



CHRISTIAN DOGMATICS



by

FRANCIS PIEPER, D. D.

Volume II



9 780570 067139

COPYRIGHT 1951 BY
CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE
SAINT LOUIS, MISSOURI



Foreword

IN 1944 the Centennial Committee of The Lutheran Church – Missouri Synod requested Dr. Theodore Engelder to prepare an English edition of Dr. Francis Pieper's *Christliche Dogmatik*. Dr. Engelder had carried his work well into the third volume when our Lord called him to his eternal reward. Several chapters, however, in the second volume remained incomplete.

The undersigned therefore was asked to bring to completion the unfinished chapters on Christology and, in general, to supervise the publication of the second volume. This he did, and acknowledgment is herewith made of the fine co-operation of Prof. W. W. F. Albrecht, who presented the first English translation in mimeographed form about a decade ago and aided in the preparation of this volume, and of Dr. L. W. Spitz, who read proof and made many valuable suggestions.

The second volume of Dr. Pieper's work is of paramount importance because, beginning with the doctrine of divine grace and concluding with the *articulus fundamentalissimus* of the Christian faith, the *iustificatio sola fide*, it leads the student to the very core of sacred theology, namely, the doctrine of Christ's person and work.

Christology has always been counted central in Lutheran theology, for there are set forth the fundamental verities of Christ's deity and His vicarious atonement. There Lutherans attest the divine truth not only against Arianism, as it was revived in the post-Reformation period of Socinianism, or Unitarianism, but also against Romanism and Calvinism, which, though conceding the personal union of God and man in Christ, deny the communion of natures and the communication of attributes, in particular, the *genus maiestaticum*, or the communication of divine attributes to Christ's human nature.

For these reasons the author has treated these doctrines with special emphasis. To the casual reader too much detail may seem to be offered on the subjects. But Dr. Pieper's thorough presentation of the great Scripture teachings of the personal union, the communion of natures, and the communication of attributes gives his plain-spoken, thoroughly Lutheran dogmatics special merit. The editor knows of no other work in the field of theology which sets forth the doctrine of Christology with such fullness, Scripturalness, clarity, accuracy, and devotional appeal, both in thesis and antithesis, as does that of Dr. Pieper.

The differences between Romanism and Calvinism on the one hand, and Lutheranism on the other, are usually traced in other areas than in Christology, as, for example, in predestination or the means of grace. Some even regard the entire controversy between the Lutherans and the Reformed

on the communication of attributes as a mere logomachy, based upon misunderstanding of terms, or a mere question in semantics. Dr. Pieper, however, demonstrates with convincing logic that the Reformed denial of the *genus maiestaticum* is not only unscriptural and unreasonable even from the viewpoint of the Reformed, but inherently rationalistic and subservient to Unitarian heresy if logically carried through. It is only by a most fortunate inconsistency, that is, by not drawing the logical conclusion from the given premises, that Reformed theology at this point remains oriented to Scripture.

For reasons set forth in the Foreword to Volume I, a discussion of theological trends in recent decades has not been added. It is to be repeated, however, that Dr. Pieper's doctrinal presentation admirably exhibits the Scripturalness of Lutheran theology also against "enthusiasm" in its latest manifestations. We are sure that as a lucid and fearless witness against Romanism, Calvinism, and religious subjectivism, also in its modern forms, this dogmatics will prove itself most helpful to students of Christian doctrine today. Just now new reprints are being made of older orthodox theological classics, and many of them are enthusiastically bought and read. From his own rich and full experience as a faithful teacher of the Christian truth, Dr. Pieper here speaks to us out of the past as a reliable Biblical theologian and a convincing champion of the great Lutheran Reformation.

It has been said that his *CHRISTIAN DOGMATICS* is Scriptural in a pre-eminent sense. That is true, for not only does it draw all doctrines from Holy Scripture, but it is also eminently practical in the sense that it constantly appeals to the Christian's heart for the grateful response to the divine Word which has salvation for its goal. Dr. Pieper was fully convinced that the ancient saying, *Theologia est habitus practicus* θεόδοτος, is absolutely true and that for this reason no one has a right to teach theology who does not in all his theological endeavors seek to lead souls to Christ for salvation. The theologian who peruses this dogmatics with that goal constantly in view will glean from its study great blessings for the strengthening of his faith, the increase of his love to Christ, and the triumphant enlargement of his hope of eternal life. The devotional values of this great work on doctrinal theology are undeniably precious.

May rich and enduring blessings, then, rest upon this second volume of Dr. Pieper's *CHRISTIAN DOGMATICS* to the glory of God and the salvation of many souls, "purchased with His own blood" (Acts 20:28).

JOHN THEODORE MUELLER

St. Louis Mo.



Preface

IN this second volume the Christian doctrines of saving grace, of the person and work of Christ, of faith, of the origin of faith, and of justification by faith are presented. The purpose of a comprehensive presentation of the Christian doctrine and the method to be employed to that end have been set forth in the preface to the first volume. In this volume, too, I have endeavored to offer a modern presentation in the true sense. No dogmatics should be oriented to “the spirit of our age” or “the modern world view.” These are, as even the liberals concede, “fluctuating quantities.” A truly modern presentation of Christian doctrine, one that is “abreast of the times,” has two outstanding characteristics.

It is, in the first place, “oriented” solely to the Word of God, that is, it makes the Word of God its sole source of knowledge. This is a mark of a truly modern dogmatics because the Word spoken by the Holy Ghost through the Apostles and Prophets, as we now have it in Holy Scripture, was written not merely for the Apostolic age, but for the Christian Church of all ages, and so is the only *principium cognoscendi* of the Christian truth also for the Church of the nineteenth and the twentieth centuries. (John 17:20; Eph. 2:20.) Christ states explicitly that only by continuing in His Word shall men know the truth (John 8:31-32), and everyone who does not consent to the wholesome words of our Lord Jesus Christ is declared by His Apostle to be “puffed up, knowing nothing” (1 Tim. 6:3-4). Protestant dogmaticians of our day who refuse to accept Holy Scripture as the sole source of Christian dogma and substitute for it “Christian faith-consciousness” or “Christian experience” thereby abandon the principle which leads to sure knowledge of the Christian truth and cease to be modern in the true sense. In no other way than by continuing in the Word of Scripture as the sole source of knowledge, the sole norm of the Christian doctrine, do we remain abreast of the times in every century, in every year, in every day, in every hour — up to the moment when our Lord will return and change us who now believe in the Word into such as see Him face to face. The word of human teachers, of individuals or of entire church bodies, even when in full agreement with the Word of Christ, must never be looked upon as the source of divine truth, but only as a testimony to it.

To be modern in the true sense of the term a Christian dogmatics must, in the second place, take account of ecclesiastical developments both past and present. It must propound and maintain the truth revealed for all times in Scripture over against human deviations not only in the past, but also today. Ecclesiastical thought, for example, now discloses a strange “trend.” Because of the “progress of science” men find it impossible to accept Scrip-

ture as Christ did (John 10:35), as the infallible Word of God and so as the sole source and norm of Christian doctrine. The representatives of this "trend" are convinced that the safest and surest way to lay hold of divine truth is to set Scripture aside and to derive the truth from their own mind, adjusting it to their reason. It is impossible to reach a dogmatic understanding with this trend, for "a discussion becomes impossible if anyone denies the principle, namely, Holy Scripture" (*contra principium*, i. e., *sola Scriptura, negantem disputari non potest*). The only way to deal with this trend, also in the doctrines set forth in this volume, is to unmask the purported "science" as unscientific self-deception and its arguments as illogical.

At first glance it may appear strange that so much space was assigned to the doctrine of Christ's Person. I, too, thought of abridging the material somewhat, but finally decided against it. For one thing, modern theology, including the positive wing, has to a great extent flatly refused to teach the *enhypostasia* of the human nature of Christ, that is, the incarnation of the Son.* Then, too, we must take account of the fact that the Lutheran Church in America is living in a Reformed environment. The dogmatical works of such prominent Reformed dogmaticians as Charles Hodge and William Shedd have found their way into Lutheran circles. In these writings, however, the Christology of the Lutheran Church is violently, yes, even fanatically, assailed. Luther is represented as a muddler in Christology, and the doctrine of the Formula of Concord is derided as a hodgepodge of contradictory teachings.† It was therefore necessary to bring to light, as much as possible, the inconsistencies of the Reformed objections and to show that they contradict not only Scripture, but also their own premises.

There will hardly be any objection to the extensive presentation of the doctrine concerning the origin of faith or conversion. This detailed discussion was occasioned by the controversy which for many years has troubled the Lutheran Church of America, as also by the fact that synergism is the disease of modern theologians. Contemporary theology, including the positive wing, is wedded to the error that the ability to decide for or against grace must be ascribed to natural man. The consciousness that in upholding this principle the Scripture doctrine of sin and grace is denied and Erasmianism is championed against Luther and the Church of the Reformation has been largely lost. I have therefore deemed it wise to draw up a complete list of the objections of synergism against monergism and to show the fatuity of every one of them.

The reason for the very full presentation of the *articulus stantis et cadentis ecclesiae*, the doctrine of justification, requires no explanation. All doctrine of Holy Scripture is either *antecedens* or *consequens* of this article, and all false teachings antagonize it either directly or indirectly.

* Dorner, *Geschichte der protestantischen Theologie*, p. 875.

† Hodge, *Systematic Theology*, II, 407-418.

The doctrines presented in the second and third volumes I have treated in greater detail in synodical essays, in articles published in our church periodicals, before the student body, and in monographs. I am sure that it will not be taken amiss if I occasionally refer to these writings. The third volume will, *Deo volente*, appear in a few months. For certain reasons the first volume will appear last.

Soli Deo Gloria!

F. PIEPER

St. Louis, Mo., August, 1917



Contents

The Saving Grace of God

	PAGE
1. The Necessity of Grace	3
2. The Concept of Saving Grace	7
3. Attributes of Saving Grace	18
4. The Theological Terminology Regarding the Divine Will of Grace	34
Concluding Remarks	49

The Doctrine of Christ

Importance and Division of the Doctrine	55
I. The Doctrine of the Person of Christ	56
Short Summary of the Doctrine	57
1. The True Deity of Christ	59
2. The True Humanity of Christ	65
Peculiarities of Christ's Human Nature	71
The Human Nature of Christ Came into Existence Through the Operation of the Holy Ghost	71
The Sinlessness of the Human Nature of Christ	73
The Impersonality of the Human Nature of Christ	79
3. The Personal Union	85
The Personal Union and the Christological Theories of Modern Theology	103
4. The Communion of Natures	118
The Reason for the Special Discussion of the Communion of Natures ..	118
Critique of the Denial of the Communion of Natures	120
The Communion of Natures More Completely Described	123
5. The Communion of Attributes	129
The Three Genera of the Communication of Attributes	132
The First Genus of Communication of Attributes	135
Critique of the Denial of the First Genus	147
Abstract Terms in the First Genus	151
The Second Genus of the Communication of Attributes	152
Communicated Omnipotence	158
Communicated Omniscience	162
Communicated Omnipresence	166
Communicated Divine Honor	215
In the Second Genus the Divine Attributes are Not Separated from the Divine Essence	224

	PAGE
The Abstract Terms of the Genus Maiestaticum	227
No Reciprocity of the Second Genus	229
All Divine Attributes are Communicated to the Human Nature	236
The Third Genus of the Communication of Attributes	243
The Importance of the Genus Apotelesmaticum	252
The Genus Apotelesmaticum and the Ancient Church	258
Lutherans and Reformed Use the Same Terms of the Third Genus in a Different Sense	260
Eutychianism and Nestorianism Repudiated in the Third Genus	268
Summary Critique of Reformed Christology	271
II. The Doctrine of the States of Christ	280
1. The Nature of the Humiliation and the Exaltation	281
False Views of the Humiliation of Christ	292
The Crypto-Kenotic Controversy, 1619–1627	296
On the Terminology Used in Describing the Humiliation and Exaltation	301
2. The Several Stages of Christ's Humiliation and Exaltation	305
Christ's Conception and Nativity	306
Christ's Education, Growth in Wisdom, and Visible Earthly Life	309
Christ's Suffering, Death, and Burial	310
Christ's Descent into Hell	314
The Forty Days Between Christ's Resurrection and Ascension	323
Christ's Ascension	324
Christ's Session at God's Right Hand	329
Christ's Second Advent	330
III. The Doctrine of Christ's Office	
In General	330
The Threefold Office of Christ	333
The Prophetic Office of Christ	
The Execution of the Prophetic Office in the State of Humiliation	334
The Execution of the Prophetic Office in the State of Exaltation	339
The Sacerdotal Office of Christ	
The Sacerdotal Office of Christ in the State of Humiliation	342
The Vicarious Satisfaction	344
Objective and Subjective Reconciliation	347
Objections Raised Against the Vicarious Satisfaction	351
Some Modern Theories of the Atonement Examined	361
The Active Obedience of Christ	372
The Sacrifice of Christ and the Sacrifices of the Old Testament	378
To Whom and for Whom Christ Rendered Satisfaction	379
The Intercession of Christ	382
The Sacerdotal Office of Christ in the State of Exaltation	382

The Kingly Office of Christ	PAGE
A Threefold Kingdom	385
The Unity of the Three Kingdoms	386
Differences of the Three Kingdoms	387
The Doctrine of the Kingly Office of Christ an Article of Faith	389
False Teachings Regarding the Kingly Office of Christ	390

The Application of Salvation

Preliminary Survey	397
Orderly Arrangement of the Doctrines Pertaining to the "Ordo Salutis"	419
Saving Faith	422
1. The Sole Object of Saving Faith Is the Gospel	423
2. Saving Faith Is "Fiducia Cordis"	426
3. Saving Faith Is "Fides Specialis"	431
4. Saving Faith Is "Fides Actualis"	432
5. The Function of Faith in Justification	437
6. Saving Faith Is "Fides Directa"	443
7. Saving Faith Embraces the Assurance of Grace, Faith, and the Testimony of the Holy Ghost	445
8. Saving Faith Is Trust in the Grace That is Offered to Us in the Gospel	446
9. The Faith of Infants	448
10. On the Meaning of the Term "Faith"	449
Conversion	452
1. The Nature of Conversion	454
2. The Efficient Cause of Conversion	455
3. The Means Through Which God Effects Conversion	459
4. The Inner Motions of Conversion	459
5. Conversion Is Instantaneous	461
6. Man Can Prevent His Conversion	464
7. Transitive and Intransitive Conversion	466
8. Continued Conversion	466
9. Re-Conversion	467
10. Objections to Divine Monergism in Conversion	471
The Ostensible Reasons Are Devoid of Logic	471
Synergism on the Defensive	480
The True Reason for Opposing Divine Monergism in Conversion	483
The Pernicious Character of Synergism	492
11. Synonyms of Conversion	498
Justification by Faith	503
1. Justification by Faith, Without the Deeds of the Law	503
2. The Strong Language Used in Scripture Against the Workmongers	506
3. The Postulates of Justification by Faith, Without Works	508
4. Justification the Central Doctrine of the Christian Religion	512

	PAGE
5. All Christians Believe in Justification by Faith	516
6. The Disastrous Results of the Denial of Justification by Faith	518
7. The Terminology Employed in Presenting This Doctrine	522
8. Justification on the Basis of Works	541
9. The Doctrine of Justification and the Distinction Between the Law and the Gospel	545
10. The Assurance of Justification	548
11. The Papacy and the Doctrine of Justification	552
12. Modern Protestant Theology and the Doctrine of Justification	555

The Saving Grace of God

(DE GRATIA DEI ERGA HOMINES LAPSOS)



1

The Necessity of Grace

SCRIPTURE teaches that by the fall of Adam all men have become sinners and, according to the sentence of divine justice as pronounced in the Law, subject to damnation, that "all the world may become guilty before God" (Rom. 3:19).¹ Scripture furthermore teaches that man's striving to observe the Law cannot change the situation, i. e., cannot change the verdict of condemnation into a verdict of justification. "By the deeds of the Law there shall no flesh be justified in His sight" (Rom. 3:20; Gal. 2:16).² By attempting it man receives the curse instead of justification. Gal. 3:10: "As many as are of the works of the Law are under the curse."³ For they cannot meet the demands of the Law, which insists on perfect fulfillment. Gal. 3:10: "Cursed is everyone that continueth not in all things which are written in the Book of the Law to do them."⁴

There is, however, salvation for men by way of God's grace (χάρτι, κατὰ χάριν). Eph. 2:8-9: "By grace are ye saved, through faith, and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God; not of works." Rom. 4:16: "Therefore it is of faith that it might be by grace." This way of grace is revealed to men in the Gospel of Christ, which because of this fact is called "the Gospel of the grace of God," Acts 20:24. The Gospel

¹ "All the world" embraces all mankind, Gentiles and Jews. Smalcald Articles: "This, then, is the thunderbolt of God by which He strikes in a heap [hurls to the ground] both manifest sinners and false saints [hypocrites], and suffers no one to be in the right [declares no one righteous], but drives them altogether to terror and despair" (*Triglotta*, 479, III, 2).

² δικαιώσεται is the logical future. It never happens that a man is justified by way of the works of the Law.

³ "Of the works of the Law." Εἶναι ἐκ τινος designates the *origin* and, as a result of that, the *nature*. Thus John 18:36: ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου τούτου, of the world, worldly, having the nature of the world. Rom. 2:8: οἱ ἐξ ἐριθείας, the self-seekers; and thus frequently. So "they that are of the works of the Law" are those of whom it is characteristic that they hope to obtain justification before God through their own efforts. These men who rely on the works of the Law "are," says Meyer, "according to Scripture, altogether under the curse; for them to receive the blessing is entirely out of the question." Calov: "Far from obtaining life through the Law, they are shut up by the force of the Law under the malediction."

⁴ Alford: "The ἐξ ἔργων νόμου cannot be sharers in the blessing, for they are accursed, it being understood that they do not and cannot 'continue in all things, etc.'"

contains the wondrous message that God declares men righteous and saves them without the Law or without good works on their part (χωρίς νόμου, χωρίς έργων νόμου, δωρεάν) by grace, for Christ's sake, through faith. Rom. 3:21, 22, 24, 28: "Now the righteousness of God without the Law is manifested . . . even the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ . . . being justified freely by His grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus. . . . Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the Law." Salvation by grace is the characteristic of the Christian religion. It distinguishes Christianity from all other religions. No other religion knows anything of the Gospel,⁵ and hence all other religions base salvation on the works of man. But according to the Christian religion, made known through God's revelation in the Word, the cause of man's salvation is the grace of God in Christ to the exclusion of all works of man. Whoever is saved among men is saved without the Law and works, saved by the grace of God in Christ. So it was determined by God: "By grace . . . not of works, lest any man should boast" (Eph. 2:8-9). Therefore no man should set himself up as a teacher in Christendom who has not fully grasped this distinction between pagan religions and the Christian religion.⁶

⁵ 1 Cor. 2:9: "Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love Him." According to the context, this passage does not refer specifically to eternal life, but to the Gospel in general. The Gospel lies wholly outside the sphere of human knowledge and investigation.

⁶ Paganism and Christianity's difference was noted by Monier-Williams [not Max Mueller—ed.] lecturing before the British Bible Society. "In the discharge of my duties for forty years as professor of Sanskrit in the University of Oxford, I have devoted as much time as any man living to the study of the Sacred Books of the East, and I have found the one keynote, the diapason so to speak, of all these so-called sacred books, whether it be the Veda of the Brahmans, the Puranas of Siva and Vishnu, the Koran of the Mohammedans, the Zend-Avesta of the Parsees, the Tripitaka of the Buddhists—the one refrain through all—salvation by works. They all say that salvation must be purchased, must be bought with a price, and that the sole price, the sole purchase money, must be our own works and deservings. Our own holy Bible, our sacred Book of the East, is from beginning to end a protest against this doctrine. Good works are indeed enjoined upon us in that sacred Book of the East far more strongly than in any other sacred book of the East; but they are only the outcome of a grateful heart—they are only a thankoffering, the fruits of our faith. They are never the ransom money of the true disciples of Christ. Let us not shut our eyes to what is excellent and true and of good report in these sacred books, but let us teach Hindus, Buddhists, Mohammedans, that there is only one sacred Book of the East that can be their mainstay in that awful hour when they pass all alone into the unseen world." (F. Pieper, *Wesen des Christentums*, 1903, p. 5.) Paganism is not essentially atheism, "for no people ever has been so

The Doctrine of Christ

(CHRISTOLOGIA)



The Importance of the Doctrine

THE supreme importance of this article rests on the fact that the saving grace of God is not absolute, founded on God's power, but has been gained by Christ. True, we generally call the doctrine of justification the central article of the Christian doctrine, the *articulus stantis et cadentis ecclesiae*. But this article is directly based on the doctrine of Christ, on the doctrine of Christ's theanthropic Person and theanthropic work. We are justified by grace, without the deeds of the Law, but that only "through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus" (Rom. 3:24), only because Christ paid the ransom for us, Christ, who is nothing less than the Son of God. Scripture stresses that particularly: "We were reconciled to God by the death of His Son" (Rom. 5:10). Faith which justifies is not any kind of belief, nor is its object Christ as a teacher of the Law, the model of virtue, the prophet "of the universal fatherhood of God," etc., but justifying faith accepts Jesus as "the Son of the living God" (Matt. 16:16), "who gave Himself a ransom for all" (1 Tim. 2:6). In spite of Harnack's dictum¹ the Gospel has to do not only with the Father, but also with the Son. Whoever denies that Christ in His theanthropic Person and His theanthropic work of redemption is the object of saving faith cancels the Christian doctrine of justification and does away with all of Christianity. It is obvious that the doctrine of Christ must be kept absolutely pure.²

Division of the Doctrine

The full presentation of the Scriptural doctrine of Christ, over against multiform error, is best served by retaining the old division into three sections. We treat (I) of the theanthropic Person of Christ, (II) of the states of Christ, since Scripture teaches that Christ in His human nature appeared in a twofold state, the *μορφή δούλου* and the *μορφή θεοῦ* (Phil. 2:6 ff.; Luke 24:26), and (III) of the office of Christ,

¹ *Wesen des Christentums*, Leipzig, 1900, p. 91: "The Gospel, as Jesus proclaims it, has to do with the Father only and not with the Son."

² Gerhard: "The necessity of the doctrine of Christ is (1) directly denied by those who attribute salvation to the better Gentiles. We have shown at the proper place that this is done by certain Romanists and Calvinists and that it follows from the theories of the Photinians. (2) In a subtle manner the Calvinists raise doubts about it by belittling the controversies which the true Church has with them on the personal union and the resultant communication of attributes." (*Loci, locus "De Persona et Officio Christi,"* § 4.)

since it is necessary to show again and again that Christ not only taught the Law and exemplified it in His life, but also became the Redeemer of man by taking upon Himself both man's obligation to keep the Law (Gal. 4:4-5) and man's punishment for his transgression of the Law (Gal. 3:13).

I

THE DOCTRINE OF THE PERSON OF CHRIST

(DE PERSONA CHRISTI)

It has become the fashion in many quarters to complain that notably the Lutheran dogmaticians, yes, even the Formula of Concord and Luther, treated this doctrine too extensively and elaborately,³ that they went to great lengths to present the true, perfect deity of Christ and the true, perfect humanity of Christ and then even treated the personal union, the communion of the natures, and the communication of attributes in the greatest detail. This detailed presentation is a fact. But while we admit that some of the old dogmaticians may have occasionally used more words than were needed for a thorough discussion, the notion that the old teachers treated the subject at such great length from mere contentiousness or the desire to plague mankind is not in accord with history. The facts in the case put the blame for this very detailed presentation on the false teachers. These false teachers never tired of going very much into detail in denying the true deity or the true humanity or the personal union of the two natures in Christ. They forced the teachers of the Church, who recognized the importance of this doctrine, to present and defend all these truths as they are taught in Scripture. And they are forcing us to do the same today. We do not delight in controversy, but we feel like Luther in this matter. "Ah, Lord God, over this blessed and comforting article men ought always to rejoice in true faith, without dispute and without doubts! We ought to sing and give praise and thanks to God the Father for His great mercy in having His dear Son become like unto us, a true Man and our Brother. But now the Evil Spirit, through proud, ambitious, and evil men, is forcing this disagreeable controversy on us, to hinder and spoil this dear and blessed joy. May God hear our plaint." (St. L. XVI:2231.)⁴

³ See Luthardt, *Komp.*, 10th ed., p. 209.

⁴ Gerhard: "As the forces of the enemy are best overcome in the fortified citadel and metropolis of any region, so the devil was determined to employ

14, 17, 20; 14:23-26; 15:3, 7; 1 Tim. 6:3 ff.; 2 Tim. 1:13; 2:2; 1 Pet. 4:11), and by faith in Christ's Word accept and teach the mystery of the *unio personalis* of God and man, which indeed transcends all human understanding. They would then no longer occupy a position which is both unscriptural and unscientific.

4

*The Communion of Natures**(De Communione Naturarum)*THE REASON FOR THE SPECIAL DISCUSSION
OF THE COMMUNION OF NATURES

It really should not be necessary to discuss the doctrine of the communion of natures in a special section, since the personal union of God and man in Christ has been presented with so much detail; for the communication of natures is not something that is outside of, and in addition to, the personal union. The personal union of God and man in Christ, according to Scripture, rather includes the communion of the divine and human natures in the Person of our Lord. The communion of natures in Christ could logically be denied only in case the terms "God" and "man" as applied to Christ were empty titles, designating merely a so-called God and a so-called man; in that case there would be in Christ a communion not of two natures, but of two designations. But since in this connection the terms "God" and "man" are used not in a figurative, but in their primary and proper sense, the communion of natures is directly predicated in all those Scripture passages which predicate a union of God and man in the one Person of Christ, i. e., in the so-called "personal propositions" (*propositiones personales*). Our Lutheran dogmaticians have rightly said that, strictly speaking, the communion of natures is not really the result of the personal union, but that both actually coincide and are distinguished only conceptually. Baier thus says: "According to our way of thinking, the communion of natures is said to result from the personal union, but it is evident that the former does not differ from the latter."¹¹⁶

But why, then, this special discussion of the *communio naturarum*?² It is necessary, in the first place, on account of Reformed theology, which indeed admits that in Christ God and man are one Person,

¹¹⁶ *Compendium* III, 38.

but which also categorically rejects any actual communion of the divine nature with the human in the Person of our Savior. Calvinistic theology indeed concedes a communion of the human nature with the Person of the Son of God, but it declares the communion of the human nature with the divine nature impossible on the ground that the finite human nature is incapable of a real communion with the infinite divine nature (*finitum non est capax infiniti*). The Reformed theologian John Henry Heidegger says: "This assumption [namely, of the human nature] took place not with relation to the nature, but with relation to the Person of the Son."¹¹⁷ Another Reformed divine, George Sohn, rightly says: "The Son alone was made man, not the Father or the Holy Ghost." But in order that he might not be obliged to admit the communion of the human nature with the divine, he separates the Son of God from His divine nature and adds: "But the Person of the Son, not the divine nature (was made man), if we wish to speak accurately."¹¹⁸ The Calvinist Lambert Daneau (Danaeus) writes against Chemnitz: "Nothing that is peculiar and essential to the Deity Himself can really be communicated to anything that is so altogether a creature as is the human nature assumed by Christ."¹¹⁹ The Reformed theologians are so much in earnest in their denial of the communion of natures in Christ that they accuse the Lutherans, who teach this communion, of Eutychianism, i. e., the transmutation of the human nature into the divine. In this almost fanatical fight against the *realis communicio naturarum* modern Calvinistic teachers are in full agreement with their ancient predecessors. Charles Hodge thus censures the Lutheran doctrine: "The capacity of human nature for divinity became the formative idea in the Lutheran doctrine of the Person of Christ."¹²⁰

But this special discussion of the *communicio naturarum* is necessary also because Roman Catholic theology on this point agrees with Calvinism.¹²¹ Hence both the Reformed and the Roman Catholic theologians are responsible for this special treatment of the *communicio*

¹¹⁷ Cp. Heppe, *Ref. Dogm.*, p. 303.

¹¹⁸ Cp. Heppe, *Ref. Dogm.*, p. 303.

¹¹⁹ Cp. Martin Chemnitz, *Examen libri de duabus in Christo naturis*, 1581, p. 104; also Frank, *Theol. der Konkordienformel*, III, 324.

¹²⁰ *Syst. Theol.* II, 410 ff.

¹²¹ The Jesuit Busaeus writes: "In the Person of Christ the natures and their properties were communicated neither really nor nominally, nor could they have been communicated" (*Dis. de pers. Christi*, th. 14; cf. Quenstedt, II, 206). So, too, Bellarmine limits the *unio personalis* to the communication of personality (*Lib. III, De Christo*, c. 8. 16). In the *Catholic Encycl.* III, 169, also A. J. Maas denies the communion of natures.

soul of the Lord was of a nature that was ignorant of the future, nevertheless, being personally united with the λόγος, it had the knowledge of all things, not by grace, but on account of the personal union.”⁴³⁷ Hodge declares with all other Reformed theologians: “Omnipresence is not an attribute of which a creature can be made the organ,” and the *Second Helvetic Confession* says: “Therefore we by no means teach . . . that Christ according to His human nature still is in this world, or even is everywhere.” But Oecumenius, in the tenth century, according to Theophylact (d. 1107), comments on Eph. 4:10: “For indeed He long ago filled all things with His bare divinity; and having become incarnate, that He might fill all things with His flesh, He descended and ascended.”⁴³⁸ Calvin transforms the miracle of Christ’s entrance, while the doors were shut, to a coming through a door opened by God’s omnipotence, since a truly human body could not enter through closed doors,⁴³⁹ but Augustine leaves the doors closed and says: “We see it [the human body of Christ] enter through closed doors.” The assertion that this could not have taken place because it is contrary to the nature of a true body, Augustine calls a *sacrilegium*, that is, a blasphemy.⁴⁴⁰ An objective, unbiased investigation thus shows that the Christology of the Lutheran Church has the consensus of the Ancient Church on its side, while the Reformed Church teaches Nestorianism, which was rejected by the orthodox Ancient Church.

*Lutherans and Reformed Use the Same Terms of the Third Genus
in a Different Sense*

In our discussion of the *genus apotelesmaticum* it became clear that the Reformed in their Christological presentation use the same terms in a different sense than the Lutherans. This is true especially of such terms as “organ,” “official act,” and “personal union.” The subject perhaps calls for more detailed information than could be given in the preceding chapters.

Not Chemnitz, but Luther introduced into Lutheran dogmatics the term “organ,” or “instrument,” to denote Christ’s human nature in the performance of His official acts or ἀποτελέσματα, since it served the Son of God as an instrument (Luther: *Handgezeug*, tool, organ, instrument) to destroy the works of the devil, a work which He did, and

⁴³⁷ *Cat. Test.* V, *Trigl.* 1139; Damasc., lib. 2, cap. 22.

⁴³⁸ Schaff, *Creeks of Christendom* III:255; *Cat. Test.* IX; *Trigl.* 1145.

⁴³⁹ *Inst.* IV, 17, 29.

⁴⁴⁰ *De agone christiano*, 24.

still does, in and through His human nature. The Lutherans, however, teach not merely a difference in degree, but an essential difference, or a difference in kind, between the organic relation of Christ's human nature and the organic relation of other men through whom God performs His divine works, as, for instance, the divine work of conversion, or regeneration, of healing the lame man, raising the dead, and the like, of which Scripture speaks in 1 Cor. 4:15; Gal. 4:19; Acts 3:6; 9:40; 20:10; 1 Kings 17:21, and others.

Lutherans prove this difference in kind by pointing out the fact that a mere man, when performing divine works, acts as an *instrumentum separatum*, that is, as an instrument which is, and remains, outside the Person of the Son of God. In other words, the divine power through which the divine works are done does not become by communication the possession of the human instrument that God so uses. The human nature of Christ, however, is not an *instrumentum separatum* in the performance of Christ's official work of destroying the works of the devil, but an *instrumentum coniunctum*, and at that, *personaliter coniunctum*, that is, an instrument which is a part of the Person of the Son of God, joined to the Son of God in a living, personal union, and so possessing the divine power by communication (*per communicationem*).

According to Reformed teaching, however, there is no difference between the organic relation of Christ's human nature and the organic relation of merely human workers of miracles. Hodge writes in this sense: "The human nature of Christ is no more omniscient or almighty than the worker of a miracle is omnipotent." In the same sense Reformed theologians in general declare that the miracles of Christ, in so far as His human nature is considered, are on the same level as the miracles of the Prophets and Apostles. This radical difference as regards the meaning of the term "organ," or "instrument," corresponds to the fundamental difference between the Reformed and the Lutherans in their whole Christological outlook. While the Reformed, when treating the *genus apotelesmaticum*, apply the principle that the finite is not capable of the infinite, the Lutherans, while considering the performance of the official acts of Christ, adhere to the Scripture truth that in Christ the finite human nature has indeed proved itself capable of the infinite Godhead, for in Christ the two natures were united into one Person.

Accordingly, the Lutherans call the human nature of Christ an organ capable of divine works and co-operating in them (ὄργανον ἐϋχρηστον καὶ συνεργόν), while the Reformed use the illustration that

of glory, in which Christ, the God-Man, having been exalted according to His human nature to the throne of divine majesty, most powerfully and by His immediate presence governs all things which are in the Kingdoms of Power, Grace, and Glory, to the glory of His own name, and for the solace and safety of the afflicted Church.”⁶⁷

The practical interest of the Lutheran Church in the Scripture doctrine of Christ’s session at the right hand of God the Formula of Concord expresses in the words: “We hold . . . that in His Church and congregation on earth He is present as Mediator, Head, King, and High Priest, not in part, or one half of Him only, but the entire Person of Christ is present, to which both natures belong, the divine and the human; not only according to His divinity, but also according to, and with, His assumed nature, according to which He is our Brother, and we are flesh of His flesh and bone of His bone.”⁶⁸ Most severely Chemnitz attacks the Reformed error that the human nature of Christ indeed had work to perform in the state of humiliation, but in the state of exaltation has been retired (*otiosam in coelis sedere ac sua tantum gloria perfrui, eamque beatis spiritibus ostentare*), so that Christ now is present and operates in His Church only according to His Godhead, i. e., “justifies, quickens, and performs and executes the remainder of the blessings necessary to salvation.”⁶⁹

Christ’s Second Advent

Christ’s visible return for the last Judgment of all men is the last stage of His exaltation. It will be treated under “Eschatology,” the doctrine of the last things.

⁶⁷ *Examen*, “*De exalt.*,” qu. 154.

⁶⁸ *Trigl.* 1043, F. C., Sol. Decl., VIII, 78.

⁶⁹ *De duabus nat.*, c. 32, p. 210.

III

THE DOCTRINE OF CHRIST’S OFFICE

(DE OPERE SIVE OFFICIO CHRISTI)

In General

Christ the *wonderful Person* — the God-Man — performed an equally wonderful work (ἔργον). The work to which He was appointed¹ and which He willingly assumed² is the salvation of

¹ John 17:4: “I have finished the work which Thou gavest Me to do.”

² John 4:34: “My meat is to do the will of Him that sent Me and to finish His work.”

mankind. Matt. 18:11: "The Son of Man is come to save that which was lost" (Luke 19:10; 1 Tim. 1:15). All that Christ, the God-Man, did for the salvation of men in the state of humiliation and still does in the state of exaltation constitutes the office, or work, of Christ.³ His very name, given to Him by God, "Jesus," indicates the nature of His office. Matt. 1:21, 25: "Thou shalt call His name Jesus, for He shall save His people from their sins" (cp. Luke 1:31, Luke 2:21).⁴

Christ's official duties did not begin with His Baptism, which was His solemn induction into His *public* ministry, but with His incarnation, with which His humiliation coincided. Christ was the Christ for us in His very conception, birth, circumcision, filial obedience, etc. Christ began the work of redemption, as already stated, very early: "Christ passed through all stages of our existence that He might fully remedy our unclean conception and birth." Hear the eloquent words of Luther: "Our salvation was brought about by this very thing, that Christ and the believing heart are so united that what the one has, is given to the other. And what do they give each other? Christ has a pure, innocent, holy birth; man's birth is unclean, sinful, cursed, as David says Ps. 51:5, which cannot be healed other than through the pure birth of Christ. . . . Thus, then, Christ takes from us unto Himself our birth and sinks it into His birth, and gives us

³ Kromayer, *Theol. pos.-pol.*, II, p. 529: "Office means the right and duty to perform certain functions." (Official acts — ἔργον — to which one is called.)

⁴ Our Lutheran theologians, Chemnitz for instance, stress the fact that His parents did not choose His name. "Not merely according to human intention, which might err, but on God's authority and command we are to adore Christ as 'Jesus.' . . . Therefore Peter [Acts 4:12] says that 'there is none other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved'" than the name Jesus. (*Harm. ev.*, c. 9, on Luke 2:21.) The name Jesus is the Gospel *in nuce*. — His official name, "Christ," Messiah, the Anointed (John 1:41), signifies that He was divinely equipped for this office He received, according to His human nature, not only with *dona finita*, as were the priests, kings, and prophets of the Old Testament through the anointing, who thus were types of our King, Priest, and Prophet, but with infinite gifts. Passages such as John 1:18; 3:31-35; 2:11 forbid us to put Christ on the same plane as the anointed of the Old Testament. Christ, who had the unique office of the Savior of mankind, is the anointed κατ' ἐξοχήν, and, according to the old axiom, "The Deity is the unction of the humanity." See Hollaz, *Examen*, qu. 3; Kromayer, *op. cit.*, I, p. 85. Meyer correctly states: "The metaphysical relation of Christ to the Father is not excluded by this general expression: 'God was with Him,' Acts 10:38." Chemnitz: "Christ was anointed according to the human nature above His fellows (Psalm 45) not merely with infused spiritual gifts, not merely in this respect, that the Spirit, dwelling in Him by grace, wrought many and great powers in Christ, but the anointing means that the divine nature of the Logos dwells personally, in all its fullness, in Christ's assumed nature" (*De duab. nat.*, c. 24, p. 139).

The Application of Salvation

(SOTERIOLOGY)



Preliminary Survey

IN setting forth the manner in which man is put in possession of the salvation gained by Christ, various terms have been used: "appropriation of salvation" (*applicatio salutis a Christo acquisitae*), "way of salvation" (*via salutis; ratio consequendi salutem*), "appropriating grace of the Holy Ghost" (*gratia Spiritus Sancti applicatrix*), "order of salvation" (*ordo salutis*), and others. It does not matter which of these terms is used in describing soteriology; what matters is that the terms be used in the right sense; the matter must be presented on the basis of Scripture and not on the basis of human speculation.

First of all, we must ever bear in mind what Scripture tells us about the nature of the salvation which Christ acquired by His vicarious satisfaction. As men's sinfulness brought disaster upon them, subjecting them to God's wrath, so Christ's vicarious satisfaction brought them salvation and deliverance from the curse by winning for them the full grace of God, that is, the forgiveness of sins. And now, how is this salvation applied to men? In this way that the forgiveness of sins, which God has actually pronounced in His heart, is offered to man in the Gospel and received by men in faith. Men know salvation when they know that their sins are forgiven: "to give knowledge of salvation unto His people by the remission of their sins" (Luke 1:77). And in presenting the "application of salvation" (soteriology), it is all-important that one makes faith alone (*sola fides*) the means of appropriating the forgiveness of sins. Nothing that precedes faith (contrition), nothing that follows faith (*unio mystica*, sanctification and good works, etc.), must be co-ordinated and joined with faith as a means of appropriating the remission of sins; otherwise the whole Christian order of salvation is perverted, that is, changed into the "way of damnation" (*Unheilsordnung*).

The Formula of Concord declares that it must be urged "that this remain the office and property of faith alone, that it alone and nothing else whatever, is the means or instrument by and through which God's grace and the merit of Christ in the promise of the Gospel are received, apprehended, accepted, applied to us, and appropriated; and that from this office and property of such application or appropriation love and all other virtues or works are excluded" (*Trigl.* 929, Sol. Decl., III, 38). This exclusion of "renewal, sanctification, virtues, or good works" from the "application or appropriation"

of the forgiveness of sins belongs to the order "between faith and good works [that] must abide and be maintained, and likewise between justification and renewal, or sanctification" (*Ibid.*, par. 40). Positively the Formula thus presents the order: "First faith is kindled in us in conversion by the Holy Ghost from the hearing of the Gospel. This lays hold of God's grace in Christ, by which the person is justified. Then, when the person is justified (*iam est iustificata*), he is also renewed and sanctified by the Holy Ghost, from which renewal and sanctification the fruits of good works then follow." (*Ibid.*, par. 41.)

Before presenting the soteriological teachings in detail, it will be well for us to give a comprehensive survey of them. By following this *modus docendi* we can show all the better that these teachings (as they are set forth in Scripture and not "constructed" by man) form an inner, compact unity, each doctrine taking its place with what we might call mathematical precision.¹ This coherence might easily be lost sight of if each doctrine were at once given the space which the intrusion of the multiform error has unfortunately made necessary. We add a limited number of ecclesiastical testimonies and terms to this survey.

All soteriological teaching must be based upon the historical, accomplished fact of the objective reconciliation, or justification, of all sinful mankind, namely, that through Christ's vicarious satisfaction God has reconciled mankind unto Himself. This reconciliation, as Scripture plainly tells us, does not consist in a change of heart in man, but in a change of heart in God.² God no longer looks upon sinful man with wrath, but "before His divine tribunal" forgives the sins of mankind, does not impute their trespasses unto them (2 Cor. 5:19). "By the righteousness of One the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life" (Rom. 5:18). And this reconciliation is, as has been shown, complete and perfect, extensively and intensively, for we certainly have no right to restrict the meaning of either the terms "world" (2 Cor. 5:19) and "all men" (Rom. 5:18) or the terms "not imputing their trespasses" (2 Cor. 5:19) and "justification" (Rom. 5:18). Nor do these passages speak merely of a new relation between God and man,³ but they state definitely that God's action produced

¹ Karl Hase (*Hutterus redivivus*, p. 273) has called attention to this close connection, though he misses the point occasionally in presenting it.

² We simply follow Scripture in describing God in terms of "anthropopathy" (cp. Vol. I, p. 439; also footnote 91, p. 454).

³ This emasculation of "the historical work of Christ" mars the entire presentation of modern "positive" theologians.

is born of the Gospel, or of absolution, and believes that, for Christ's sake, sins are forgiven." (*Trigl.* 49, XII.) — Good works are, properly speaking, an effect, or fruit, of repentance: "Then good works are bound to follow, which are the fruits of repentance" (*Trigl.* 49, A. C., XII; 259, Apol., XII [V], 28).

The Roman doctrine of penance is a complete denial of the Christian doctrine of repentance. It instructs the sinner to repent or to return to God by performing three human works: *contritio cordis*, *confessio oris*, *satisfactio operis*, and expressly excludes faith in Christ (see the chapter "Re-conversion"). Even the *contritio cordis* is represented as being a human performance. The *contritio cordis*, which is wrought by God, through the Law (*contritio passiva*), has no place in the Roman doctrine of penance.⁸⁷ The Roman sacrament of penance is one of the devices by which souls are ensnared in work-righteousness, subjected to the Popish hierarchy, and kept away from Christ.⁸⁸

JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH

(DE IUSTIFICATIONE)

I

Justification by Faith, Without the Deeds of the Law

When the sinner comes to faith in Christ or in the Gospel, he is at once justified before God by his faith. Since the Gospel offers him the forgiveness of sins gained by Christ for the whole world (objective justification), the acceptance of this offer, by faith, is all that is needed to accomplish his subjective justification (see Chapter Three). Subjective justification is meant when Paul says Rom. 3:28: "Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith."

⁸⁷ Bellarmine: "The terrors which are wrought in the soul by the Law, and which the Lutherans call contrition, do not form a part of penance. This proposition is in accord with the Council of Trent, Sess. 6, Can. 6." Bellarmine likewise excludes faith in the Gospel from penance (quoted by Quenstedt, II, p. 855). Walther: "The Papists take *contritio* to be not what God does by the Law, but what man himself does. With them repentance is simply penance, by which man atones and makes satisfaction for his sins."

⁸⁸ The confusion and torture of consciences which necessarily result from the Roman doctrine of penance is thus described by the Apology: "Let any one of the adversaries come forth and tell us when remission of sins takes place. O good God, what darkness there is!" (*Trigl.* 255, Apol., XII [V], 4-10.)

"By faith," and that means, as Scripture expressly states, "*without the deeds of the Law.*" Natural man cannot conceive of such a thing as the divine method of justification; he knows only a justification by works.¹ Scripture therefore is intent on inculcating upon man the truth that any and all works of the Law are excluded from justification. Rom. 3:28: "Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith, without the deeds of the Law." Gal. 2:16: "Man is not justified by the works of the Law." All works, works of any kind or description, are excluded. Neither the "good" works of unbelievers, such as those of the Pharisees,² nor the truly good works which flow from faith, such as those of faithful Abraham,³ can justify a man before God.

It is a method of justification unheard of among men. But Scripture tells us why God justifies men without the Law and the works of the Law. He does it (1) because He wants men to be sure of the forgiveness of sins (Rom. 4:16: "Therefore it is of faith that it might be by grace, to the end the promise might be sure to all the seed")⁴; and (2) because He wants man to glory not in himself, but in God's entirely unmerited grace in Christ (Eph. 2:9: "Not of works, lest any man should boast"; Eph. 1:6-7: "To the praise of the glory of His grace, wherein He hath made us accepted in the Beloved,

¹ Apology: "This godless opinion concerning works has always existed in the world." "Men judge by nature that God ought to be appeased by works. Nor does reason see a righteousness other than the righteousness of the Law, understood in a civil sense." (*Trigl.* 177, Art. III, 85; 225, *ibid.*, 273.) Luther: "We ourselves taught in the Papacy that whoever would rid himself of sin would have to perform this or that work" (St. L. XIII:2495).

² The works named Luke 18:9-14 cannot effect justification. Paul declared that before his conversion he was "blameless," but immediately adds: "I count all things but loss . . . and do count them but dung" (Phil. 3:6, 8).

³ Rom. 4:2-3. See the Formula of Concord on the exclusion of the works of the believers from their justification (*Trigl.* 927, Sol. Decl., III, 33 ff.). Chemnitz: "When Paul excludes the works of the Law from justification, does he mean only the Levitical ceremonies, or only the works performed without the Spirit or faith? Paul speaks of the whole Law and particularly the works of the Ten Commandments, Rom. 3:7; Galatians 3, and includes also the works of the believers, as is clear from Romans 4 and 1 Corinthians 4." (*Enchir.*, p. 91.) Luther: "So it is clear that those who teach that Paul speaks only of the Ceremonial Law do away entirely with Christ and the whole Gospel. They teach that we ourselves accomplish our justification through the Moral Law, or the Ten Commandments, without Christ." (St. L. XIX: 1445.)

⁴ Philippi: "God wants to make the promise sure by basing it solely on grace. . . . If the promise of salvation is conditioned in any way on our works, even on the works of the regenerate, doubt must naturally take the place of certainty because of the imperfection of these works."

We note, finally, that the assurance of justification is bound up with the truth that the creation of faith and justification occur at the same moment. Apology: "Faith reconciles and justifies before God the moment we apprehend the promise by faith." (*Trigl.* 213. See also *Trigl.* 149, Art. IV [II], 97; 147, *ibid.*, 87.)¹⁰⁵ Objective justification precedes faith, for it is the object of faith, and its proclamation creates faith (Rom. 10:17). Subjective justification, however, does not take place prior to faith nor later than faith. To assume a *prius* or *posterius* in time would abolish the "by faith" (πίστει) and thus also the assurance of justification.

II

The Papacy and the Doctrine of Justification

The Roman Catholic Church is not the only body which denies the Christian doctrine of justification. All Unitarian communions deny justification by faith, because they deny the deity of Christ and the Vicarious Atonement. All Protestant bodies which make ethical improvement and works a factor in justification deny justification by faith alone. But the Church of the Pope does more than merely deny the Christian doctrine of justification. She curses this doctrine, and her entire church work is aimed at destroying the Christian doctrine of justification and setting in its place pagan work-righteousness.¹⁰⁶ This action and the further fact that the Church of the Pope sets

¹⁰⁵ Baier, too, still says correctly: "The moment faith is given, man is at once justified, so that the act conferring faith on man and the act by which man is justified are simultaneous" (III, p. 246).

¹⁰⁶ The Romish teaching on justification is given in detail in footnote 67 of this section. We add here additional maledictions from the *Tridentinum*, Sess. 6, Can. 9: "If anyone saith that by faith alone the impious is justified, in such wise as to mean that nothing else is required to co-operate in order to obtain the grace of justification, and that it is not in any way necessary that he be prepared and disposed by the movement of his own will, let him be anathema." Can. 11: "If anyone saith that men are justified either by the sole imputation of the justice of Christ, or by the sole remission of sins, to the exclusion of the grace and the charity which is poured forth in their hearts by the Holy Ghost and is inherent in them, or even that the grace whereby we are justified is only the favor of God, let him be anathema." Can. 12: "If anyone saith that justifying faith is nothing else than confidence in the divine mercy which remits sins for Christ's sake, or that this confidence alone is that whereby we are justified, let him be anathema." In Can. 20 the statement is anathematized that the Gospel is "a bare and absolute promise of eternal life, without the condition of observing the commandments."

itself up as the true Church and covers its wicked work with the mask of great sanctity proves beyond doubt that the Papacy is the Anti-christ described in 2 Thessalonians 2.

The Church of the Pope, which parades as the Christian Church, is diametrically opposed to Christ and the Christian Church. While the Apostle Paul, in the name of Christ (2 Cor. 13:3; 1 Cor. 14:37), pronounces the curse on all teachers who falsify the Gospel of Christ by the doctrine of works (Gal. 1:8-9; 5:12), the Papacy in its official Confessions anathematizes all teachers who refuse to mix works into justification. See Canon 11 above. Since the Christian Church lives and has its being in the Christian doctrine of justification, the Papacy, incorporated under the name of Christ, is the greatest spiritual murder agency in existence. Christians are officially excluded from the Pope's Church. True, there are Christians in the Catholic Church. But that happens only because souls stricken by the Law have somehow become acquainted with the Gospel and, through the operation of the Holy Ghost, in spite of the prohibition and curse of the Pope, put their trust in Jesus as the sole Expiator of sins. (*Trigl.* 225, *Apol.*, Art. III, 271; *Trigl.* 417, Art. XXIV [XII], 98.)

The Papacy is the negation of Christianity. Luther puts it thus: "From this you see against what the entire Papacy and all its adherents are raving and storming and how they are to be regarded who will not hear and endure this article [forgiveness of sins by faith in Christ, without the deeds of the Law], which St. Peter here preaches and establishes with the testimony of all Prophets and the whole Scripture, and who do not cease to persecute on that account pious, innocent persons, pretending that they are the Church and flaunting this name to the utmost against us, while they bear witness against themselves with their doctrine, faith, and work, believing and teaching contrary to the witness of all Prophets and therefore of the whole Church. They certainly cannot be the Church of Christ, since they so boldly and impudently contradict St. Peter and all Scripture, yea, tread Christ Himself, the Head, under foot in His Word. No, they are the accursed band of the wicked devil and the worst enemies of the Christian Church, worse and more harmful than any heathen and Turks." (St. L. XII:495 f.)

What it means that the Papacy anathematizes the Christian doctrine of justification and thus seeks to ban it from the Church and the world we have shown elsewhere.¹⁰⁷ Let us repeat it here: "There can

¹⁰⁷ *Vortraege ueber die Lehre von der Rechtfertigung (Lutherstunde)*. St. Louis, 1889, p. 65 f.