

# CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY

---

Vicarious Satisfaction:  
A Study in Ecclesiastical Terminology  
HENRY W. REIMANN

The Vicarious Atonement in John Quenstedt  
ROBERT D. PREUS

Brief Studies

Homiletics

Theological Observer

Book Review

VOL. XXXII

*February 1961*

No. 2

# The Vicarious Atonement in John Quenstedt

By ROBERT D. PREUS

The last decades have witnessed some significant and provocative studies in the doctrine of the Atonement. Two of these studies particularly have stimulated interest by the way in which they have broken with the old Lutheran and Protestant treatment of the doctrine while attempting at the same time to be entirely Biblical in the approach and presentation of the doctrine. On the one hand, Gustaf Aulén classifies the post-Reformation teaching as only a slight and more logical modification of the doctrine of Anselm, a teaching dominated by the idea of satisfaction and the legal motif. In contrast to this, Aulén offers his well-known "classic idea" with its victory motif, and identifies this with Luther's teaching.<sup>1a</sup> Barth, on the other hand, primarily in Vol. IV, 1 of his *Church Dogmatics*, deals with the Atonement as a part of his discussion on justification and reconciliation. He feels that the forensic image so common in Scripture is the best point of departure in setting forth the doctrine of the Atonement and is to be preferred to the way in which Orthodoxy considered the matter, viz., under the locus on the sacerdotal office of Christ. Barth makes no sweeping criticism of the method and manner in which Orthodoxy treated this doctrine, although he cannot agree always with the conclusions of the older orthodox theologians. Barth, then, is much closer to the older doctrine than Aulén and seems to

have read the Reformed and Lutheran dogmaticians with more appreciation and understanding than Aulén — in fact, he often draws upon their arguments.

Because of the rather frequent reference to the old classical Lutheran doctrine of the Atonement and the rather scanty firsthand knowledge of this doctrine, and also because of the new approaches made to this doctrine in recent times, I have attempted here to clear the air, so to speak, to establish so far as possible in an article of this nature what Orthodoxy actually taught on this matter. It is my opinion that if we can overcome our antipathy to some of their scholastic terminology and the rather schematic order of their material, we shall discover that the old Lutheran theologians offer something which is remarkably well balanced and solidly Scriptural.

We might comment on Aulén's charge that Orthodoxy's doctrine of the atonement was one-sided. Quenstedt has discussed the object for which Christ's satisfaction was made under five points: (a) sin, (b) punishment for sin, (c) the curse of the Law, (d) the power of the devil, (e) death. All of these *obiecta* are somehow related to the idea of satisfaction according to this treatment, although in the last two cases the concept of satisfaction is not allowed to color or even enter into his exegeses so as to vitiate the thought and image of Scripture. The victory motif which Aulén finds in Scripture was not neglected or toned down by Orthodoxy, but was clearly set forth and given its place along with the other themes which Scripture uses in

---

<sup>1a</sup> G. Aulén, *Christus Victor* (New York, 1931), pp. 142 ff. R. Prenter, *Skabelse og Genløsning* (København, 1955), p. 448, seems to follow Aulén in his judgment of orthodoxy.

speaking of the work of Christ. On the other hand, it is clear that Quenstedt has offered far more than merely a logical modification of the legal satisfaction motif of Anselm, as Aulén charges. Barth<sup>1b</sup> is more Biblical than Aulén when he admits that he prefers the forensic image in setting forth the doctrine of Christ's work but that the ransom picture or victory motif might also be used as the point of departure in treating Christ's work. However, the procedure of older Lutheran dogmatics would seem to be far preferable when they dealt with the work of Jesus Christ under the title *Munus Christi sacerdotale*, for the Bible points more often to this "cultic" picture in speaking of the work of Christ. Barth says he prefers his forensic point of departure to the cultic, because the latter is not so meaningful today. We would probably disagree with Barth's choice and say rather that it must be our purpose as theologians to make Christ's high-priestly office meaningful also today. But at the same time we will grant that the forensic figure would not be the most unfortunate starting point in dealing with this doctrine. At any rate we can learn one thing from studying Quenstedt: he draws in every Scripture image which will help him to set forth the doctrine of the vicarious atonement. His treatment is well balanced and not dominated by a legal motif or any other. It is Aulén's doctrine which is one-sided, with its exclusive emphasis on the victory theme.

This study of a typical Orthodox Lutheran discussion of the doctrine of the vicarious atonement will, I hope, serve to show us two things: first, how much we

<sup>1b</sup> *Church Dogmatics* (Edinburgh, 1956), IV, 1, pp. 273 ff.

today owe to the orthodox Lutheran theologians for the theology which has been handed down to us, and second, how we can still learn from their careful, Scriptural treatment of all doctrine.

In this delineation I shall restrict myself to the presentation by John A. Quenstedt (1617—88). This, I believe, is fair and adequate inasmuch as Quenstedt was the Thomas Aquinas, so to speak, of Lutheran Orthodoxy, the last great representative. To anyone following his arrangement of material and noting his exegesis it will become evident that he was fair and meticulous in his work and drew from the best which his precursors had to offer. The strong exegetical basis for his entire treatment will be noticeable throughout. Quenstedt's systematic section on the Atonement actually presents nothing but exegesis of passages pertaining to the doctrine, arranged according to a quite skeletal scholastic outline.<sup>1c</sup> The reader will notice, too, how very closely Quenstedt's terminology and understanding of this great doctrine approximate what has always been believed and taught concerning the vicarious atonement within conservative Lutheranism. This fact alone makes a study like the following relevant and useful today.

1. Like the other Lutheran and Reformed theologians Quenstedt offers his treatment of the vicarious atonement within his discussion of the priestly office of Christ. His thesis is simple and straightforward:

The priestly office is a work of the God-man; accordingly Christ by the eternal

<sup>1c</sup> The present study is based entirely on Quenstedt's *Theologia didactico-polemica sive systema theologicum*, 1685, Part Three, Cap. III, Membrum II, "De officio Christi," Sec. 1, Th. 14 to 44.

counsel of God and by His own voluntary decision placed Himself in time under God's Law and did so on our behalf and in our stead. And by fulfilling that Law perfectly and by suffering all punishment He presented an obedience to divine righteousness which was sufficient to the last ounce (*ex asse*) and also freed us from the wrath of God, the curse of the Law, from sin and all evil. This obedience He now offers God the Father, and by His intercession He obtains everything good and needful for us. (Thesis 14)

We see from this statement that the priestly office of Christ is divided into two parts: satisfaction and intercession. We shall review only Quenstedt's treatment of the former.

Quenstedt begins his discussion by pointing out that the term *satisfactio* was not found in the Vulgate. However, the idea of satisfaction is expressed by many images of Scripture: (a) Restoration. Ps. 69:4: "Then I restored that which I took not away"; (b) λύτρον, Matt. 20:28; (c) ἀντίλυτρον, 1 Tim. 2:6; (d) Propitiation, 1 John 2:2; 4:10; (e) ἱλαστήριον, Rom. 3:24, 25; (f) Reconciliation, Rom. 5:10; 2 Cor. 5:18ff.; (g) ἀπολύτρωσις, Eph. 1:7; Col. 1:14; (h) λύτρωσις, 1 Peter 1:18; (i) ἀγόρασις, 1 Cor. 6:20, "Ye are bought with a price"; (j) ἐξαγόρασις, Gal. 3:13. Also other terms are used in Scripture, such as oblation, expiation, sacrifice for sins, etc.

The satisfaction and the merit of Christ are not to be taken as equivalents. There are a number of differences in the two concepts.

a. Satisfaction compensates for a wrong (*iniuria*) against God, it makes expiation (*expiat*) for sin, it pays a debt and frees fully from eternal punishment. Merit, on the other hand, restores us into a state of

divine favor, it gains for us a reward of grace (the grace of forgiven sins), it acquires justification and eternal life for sinners.

b. Satisfaction is a cause; merit an effect. Merit arises out of satisfaction. "Christ made satisfaction for our sins and for the punishment of sins, and thus He merited for us the grace of God, forgiveness of sins, and eternal life."

c. Satisfaction is something which has been rendered to the Triune God, not to us, although it was made *for us*. Christ, however, did not merit anything for the Triune God, but for us.

d. The humiliation of Christ, His obedience under the Law, His suffering and death, are both satisfaction and meritorious. The exaltation, resurrection, ascension, and session at the right hand of God are not works of satisfaction, but they are meritorious, thereby assuring our resurrection and reserving a place in heaven for us.

e. Satisfaction arose because a debt had to be paid (*satisfactio ex debito oritur*), but merit is not something owed, it is free. Quenstedt remarks that not all theologians observe these distinctions, but many speak of merit in a broad sense as embracing also the idea of satisfaction.

2. The One who made the satisfaction (*principium quod satisfactionis*) is Christ, the God-man. To illustrate this, Quenstedt considers two Scripture passages in great detail. (a) Is. 63:3: "I have trodden the winepress alone; and of the people there was none with Me." Here is a reference to the Messiah, who comes with red garments from Bozrah, who speaks righteousness and is mighty to save. This Savior treads the winepress alone. He conquers

the enemies, Satan, death, and sin, treads them underfoot, and gains complete victory. But not without wounds. He suffers and dies to gain the victory. (b) 1 Tim. 2: 5, 6. Just as there is only one God among all false gods, so there is only one Mediator. A mediator is one who intervenes or intercedes. He also may be one who placates another and brings peace where there was formerly wrath between two hostile parties. A μεσίτης is never one who merely reveals and interprets another's will (Socinus). Jesus is a Mediator of a new covenant by reason of the shedding of His blood in redemption. (Heb. 12:24)

This Mediator is described in the above passage (a) according to His personal majesty.

He is called man, but not an ordinary man or merely a man. The Mediator is One who, although He was God, was made man that He might fulfill the office of a mediator. Therefore the term man in this passage is not a person in the abstract, or what would be the same thing, the human nature in the concrete, but it is the entire person in the concrete, although only one nature, namely, the human, is referred to. This is seen from the fact that (1) this man is immediately called Jesus Christ and this name points to the entire unity of the Person, and that (2) this man is the One who gave Himself a ransom for all, v. 6. Now this is no mere man, but θεάνθρωπος, the God-man, for no mere man was able to effect such a redemption (Ps. 49:7). Therefore this man is clearly a singular man, who in the unity of His person is God and the Lord God (2 Sam. 7:19) . . . who is over all, God blessed forever (Rom. 9:5). . . . The apostle calls our Mediator in this verse man and not God because (1) it was for the sake of the mediatorial office that He

was made man, and (2) we then might come to this Mediator with greater confidence and flee to Him, as men to a man and brothers to a brother. (Thesis 2B, Obs. 3)

The Mediator is described in this passage (b) according to the dignity of His office. He is called Christ, the Anointed One, who according to His human nature was anointed with the infinite glory of the Holy Spirit. He is called Jesus, Savior, because that is the purpose of His office as Mediator, to save His people from their sins. (Matt. 1:21)

The satisfaction is accomplished by Christ with the participation of both the human and the divine nature, the divine as source and formally (*originaliter et formaliter*) and the human nature as a means (*organice*) by virtue of its personal union with the divine nature.

Note: The suffering and death of only the flesh of Christ could not free us from sin, from the wrath of God and the curse of the Law, and from eternal perdition, nor could it render an adequate price for redeeming the human race. No, the satisfaction for the sin of the entire world, the propitiation of divine wrath, the bruising of the serpent's head, the performing of perfect righteousness, required a divine and infinite power. Therefore the divine nature fortified the suffering flesh so that it did not sink under these sufferings, and it procured for these sufferings and death infinite effectiveness. (Thesis 29)

3. Quenstedt strongly insists that only the Triune God is the indirect object of the satisfaction. Against Him we have sinned (Ps. 51:4). Therefore the ransom and satisfaction must be made to Him.

The One to whom the satisfaction was made (*objectum cui*) was exclusively the

Triune God. The entire Trinity was offended with sin and angry with men; and because of the immutability of God's justice and the holiness of His nature and the truth of His threatenings, He could not remit sins without punishment (*impune*), nor can He receive men into grace without satisfaction. Therefore the human race was reconciled to the whole Trinity through Christ. And that old cuckoo-cry that no one can offer satisfaction to himself or mediate in respect to himself does not hold true. If the Father King is offended, the Son is offended, too; but nothing prevents the Son from procuring mercy for the one who is accused of the Father. Thus 2 Cor. 5:19 says: "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself," and in Rom. 5:10 we are said to be "reconciled to God through the death of His Son." (Thesis 30)

Quenstedt goes on to insist that there is nothing wrong according to 2 Cor. 5:19 with saying that Christ reconciled the world unto Himself, inasmuch as He is God, the subject of the action in the verse. Thus in this transaction God is the injured party and the party who is placating. He makes satisfaction to Himself as the injured party (*satisfecit sibi ipsi ut offenso*).

Quenstedt says that Rom. 5:10 teaches such a full reconciliation. Grotius had entertained the idea that the reconciliation was conditional, depending upon our accepting it all in faith. Quenstedt argues that our appropriating to ourselves God's deed is not the completion of the deed itself. The reconciliation through the death of the Son was accomplished *plene, imo plenissime*. "We were not redeemed or reconciled nor were our sins paid for in any way conditionally, but we were reconciled completely and perfectly and fully." This applies both to the actual carrying out of the reconciliation and to our appro-

priating it by faith. For faith is nothing else than accepting the finished reconciliation.

When we discuss reconciliation and satisfaction, we must bear in mind that God is a just Judge who demands satisfaction for every infraction of His Law. That God is a righteous God and deals with sin according to righteousness is brought out clearly in Rom. 3:25: "Whom God hath set forth to be a Propitiation through faith in His blood, to declare *His righteousness* for the remission of sins that are past." Here it is indicated that punishment for sin is necessary, either upon the guilty, namely, sinful man, or upon his surety (*vas*), Christ. "If God had been able to overlook man's transgression without satisfaction and without compromising His infinite righteousness, so great a sacrifice on the part of the only-begotten Son would not have been necessary. God, who is infinite, was offended by sin, and because sin is an offense and outrage and profaning of the most high God (I might call it *deicide*), it carries with it a kind of infinite wickedness . . . and deserves infinite punishment; and therefore it required the price of satisfaction which only Christ could pay." (Thesis 31)

Quenstedt insists against the Socinians that God must not be thought of merely as a private creditor (*creditor privatus*) but as a just Judge (*creditor publicus iudicarius*) who cannot let sin go unpunished without violating His own righteousness. According to 2 Tim. 2:13, God cannot deny Himself, that is, He cannot go back on His Word of promise or of threat. Sin is not something with which the one sinned against can do as he pleases, but sin is always in reference to God's righteousness,

which is of His very essence, and God cannot connive against His own righteousness. Certain scholastics had said that God by an absolute decree of His power could remit sin without any satisfaction.<sup>2</sup> Quenstedt claims that it is wrong to speak of such absolute power in God, for it conflicts (a) with the very nature of God, who cannot be not angry against sin, (b) with the integrity of God, who told Adam that he would die if he ate from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, (c) with the holiness of God, which is unchangeable and cannot remit any sin without punishment.

4. The real object for which (*objectum reale pro quo*) Christ made satisfaction is sin, all sin, original and actual, all sin which ever has or ever will be committed, even the sin against the Holy Ghost. This is shown in Is. 53:4 ff. "Surely He hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows. . . . But He was wounded for our transgressions, etc." (Cf. Matt. 8:17; Acts 8:32; 1 Peter 2:24, where the same fact is taught.) In the NT βασιτάζειν expresses the same idea of Christ carrying our sin. The object of this bearing and carrying are griefs and sorrows, which are to be taken as disorders of the soul, spiritual griefs and sorrows, that is, sins which are the cause of all punishment and of all sorrow and grief. This is clear from the context (v. 6) and from parallel references such as 1 Peter 2:24: "His own self bare our sins in His own body. . . ." That Christ carried our sins means that indirectly He carried also the miseries and sicknesses of our bodies (*portando peccata Christus etiam morbos portaverit*); and thus we have healing and for-

giveness. Commenting on Is. 53:8b: "For the transgression of My people was He stricken," Quenstedt says,

Our sins deserve wounds, our transgressions bruises, our iniquities stripes. But we were unable by suffering these wounds and bruises and stripes to free ourselves from sins and transgressions and to heal ourselves from iniquities. In such a manner there could be no satisfaction made to divine righteousness so that we should be whole and well. Therefore by a judicial imputation the Lord made the sins of all fall upon the Messiah: like a storm they would carry Messiah away, like an army they would destroy Him (עָנָה, v. 6, means to meet, to run against, to make an impact upon someone, to wield a sword. See Judg. 8:21; 15:12). Christ voluntarily bore that load of sin, the wounds, the bruises, the stripes; and thus He made satisfaction to God for us. (Thesis 33)

This is just a portion of Quenstedt's long discussion of the important Is. 53 passage.

The second passage for consideration is Titus 2:14: "Who gave Himself for us, ἵνα λυτρώσῃται ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ πάσης ἀνομίας." The δόσις points to Christ's giving Himself over to suffering and death, although He was delivered by other persons, viz., Judas (Matt. 26:15), the high priests (Matt. 27:2, 18), Satan (John 13:2), Pilate (Matt. 27:26), and also the Father (Rom. 8:32) out of His great love for mankind. These words "who gave Himself" (also Gal. 1:4; 2:20; Eph. 5:2) point to Christ's free and willing oblation unto the death of the cross, an oblation performed out of the most ardent love toward us. And so He gave willingly, not because He was forced; but He was moved only by His love for us, moved to give not gold or silver or animals, not another man

<sup>2</sup> Thomas Aquinas, *Summa theologiae*, Part III, qu. 46, art. 2.

or even all angels, but Himself (ἑαυτόν). Elsewhere He is said to give His flesh (John 6:51), His body (Luke 22:19), His blood (Luke 22:20), His life (Matt. 20:28). All this means that the whole Christ was given, not merely His body or merely His soul, but Himself, God and man.

Speaking next about the redemption which is expressed here, Quenstedt mentions that the redemption should be considered qualitatively and quantitatively. Taken *qualitatively*, Christ's redemption is a true and proper and satisfactory redemption and must not be regarded as something metaphorical (Socinus). When the apostle uses the term λυτροῦν, he is not signifying merely a liberation, but a real redemption and satisfaction, which was made with an adequate ransom (*interventu* ἰσορροποῦ λύτρου καὶ ἀντιλύτρου), 1 Tim. 2:6. It is true that the term redemption can be taken broadly as a mere freeing without any price, but in the present context and in other similar contexts there can be no doubt as to its meaning (cf. Matt. 20:28; 1 Peter 1:19, where the price is mentioned). Taken *quantitatively*, the redemption of Christ may be considered in respect to the *subjects* involved, namely, all sinners ("that He might redeem us"), or in respect to the *object* involved, namely, that from which all sinners are redeemed, i. e., "all iniquity." "All iniquity" means that there is no sin which is not covered by Christ's expiation.

The last passage to be discussed under the first *objectum reale pro quo satisfactum* is 1 John 1:7: "The blood of Jesus Christ, His Son, cleanseth us ἀπὸ πάσης ἁμαρτίας." It must first be noted that this blood is precious, because it is the blood of God's

Son (τοῦ υἱοῦ, 1 Peter 1:19 and Acts 20:28). To Him nothing can be compared in heaven or earth; therefore the ransom which is His life has infinite value before God, and we have τὸν πλοῦτον τῆς χάριτος θεοῦ διὰ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ, and we have reconciliation as well through His blood (Eph. 1:8; Col. 1:20). Secondly, this verse indicates the efficacy of Christ's blood to cleanse us from sin. Here we learn that Christ did not shed His blood merely to declare and show that God would cleanse us from all our sins, but Christ's blood cleanses us really (ὄντως). The work of cleansing is attributed to His blood. "The blood of Christ all by itself (*immediate*) produces and brings about this effect, viz., καθαρισμόν, cleansing, propitiation from sins." The Son of God is said to have washed us from our sins in His own blood (Rev. 1:5). [Cf. also Heb. 1:3: "Christ purged our sins," where the same *objectum reale* of the atonement is pointed to]

The second *objectum reale pro quo* of the vicarious atonement is the punishment for sin, both temporal and eternal. Christ made satisfaction for all the punishment which men deserved on account of sin, and that by enduring these punishments Himself. Again Is. 53:5 is cited. The מַשָּׁחַת is the guilt and blame against which punishment is brought. The punishment which was essential for our peace and our good was endured by Him. The peace here means *bonum impunitatis, pacificatio*, reconciliation with God (Rom. 5:9 ff.). "The punishment for our sins in Christ brought to us and acquired for us impunity, peace, and reconciliation with God."

More specifically the Scriptures speak first of God's wrath, as that for which atonement was made, for it is the wrath which

brings the punishment which is the sinner's due. Rom. 5:9 makes it clear that the suffering and death of Christ are a ransom by which the wrath of God is appeased and by which we are reconciled to God. The fact that Paul says in the next verse that we shall be saved by Christ's life, i. e., His resurrection, should present no difficulty. "Salvation from wrath is attributed to the death of Christ *respectu acquisitionis*, it is referred to the resurrection and life of Christ *respectu manifestationis, applicationis, confirmationis et actualis a peccato absolutionis*" (Thesis 34, β, Obs.). The wrath is eschatological (σωθησόμεθα cf. 1 Thess. 1:10: "from the wrath to come"). Quenstedt quotes Augustine: "God's wrath is not a disturbance (*perturbatio*) of His mind, but is His righteous decision to punish sin" (*De civitate Dei*, Book XV, c. 25).

The next specific *objectum reale pro quo satisfactum* is the curse of the Law. According to Gal. 3:13 and its immediate context we learn that all men are under the Law and obligated to obey it. But because of the sin clinging to us we cannot do this. Therefore we are under the curse (v. 10). But Christ redeemed all who were under this curse (cf. 4:5). The evil from which Christ redeemed us the apostle calls κατάρα τοῦ νόμου. This is much more than only saying that we were redeemed from the Law. The curse of the Law is the sentence of the divine Law, the damning sentence which metes out punishment against sin. This punishment is not only temporal but eternal. It was under such a sentence that we placed ourselves by our violation of God's Law (v. 10). The means by which we were freed from this curse the apostle first mentions in a general way

when he says ἐξηγόρασεν. The word means to buy back or redeem, and always denotes an acquisition which is bought with a price (2 Peter 2:1). The prefixed word (ἐξηγόρασεν), which Paul does not ordinarily use in similar contexts, is employed here to indicate the depth of misery from which Christ redeemed us and the firm and complete nature (*soliditas*) of His redemption (cf. Zech. 9:11). The apostle then proceeds to recount more explicitly the means by which we were redeemed from the curse. This he does with the words γεγόμενος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν κατάρα. The intensity of the noun is brought out by the composite ἐπικατάρατος which immediately follows. He who is cursed is detestable, abominable, hateful, damnable, in the eyes of God. And Christ is not simply called cursed but a curse, which means an outcast (κάθαρμα), *fex, excrementum*, destruction, filth, offscouring (1 Cor. 4:13; Gal. 1:8). The noun is used for emphasis, as when we call an infamous person (*scelustus*) wickedness (*scelus*).<sup>3</sup> Christ was made a curse, the curse of all curses descended upon Him. This thought must not be glossed over; just as the Word was made (ἐγένετο) flesh and made (γενόμενον) of a woman, He was truly made (γενόμενος) a curse, and that according to "the judgment of God which is according to truth" (Rom. 2:2). Against all who would take away the force of this statement the words of Chrysostom apply (*Hom. 10 in Job.*), "When Christ took on flesh for us, He took on the curse for us." The words of Augustine are also pertinent (*Con. Fau-*

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Luther, WA, 40<sup>1</sup>, 449: "Non solum igitur fuit Maledictus, sed factus est pro nobis Maledictum. Hoc vere est interpretari apostolicæ Scripturas. Nam homo sine Spiritu Sancto non potest ita loqui."

stum, 4), "He who denies that Christ was a curse denies also that He died." Here belongs also the reference to 2 Cor. 5:21, where Paul says that Christ became a great sinner. Thus Christ was covered and clothed, as it were, with the foulness of all sinners because the Lord laid the iniquity of us all upon Him (Is. 53:6), and consequently He was covered with the misery of divine wrath and curse and abomination against sin, and bore it away. (John 1:29)

The *pro nobis* depends upon Christ being made a curse. *Pro nobis* means not for our benefit but in our place.

Therefore the curse which we brought down upon ourselves by our transgression of the Law Christ bore and sustained for us by taking our place. That is to say, He paid by His Passion and death all the penalties which were owed by those who transgressed the Law. God imputed our obligations to His Son as to our Surety and Bondsman. On the basis of the Law God required from Him, as the one standing surety for the accused, the due penalties of sin. The Son voluntarily put Himself at the disposal of God the Father (Ps. 40:10, 11; Heb. 10:7, 9) and in our stead and place made Himself a bondsman on behalf of sinful man and a debtor. He took our cause upon Himself, that is, He undertook to pay all the debts of the world and to expiate all its sins. Thus the curse of the Law was not directed against the one who deserved it, but by an imputation arising from His suretyship against the One who took up our cause, and He truly felt and experienced that divine curse. (Thesis 34, γ, Obs. 3)

Christ was not made a curse in only a verbal or symbolic manner like the beasts of the OT which were merely types, but by implication and direct association, by im-

putation and involvement (*coniectioe imputatione et applicatione*). And Christ was not merely a curse according to our way of thinking, but He was a curse to God. Nor was there anything contingent or fortuitous about this occurrence, but it was according to the determinate counsel of God (Luke 22:22; Acts 2:23). Christ submitted Himself knowingly and willingly (John 13:1; 18:4; Heb. 10:7, 9; 9:14)

We can speak of still another specific *objectum reale pro quo* of Christ's atonement, namely, the power of the devil. Heb. 2:14, 15 must here be considered. "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 them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage." Notice first that the power of death is attributed to the devil, not, however, as a lord, but as a lictor and hangman. It is God, the Giver of the Law, who has absolute power over death, but since the entrance of sin into the world He allows the devil to be His hangman. The *κατάργησις* does not mean an annihilation of the devil but a taking away of his power and tyranny. The *κατάργησις* will occur most completely when all things are put under Christ's feet (1 Cor. 15:23-28; Rev. 20:14). The means of this victory and destruction is again the death of Christ. Through death He destroys him who had power over death, and this occurs partly by the confusion of Satan, whose machinations fail and bring about his utter disgrace, and partly through the overthrow of his power in that Christ broke the bands of death and hell and opened for us a way of escape (Ps. 68:20), and partly

finally by taking the devil captive, restraining his power and allowing him to harm no one belonging to Christ. Notice that the apostle in this passage does not say we are freed from death but from the fear of death. Although Christ has freed us from eternal death, which is the second death, and also from temporal death, which is the result of sin, so that death no more has any claim over us, still there is nothing more dreadful to a sinner than death. By fear of death the apostle means a bad conscience, which knows the just judgment of God and is disturbed by sin. By bondage he means the state of corruption; after the Fall and before regeneration all men are in such a state and are under the devil, they are unable not to sin and do evil and serve the devil. But from such servitude Christ freed us by His Passion and death, and when we become His we can bear not only the fear of temporal death but death itself, for He has suffered it in our place. The ἀπαλλάξιη points significantly to the great reconciliation of the human race with God whereby the wrath of God and curse of the Law which we deserved for our sins was endured by another, Christ.

We may speak finally of death and hell as a specific *objectum reale pro quo* of the atonement. Death, both temporal and eternal, is the result of sin (Rom. 6:23). Hos. 13:14 and 1 Cor. 15:54 tells us Christ is the plague of death and the destruction of the grave; thus He ransoms and redeems us from these enemies. Through Christ the destruction of death is effected: it is called κατάποσις, a swallowing up. This victory over death Christ really accomplished by descending into hell and taking captivity captive, being gloriously triumphant over the devil, death, and hell.

5. The personal object of Christ's satisfaction is the entire sinful race (cf. Rom. 5:6; 1 Peter 3:18; 1 John 3:16, where the context indicates that the ὑπέρ means in the place of, denoting a substitution).

According to God's serious and sincere good pleasure, by which He desires all men to be saved, we must say that satisfaction was made for *all* men, not just apparently or according to a particular way of thinking, but really and truly. This important fact is brought out explicitly in many passages from Scripture. Is. 53:6: "All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned everyone to his own way; and the Lord hath laid on Him the iniquity of us all." The hiphil of וַיִּפֹּד, which means to light upon, strike, encounter, denotes that sins have settled down upon the Messiah and like a torrent overwhelmed Him. The context shows that as the whole human race went astray, the sins of the entire race were laid upon the Messiah. Speaking to Matt. 20:28, Quenstedt makes note of the ἀντί, which would indicate that Christ was a victim in our place. The "many" is not to be taken in an exclusive sense for some, but extensively and universally for all (cf. this common Hebraism also in Dan. 12:2 and Rom. 5:19). Quenstedt comments next on Rom. 8:32: "God spared not His own Son, but delivered Him up for us all." God allows the torments and punishment to strike His Son and does not spare Him; He is tortured and crucified for us. But the apostle adds significantly "for us all." Here universal grace is set forth so that every sinner may have the promise of complete satisfaction for all his sins.

The same thought is expressed in 2 Cor. 5:14, 15, where it is said in so many words that Christ died for all, meaning clearly

that the death of Christ was effective and adequate as a ransom for all sinners. Quenstedt expends great pains showing how the words of this verse teach (1) that Christ's death was a true death; (2) that it was a vicarious death; (3) that it was universal in scope. The clause "then all were dead" will admit no limitation to the universal effect of Christ's death. In passages like this the *fnis competens* of Christ's death must always be borne in mind. It is not an absolute death; it is always spoken of in reference to sin, the curse, the world. It is the world which has been reconciled to God, and the Word of reconciliation is to be brought to the whole world. Surely no one would seriously think of restricting the preaching of the Word to only some. The meaning of the verse then is quite simple. When Christ died for sin, it was according to God's reckoning as though the whole world died for sin.

Quenstedt has some interesting comments on Heb. 2:9: "That He [Jesus] by the grace of God should taste death for every man." What is implied when it is said that Christ tasted death? The term *γεύεσθαι* is employed with death in a number of other passages where the context points without doubt to physical death (Matt. 16:28; Mark 9:1). However, in John 8:52 the *γεῦσις θανάτου* must be understood as referring to eternal death, or hell. For here the words *οὐ μὴ γεύσῃται θανάτου εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα* can only point to *θάνατος αἰώνιος*. This is the death which Christ, the Captain of our salvation, tasted: a death corporal and temporal, but spiritual and eternal as well. The death which He endured was, of course, not eternal by virtue of its duration, for that was accidental to eternal death. But in that Christ

endured pains of soul and the horror of being forsaken by God, He suffered eternal death and the suffering of hell. A second point to be observed is that Jesus tasted death "for every man." Notice the use of *ὑπὲρ παντός*, *pro omni*, not *ὑπὲρ πάντων*, *pro omnibus*: Not just the human race as a whole has been benefited by the death of Christ, but He has tasted the pains of eternal death in the place of each and every sinner. Finally we are to notice that Christ tasted death for each and everyone according to the *grace* of God. Christ's death did not happen out of necessity or because we were deserving of anything from God, much less because there was any guilt associated with His life, but Christ tasted death *χάριτι θεοῦ*, because God is merciful toward us and wants His Son to die for us.

The *ὑπὲρ πάντων* is brought out also in 1 Tim. 2:6, where Christ, the Mediator between God and men, is called a ransom (*ἀντίλυτρον*) for all. That the "all" does not mean only the elect is seen from v. 1 of the same chapter, where Paul urges prayers and intercessions to be made for all men (*ὑπὲρ πάντων ἀνθρώπων*), and again in 4:10, where this Mediator is said to be the "Savior of all men" (cf. also John 4:42; 1 John 4:14), and in the most immediate context of v. 4, which announces the will of God to save all men and to lead them to a knowledge of the truth.

That Christ's vicarious work extends to all the world is brought out again by John 1:29, where the term "Lamb of God" may be understood *analogically* as pointing back to the Passover victim spoken of in Ex. 12:3 ff. and elsewhere. The Paschal Lamb was a type of Christ who was to be the Sacrifice for us (1 Cor. 5:7). But the term must also be taken *materially* as the true

Lamb which all the Old Testament offerings only prefigured. Therefore the emphatic ὁ ἀμνός, contrasting this Lamb with all the Levitical lambs as the One who the prophets had predicted would come and wash away sin. This is no ordinary lamb, but is the Lamb of God, the One appointed by God Himself to be a victim. "Therefore He was the true Lamb of God, the heavenly Lamb, the Lamb who was Himself God, the Lamb who offered Himself to God that He might perfect the saints" (Rom. 3:25). The αἴρων denotes the act of carrying or bearing, the transferal of a burden and as well the bearing of a transferred burden. The burden which Christ carried is sin, and He bore this burden as One guilty of sin (Lev. 5:5), as One taking the burden away from another (Is. 38:17). The burden is the singular ἡ ἁμαρτία, which is the reading in the best ancient MSS. By ἡ ἁμαρτία is not to be understood only original sin (Bellarmine), but everything which can be called sin, all sin collectively. There are many other passages where the singular ἡ ἁμαρτία refers not to original sin, but to specific acts of sin (cf. John 8:46; 15:22, 24; Rom. 3:9, 20). Finally it must be noted in this passage that the term κόσμος means all men and cannot be narrowed to future generations (Socinians) or those who have been chosen for eternal life by some absolute decree (Calvinists).<sup>4</sup>

The last passage taken up by Quenstedt

<sup>4</sup> Cf. *Canons of the Synod of Dort*, II, viii: fuit enim hoc Dei Patris liberrimum consilium, et gratiosissima voluntas atque intentio, ut mortis pretiosissimae Filii sui vivifica et salvifica efficacia sese exereret in omnibus electis, ad eos solos fide iustificante donandos, et per eam ad salutem infallibiliter perducendos. (*Acta Synodi . . . Dordrechtii habitae Anno MDCXVIII et MDCXIX* [Leyden: Isaac Elzevir, 1620], p. 251)

to illustrate that Christ's vicarious atonement extends to the entire world is 1 John 2:1, 2: "And He is the Propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world." The "He," of course, is Christ θεάνθρωπος who in the unity of His natures became our ἰλασμός by suffering and dying and shedding His blood for us and thus destroying the works of the devil and bringing eternal righteousness to us. Of special importance in this verse is the οὐ μόνον, ἀλλά which denotes, according to Quenstedt, an αὔξησις, an intensifying of the meaning. By the οὐ περὶ τῶν ἡμετέρων δε μόνον the apostle is indicating all his readers who believe, all believers at that time, both Jews and Gentiles, for his epistle is catholic and addressed to all. If all believers of all times are included in the first part of the statement, then the contrasting καὶ περὶ ὅλου τοῦ κόσμου of the second half of the verse can only mean the entire human race.

The apostle contrasts a part with the whole (ὅλος ὁ κόσμος), that is to say, he contrasts himself and other believers with the entire human race; he is not contrasting some believers with other believers, nor does he distinguish between believers in respect to time and place. By the words ὅλου τοῦ κόσμου are understood all men, even those who are lost. Thus the sense of the verse must be this: Christ is the ἰλασμός not only for the sins of believing Christians, but of each and every sinful man and thus also of the damned. For here we have not only the general term κόσμος, which quite often in the Sacred Scriptures embraces men of all ages (Rom. 3:6, 19; 5:12, etc.), but we have added another term of universal connotation ὅλου τοῦ κόσμου, "of the whole world." This is done so that we do not suppose that propitiation has been made only for some, but rather

believe that propitiation has been made for all men in the world equally through Christ. (Thesis 36-II, β, Obs. 3)

The basis which establishes the vicarious satisfaction is the value (*pretium*) of the entire obedience of Christ. This obedience includes (a) Christ's perfect obedience of the Law, and (b) His suffering the punishment which was due transgressors. "By *doing* He made compensation for the guilt which man wrongfully incurred, and by *suffering* He bore the punishment which man rightfully was to suffer." Thus we commonly speak of active and passive obedience. Quenstedt proceeds to speak in a more detailed manner of this obedience and its twofold nature:

Christ made atonement for sinful man in a twofold manner: first, by performing a complete and perfect obedience of the Law in our place and in this way fulfilling the Law; second, by taking upon Himself the punishment and curse of the Law which we had merited by our disobedience and willingly suffering all this. The point is that man not only had to be delivered from the wrath of God, the righteous Judge, but he also had to stand before God with a righteousness which he could not acquire except by the obedience of the Law. Therefore Christ undertook both tasks. He not merely suffered for us, but He also fulfilled the Law in all things, to the end that His fulfilling of the Law and His obedience might be reckoned to us for righteousness. (Thesis 37, n. 1)

Quenstedt then points out that the distinction between active obedience and passive obedience (which he traces back to St. Bernard) is not the most fortunate one. For the passive obedience must not be thought of as excluding the active, but rather including it. In His deepest suffering Christ

was active and willing.<sup>5</sup> All three passages chosen by Quenstedt to support his thesis that the basis of the vicarious satisfaction is the obedience of Christ refer to the so-called active obedience. In Quenstedt's polemical section these passages are taken up in proving that Christ perfectly fulfilled the Law in our stead.<sup>6</sup> Quenstedt no doubt feels that he has already discussed sufficiently the Scripture passages dealing with the suffering and death of Christ. The first passage for consideration is Ps. 40:6, where the Messiah speaks, "Thou hast opened Mine ears." This was the common way in which a Hebrew would indicate his willingness to obey the Lord (Ex. 21:6; Deut. 15:17). Thus when the Messiah speaks these words, the meaning is: "Thou, O God, hast brought Me, Thine only-begotten and beloved Son, into Thy continuous service. To this continuous obedience I give Myself as a faithful Servant." The opening of the Messiah's ears denotes a prompt, steadfast, and perfect obedience which the Son of God performed when He took upon Himself the form of a servant and became obedient unto death (Phil. 2:7). It must be noted that Hebrews, ch. 10, verse 5, follows the reading in the LXX in quoting this passage, "A body hast Thou prepared Me *σῶμα δὲ κατηρτίσω μου*." There is no difference here between the meaning of David and the New Testament when, quoting the LXX, it sub-

<sup>5</sup> Quenstedt's caution here reminds us of Gerhard's words (*Loci theologici* [Tubingae: Sumtibus I. G. Cottae, 1762], VII, 70 a): "To separate the active and passive obedience of Christ is to upset and reverse the whole order of things and to substitute for the whole righteousness and obedience of Christ only a certain part of it."

<sup>6</sup> *Systema*, Part Three, Cap. III, Membrum II, "De officio Christi," Sec. 2, Quaes. 3.

stitutes "body" for "ears." The Hebrew  $\text{הִפְתָּח}$  means not only to dig or open but also to prepare by digging and opening and thus to give the means of hearing and obeying. The LXX and the New Testament merely substitute an antecedent action for a consequent one, or a means for an end. The result is that there is this extension of meaning: The Son is to be provided a body in order that His ears may be opened and He may obey the Father in accomplishing our redemption. "Hence the  $\text{κατατίζω}$  corresponds beautifully to the verb  $\text{הִפְתָּח}$ . For all these things were accomplished at once: The flesh was united with the Logos; at the same time the flesh was enriched by the excellencies of the divine nature; and at the same time also the flesh was appointed to the priestly office." (Thesis 37, *ad* Ps. 40:7)

Citing next Matt. 5:17, Quenstedt remarks that the  $\text{κατάλυσις}$ , which is placed in opposition to the  $\text{πλήρωσις}$ , points to more than just a violation and transgression of the Law; it points to an abolishing of the Law. Contrariwise the  $\text{πλήρωσις}$  is more than a mere explaining of the Law; it is a perfect obedience and conformity of Christ's whole life and of all His actions.<sup>7</sup>

Citing finally Gal. 4:4, 5, Quenstedt points out how the purpose of Christ's being made under the Law was that ( $\text{ἵνα}$ ) He might redeem us. The  $\text{ἵνα}$  clause shows conclusively that the basis of our redemption was Christ's obedience under the Law.

6. What is the nature of this satisfaction? What precisely takes place? A payment in kind and entirely adequate is made for all that we owed. Put slightly differ-

ently, Christ freely took upon Himself our whole debt; God in divine righteousness imputed this debt to Him, and He paid it fully: thus the Messiah says, "I restored that which I took not away" (Ps. 69:4). After a full exegesis of Ps. 69:4 Quenstedt proceeds to emphasize that Christ's payment was entirely in kind and entirely satisfactory. He says:

This payment of another's debt which was freely undertaken by Christ and imputed to Him according to divine judgment was not sufficient just because God accepted it. God did not, out of liberality, accept something in this satisfaction which was not in itself sufficient. Neither did God by demanding rightfully the punishment due us, a punishment which was taken by our Bondsman (*Sponsor*), relax any of His justice. No, in the satisfaction Christ endured everything which the rigor of God's righteousness demanded, even to the degree that He experienced hellish punishments, although not in hell and not eternally. At the same time there is, of course, here a certain tempering of divine mercy and divine justice and a sort of softening of the Law in this, that the Son of God Himself took His stand as our Bondsman and Satisfier, that the satisfaction which He brought was accepted, that another Person was put in the place of those who were actually guilty; but this takes away nothing from the satisfaction itself. Hence the satisfaction of Christ is completely sufficient and final in itself by virtue of its own intrinsic, infinite value. This infinite value arises from two facts: 1. the Person making the satisfaction is infinite God, 2. the human nature by means of the personal union was made to share in the divine and infinite majesty, and therefore its suffering and death are regarded as having infinite value and worth as though belonging to the divine nature. (Thesis 39—40)

<sup>7</sup> Cf. p. 405, 1715 ed.

The last sentence of this statement is so important to a proper delineation of the doctrine of the atonement that Quenstedt feels constrained to repeat briefly what he has already said in great detail in his discussion of the personal union and the second genus of the communication of attributes. He confines himself to a study of one significant Scripture passage, Acts 20:28: Ὁ θεὸς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν περιποιήσατο διὰ τοῦ ἰδίου αἵματος. The subject in this verse, the *causa efficiens* περιποιήσεως *ecclesiae*, is God in the proper and absolute sense of the word, i. e., the one true and infinite God. That the subject is not God the Father (Socinians), but Christ or *Deus ἕνσαρκος*, Quenstedt attempts to prove in the following manner: (a) Scripture indicates that Christ possesses the church equally with the Father. For instance, 1 Cor. 1:2 speaks of "the church of God" as "those who are sanctified in Christ Jesus." Again in 1 Cor. 10:32 we meet the term "church of God," but again Christ is not excluded from the thought, for He is the "Lord" referred to in vv. 26 and 28 and clearly in v. 21 (cf. 1 Cor. 11:23, 32). (b) The reference to God's own blood indicates that Christ must be subject of the clause and that the τοῦ θεοῦ refers to Him. (c) Περιποίησις *ecclesiae* is never attributed in Scripture to the Father or the Holy Spirit but only to Christ (Eph. 1:14; 1 Thess. 5:9; 2 Thess. 2:14). (d) The God who has purchased the church with His own blood is the One who has instituted the ministry according to the context of the verse. This is Christ (Acts 20:24; 1 Cor. 3:11). The conclusion can only be that Christ, the Son of God, sheds His blood (which of course is a property of His human nature), and that this is an

act of God. The *mode* of this transaction of Christ is brought out by the περιποιεῖν, which in Scripture is used to express what takes place in bringing about our redemption (Eph. 1:14; 1 Thess. 5:9). We have here a redemptive transaction (*negotio redemptionis*) which does not imply that something is gotten without a price being paid, but rather that a possession is acquired by the correct payment of a correct price (*interveniente vera veri pretii solutione*), that is, we become Christ's own by the sufficient doing and suffering of Christ (*satisfactionis et satispassionis Christi negotium*). The περιποίησις is accomplished with God's own blood; therefore it is not a simple acquisition, but an adequate acquisition (*satisfactoria acquisitio*). The object of this περιποίησις is the church, the called of God, whom Paul commends to the care of the bishops and ministers, among whom grievous wolves will enter in, and out of whom false teachers shall arise. The context indicates that Paul refers to the church here not as the elect, but as the called, as the visible body which contains hypocrites along with the believers. The means of the περιποίησις is God's blood. It is called God's "own blood" not because it is natural to the Son of God, but because it is His personal blood.

7. On the part of God there are two purposes for the vicarious atonement. First, His divine justice must be satisfied, for God is not willing to remit sins without satisfaction being made. Quenstedt insists that this contention is not his personal conjecture, but is based solidly on what Paul says in Rom. 3:24-26. The δωρεάν here does not rule out a price paid (cf. Matt. 10:8; 2 Cor. 11:7), but human work-righteousness and merit. The *causa finalis* of

Christ's work here is ἔνδειξις τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ (v. 25). The δικαιοσύνη in this verse is to be taken as *iustitia* διανεμητική *et* ἀνταποδοτική, a righteousness which rewards or requites, not viewed according to the rigor of God's justice only, but as an evangelical, equitable righteousness (ἐπιείκεια *evangelica*). This righteousness is a modulation of righteousness and mercy. Thus God punishes the sins of others in His Son, who was made a bondsman for sinners.

The ἔνδειξις of God's righteousness consists in this, that the sins of the entire world were heaped upon Christ by a fair and equitable transferal, and these sins were punished in Him, although He was in Himself free of all sin. Paul points to this purpose [of the satisfaction] when he says in v. 26, "that He might be just," that is, that God might be recognized to be just in punishing with all severity the sins of the human race in His Son, the Mediator, and in not remitting sins except by means of and because of the bloody redemption of Christ and through faith in Him. (Thesis 41, *ad* Rom. 3:24-26, Obs.)

The second purpose of the vicarious atonement on God's part is to show forth the mercy which He has toward our fallen race. And how more clearly could He show His love for us than by sending His own Son to be our Substitute (Rom. 5:8; John 3:16; 15:13; Eph. 5:25; 1 John 3:16)? Commenting on the meaning of the ἀγάπη in these verses, Quenstedt has these touching words to say:

This is the love of God: rather than banish men eternally from heaven, He removed Himself from heaven, clothed Himself with flesh, became a Creature of a creature, enclosed Himself in the womb of the

virgin, was wrapped in rags, laid in hay, and housed in a barn. Nor does His love stop at this point; but after a life spent in poverty and adversities this love drove Christ to the ground on Olivet, bound Him in chains, delivered Him to jailers, cut Him with the lash, crowned Him with thorns, fastened Him with nails to the cross, and gave Him to drink the cup of bitterness. And finally this love compelled Him to die, to die for adversaries and enemies (Rom. 5:6). Continuously and in these sundry ways Jesus, who thirsted so greatly for our salvation, declared His love and mercy toward the human race. (Thesis 41, *ad* Rom. 5:8, Obs. 1)

The purpose of the vicarious atonement so far as we are concerned (*ex parte nostri*) is that we might have the perfect righteousness of Christ and be saved eternally. Here the first passage to be considered is Dan. 9:24: "Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people and upon thy holy city, to finish the transgression, and to make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to seal up the vision and prophecy, and to anoint the Most Holy." The angel is commemorating for Daniel the results and fruits of the vicarious suffering and death of the Messiah. The *first* result is the restraining of transgression, which in Hebrew denotes a malicious and persistent rebellion against the holy God. Significantly the verb used here means to subdue, hold back, restrain. Thus this restraining of transgression is like the imprisoning and subduing of a savage and unmanageable beast. This has been accomplished by the Messiah, lest any further trouble come upon our poor human race. Luther has correctly rendered the passage: *der Suende wird gewehret werden*. The

*second* result is the sealing up of sins. Here the Hebrew word  $\text{תְּאַרְחֵם}$  denotes every aberration from the standard of the Law, whether voluntary or involuntary, whether a sin of omission or commission. There is a variant reading of the verb in this strophe. The LXX and Luther seem to have followed a reading which would denote a sealing up of sin, thus a removal of sin from God's sight by an act of closing it off. The Vulgate and Aquila must have read  $\text{וַיִּלְחַם}$ , for they render the Hebrew by *finem accipiet* and  $\text{τοῦ τελειῶσαι τὴν ἁμαρτίαν}$  respectively. In this case the sense would be that an end is made of sins — not that they are no more, but that they are not imputed to those who embrace the merits of Christ. The *third* result is reconciliation, or the expiation of iniquity. In this verse  $\text{וַיִּצְוֶה}$  means the offscouring of the sins of the whole human race, the results of sin.  $\text{לְכַפֵּר}$ , which means to propitiate sacrificially, points to the erasing and wiping out of our iniquity. In the Old Testament the blood of the sacrificial beast (which was a type) propitiated for sin, and sin no longer remained in God's judgment. The sacrificial animal was looked upon as the one to which sin and guilt attached. In the same manner the Messiah makes a propitiation or  $\text{ἱλασμός}$ ; within 70 weeks He makes a propitiation by offering Himself as a victim (Eph. 5:2). The *fourth* result, according to this verse, is the bringing or restoring of everlasting righteousness (cf. Jer. 23:5, 6; 33:15, 16, where the Messiah is called "a righteous Branch" and "the Lord, our Righteousness"). Through Adam the original righteousness of man was lost (Eph. 4:24). The "everlasting righteousness" (*iustitia seculorum*) in the text is that original, primeval

righteousness. Now it is promised that this righteousness shall be restored. The Messiah will come with His perfect active and passive obedience, which will be imputed to believers. The Messiah will atone for sin, suffer our punishment, and render perfect obedience to the Law, not for His own sake, but for others (cf. v. 26). Thus it is not the righteousness of our works that is spoken of here; such a righteousness is only momentary and transitory and does not avail before God. It is rather  $\text{צְדָקָה עֲלָמִים}$ , not restricted to a certain time; it is the righteousness of faith (Rom. 4:11), a righteousness of infinite worth. The righteousness is called eternal because God from eternity decreed that this righteousness would avail before Him and be imputed to faith. It is called eternal righteousness also because of the Person who acquired it, a Person who is eternal and therefore performed in time an eternal and infinite righteousness. Finally it is called eternal because the fruits of this righteousness remain to all eternity.

The second passage which brings out the results of Christ's atonement *ex parte nostri* is 2 Cor. 5:21. Quenstedt is most thorough in dealing with this *sedes doctrinae*. The subject of the verse is  $\text{ὁ μὴ γινὼς ἁμαρτίαν}$ , viz., Christ (cf. v. 20). When Christ is said to know no sin, this is no reference to His divine omniscience (cf. 1 John 3:20), or to some sort of *negatio notitiae* on his part, but the reference is to His deeds (like the  $\text{τὸ μὴ ποιῆσαι ἁμαρτίαν}$  in 1 Peter 2:22 and Is. 53:9). Christ did no sin and was removed from any inclination toward and possibility of sin. In Him was only simple holiness and righteousness. The apostle speaks of the holiness and sinlessness of Christ according to His human

nature to bring out the fact that according to that nature Christ was made the subject of sin by imputation and was made a victim for sin. The explanation for the sinlessness of Christ is the personal union which we observe mentioned in v. 19, "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself." This "being in Christ" is not of the same kind as when God is said to be present in believers; rather it is the fullness of the Godhead dwelling in Christ (Col. 2:9); it is the divine nature and infinite essence of the Logos united with the flesh in the person of Christ. Thus in this union the human nature cannot be touched by sin.

Three things are predicated in this verse: (1) Christ is made to be sin by God, (2) He is made to be sin for us, (3) He is made to be sin that we might be made the righteousness of God. The term "sin" has several significations: it may denote the results or punishments for sin (Gen. 19:15), or it may denote the victim or sacrifice for sin (Hos. 4:8; Lev. 4:3; Ps. 40:6). Both of these meanings must be understood in the present context. Some (Socinians) have said that the verse means only that Christ was found among sinners, as Isaiah says, "He was numbered with the transgressors." But the term ποιεῖν ἁμαρτίαν is never found with such a meaning in Scripture. And the verse clearly says that Christ was sin according to the reckoning of God. "Hence Christ will be that very thing which God makes Him to be, that is to say, He will be a true sinner by a true and most real imputation. Nay, He will be the greatest of all sinners under the sun, as the abstract noun used here wishes to emphasize." The abstract is often used for the concrete or the substantive

for the adjective, and this for the sake of emphasis (Gen. 3:6; 12:2, etc.). Thus when God made Christ sin, the meaning is that He made Him a sinner, the greatest of all sinners. The verb ποιεῖν is used to denote a divine imputation (cf. Rom. 2:25,26). The making is an imputation and does not imply that there was any sin actually dwelling inherently in Christ. The ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν expresses substitution. "It is clear that Christ was made to be a sinner by imputation that He might be a substitute and representative in the place of our human race, although in His person He was and would always be utterly holy." Finally this text says that Christ was made sin that we might become the righteousness of God. The δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ is not the original or essential righteousness of God. It is indeed a righteousness which is foreign to us (*ex parte nostra aliena*), not inherent, but imputed to us by a merciful God. It is opposed to any righteousness which we work out for ourselves (cf. Rom. 10:3 and Phil. 3:9). The ἐν αὐτῷ tells us the nature of this righteousness. It is the righteousness of Christ acquired in His life and death, a righteousness which becomes ours through faith.

Here we have a most precious exchange taking place: Christ takes to Himself our sin that He might give to us His righteousness. He who in Himself is completely holy and inherently righteous has been made sin by the imputation of our sins. In like manner we who in ourselves are sinners and inherently unrighteous are made to be the righteousness of God, that is, we are made perfectly righteous before God by the imputation of Christ's righteousness. (Thesis 42, β, Obs. 2)

The third passage chosen by Quenstedt to express the fruits of Christ's satisfaction

is Heb. 9:11, 12. Here an eternal redemption is spoken of, eternal in the absolute sense. This redemption acquired by Christ is eternal in God's just reckoning because it was considered by the Father from eternity and into eternity and because it is eternally valid in that it frees us from eternal death and acquires for us an eternal inheritance. It is said that Christ by His own blood "found" this eternal redemption for us. This redemption was something no one else could "find." That Christ found this redemption means that He alone is its Author. And He found it only with much care and labor. The εὐράμενος expresses not only the idea that Christ laboriously worked out our redemption but also a judicial thought (cf. the use of the verb in Gal. 2:17; 2 Cor. 5:3; Acts 13:28). Thus the forensic idea is coupled with the image of redemption.

Another Bible passage bringing out the fruits of the vicarious satisfaction is Heb. 5:8, 9: "Though He were a Son, yet learned He obedience by the things which He suffered; and being made perfect, He became the Author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey Him." The learning which is here spoken of does not refer to a gradual comprehending of teaching and facts (*doctrinae perceptio*) but to a knowledge which is acquired by experience (*experimentalis notitia*). By experience Christ understood (*cognovit*) and became well acquainted with the difficulty of obeying God, the difficulty of suffering the crucifixion and actually dying the shameful death of the cross. He endured His Passion out of obedience, and therefore that suffering pressed Him all the more. The obedience is to be understood in the broad sense as having its beginning with

the κένωσις and the λῆμψις μορφῆν δούλου and as being accomplished in all the deeds and in all the sufferings of Christ until the last moment of His exinanition. The τελείωσις points to the perfect rendering of Christ's priestly work. A perfect sacrifice has been offered by this Priest. A perfect absolution has been acquired for all people. He is therefore said to have been made the cause (αἴτιος) of an eternal salvation to all who obey Him. Christ is called a cause of an eternal salvation by virtue of His execution and fulfillment of a duty given Him in the eternal counsel of the Godhead (Rom. 16:25; Eph. 3:9; Col. 1:26; 2 Tim. 1:9). The force of the αἴτιος must not be minimized (cf. Heb. 2:10). Christ is not merely a means (*causa media*) whereby we are saved; He is the Source (*causa principalis*) of our salvation; not merely the minister but also the Author and Lord of our salvation; He has merited salvation, and He gives it us. "Therefore the fruit of Christ's suffering and obedience is our eternal salvation, for by His obedience unto the death of the cross He not only merited eternal salvation for us but also imparts it to believers." (Thesis 42, δ, Obs. 3)

8. The vicarious atonement begins at the moment of Christ's exinanition and terminates with His death. Every act of Christ from the moment of His conception to His death was substitutionary. That He was in the womb nine months, that He was born in poverty, that He endured throughout His life misery, hunger, thirst, cold, etc. — all this He endured for our sakes and in our place.

9. Quenstedt concludes his discussion of the vicarious atonement with a final definition of satisfaction:

Satisfaction is an act of the priestly office of Christ, the God-man. From an eternal decree of the Triune God and for the sake of His great mercy Christ gladly and willingly substituted Himself as the Surety and Bondsman for the entire human race, which had been cast into unspeakable misery through sin. By taking upon Himself each and every sin of the whole world, by His most perfect obedience, and by His suffering of the punishments which men had merited He satisfied the Holy Trinity, who had been grievously offended, and that through the whole time of His exinanition on earth and especially in His last agony. By thus making satisfaction He procured

and merited for each and every man remission of all sins, exemption from all punishments of sin, grace and peace with God, eternal righteousness and salvation. (Thesis 44)

The purpose of this article has been to review the doctrine of the vicarious atonement as formulated in Lutheran Orthodoxy. The study has shown us not only that the Lutheran theologians of this era have left us a mass of useful terminology in this area but it has also demonstrated that they present a well-balanced and most timely Scriptural account of the whole doctrine.

St. Louis, Mo.