^V/_A 21" (Pop. Symb. p.65-66).

Also the Old Catholics, the Greek Catholics, and the Eastern Catholics have a clear stripe of Semi-pelagianism running throughout their doctrinal systems. Works are mingled into the doctrine of conversion to such an extent that the all-sufficiency of Christ's atonement is pushed far into the background. Cf. Pop. Symb. pp.207; 141; 144-145.

All acceptilationists (section 54) from the nature of the case are also teachers of work-righteousness, unless they are inconsistent. Those who deny that Christ's work is incomplete in any respect cannot teach the righteousness of faith in Christ Jesus, but must substitute, at least in part, the righteousness of some achievement of man. Rom. 4,

4.5 denies any human work or characteristic a place in the Christian doctrine of merit.

The Formula of Concord states that the Anabaptists taught "that our righteousness before God consists not only in the sole obedience and merit of Christ, but in our own renewal and our own piety in which we walk before God; which they, for the most part, base upon their own peculiar ordinances and self-chosen spirituality, as upon a new sort of monkery". (Thor. Decl. XII, Concordia Triglotta, p.1097) See Rom. 3,28; 4,4.5. Similarly the Mennonites, successors to the Anabaptists, make justification a kind of sanctification and turn Christ's significance into that of a law-giver. cf. Pop. Symb. p.261.

In the "Majoristic Controversy, from 1551 to 1562, in which George Major and Justus Menius defended the phrase of Melancton that good works are necessary to salvation" (Concordia Trigl., Intr. p.103), we have the doctrine which was taken up and defended by many sects and is widely held today. Among these are the Waldenses (Pop. Symb. p.250), the Arminians (Pop. Symb. p.232), The Adventists (Pop. Symb. p.355), and the Plymouth Brethren (Ibid. p.308-309).

Though all the sects mentioned in this section do not state this outright, it is of course implied in their doctrine because of their rejection of the sole Saviorship of Jesus. Good works are indeed necessary because they are God-pleasing, but they "are not necessary for justification, for salvation... 'this godless opinion which sticks to the world, ^{QUITE} tightly' (Ap., III, 85), to the pagan world, the Jewish world, the Catholic and rationalistic world, denies the chief article of the Christian religion (that the forgiveness of sins and eternal life are the free gift of God, gained by Christ alone, appropriated by faith alone), John 3,16.36; 20,31; Acts 4,12; 16,30f.; Rom. 3,24.28; 6,23; 11,6; Eph. 2,8f.; 2 Tim. 1,9; Titus 3,5f.; I John 5,11, destroys the Gospel, Acts 20,24, and robs men of Christ, Gal. 5,4, holding them under

the curse, Gal. 3,10; Acts 15,24. The rationalizations: Good works are necessary, therefore they are necessary for justification; faith is never without good works, therefore faith saves because of the good works, violate both Scripture and the laws of sound reasoning. A.C., VI.XX. Ap., III, lf. 67f. 104f. 235f.; XV, lf. F. C. IV, Ep., 6.15f.; Th. Decl. 7.14.16.22.30". (Pop. Symb. p.71)

A similar error of the days shortly after Luther's death, gave cause to the "Synergistic Controversy, from 1555 to 1560, in which Pfefinger, Eber, Major, Crell, Pezel, Strigel, and Stoessel held with Melancton that man by his ^{DWH}natural powers cooperates in his conversion. Their opponents (Amsdorf, Flacius, Hesshusius, Wigand, Gallus, Musaeus, and Judex) taught, as formulated by Flacius: "God alone converts man... He does not exclude the wibl, but all efficaciousness and operation of the same'. This controversy was decided and settled by Article II" (of the Form. of Conc.). (Bente, Concordia Triglotta, Intr. p.103) Therefore not only Pelagianism (Man possesses the power of self-regeneration), but also Semi-pelagianism, Arminianism, and synergism in their various forms (Man can and must cooperate with God towards his regeneration, the production of faith) are to be included under this head, as systems which, when consistently carried out, rob the Christian of assurance of salvation and make him trust in his own deeds or character instead of Christ's merit alone. On the contrary Scripture teaches that conversion is entirely the work of God, Phil. 1,19f., and is based on the vicarious atonement of Christ (section 3).

Methodists and Winebrennerians (Pop. Symb. p.311), being Arminians, also fall under the above head. Likewise certain Presbyterians, as for instance the Cumberland Presbyterians (Pop. Symb. p.249). In the Declaratory Statement of 1903, the clause, "that men are fully responsible for their treatment of God's gracious offer", lends itself to an Arminian interpretation.

Adventists make justification a kind of sanctification (Pop. Symb.

107
p.355), the Salvation Army people are thoroughgoing Pelagians (Ibid. p. 329-330), the Disciples (Campbellites) make works the concurring cause of justification (Ibid. p.302), Swedenborgians make salvation solely dependent upon man himself, the latter being considered a free agent (Ibid. p.392), Universalists hold that by a process of purifying corrective punishment all men will be made worthy of eternal life (the merit being man's own --Pop. Symb. p.405ff), Unitarians state that "man can maintain his own ^{AT-ONE-MENT} atonement with God"(Ibid. p.404), Freemasons think to gain salvation "by the pass of a pure and blameless life"(Ibid. p.460), Theosophy makes man his own savior (Ibid. p.464), Jews reject Christ and attempt their own atonement through repentance (Ibid. p.438), and Modernism with its social Gospel stresses only good works and social reform, and therefore all these and many other life sects and tendencies are to be considered among those who support a system which denies the sufficiency of Christ's work intensive and sets up human merit instead.

We conclude this section with the argument of Luther, which he used against the Papistical work-righteousness: "Da stehet der Artikel, den die Kinder beten: Ich glaube an Christum Jesum, gekreuziget, gestorben, usw. Es ist ja niemand fuer unsere Suende gestorben denn allein Jesus Christus, Gottes Sohn. Allein Jesus, Gottes Sohn; noch einmal sage ich: Allein Jesus, Gottes Sohn, hat uns von Suenden erloesst, das ist gewisslich wahr and die ganze Schrift; und sollten alle Teufel und Welt sich zerreißen und bersten, so ist's ja wahr. Ist er's aber allein, der Suende wegnimmt, so koennen wir's mit unsern Werken nicht sein" (Quoted in Pieper, Dogm. II, p.414, from E.A. 25.76).

59. THE PAPISTIC SACRIFICE OF THE MASS.

"The Roman Church defines the Eucharist as not only a sacrament, but also a sacrifice (sacrificium propitiatorium, more exactly, impetratorium). The same Christ who brought the bloody sacrifice of His life on the cross in the Eucharist is offered forever without the shedding

108

of blood for the satisfaction for sin of the living and the dead, of the present and the absent. The solemn act, embellished with magnificent ceremonial, in which the priests bring the unbloody sacrifice is called the Mass". (Pop. Symb. p.188) "While the sacrifice of Jesus on the cross is meritorious and made satisfaction for sin, the sacrifice of the Mass properly is impetratory, i.e., gains by entreaty. There is no agreement among the theologians. 'It may be called propitiatory, however, because it gains by entreaty and remission of guilt; it may be called satisfactory because it gains the remission of punishment; it may be called meritorious because it obtains the grace of doing good and of acquiring merit'. Bellarmine, in Winer, A Comparative View of the Doctrines and Confessions of the Various Communities of Christendom, p.148".(Pop. Symb. p.189)

The Greek Church is in substantial agreement as to the Mass. (Pop. Symb. p.143-144)

The Irvingites approach the Roman doctrine of the efficaciousness of the Mass in that the preserved elements are efficacious for prayers, but only as a "representation" of the heavenly elements. See Guenther, Symbolik, p.334.

But the New Testament teaches that there is to be no repetition of the all-sufficient sacrifice which Christ offered in His own body on the tree. I Pet. 3,18: "For Christ also hath once offered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God". Also Heb. 7,27; 9,12. The words of Heb. 10,12.14.17.18 need no commentary: "But this man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins for ever, sat down on the right hand of God... For by one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified.... And their sins and iniquities will I remember no more. Now where remission of sins is, there is no more offering for sin". The Roman Mass is supposed to be "unbloody" and at the same time to forgive sins, but Heb. 9,22: "Without shedding of blood is no remission". The complete redemption of the world was finished on the cross,

according to Jesus' own words, John 19,30. Luther's rebuke is in place (St. Louis Ed. XII, 1552): "Die Juden haben einen Hohenpriester gehabt, ergo (folglich), wir sollen es auch haben. Nein, es hilft nichts das Gewissen, es muss hier alles zu Boden fallen; dass man will Christum aufopfern in der Messe, es ist eine Gotteslaesterung und ein Greual, und die aergste Suende, die da geschehen kann. Christus ist nun einmal geopfert, jetzt darf es nichts, denn dass man ihn thanksage in Ewigkeit. Das Opfer Christi, das einmal geschehen ist, gilt ewig, und wir werden selig, dieweil wir dran glauben. Richtet man neben dem Opfer etwas weiter auf, so ist es eine Gotteslaesterung". See also Augsburg Conf. XXIV, 24f. Apol. XXIV, 22.56.

60. ATONEMENT FOR THE ELECT ONLY, A DENIAL OF CHRIST'S WORK EXTENSIVELY.

This error was first thoroughly propounded by Augustine. It is summarized by Luthardt (Komp. p.128) thus: "Da alle einzelnen zu derselben massa perditionis gehoeren, so kann der Unterschied des Erfolgs nur in Gott u.s. Willen liegen, welcher sich an den electis durch die gratia particularis und irresistibilis u. in der Gabe des donum perseverantiae vollzieht".

It is interesting to note that Abelard has this reason among others for rejecting the notion of redemption from the devil, that Christ redeemed only the elect, but these never were in the devil's power.

By Calvin and the Reformed the work of Christ is subordinated to the Augustinian doctrine of predestination. Just as Calvin's doctrine of predestination limits Christ's work intensive (section 54) in the matter of acceptilation, so it limits Christ's work extensive in this connection. Luthardt, Komp. p.129-130, shows how Calvin's system is completely controlled by his first principle of double predestination. Later Calvinists have incorporated this horrible doctrine into their confessions. Cf. Westminster Confession: "The rest of mankind God has pleased . . . to pass by and to ordain them to dishonor". Pöp. Symb. p.

226. This contention was heatedly defended, as Franks (Op. cit. II, 8) shows: "The Reformed . . . at least from Beza onwards, shows a distinct tendency to restrict the satisfaction of Christ, or at least, if not its sufficiency, yet its efficacy, to the elect. Quenstedt, 'Systema', pars II, cap.iii, memb. 2, sect.2, qu.7, quotes Beza, 'Respons. part.2, ad acta Colloq. Mompelg.', as follows: 'I say again, and profess before the whole Church of God, that it is false, blasphemous, and wicked to say that Christ, whether as regards the divine plan, or as regards the effect, suffered, was crucified, died, and made satisfaction no less for the sins of the damned and those adjudged to eternal judgment than for the sins of Peter, Paul and all the saints.' "

Franks (Op. cit. p.112-113) says of Heidegger, a Reformed theologian who gave final form to Calvinistic doctrines in his "Corpus Theologiae Christianae": "In dealing with the Scriptural arguments for a universal satisfaction, Heidegger first emphasizes the passages in which Christ is said to have died for His friends (John 15,13), or for His sheep, or for many; he then urges that, where Christ is said to have died for all, the sense must be that He died for all the elect. This he says, is quite clear from the context in such passages as 2 Cor. 5,15-19. He points out that in Rom. 11,32; I Cor. 15,22, 'all' can only refer to those who are Christ's. (Cf. I Cor. 15,23) As regards the arguments from passages in which Christ is said to have died for the reprobate, Heidegger takes them one by one and gives them a different sense. 2 Pet. 2,1 "refers to not a real redemption, but to an external calling and external inclusion in the church only. In Heb. 10,29 ἐν ᾧ ἠμάρτην refers to Christ, not to the unbeliever. Rom. 14,15 does not imply the ruin of those for whom Christ died, but only their attempted ruin . . . Finally, Heidegger appeals to Christian experience. The foundation of our consolation is to know that Christ died for us; but if Christ died for some who are to be damned, we do not know that we are included in the benefit of His death. It is not in virtue of our common humanity,

-91-

but of our faith, that we have communion with His death". The latter argument is in reality a very strong one against Heidegger, if only he would, as Scripture does, leave out all mention of reprobation in connection with the doctrines of Christ's work and its acceptance on the part of man (conversion).

The concept of reprobation does not belong in the doctrine of conversion. It is just this that is the fault of Heidegger's interpretation of the passages he mentions. There is no warrant for dragging in a consideration of a decree of predestination to damnation, and thus supposing that Christ did not die for all. ^{II} Pet. 2,1 clearly states that those who had brought upon themselves (Notice: Not because of a divine decree, but because of their own fault -- the only reason Scripture assigns for damnation) destruction had been "bought" by the Lord Jesus. Heidegger's statement regarding Heb. 10,29 cannot be insisted on on grammatical grounds, considering the original text, and Delitzsch (Hebrews, II, p.189) says the words referred to are to be understood "of and inward experience, a former sanctification of heart and life in the person of the now apostate. Such an irrevocable fall would indeed, without some such gracious experience, have been impossible. What was expressed by ἄταξ φωτισθέντας -- etc., at ch. vi.4sq., is expressed here by the simply indispensable ἐν ᾧ ἡγιασθη .". The interpretation of Rom. 14,15 is forced, necessitated by the postulate of double election, and thus limited atonement on the part of Christ, which simply does not exist in Scripture, as will be shown below.

Then there are the arguments of reason which have been advanced by the Reformed. John Owen^s, one of the greatest of the Puritan theologians, brings us into the dilemma thus (Quoted by Franks, Op. cit. p.137, from "The Death of Death in the Death of Christ". 1647): (If it is said that Christ died for all) "then one of these two things will necessarily follow: - that either first, God and Christ failed of their end proposed and did not accomplish that which they intended, the death

192

of Christ being not a fitly-proportioned means for the attaining of that end (for any cause of failing cannot be assigned); which to assert seems to us blasphemously injurious to the wisdom, power, and perfection of God, as likewise derogatory to the worth and value of the death of Christ; or else, that all men, all the posterity of Adam, must be saved, purged, sanctified, and glorified; which surely they will not maintain, at least the Scripture and the woeful experience of millions will not allow". That Christ died for only the elect, then, is the Calvinistic solution of the crux theologorum, for which Scripture gives no solution. As will be shown below, we are to believe that Christ died for all men, that they are truly redeemed. On the other hand, Scripture gives as the reason for the damnation of some that it is their own fault for rejecting the Gospel, and not a divine decree of reprobation. (Hos. 13,9; Matt. 23,37; Acts 7,51)

Remensnyder (Op. cit. p.85) quotes Hodge (Systematic Theology, vol. 2, p.558) approvingly as follows: "Augustinians do not deny that Christ died for all men. What they deny is that He died equally and with the same design for all men . . . He was a propitiation effectually for the sins of His people, and sufficiently for the sins of the whole world". But we cannot approve of such a distinction, because it is not found or suggested in Scripture. It is suggested by reason, which judges from apparent results. How can it be denied, in the face of I John 2,2, that Christ was the effectual propitiation for the whole world? A denial of objective reconciliation is involved (Sections 13 and 20).

As a novelty we enter a summary of the doctrine of the Two-seed-in-the-Spirit Predestinarian Baptists, to show with what ridiculous conceptions the concept of an absolute decree are often bound: "Their position is somewhat difficult to explain. They say that, in creating Adam and Eve, God put something of His essence into them, and all the descendants of Adam who have received a portion of this divine essence are God's children ('seed of God') and were redeemed by Christ and will

be saved. But Satan, too, put into the first parents something of his essence, and those of their descendants who have become sharers of this evil essence, constituting 'the seed of the Serpent', are not among the people whose sins Christ atoned for, and they will be lost". (Pop. Symb. p.269)

Fortunately there have been many defections from strict Calvinism even among the Reformed. The Declaratory Statement of 1903, as mentioned above, allows for Arminianism in the words: "That men are fully responsible for their treatment of God's gracious offer". (See the paper on Calvinism in the Report of the Northern Illinois Distr. of the Mo. Syn., 1933, in which there is a section on defections from Calvinism). Great Reformed preachers, like Spurgeon, though they insisted on discriminating when treating of the doctrine *ex professo*, are clear and unmistakable in their presentation of universal atonement in their evangelistic sermons. So then though it may seem philosophically plausible to limit the extent of Christ's atonement, it is not, practically considered, conducive to the full assurance of salvation in the soul of a sinner.

Franks (Op. cit. p.92-93) brings us some interesting observations from Quenstedt's *Systema*: "Quenstedt divides his Calvinist adversaries into three classes: (1) the rigid, who say absolutely that Christ satisfied only for the elect; (2) the less rigid, who say that Christ satisfied sufficiently for all, efficiently for the elect only; (3) the school of Saumur, Amyraut, Cameron, etc., who teach hypothetical universalism, that Christ died for all, if only they believe, presupposing, however, an absolute decree of election restricting the gift of faith . . . Next Quenstedt refutes the arguments of the Calvinists. They urge that Christ would not pray for the non-elect (John 17,9): it is not therefore possible that He would die for them. The answer is, that we must distinguish between general and special petition: Christ refused to make the latter only . . . The Calvinists object that, if Christ died for all, He died

even for those already damned, which was vain. Quenstedt replies that it was not vain, for they could when alive have apprehended Christ's merit".

"Calvinism, denying universal grace, restricts the vicarious satisfaction to the elect. Scripture teaches that it takes in all sinners. 'He is the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world', I John 2,2; Matt. 18,11; John 1,29; Rom. 5,19; 8,32; 2 Cor. 5,15; I Tim. 2,5.6; Titus 2,11; Heb. 2,9; 2 Pet. 2,1. 'The human race is truly redeemed and reconciled with God through Christ'. F.C. Th. Decl. XI,15.28" (Also 29 and 34)"III,57; V.22; Ap. IV, 103f.; XIII, 8. S. A.,P. II,1.2." (Pop. Symb. p.54)

61. THE THEORY OF JEHOVAH'S WITNESSES.

Russell, Rutherford, and their followers (Millennial Dawn, International Bible Students, Jehovah's Witnesses) teach a combination of errors on the atonement. An explanation, with a few of the elements of error, is presented here briefly. It is gleaned from Pop. Symb. p.414-416.

(1) The elect only, to the number of 144,000 are saved during this present age. They are offered here as a part of the sacrifice of Christ. It is not really God's purpose to save anyone during the present era.

(2) "The ransom for all given by the man Christ Jesus does not give or guarantee everlasting life or blessing to any man, but it does guarantee to every man another opportunity or trial for everlasting life". (Russell, Vol. I, p.150) Thus a species of restorationism enters in also.

(3) Then there is a strong element of annihilationism. Those who are not saved either in this life or by reason of their second chance after this life are simply annihilated.

One can easily imagine the medley of errors connected with this view of redemption. We have handled the error of salvation for the elect only in section 60 and that of restorationism in section 53. Scrip-

tural proof that everlasting damnation, and not annihilation, awaits the wicked will be found in *Pop. Symbo.*, p. 134-135.

62. THE GOVERNMENTAL THEORY.

Dau gives us a fine historical introduction and definition of this theory (*Theol. Quarterly*, Vol. 20, pp.9.10):

"The penal view of the death of Christ was held also by Calvin. However, the practical view of Christ's death was limited to the elect. This limitation brought on a revulsion. Arminianism, justly shocked by the teaching of a divine decree that nullified to a great extent that marvelous act of reconciliation in which the justice and the mercy of God are both satisfied, proceeded to declare the sinner's reconciliation an act of his own free choice. Socinianism, attacking this matter from entirely rationalistic grounds, argued that punishment and forgiveness mutually exclude one another. Either the one or the other takes place, but not both. Moreover, the distributive justice of God which has to do with the individual man, not with the genus man, cannot permit the transfer of guilt from one to another. But, if for any reason sufficient to Himself God did undertake such a transfer, and accepted the penal offering of one for all, He is unjust if He does not forgive all. Both Arminianism and Socinianism strongly emphasized the suffering and death because of its exemplary effect on the moral nature of man. Against this theory the governmental theory of the atonement which Hugo Grotius advanced was inwardly too weak to save the day for Scriptural orthodoxy as regards the death of Christ, as Grotius earnestly hoped it would. It is plain that in his treatise on the satisfaction of Christ Grotius starts from Socinian premises. The point where he deviates from his opponent is reached when the argument begins as to the quality and character of that justice in God which necessitated the propitiatory sacrifice of Christ. For the distributive justice of Socinus, Grotius put rectoral justice. He viewed God not as judge sitting in judgment

on the crime of individual man, but as Sovereign and Governor presiding over the affairs of the human race. Public justice, the maintenance of God's equable rule on earth, demanded the sacrifice of the life of Christ. The death of Christ in the governmental theory becomes an overawing spectacle, which impresses the vulgus humanum as a deterrent from sin. Virtually this is, in the last analysis, another effort to make the atonement intelligible to man by way of its moral influence on man. That the offended justice of God received a satisfaction due it by the death of Christ is not denied, but it is not the element of primary importance!

Remensnyder (Op. cit. p.94) has the following observation on the theory: "The right to relax the laws demands at will belongs to His prerogative as moral governor".(cf. Franks, Op. cit. p.54) "But lest this encourage the sinner to transgress with impunity, Christ is allowed to suffer as a warning that sin shall not escape".

Grotius saw that to have any power his teaching had to be bolstered from another angle, so (Franks, Op. cit. p.60) he taught that "besides testifying to the divine hatred of sin and acting as a deterrent, the sacrifice of Christ reveals the love of God, who thought so much of sin that He gave His only-begotten Son to bear its penalties for us".

There are no such things as objective reconciliation or substitutionary sacrifice and satisfaction in Grotius' theory. Franks (Op. cit. p.67): "On the basis of Rom. 3,24.25, he develops the thought that the death of Christ is to be understood as a penal example, which God establishes in order to honor the law, while yet pardoning sinners. This penal example, then, is what Grotius means by satisfaction: how different the idea is from that of Protestant orthodoxy may be seen in that Grotius says that, no strict satisfaction being applied, a further condition of salvation can be demanded of men, viz. faith".

Grotius' writing are acute, but rather ponderous and strictly legal (he was well versed in law), without reverence for Scripture as the final authority in doctrinal matters.

Warfield observes (Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia, s.v. Atonement) that Grotius' theory was invented "in the effort to save something from the assault of the Socinians" and "has ever since provided a half-way house for those who, while touched by the chilling breath of rationalism, have not yet been ready to surrender every semblance of an 'objective atonement', and has therefore come very prominently forward in every era of decaying faith".

In the time of 18th century rationalism, Reinhard and others in Germany (Hagenbach, Op. cit. ^{II}_A p.498n) followed Grotius' principles. The movement is called Supernaturalism in Luthardt's Kompendium(p.240).

J. Edwards, Sr. (d.1758), whose agreement with Socinus in rejecting the atonement has been observed in section 40, modified the governmental theory on the following bases (Franks, Op. cit. p.184, summarizing from "Concerning the Necessity and Reasonableness of the Christian Doctrine of Satisfaction for Sin"): "(20) Some definitions require to be premised.

"By merit, I mean anything whatsoever in any person or belonging to him, which appearing in the view of another is a recommendation of him to that other's regard, esteem, or affection'(p.472). Merit, in short, is whatever recommends, irrespective of intrinsic worth.

"By patron, I mean a person of superior dignity or merit, that stands for and espouses the interest of another, interposes between him and a third person or party, in that capacity to maintain, secure, or promote the interest of that other by his influence with the third person, improving his merit with him, or interest in his esteem and regard for that end. And by client, I mean that other person whose interest the patron thus expresses, and in this manner endeavors to maintain and promote'(p.473).

"(21) These things premised, Edwards now argues:-

"(i) It is not unreasonable, that respect should be shown to one person in view of his union with another, or, what is the same thing,

on account of that second person's merit.

"(ii) In such a case the merit of the second person is imputed or transferred to the first; and these persons are so far substituted, the one for the other.

"(iii) This will fitly take place, in proportion to the closeness of the union between the two persons.

"(iv) It will take place, above all, where the union is the closest possible.

"(22) The union is perfect, when the patron's love puts him so fully in sympathy with the client, that he is willing even to be destroyed for his sake.

"(23) The person's intercession will especially avail, if he has manifested his interest in his client at his own expense. His hardships are calculated to purchase good for his client."

Very similar was the presentation of the younger Edwards (d.1801), the foremost proponent of the New England theology. (Franks, Op. cit. p.408n)

In all these expressions we see that a very fertile breeding place was being made ready for the germs of the variously expressed prevalent modern theories. The kernel of the Gospel is given up. The door is open for further speculation.

Warfield (Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia, s.v. Atonement) calls the governmental theory "American Methodism's regnant doctrine and the 'traditional orthodox doctrine' of the Congregationalists".

This theory reduces the concept of God's justice in punishment to that of a mere means of frightening into godliness, coupled with a taint of the moral influence theory (which see, section 68). A queer combination, indeed. There is an admitted relaxation of the justice of God (cf. Franks, Op. cit. p.54). Then the theory runs up against the absurdity that it accounts to man a more intensive feeling of justice than to God Himself. Its proponents will not accept the Scriptural

doctrine of the atonement, as it was brought out in our investigations in Part I.

63. THE ACCIDENT AND MARTYR THEORIES.

These two theories of Christ's death are so palpably weak that certainly none who read their New Testament can hold them and at the same time take the Bible seriously. They have always proved to^{be} untenable, because they have never been^{HELD} entirely unalloyed with heavy bolsters of dogmatic moralizings, in particular with the moral-influence theory (see section 68). Therefore the treatment of these two theories, the last named in particular, will be confined to a mention of a few of their exponents and a few remarks.

Even in the early Church, Origen "compares the death of Jesus with that of Socrates . . . and represents it as a moral lever to elevate the courage of his followers". (Hagenbach, Op. cit., I, p.186) Clement had kindred ideas.

The Socinians, Toellner, Steinbart (and the rationalists) "looked upon the work of Christ as summed up in the proclamation of the willingness of God to forgive sins, on the sole condition of its abandonment, and explained his sufferings and death as merely those of a martyr in the cause of righteousness or in some other non-essential way" (Warfield, in Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia, s.v. Atonement).

Forsch (Modern Religious Liberalism, p.92): "A pertinent example of the treatment of the Atonement in modern theology is offered by Walter Rauschenbusch, in his book 'A Theology for the Social Gospel'. This author devotes about thirty pages to the subject of the Atonement. He addresses himself to the task of showing that Jesus died for the sins of the world, not however in the Scriptural sense, but rather in the sense that everyone who suffered innocently and died a martyr, suffered and died for the sins of the world. But, if this be the right view, the question is in order, why is it that this author gives so much

space to the subject of the Atonement? What is there in his view of the Atonement that would justify his extensive treatment of this question? Why should theology concern itself particularly with the Atonement and the death of Christ, if He merely died the death of a martyr? This is precisely the point which Rauschenbusch fails to clear up. The unreality and artificial character of this liberal teaching on the Atonement is clearly apparent from Rauschenbusch's treatise. Having labored to show that Jesus died for the sins of the world, he says the death of Jesus is 'a matter almost negligible in the work^K of salvation'. And again he says: 'What the death of Jesus now does for us, the death of the prophets did for him' (p.262). After all is said, the fact remains that the denial of the Atonement, as taught in Scripture, not only takes the heart out of the Gospel message but it utterly distorts the picture of Jesus. Deny that His agony and His feeling of being forsaken of God were the result of His sin-bearing, and you are forced to admit that Socrates who innocently suffered death calmly and without agony, was greater as a martyr".

See Pop. Symb. (pp.360f; 363) for similar expressions of Jesus' martyrdom in the Creed of Modernism of Dr. Pierson and in connection with the concept of moral-influence.

64. THE GUARANTEE THEORY.

The germ of this theory, made famous by Schleiermacher and his followers, was found, often carried out to its later fulness, in the early Church. "Die alte Kirche betonte zunaechst mehr die Person als das Werk Christi und liebte es, in der Person selbst die Versoehnung Gottes und der Menschh. zu schauen, die sich dann in s. Leben u. Leiden nur vollzogen". (Luthardt, Komp. p.236) Irenaeus' conception of Anakephalaoosis, referred to in section 30, shows this tendency.

Hegel (d. 1832) held to a similar concept on the basis of his principle that the ultimate truth of philosophy is the identity of the Infinite and the Finite. Man is supposed to be taken into "divine con-
finite and the Finite. Man is supposed to be taken into "divine con-

sciousness" through "faith" in the divinity of Christ and His perseverance in testifying to His moral teaching and His mission of uniting God and man. (Franks. Op. cit. p.218ff)

But the theory reached full development under Schleiermacher (d.1834). Luthardt (Komp. p.247): "Schleierm. (Glbst. #100.101.104), welcher ueberhaupt das Werk Chr. hinter die Person dess. zuruecktreten und in der von Jesu ausgegangenen neuen Lebensgemeinschaft aufgehen laesst, weiss nichts von einer obj. Suehne, u. Genugtuung, weil nichts v. e. eigentl. Schuld der *sondern macht aus der obj. Versaechnung Gottes eine subj. Erloesung u. Suende,* Versoehnung des Menschen: die Aufnahme der Glaebigen in die Kraeftigkeit des Gottesbewusst. Chr. ist die Erloesung, die Versoehnung aber die Aufn. in s. Seligk., welche auch unter dem aeussersten Leiden sich behauptete, das er litt, indem er ein Mitgefuehl unserer Suende, durch deren Bewusst. wir unselig sind, hatte u. die Uebel des menschl. Lebens mittrug, ohne durch eigene Suende sie mit verursacht zu haben -- so dass also die Versoehnung hier nur etwas Zustaendiges ist". Hagenbach rightly emphasizes that the atoning principle here is a "vital union with him (Christ). (In this union he recognizes a mystical element, which he distinguishes from the magical as well as the empirical, assigning to it an intermediate place.) By means of this vital union we appropriate to ourselves Christ's righteousness (his obedience unto death); (Schleiermacher rejected the phrase that Christ fulfilled the law; he only fulfilled the Divine will) this appropriation, however, is not to be confounded with the mere external theory of vicarious satisfaction. But inasmuch as this single being represents the totality of believers, he may be rather called our satisfaction-making substitute." (Op. cit. II, p.500) Schleiermacher reverses the traditional phrase, making Christ a mere general "satisfactory vicar", His redeeming activity being merely "archetypal". Justification, then, is resolved into a process of sanctification, and Schleiermacher would have Christ as the power behind this process through His indwelling in man. The Scripture passages appealed to by Schleiermacher are not relevant to the subject

of atonement and reconciliation, but to sanctification and the indwelling of Christ after conversion. This is his *πρωτον ψευδος*. In quoting Rom. 8,1, he forgets that the doctrine of reconciliation has been presented in the third and fifth chapters of this letter (see sections 8, 12, and 20). In I John 1,8.9; 2, 1.2 the context shows the Scriptural doctrine of the atonement (cf. section 7 with reference to the latter passage). Gal. 2,19-21; 5,22-24 are irrelevant; ch. 3,10-13 presents the atoning work of Christ (cf. sections 1 and 2). Schleiermacher utilizes a pliable method of interpreting Scripture, considering it merely a formulation of Christian experience, he interprets it according to "experience", using a so-called "psychological exegesis".

Nitzsch, from whose development of the theory the name "Guarantee" was derived, "following Scheiermacher, endeavored (System der christlichen Lehre, p.238-248), to assign a more definite significance to Christ's passive obedience, which in the opinion of Schleiermacher, is only the crown of his active obedience".(Hagenbach, Loc. cit.) Pieper (Dogm. II, p.433-444) quotes Nitzsch-Stephan (Ev. Dogmatik³, S.597): "Mittelbar beruht allerdings die Versoehnung selbst auf der dem Heilsmittler gelingenden Gewinnung der Nachfolge, auf der Besiegung der Suendenherrschaft; denn dadurch, dass er das Gelingen dieser und die Sicherstellung des gotteinigen Lebens in einer von ihm zu gruendenden Gemeinde der Gottesherrschaft dem Vater gegenueber verbuergt, beschafft er die erforderliche Suehne. Aber die Versoehnung besteht vielmehr eben in dieser Buergschaftsleistung, nicht in der sittlich-religioesen Umschaffung selbst". Likewise Kirn (Dogm. p.118) Here again a man must be saved through sanctification. Surely Christ is our guarantee of salvation, but He is that because of His substitutionary atonement, arithmetically and juristically sufficient (sections 3, 40, and the last of 58). This is supported by Meyer, commenting on Rom. 3,24: "Die Befreiung vom Suendenprinzip"(from its dominion)"ist nicht das Wesen der *ἀπολύτρωσις* selbst, sondern ihre Folge durch den Geist, wenn die im Glauben angeeignet ist.

Jede Auffassung, welche die Erloesung und Suendenvergebung nicht auf die wirkliche Suehnung durch den Tod Christi, sondern subjectivierend auf das durch diesen Tod verbuergte und gewirkte Mitsterben und Aufleben zurueckfuehrt (Schleiermacher, Nitzsch, Hofmann), ist gegen das Neue Testament, eine Vermengung der Rechtfertigung und der Heiligung".

Rothe (d.1867) endeavored to spiritualize the system to a greater extent. According to him Christ "makes himself the instrument of the world's regeneration, by himself attaining the spiritual perfection through victory over temptation -- victory at the cost of life". (the expiation) "On this path he ascends to the glorified state, in which, through the Holy Spirit, he can act on the hearts of sinful men, and create in all who give themselves up to him, to be moulded in his image, a participation in sonship, and in the heavenly purity and blessedness which follow in its train".(Fischer, History of the Chr. Church, p.639)

The following remarks from Franks serve to knit together the above discussion: "Dorner"(d.1884)"is a true follower of Schleiermacher, in so far as he endeavors to understand the work of Christ, above all through His communication of life. He differs from Schleiermacher on the important point, that he conceives it possible for Christ so to identify Himself with humanity as to share its consciousness of guilt. Schleiermacher admitted the sympathy of Christ with human sin, but would not allow to Him a consciousness of guilt, and refused to regard His vicarious suffering as satisfactory; Christ's satisfaction he placed in His perfect obedience, which is through our fellowship of life with Christ the guarantee of our obedience also. Rothe, virtually agreeing with Schleiermacher, prefers, however, to call this guaranteeing obedience of Christ by the name of expiation; it is what makes our sin forgivable. But Dorner makes the satisfaction or expiation consist above all in Christ's vicarious suffering, or His entrance into humanity's consciousness of guilt and condemnation; in so far, therefore, he approximates to the

orthodox Protestant view of satisfaction, only that he abandons the idea of equivalence between Christ's sufferings and ours. It is important, however, to observe that, according to Dorner, the expiation is made only for generic, not for fully personal sin: the destruction of personal sin belongs to Christ's prophetic and kingly work, by which He takes men into a fellowship of life with Himself". (Op. cit. p.296) Despite these many intricate differences, Pieper is absolutely right in stating (Dogm. II, p.433n): "Wir haben es bei den Leugnern der Satisfactio vicaria Im Grunde immer mit derselben Sache zu tun. Nur die Ausdruecke wechseln".

Concerning Hofmann's theory of the establishment of a new righteous humanity in the person of Christ, we have already made intimations in section 41: Reconciliation in Christ, not through Him. Luthardt presents a summary of Hofmann's position at some length (Komp. p.248-249). Pieper's discussion of it is excellent (Dogm. II, p.431-433). From the latter we cull the following refutations: "Aber nicht durch das, was Christus in seine Person war, sondern durch das, was diese einzigartige Person zum Besten und an Stelle der Menschheit getan und gelitten hat, wurden die Menschen mit Gott versoeht. Der Hohepriester musste nicht bloss 'heilig', usw. sein, sondern auch sich selbst Gott als Schlachtopfer (θυσία) fuer die Menschen darbringen (Eph. 5,2), durch sein eigenes Blut (διὰ τὸν ἴδιον αἵματος) musste er in das Heilige eingehen (Hebr. 9,12); durch den Tod (τῷ θανάτῳ) seines Sohnes sind wir Gott versoeht worden, erloest sind wir durch das teure Blut (αἵματι) Christi als eines unschuldigen und unbefleckten Lammes (I Pet. 1,19), losgekauft durch seinen Gehorsam unter dem den Menschen gegebenen Gesetz (Gal. 4,4.5.)..... Meyer bemerkt gegen Hofmanns Versoehnungslehre: 2 Kor. 5,18-21 'enthaelt das gerade Gegenteil von der Behauptung Hofmanns, dass nicht sowohl durch Christum die Versoehnung geschehen sei als vielmehr in Christo, sofern naemlich in seiner Person ein neues Verhaeltnis der Menschheit zu Gott wiederhergestellt sei'. 'Nein,

der Tod Christi wirkt als ἰλαστήριον (Rom. 3,25; Gal. 3,13), mit-
hin als Gottes heilige Feindschaft, die ὁργὴ θεοῦ tilgend, so dass
er den Menschen nun die Sünde nicht zurechnete (v.19) und so auf die-
se Weise, actu forensi, mit sich versöhnte (v.21), wobei lediglich der
Glaube die subjective Bedingung der Aneignung auf seiten des Menschen
ist. Die Dankbarkeit, der neue Mut, das heilige Leben usw'. (auch die
unio mystica oder die Einpflanzung in den Leib Christi)'ist erst con-
sequens der im Glauben angeeigneten Versöhnung nicht Teil derselben".

In close affinity with these men is the group of mystics whose
theory Warfield (Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia, s.v. Atonement) calls
"Salvation by sample" or "by gradually extirpated depravity". It was
supported already by Felix of Urgel (d.818), an Adoptionist, and in
modern times by Dippel, Swedenborg, Menken, and Edw. Irving. "The es-
sence of this theory is that what was assumed by our Lord was human
nature as He found it, that is, as fallen; and that this human nature,
as assumed by Him, was by the power of His divine nature (or by the
Holy Spirit dwelling in Him beyond measure) not only kept from sinning,
but purified from sins and presented perfect before God as the first-
fruits of a saved humanity; men being saved as they become partakers
(by faith) of this purified humanity, as they become leavened by this
new leaven".

Interesting is the fact that in the Osiandristic Romish gratia in-
fusa we have a kind of precedent to all the views of this section. The
Formula of Concord (Th. Decl. III, 63) rejects: "That faith looks not
only to the obedience of Christ, but to His divine nature as it dwells
and works in us, and that by this indwelling our sins are covered before
God".

65. IHMELS' COMPROMISE.

Ihmels (d.1933) is a representative of the newer Erlangen school.
His conception of the atonement is an unsuccessful attempt at compromise

between liberal and biblical orthodox views, as Pieper so ably shows (Dogm. II. p.435-440). His theory approaches the biblical view very closely, and, as Pieper shows, his personal belief may have been a strong Christian faith in Christ's full atonement for his sins, but unfortunately he conceded also the liberal basis of doctrines, namely, "experience", and thus made statements which are distinctly anti-biblical. In his attempt to unite both the subjective and the biblical views, he ran into many contradictions. On the one hand, he, with Ritschl, denied the justice and wrath of God over sin, and on the other hand, he, to distinguish his tenet from Ritschl, stated that the human consciousness of guilt was not a delusion, but an expression of an objective reality in God. Again, he denied the "juridical" and exact atonement of Christ, but at the same time taught that Christ's death was required by the justice of God. He denied an "Umstimmung Gottes im Werke Christi", and at the same time maintained an "Aenderung der Gesinnung Gottes" toward men. Pieper shows that in reality the difference is one of words only. Ihmels objects to the first phrase on the grounds that it gives the impression that our reconciliation was forced from God, and that it assigns to God mutability, both of which conceptions are inconceivable. But Pieper answers that in the first place the reconciling love had its beginning in God, not being forced from Him (John 3,16; Rom. 5,8; I John 4,9.10), and in the second place, the objective reconciliation is complete in Christ -- all men are redeemed by the death of Christ. Therefore to say that there is an "Umstimmung Gottes im Werke Christi" is not erroneous. The phrase is derived from 2 Cor. 5,19 ("Not imputing their trespasses unto them"), as sections 13 and 20 show.

66. THE THEORY OF BLOOD EFFICACY.

Warfield (Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia) reports this theory as taught by Trumbull ("The Blood Covenant", New York, 1885) thus: He "looks upon

sacrifice as only a form of blood-covenanting, i.e., of instituting blood-brotherhood between man and God by transfusion of blood; and explains the sacrifice of God as representing communing in blood, i.e., in the principle of life, between God and man, both of whom Christ represents". The blood set free from Christ's body vitalizes ours, as it were, by transfusion. This view is held also by Wm. Milligan ("The Ascension and Heavenly Highpriesthood of our Lord", London. 1892), the Socinians, and in a modified form by B. F. Westcott ("The Victory of the Cross". London. 1888). The theory is distinctly mystical, or, we may say, magical.

None of the sedes doctrinae on atonement contain anything of this transfusion idea, nor can it be derived from any part of the Bible without a good deal of eisegesis. The Scriptural doctrine is certainly much more clear, less mystical and subjective, and more assuredly comforting. Our comments on Nitzsch and Kirn in section 64 apply also here in general.

67. THE DECLARATORY THEORY.

Since Ritschl (d.1889) is the foremost exponent of this theory in modern times, we present his view first. Dr. Engelder summarizes it (Dogm. Notes, II): "The love of God, who is not angry with the sinner, declared and revealed by Christ the prophet, awakens man's love, which love, with the realization of God's love, effects the reconciliation". This summary will serve as a basis on which to build the following explanatory remarks.

The two focal points of Ritschlian theology are "God" and "the kingdom of God". The latter term does not mean the church in the common dogmatical sense, i.e., the communion of saints, but rather it means the "moral association of mankind", mankind culturally bound together. The kingdom of God has for its purpose the attainment of a moral goal, the realization of the cultural idea. This is the purpose of God, the common goal of both God and man. The only manifestation of God that is useful in this system, therefore, is that of love. God has but one purpose,

and that is to ST arrive in cooperation with man to attain the common goal of God and man, i.e., the high moral ideal of the "kingdom of God". Thus God and the Kingdom of God are well made to order, so that the path is cleared for the rest of the system. (cf. L.u.W. 41,98)

Sin is simply a form of human "ignorance" (cf. section 6). It does not arouse the wrath of God, for God is simply immutable love. There is no such thing as God's penal righteousness. Such notions are a part of human "ignorance", and when this ignorance of man concerning sin is eradicated, and man realizes that God is only love, then reconciliation is effected. Scriptural passages proving the total depravity of man and his original sin are simply brushed aside (L.u.W, 41,99). Ritschl will indeed admit that God seems to be angry, but that is only to help believers to repentance, or it is necessitated by hardheartedness against God (L.u.W. 40,227).

"Rechtfertigung und Versoehnung". That is the name of Ritschl's famous three volume work. It will be noticed that the order of the two words in the title is turned to oppose the old orthodox order. This has its purpose, as Ritschl explains (Vol.1,2): "Der Titel, Rechtfertigung und Versoehnung hat den Sinn, dass die richtige Darstellung der Sache in der Linie gedacht ist, welche die Annahme einer Umstimmung Gottes durch Christus von Zorn zu Gnade ausschliesst". These are plain words. There is no reconciliation of God with men, but only of men with God. Men have simply to recognize that God is love, and not wrath. Thus in reality man makes himself righteous, and saves himself. cf. section 39.

But what is the place of Christ in this system? He admittedly does not occupy the place of the Redeemer, i.e., He did not work redemption in the place of men. Christ is supposed to have revealed God as fatherly love and to have destroyed the error of a wrathful and penal God by His works and courage in the face of death (Luthardt, Komp. p.250). How weak and comfortless is this Christ compared to that of the Bible!

What are the means by which the Ritschlian believer takes hold of redemption and becomes assured of it? Luthardt (Komp. p.250) has the following description of the doctrine: "-e. Erkenntniss, welche mit den entsprechenden sittl. Motiven in der Gemeinde Christi vorhanden ist, so dass, wer zur Gemeinde gehoert, in dieser seiner Zugehörigk. die Buergerschaft der auch ihm geltende Liebe Gottes u. damit die Ermoglichung seiner Berufserfuellung im Reiche Gottes hat". All this in spite of the existence of sin! Isa. 59,1-2: "Behold, the Lord's hand is not shortened, that it cannot save -- but your iniquities have separated between you and your God, and your sins have hid his face from you, that he will not hear". And "the wages of sin is death".

Ritschl naturally must do violence to Scripture in order to lay claim to its support. As to Isaiah 53, especially verses 4 and 5, he has many counter-arguments. He calls the whole chapter apocryphal, and explains that it is not in harmony with what he considers to be the biblical idea of sacrifice. The מְרַפֵּא שְׂלוֹמָנוּ in v.5 is merely an urging of the evil-doer toward betterment and toward peace. But see section 14. Dr. Fuerbringer (L.u.W.40,336) points out the inevitable substitutionary meaning of verses 4 and 5 in the force of the pronouns: "Er trug unsere Krankheit, und lud auf sich unsere Schmerzen. Er ist um unsere Missetat willen verwundet und um unserer Schuld willen zerschlagen. Die Strafe liegt auf ihm, auf dass wir Friede haetten, und durch seine Wunden sind wir geheilet". Luther translates the words

מְרַפֵּא שְׂלוֹמָנוּ מְרַפֵּא שְׂלוֹמָנוּ literally: "Die Strafe unseres Friedens auf ihm".

When we point as final proof of the substitutionary meaning of Isa.53 to the passages of the New Testament which substantiate this meaning (I Pet. 2,21-25; Heb. 9,28; I John 3,5; Acts 8,32-35; Mark 15,26; Luke 22,37), Ritschl calmly ignores these passages as doubtful, secondary in importance, etc. (Cf. L.u.W. 40,337-338) As to the clear statement of Jesus in Mark 10,45 and Matt. 20,28, Ritschl finds in it a theological riddle which is hard to solve. The interpretation he finally arrives at, after

much philosophical and exegetical gymnastics, is that Jesus gave His life in order that the believers might have certainty against death, and no more fear it, the weight of the $\alpha\nu\tau\acute{\iota}$ being eliminated. (L.G.W. 40,338-340) But see section 9 and 23. Cf. Ritschl's handling of $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha\gamma\eta$, section 13. Ritschl, like all other false prophets, has an uncanny way of making all Bible passages fit into his system. We prefer to abide by sound hermeneutical rules of interpretation.

Abelard, centuries before Ritschl, was a champion of the same error. It had, however, a more mystical touch, justification evidently being identified with an infusion of love. Abelard's theory, furthermore, was definitely combined with the moral influence theory, as will be pointed out in the next section. Then too, that was missing for which Ritschl consciously strove, namely, the two focal points around which the latter's system is built up. In short, Ritschl, is Abelardus redivivus, with a touch of the rationalistic chill, and espoused to philosophical systematization. (cf. Franks, Op. cit. I, p.188).

Menken (d.1831) is among those who must be mentioned as a forerunner of Ritschl. He held, however, to the reality of sin. Christ destroyed sin by His active obedience. But, as Ritschl held, God is not reconciled with men, but men with God. (cf. Luthardt, Komp. p.248)

Among English speaking theologians Erskine, as early as 1820, arrived at a theology based on the "Christian consciousness", though independently of the German theologians. His style was very popular and his doctrines were not presented in theological terms, as were those of the German theologians. According to his tenets man must save himself by his own acts. "The Gospel believed conveys us into the Spirit of Christ, conforms us to His sufferings and death". Christ is the second Adam, in whom all men are liberated. He has put mankind under a dispensation of redemptive, forgiving love. (cf. Franks, Op. cit. II. p.363-366) We see here the essential elements of the declaratory theory.

Among the many adherents of Ritschl's theology (sometimes in a more or less modified form) are A. Harnack, Kaftan, Haering, Schuerer, Herrmann, Schultz, Reischle, Kattenbusch, Gottschick, Achelis, Wendt, and, in America, George B. Smith of Chicago University.

The Universalists, already discussed in section 53, have a liking for this doctrine also. Quakers, putting great emphasis on the "second redemption", that within us, teach practically the Ritschlian doctrine (Pop. Symb. p.385). Likewise, the Swedenborgians teach practically the Ritschlian doctrine, that man is reconciled to God, and not God to man, and that only the love of God is manifested, the "union" of God and man being the essence of salvation. (Cf. Keyes, Vicarious Atonement, p. 3; section 39; Pop. Symb. ^{page 392} §) Ritschlianism abounds in the statements of the Modernists (Cf. Cadman, quoted Pop. Symb. p.363-364).

Some quotations from Warfield (Remensnyder, Op. cit. pp.xxvi-xxix):
"As one reads the pages of popular religious literature teeming as it is with ill-considered assertions of the general Fatherhood of God, he has an odd feeling of transportation back into the atmosphere of, say, the decadent heathenism of the fourth and fifth centuries, when the gods were dying, and there was left to those who would fain cling to the old ways little beyond a somewhat saddened sense of the benignitas numinis. The benignitas numinis! How studded the pages of those genial old heathen are with the expression; how suffused their repressed life is with the conviction that the kind Deity that dwells above will surely not be hard on men toiling here below! How shocked they are at the stern righteousness of the Christian's God, who loomed before their startled eyes as He looms before those of the modern poet in no other light than as 'the hard God that dwelt in Jerusalem!'------ Like Omar Khayam's poet, they are convinced, before all things, of their Maker that 'He's a good fellow and t'will all be well!'. "A benevolent God, yes, men have framed a benevolent God for themselves. But a thoroughly honest God, perhaps never. That has been left for the revelation of God

Himself to give us . . . a thoroughly conscientious God, we may be sure, is not a God who can deal with sinners as if they were not sinners. In this fact lies, perhaps, the deepest ground of the necessity of an expiatory atonement!.

This theory, as well as others for which it is claimed that a deeper theological significance is given to atonement, does not satisfy the conscience of man. It is ^{USELESS, PRACTICALLY.} practically useless. "Ritschl, in his History of Pietism (2,65), had severely criticized Paul Gerhardt's hymn: 'O Haupt voll Blut und Wunden' as describing physical suffering; but he begged his son to repeat the last two verses of that hymn: 'O Sacred Head Now Wounded' when he came to die". (Strong, Syst. Theol. p.739sq., quoted by Pieper, Dogm. II, pg.443, where accounts of the deaths of Schleiermacher, Grotius, and others are to be found)

68. THE MORAL-INFLUENCE THEORY.

The moral-influence (Moral-Power, Moral-Example) theory of atonement holds that "Christ's death was an influence upon mankind for moral improvement. The example of His suffering softens human hearts and helps man to reform, repent, and better his condition". (Mueller, Dogm. p.312)

As far back as Origen we find expressions like the above. To him, as it had been to his teacher, Clement, "the doctrine of the cross remains as comfort for those who are not yet strong enough to avail themselves of Christ's example". (Franks, Op. cit. I, p.53) In his De Principiis he urges the Christian to "cleanse himself from stains, in view of His example, and taking Him as the guide of his journey, enter upon the steep way of virtue; that so perchance by this means, as far as possible, we may by imitating Him be made partakers of the divine nature". (Loc. cit.)

Abelard taught that Christ's love kindles such love in our hearts (cf. section 67), by melting our hearts, as it were, that we show love in return. This love is that by which God blots out sin and with sin its guilt. (Cf. Hagenbach, Op. cit. II, p.47.48)

Mysticism, which stressed so much the imitation of Christ, led to some monstrous practices during the Middle Ages, and misled many people into self-righteousness. As Hagenbach points out (Op. cit. II. p.52-53), the Flagellantes and other ^{ASCETICS} ~~sects~~ professed to be imitating the very suffering of Christ, but "it must, however, be admitted, that as the spirit of self-righteousness was called forth, the merits of Christ were thrown into the shade". How well this coincides with Paul in Col. 2,23.

F. Socinus held that it was one of the objects of Christ's death, that it "was an example set before men for their imitation".(Hagenbach, Op. cit. II, p.360)

The Rationalists, especially those of the lower stripe, followed the arguments of Socinus, but with added stress and haughtiness. (Cf. Franks, Op. cit. II, p.190-203, on Steinbart, d.1809)

Kant is "the father of all Modernism, which, distinguishing between the Christ of faith and the Jesus of history, finds the doctrines of the Church profoundly true as ideas, though untrue if understood literally as referring to the historical Jesus".(Franks, Op. cit. p.216) Kant regarded the atonement "as an aesthetic religious symbol which exerts the most beneficial influence upon the pious mind . . . In the death of Christ, which is the greatest proof of his love, we see displayed both the magnitude of our depravity, and the victory over it". (Hagenbach, Op. cit. p.500, quoting Kant) "It is our duty to raise ourselves to this ideal of human perfection, for which duty the ideal itself can give us strength". (Franks, Op. cit. p.212) De Wette addressed the symbolical interpretation of Christ's death to the feelings of man, while Kant addressed to the understanding. It was a "needful aid for those who require a symbolical representation of abstract ideas".(Hagenbach, Loc. cit.)

In its bald form this theory was upheld by F. D. Maurice (with a mystical clothing), F. W. Robertson, and Auguste Sabatier ("universal redemption by love", i.e., anybody ^{who} loves is a savior as well as Christ).

(Schaff-Herzog)
 Horace Bushnell (d 1876) approximates to Schleiermacher and Ritschl.
 Horace Bushnell (d.1876) approximates to Schleiermacher and Ritschl

in his method of interpreting the Bible, and, with Ritschl especially, in his conception of justification as the reconciliation of the sinner to God, not of God to the sinner. Christ "operates in regeneration as the moral power of God. He is more than an example, more even than a revealer of God's love, so far as this means simple tender pity and sympathy. In Him the whole moral energy of God is manifested". (Franks, Op. cit. p.403) Bushnell says that Christ's "work terminates, not in the release of penalties by due compensation, but in the transformation of character, and the rescue, in that manner, of guilty man from the retributive causations provoked by their sins" (From "Vicarious Sacrifice", quoted in Pieper, Dogm. II, p.427. From Hodge, Syst. Theol. II, p.566) Bushnell used many, if not all, of the orthodox terms, but gave them a meaning which emptied them of the biblical import. He even admitted that "his system utterly lacked efficiency unless clothed in the altar-terms which belong to the orthodox system". (Remensnyder, Op. cit. p.200)

Of the presentations of this theory by S. T. Coleridge, John Young of Edinburgh, as well as that of Bushnell, Warfield says (Schaff-Herzog) that they are the most attractive form, showing Christ's love so ineffably that it "breaks down our opposition to God, melts our hearts, and brings us as prodigals home to the Father's arms".

Modernists use this conception of the atonement frequently. Dr. G. A. Barton claims that Jesus only longed "to help all men to live the satisfying life with God that he had lived". (Quoted in Th. Monthly, VI, p.216, from "Jesus of Nazareth"). G. B. Smith writes: "The salvation which we may have through Christ is located in the social power of the Christian community to transform from generation to generation the God-consciousness which is possible because of the moral courage and spiritual insight created by our acquaintance with Christ. (Social Idealism and the Changing Gospel, p.231)" (C. T. M., III, p.114). Fosdick finds in the cross of Christ "so perfect and convincing an illustration of the power of a boundless love expressing itself through utter sacrifice that

He has become the unique representative on earth of that universal principle and law . . . Jesus has supplied an object of loyalty for the noblest devotions of the generations since He came". ("The Modern Use of the Bible", p.230ff., quoted C.T.M., III, p.115) Modern text books, such as Stolz's "Pastoral Psychology", present this theory as a means of strengthening men. On page 108, in the chapter on "Religion as a Rallying Center", it is advised that the downcast be pointed to the "leadership of Christ", the "personality of Christ", and the "example of Christ", thus making him a hero instead of a coward in facing his problems.

The Universalist Ballou, at the beginning of the last century, taught that Christ's work was of moral significance only, demonstrating God's love, and reconciling man to God, not God to man. (cf. Pop. Symb. p.406-407) The doctrine is held by that church body to this day.

Also the Adventist Mrs. White taught that "Christ's work consisted chiefly in showing that the Law of God could be kept in humanity". (Op. cit. p.355)

Scripture does not support this theory. It makes man his own savior. What has been said against all theories of work righteousness in section 56 applies here. The doctrine of the whole Bible, as presented in the first part of this treatise, militates against the idea that Christ was a mere example or power for good. Especially the passages listed in section 27, showing that redemption is through the death and blood of Christ, speak against it. Cf. Ap. III, 58; F.C. Th. Decl. III, 4.15.55.57.

69. THE THEORY OF CHRIST AS THE PENITENT.

This theory gained prominence through the writings of John McLeod Campbell ("The Nature of the Atonement", etc. London. 1856) and R. C. Moberley ("Atonement and Personality". London. 1901). Warfield describes it (Schaff-Herzog, s.v. Atonement): "Our Lord, by sympathetically entering into our condition (an idea independently suggested by

Schleiermacher), so keenly felt our sins as his own, that he could confess and adequately repent of them before God; and this is all the expiation justice asks. Here 'sympathetic identification' replaces the conception of substitution; 'solidarity' of race unity; and 'repentance' of expiation".

The Deists, at the very outset of their new departure in theology, which was characterized chiefly by the setting aside of the Scriptures, incorporated the idea of repentance as satisfactory to God. Lord Herbert of Cherbury (d.1648) set down as one of the five points of natural religion, "that man should repent of sin, and that, if he does so, God will forgive him". (Franks, Op. cit. p.154)

John Locke set up as the two points of redemption, "repentance and faith". Repentance meant "not only a sorrow for sins past, but -- a turning from them into a new and contrary life". (Quoted by Franks, Op. cit. p.159) Faith was a simple and general belief in the Messiahship of Christ.

It was Campbell, who, picking up these and similar other threads on the concept of repentance, fully developed the idea of Christ as the substitutionary and exemplary penitent. Fischer (History, p.638-639) writes: "A Scottish theologian, J. McLeod Campbell, in a suggestive and devout volume on the atonement, makes its main element to be a repentance on the part of Christ -- the element of self-blame being, of course, absent -- for the sins of mankind. He realized in consciousness the full depth of human guilt, and the feeling of condemnation in the mind of God, and out of a heart thus complete in its sympathy with the holiness as well as the mercy of God, and with the guilty and forlorn condition of men, he prayed for their forgiveness. The means by which Christ attained to this consciousness was the experience of suffering -- the experience of death, which is 'the wages of sin'. He is thus and then enabled to respond with an 'amen' to the Divine condemnation of sin. Faith is the 'amen' of the sinful human soul to this response of

Jesus. The sonship which he has realized in himself he imparts to believers". Moberley incorporated the sacraments into his furtherance of Campbell's theory. They were at once the vehicle and symbol of the presence of the Holy Spirit, which is the indwelling of the Spirit of Christ. (Cf. Franks, Op. cit. p.434-435) These two theologians are at one with Schleiermacher in conceiving "salvation as essentially fellowship with God, brought about by the impartation of the Spirit of Christ". (Ibid. p.400)

A staunch defender of Campbell in America was Dr. Samuel Graves. We quote him (Baptist Qu. Rev., Vol. 5 --"A Study in the Atonement"): "The Bible, as I understand it, gives no theory of the Atonement, attempts none . . . But I doubt whether there have been furnished data enough in the Bible, with the light which at present breaks up from it, to offer a satisfactory solution to these problems, or to give us anything more than materials for the construction of a tentative theory of the Atonement. (p.195)

"I quote from Dr. Campbell ('Nature of the Atonement'): 'That oneness of mind with the Father, which toward men took the form of condemnation of sin, in the Son's dealings with the Father in relation to our sins, takes the form of a perfect confession of our sins. This confession, as to its ^{own} nature, was a perfect amen in humanity to the judgment of God on the sin of men. He who was the Truth could not be in humanity and not utter it. He who would intercede for us must begin with confessing our sins; and in this confessing he bore the burden of our sins, which had in it a severity and intensity of its own, a fulness and a depth of meaning which made it a sacrifice for sin, coming from the depths of the humanity of Christ as a response to the divine condemnation of sin'. And this response of Christ in humanity to all the demands of the law is the true expiation of sin, and meets the claims of righteousness, not on the plane of law, where they never can in reality be met -- for punishment does not mend broken law--(Gal. 3,1⁰₉; 4,4) but

on that of grace, where they can be, and to which the whole matter of the Atonement is lifted. (p.210-212)

"The chief objection to Dr. Campbell's view in the minds of many -- and this is a most serious objection -- is that it seems to lack Scriptural backing. Certainly on a mere proof text showing, it finds meager support. Nor does it lie so on the surface of Scripture as to commend it to a superficial reader. But if, as is claimed, it lies in the very grain and soul of the Scriptures themselves, which, on this subject have been misapprehended and misinterpreted by reason of the theories of the Atonement, which have heretofore prevailed, and which have given coloring to the interpretation, and can so be shown by a better exegesis, which shall take into larger account the figurative use of language, the Eastern type of thought, the Old Testament imagery, the altar-terms which are so largely employed by the New Testament writers to illustrate and popularize this doctrine -- if by these and kindred considerations which are influencing at the present time, as never before, Biblical interpretation -- this objection, the chief, and I think the only serious one, will be met and gradually disappear. (p.213)

"Every true believer, in order to do effectual work in the saving of men, must be, in his measure, a Christ to them; must make a kind of Atonement for them by taking the souls and sins of lost men upon himself, and bearing them in compassion, confession, and intercession to God". (p.216) (This is Roman supererogation. Cf. Ps. 49,7.8; Matt. 25,9)

These statements are in themselves a good refutation of the theory for a Christian who regards Scripture as God-inspired in its entirety. These interpretations are making their way into modern commentaries, as Dr. Dau shows (Th. Quarterly, 20, pp.11.12). A masterly refutation of Graves' article was written by Dr. Pieper in Lehre und Wehre, Vol. 29, and we shall draw on this article when we briefly refute Campbell's theory below.

The idea of Christ as the exemplary penitent and the producer of

penitence has been incorporated into Modernism's proclamations. (Cf. Pop. Symb. p.364: Cadman)

Warfield (Remensnyder, Op. cit. xxii-xxiii): "The essential emphasis in all these transition theories falls obviously on man's own repentance rather than on Christ's. Accordingly the latter falls away easily and leaves us with human repentance only as the sole atoning fact -- the entire reparation which God asks or can ask for sin. Nor do men hesitate today to proclaim this openly and boldly. Scores of voices are raised about us declaring it not only with clearness but with passion... Again, we are told that Christ enters sympathetically into our condition, and gives expression to an adequate sense of sin. We, perceiving the effect of this, His entrance into our sinful atmosphere, are smitten with horror of the judgment our sin has brought on Him. This horror begets in us an adequate repentance of sin. God accepts this repentance as enough; and forgives our sin. Thus forgiveness rests proximately only on our repentance as its ground; but our repentance is produced only by Christ's sufferings: and hence, we are told, Christ's sufferings may be called the ultimate ground of forgiveness".

A study of only a few of the passages listed under section 27 will show that repentance, according to the Scriptures, is not at all the atoning factor in Christ's work, but rather His death and the shedding of His blood. I Pet. 3,18: "For Christ hath also once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh . . ." Isa. 53, 5 shows the same substitutionary punishment of the Messiah to be the price of our redemption. Note especially the $\text{7 } \text{D } \text{10}$, Strafe, Zuechtigung, chastisement (section 14).

Barnes ("Atonement", p.161-184) has the following objections from natural religion over against any theory of mere repentance:

"1. It is clear that repentance is not what the law demands. No law of God or of man contains this as a part of its requirement, that there shall be repentance for a fault; that is, that an offence may be tolerated by the law on condition that there shall be
offence may be tolerated by the law on condition that there shall be

a suitable expression of penitence after the offense has been committed. Law knows but two things, -- the absolute precept, and the penalty: the one to be obeyed, the other to be suffered.

"2. It is a matter of fact that mere repentance does not remove the effects of sin and restore an offender to the condition in which he was before he committed the offence. --- Does repentance bring back the property that has been squandered in gambling or dissipation, the health that has been ruined by debauchery and intemperance?

"3. Equally is it clear that mere repentance does not remove the effects of crime on the conscience of the offender himself. Even though all the external consequences of sin could be averted by an act of penitence, still, there would be consequences of guilt on the mind itself which would not be removed. Remorse, the sense of self-dissatisfaction, the apprehension of what might occur hereafter, would still remain".

70. The theories described sections 63 to 69 are not sharply defined in their practical application by their adherents. Often the Modernist will combine as many of them as he chooses when he writes and preaches. (Cf. Cadman in Pop. Symb. p.363-364) Cumulatively they form the recognized stream of modern atonement theology. This theology is expressed even in books on religious instruction. "The Kingdom of Love", by Blanche Carrier, and "How to Teach the Old Testament", by F. J. Rae, a radical, are among the books in wide use by religious instructors of children. Other books on the subject in general are "Emme and Stevick: Principles of Religious Education", Soares: "Religious Education", and Betts; "How to Teach Religion" (esp. ch.7). These books unstintingly reject or entirely ignore the atonement and other fundamental doctrines.

71. THE THEORY OF EDDYISM.

Mrs. Eddy denies the Scriptural doctrine of the atonement. Kildahl ("The Chief Teachings of Christian Science", etc., 8): "Mrs. Eddy writes *atonement at-one-ment, and says that it is the exemplification of man's* atonement at-one-ment, and says that it is the exemplification of man's

unity with God, that Jesus taught and demonstrated this oneness with the Father, and that He did His work aright, 'to show mortals how to do theirs, but not to do it for them' (pages 18 and 19 of "Science and Health, etc., the Three Hundredth and Forty-ninth Thousand, 1905)". P6p. Symb. (p.450) quotes "Science and Health", etc., as follows: "The atonement is a hard problem in theology; but its scientific explanation is that suffering is an error of sinful sense which Truth destroys. (p.23) "Jesus bore our sins in His body. He knew the mortal errors which constitute the material body, and could destroy these errors." p.53".

All this in spite of the clear presentation of the atonement doctrine in Scripture. Without a doubt Mark. 10,45; Rom. 5,10; I John 1, 7; Isa. 53,5.6. need such "scientific explanations".

72. GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE FALSE THEORIES OF ATONEMENT.

There are certain marks or "touchstones" by which one can determine whether the views of any man on the atonement are correct or not, when he says or writes a few words on the matter. Already in section 26 we have shown that error in the matter of atonement brings with it error in every other doctrine. There are general characteristics which all these theories bear, with a few exceptions in certain cases, which we shall point out. We shall make no attempt to enter our full examination of each particular false theory, but in this section we shall simply point out a few of the general characteristics of the theories, with notations as to exceptions or doubtful cases.

Dr. Jacobs says ("Summary of the Christian Faith", quoted in "The Lutheran View of the Atonement", Keyser, p.18): "They (the moral theories of the atonement) spring from a superficial view of the guilt of sin and all that it implies. The more sin is minimized the less need is felt for any satisfaction. The result at last is that, with the native goodness of the human nature exalted, nothing is left for which a satisfaction is deemed necessary, and the entire life of Christ on

earth, ending with His heroic death, is made simply an incentive to evoke virtue in men, and especially to enkindle love of God and all that is godlike". This superficial view of sin is a characteristic of all the theories we have mentioned, with the exception of the denial of the active obedience, for we cannot say that the teachers of this view deny the guilt of sin and its entire satisfaction through the sacrifice of Christ. (Cf. section 28 on sin).

Remensnyder says aptly (Op. cit. p.140): "In general, Rationalism is that tendency which, in matter of faith, makes reason the measure and rule of faith . . .'. . . The atonement is the last discovery which could have been made by the human reason. Hence where it, over against revelation, is made the test of what God did, or could have done, in the work of redemption, the atonement is dismissed with curt tolerance". Every one of the theories taken up in Part III owes ^a measure of falsehood to the degree in which human reason was made the master, over against the plain words of Scripture, in determining the doctrine.

Nor are these theories "legitimately entitled to be called theories of the atonement. Rather should they be designated schemes by which to minimize and evade the atonement. In fact, a feature of our day is the use of this word theory as a plausible cover for emptying a Christian doctrine of its core and substance". (Ibid. p.96) The statement of Machen at the end of section 28 applies here with full force. With the possible exception of the Triumphantorial theory and the denial of the active obedience, the teachers of every theory of atonement have as one of their objects, if not the chief one, the minimizing and evasion of the Scriptural doctrine of the atonement.

Especially with regard to the modern views, we must say that they are all of a this-worldly type. (~~Their outlook and hope center on this present life, and the next life is an incidental consideration, if any at all.~~) ^{OMIT} (~~Sections 63-70~~) ^{OMIT} The seriousness of sin and the biblical view of the kingdom of God cast out, there is no profit from a consideration

of the world to come. But Christ saves us eternally (Hos. 13,14; Heb. 2,9,15; 2 Cor. 5,15).

"By their fruits ye shall know them'. Every other idea of the atonement has resulted in a paralysis of earnest and persistent effort toward the evangelization of the world. Neither missionary nor martyr are its fruits. It has no victorious power. The great doctrine of the atonement needs peculiarly to be studied in the light of its triumphant achievement and its rare fruitage. The world may have advanced wonderfully in scientific achievement -- but never can it safely get away from the cross. That would be no progress, but a retrogression to the dark ages. Never, while sin and conscience and death last, will the great redeeming sacrifice lose its power. The experience of mankind will ever cling to it as the hope and anchor of the sin-burdened, storm-tossed spirit, and as the fructifying seed of spiritual life" (Remensnyder, Op. cit. p.201) . Though this element, the lack of fruits, does not seem to be evident in all the false theories, it is certainly true that a false view of the central doctrine of Christianity will be a hindrance in practical work. With the modern teachers especially, who scoff at the very idea of "saving souls", we must say that no progress is added toward the enlarging of the kingdom of God, for that is done by saving souls through faith in the atonement wrought by Christ. Without Christ, the atoning, crucified, Christ, we can do nothing (John 15,5).

All man-made religions are law-religions, while the revealed religion is the Gospel-religion. All false theories of the atonement are law-religions, for they take away the foundation of the Gospel, the work of Christ. They must hold to the other alternative, which is the opinio legis, the central article of natural religion. Even the Triumphatorial theory comes under this head, for we find that its proponents stressed salvation by works as well as by the merit of Christ. (See section 66, at the beginning, for Origen's view; cf. section 52) The denial of the active obedience, as carried out by the modern theologians, *has become a law-religion. (cf. section 56).* has become a law-religion (cf. section 56).

All deniers of the objective reconciliation (objective justification) must necessarily teach falsely on the atonement. (See sections 8, 13, and 20) Dr. Pieper remarks (Dogm. II, p.426): "So ist - - bei der Lehre vom Versöhnungswerk Christi die Zweiteilung festzuhalten: man lehrt entweder eine objektive Versöhnung, oder man lehrt sie nicht. Sobald zutage liegt, dass die objektive Versöhnung aller Menschen durch Christi stellvertretendes Leben, Leiden, und Sterben geleugnet wird, ist das Fundament der christlichen Lehre aufgegeben". Again, because of the peculiar makeup of the theory including the denial of the active obedience, we cannot say that intrinsically it has this general characteristic. The Triumphatorial theory, as pointed out above, in practice incorporates work-righteousness into its system, and therefore does not allow the sinner to trust alone in the merits of Christ's atonement.

A decided characteristic of all the false theories of the atonement, even of the theory which denies the active obedience, in its modern development, is subjectivity. Denying the objective reconciliation, the true atonement by Christ, they render the whole theology on which they are built subjective. Dr. Walther (Quoted in Dr. Engelder's Notes, Means of Grace, #25): "The characteristic of our dear Evangelical Lutheran Church is her objectivity, this meaning that all her doctrines by their very nature keep man from seeking his salvation in himself, in his own powers, aspiration, performance, and condition, and lead him to seek his salvation outside of himself; while the characteristic feature of all other churches is their subjectivity, they all leading man to ground his salvation upon himself".

Justification is made a mode of sanctification in all the theories presented, in their consistent development. A man is not declared righteous (*actu forensi*) because of the substitutionary, objective reconciliation wrought by Christ, but he must make himself righteous and presentable before God. The sects which teach out and out work-righteousness (section 58) hold that righteousness is infused into men. This is at the

bottom also of all the modern theories.

The Scriptural doctrine is so unified and so closely bound to the atonement of Christ, that any tampering with this article results also in the falsification or denial of other articles. Let us hold to every Word of God!

73. CONCLUSION.

"Sobald zutage liegt, dass die objektive Versoehnung aller Menschen durch Christi stellvertretendes Leben, Leiden, und Sterben geleugnet wird, ist das Fundament der christlichen Lehre aufgegeben. Man mag dann seine Ansicht ueber die Versoehnung gestalten und benennen, wie man will: immer wird ganz oder teilweise dem Tun der Menschen zugeschrieben, was doch Christus allein vollbracht hat. Mit dem Seligwerden aus Gnaden, um Christi willen, durch den Glauben, mit Christi Heilandsehre und mit der Gewissheit der Gnade und Seligkeit ist es dann ein fuer allemal aus!"
(Pieper, Dogm. II, p.428)

"So hat denn die Dogmatik, welche die christliche Lehre in ihrem in der Heiligen Schrift geoffenbarten Zusammenhange darzulegen hat, vor allen Dingen die objektive, durch Christum gestiftete, vollkommene Versoehnung darzulegen und gegen alle Verkehrung und Abwaechung festzuhalten. Die Lehre verliert sofort ihren christlichen Charakter und wird zur heidnischen Werk-lehre, sobald die vollkommene Versoehnung aller Menschen durch Christi stellvertretende Genugtuung preisgegeben ist. Auch wird die ganze Lehre sofort praktisch unbrauchbar, da kein vom Gesetze Gottes recht getroffenes Gewissen eher zur Ruhe kommt, als bis es im Glauben sich einzig und allein auf die durch Christum bewirkte und im Evangelium proklamierte Versoehnung gruendet."
(1810, 415)

The clear and simple Scriptural doctrine was explained in the first part of this thesis, and defended against attacks in the second part. In the third part the various theories which have been substituted for the Scriptural doctrine of the atonement were weighed and

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

- Bard, Dr. P., "'Das Blut Jesu Christi'-nichts sonst-'macht uns rein von aller Suende'" Ein Bekenntnis. 1913. Friedrich Bahn, Schwerin i. Mecklb.
- Barnes, Albert, "The Atonement, in its Relations to Law and Moral Government." 1860.
- Bente, F., Historical Introductions to the Symbolical Books of the Evangelical Lutheran Church. Printed in the Triglot Concordia. C.P.H. 1921.
- Dana and Mantey, "A Manual Grammar of the Greek New Testament." Macmillan. 1928.
- Delitzsch, Franz, "Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews." Tr. Kingsbury. T. and T. Clark. 1872. A dissertation on the atonement, p.418ff.
- Engelder, Dr. Theo., Mimeographed Dogmatics Notes.
- Fischer, G. P., "History of the Christian Church." Scribners.
- Franks, R. S., "A History of the Doctrine of the Work of Christ." 2 volumes. Hodder and Stoughton.
- Graebner, A.L., "Outlines of Doctrinal Theology." C.P.H. 1910.
- Graebner, Dr. Theo., "God and the Cosmos." Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, Mich. 1932.
- Hagenbach, "A Textbook of the History of Doctrines." Tr. Smith. Sheldon and Co., New York. 1861.
- Horsch, John., "Modern Religious Liberalism." The Bible Institute Colportage Ass'n, Chicago. 1924.
- Keyes, E. R., "Vicarious Atonement, Unscriptural and Irrational." Philadelphia. (Swedenborgian pamphlet)
- Keyser, Leander S., "The Doctrines of Modernism, its Beliefs and Misbeliefs Weighed and Analyzed." The Lutheran Literary Board, Burlington, Ia. 1925.
- Keyser, Leander S., "The Lutheran View of the Atonement." Reprinted from the Lutheran Quarterly, April, 1916. Gettysburg Compiler Print.

- Kildahl, Dr. J.N., "The Chief Teachings of Christian Science Compared with the Teachings of the Bible." Augsburg P.H. 1930.
- Kretzmann, Dr. P. E., "The Religion of the Child and Other Essays." C.P.H. 1929.
- Luthardt, Chr. Ernst, "Apologetische Vortraege ueber die Heilswahrheiten des Christentums." 1871.
- Luthardt, Dr. Chr. E., "Kompendium der Dogmatik." Doerffling u. Franke, Leipzig. 10. Ausgabe. 1900.
- Machen, Dr. J.G., "Christianity and Liberalism." Macmillan. 1924.
- Machen, Dr. J. G., "The Origin of Paul's Religion." Macmillan. 1923
- Moenkemoeller, Wm., "The Festivals and Sacrifices of Israel." C.P.H. 1932.
- Mueller, Dr. J.T., "Christian Dogmatics." C.P.H., 1934.
- "Popular Symbolics." By Drs. Engelder, Arndt, Graebner, and Mayer. CP. H. 1934.
- Remensnyder, Dr. J. B., "The Atonement and Modern Thought." Lutheran Publication Society, Philadelphia. 1905.
- Robertson, A.T., "The Minister and His Greek New Testament." Doran. 1923.
- Stolz, K. R., "Pastoral Psychology." Cokesbury Press, Nashville. 1932.

REFERENCE WORKS.

- The Concordia Cyclopedia, edited by Drs. Fuerbringer, Engelder, and Kretzmann. C.P.H. St. Louis, Mo.
- "A Dictionary of Religion and Ethics," ed. by Shailer Mathews and G. B. Smith. Macmillan, 1921. Article "Atonement" by Mathews.
- Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics. Ed. James Hastings. Scribners, 1928. Vol.5 - Article "Expiation and Atonement (Christian)" by W. Adams Brown.
- The Lutheran Cyclopedia. Edited By Jacobs and Haas. Scribners, 1905.
- "The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge." Funk and Wagnalls, 1906. Article "Atonement" by Benj. Warfield.

PERIODICALS

- Dau, W.H.T., Did God Have to be Reconciled by the Death of Christ?*
- Dau, W.H.T., "Did God Have to be Reconciled by the Death of Christ?"

Theological Quarterly, Vol. 20, 1-13.

Dau, W.H.T., Review of H.M. Smith's "Atonement." Theological Monthly, 6, 30.

Engelder, Dr. Th., "The Active Obedience of Christ." Concordia
Theological Monthly, 1, pp. 810ff., 888ff.

Fuerbringer, Dr. L., "Ritschls Theologie." Lehre und Wehre, XL, 224-8,
234-41; XLI, 98ff., 162.

Graebner, A.L., "Doctrinal Theology, Christology." Th. Quart., IV, 145ff.

Graebner, A.L., "Doctrinal Theology, Soteriology." Th. Quart., V, 193ff.

Graebner, Dr. Th., "The Modernistic Christ." C.T.M., IV, 81ff.

Graves, Dr. Samuel, "A Study in the Atonement." Baptist Quarterly
Review, Vol. 5, (1883), pp. 193-218.

Hoeness, J., "A Pen-Picture of Christ Drawn from the Prophet Isaiah."
Th. Quart., III, 452ff.; IV, 42ff., 157.

Hoyer, Th., Review of C. F. Taylor's "Christ for Me!" C.T.M., V, 815.

Klyve, S.S., "The Bible Idea of Atoning Sacrifice over Against the
Conception of Sacrifice Held in Ethnic Religions, Especially
Those of China." Teologisk Tidsskrift, Bind IX, Hefte 4. (1926)

Kretzmann, Dr. P.E., "Christi stellvertretende Genugtuung als das wesentliche
Moment in seinem Erloesungswerk." C.T.M., III, 113ff.

Kretzmann, Dr. P.E., "Der Schriftgrund fuer die Lehre von der satisfactio
vicaria." A series beginning in C.T.M., V, 863ff. and
continuing into the next volume.

Mueller, Dr. J.T., Review of G. A. Barton's "Jesus of Nazareth."
Th. Monthly, VI, 218.

Mueller, Dr. J.T., On "The Ethical Conception of Christ" as expressed in the
"Presbyterian" of May 4, 1922. Th. Monthly, II, 261.

Pleper, Dr. F., on Graves' "A Study in the Atonement" in the Bapt. Qu.
Rev. Lehre und Wehre, vol. 29, pp. 345-58.

Preuss, Ed., "Die Rechtfertigung." Tr. J.A. Friedrich. Th. Monthly, VIII, 33ff.