

TH
H 369

THE DOCTRINE OF ATONEMENT
IN THE THOUGHT OF
ORTON WILEY AND EMIL BRUNNER

By

W. Meredith Helsby

A.B. Alfred Holbrook College

B.D. Asbury Theological Seminary

A Thesis

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for
The Degree of Master of Sacred Theology
in
The Biblical Seminary in New York

New York, N. Y.
May, 1962

**BIBLICAL SCHOOL OF
THEOLOGY LIBRARY**
HATFIELD, PA.

22697

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
INTRODUCTION	V
A. The Subject.	V
1. The Subject Stated and Delimited.	V
2. The Significance of the Subject	VI
B. The Method of Procedure, Sources and Data.	IX
 I. THE HISTORICAL FRAMEWORK OF THE DOCTRINE OF THE ATONEMENT.	 1
A. Pre-Reformation Theories of the Atonement	1
1. The Classic Theory in the Patristic Period	1
a. Ante-Nicene Fathers, Particularly Irenaeus and Origen	3
b. Augustine and Double Predestination	8
2. The Latin Theory in the Scholastic Period.	12
a. Anselm and the Satisfaction Emphasis.	13
b. Thomas Aquinas and Superabundant Merit.	15
3. The Subjective Theory and Abelard	17
B. Divergent Views of the Reformation Era.	18
1. Penal Satisfaction Theory	18
a. Luther and Monergism Without Determinism.	20
b. Melancthon and Synergism	21
c. Calvin and Limited Atonement.	24
2. Governmental Theory of Atonement	26
3. Moral Influence Theories of Atonement.	30
C. Summary	33
 II. THE PRESENTATION OF THE ATONEMENT BY DR. WILEY	 37
A. Significant Biographical Notations.	37
B. The Atonement: Its Biblical Basis and History	38
1. Noteworthy Emphases in the Biblical Basis.	39
2. Various Theories in the Earlier History of the	43
Atonement	43
3. Modern Theories and Their Inadequacies	46
C. The Atonement: Its Nature and Extent	50
1. The Nature: Definition, the Ground, Vital Principle	51
and Legal Aspects of the Atonement	51
2. The Vicarious Expiation	54
3. The Godward and Manward Aspects of the Atonement	56
4. The Extent of the Atonement.	58

Gift of Author

H3441

Jan. 1963

Chapter	Page
D. Predestination and Freedom of the Will	60
E. Summary	62
III. THE PRESENTATION OF THE ATONEMENT BY DR. BRUNNER.	70
A. Significant Biographical Notations.	70
B. The Necessity for Reconciliation.	73
1. The Cross as the Divine Act of Reconciliation.	73
2. Schleiermacher's Theology Not the Answer	74
3. Guilt Stands in the Way.	75
4. Sin an Attack on God's Honor	77
5. The Meaning of Forgiveness	78
6. The Meaning of Reconciliation through Christ	79
7. "God Meets Us at the Point Where We Become Real"	80
C. The Penal Theory of the Atonement	81
1. Satisfaction, Sacrifice Ideas Not to be Minimized.	81
2. Penalty, Guilt Ideas Deep-rooted in the Knowledge of Divine Law	82
3. God Cannot Repeal His Law.	83
4. Sin an Infringement of His Glory	85
5. Disobedience to Divine Law Points to Death and Ruin.	86
6. Forensic Expressions Denote Vital Force.	87
7. A Real Alteration the Only Way Out	88
8. Man Cannot Pay the Debt; the Son of God Pays	89
D. The Expiatory Sacrifice	90
1. The Great Significance of the Ritual Idea.	90
2. Sin Incurs Divine Wrath; Expiation Reopens the Way	91
3. God Alone Can Expiate.	93
4. The Real Act of Expiation.	94
5. Expiation Expresses the Love of God.	95
E. The Mediator.	96
1. The Mediator, the "Nostra Assumpsit".	96
2. The Identification of the Mediator with Humanity	98
3. The Mediator, Both God's Representative and the Second Adam	100
4. The Vicarious Suffering of the Mediator.	101
5. God's Dealings with Humanity through the Mediator.	102
6. The Once-For-All Atonement of the Mediator	103
7. Death, the Sole Reason for the Mediator's Coming?.	104

Chapter	Page
F. The Atonement.	105
1. Man, at Enmity with God	105
2. God, at Enmity with Man	106
3. The Necessity of the Subjective Process in the Atonement	108
4. Atonement Real in Subjective Experience	110
5. Repentance, the Presupposition of Atonement	111
6. The Atonement, the Beginning of Redemption.	112
G. Predestination and Freedom of the Will	113
H. Summary.	118
IV. CONTRASTS AND SIMILARITIES	125
A. Basic Differences.	125
B. Striking Similarities.	130
C. Attitudes toward Irenaeus.	132
D. Attitudes toward Anselm.	133
E. Evaluation	136
BIBLIOGRAPHY	141

INTRODUCTION

THE DOCTRINE OF ATONEMENT IN THE THOUGHT OF
ORTON WILEY AND EMIL BRUNNER

INTRODUCTION

A. The Subject.

1. The Subject Stated and Delimited.

To investigate the Doctrine of Atonement in the writings of Orton Wiley and Emil Brunner, two contemporary theologians, is the purpose of this thesis. After investigation it will be possible to see similarities and distinctions and arrive at an evaluation.

The Doctrine of Atonement is a part of the larger Doctrine of Incarnation. Incarnation is closely related to Revelation and Anthropology, in fact to all of Theology. Focusing attention upon the Atonement writing of two eminent men may, at first glance, seem a very narrow area of study. It is true many other important doctrines will lie outside the scope of this investigation, yet Atonement is central to our Christian faith. In the opinion of the Reformers, he who understands the Cross aright, understands the Bible, understands Jesus Christ. Brunner in his opening remarks on the subject of the necessity for reconciliation makes this statement: "The whole struggle of the Reformation for the sola fide, the solī deo gloria, was simply the struggle for the right interpretation of the Cross."¹ This is a critical area of the Christian faith and

1. Emil Brunner, The Mediator, tr. by Olive Wyon (London, The Lutterworth Press, 1934), p. 435.

careful analysis of the thought of these theologians will help bring us abreast of the present day trend.

2. The Significance of the Subject.

The Atonement has been called a diamond of many facets, the crux of the Christian faith, and all during Church History much theological thought has centered here. In the Atonement the work of the triune God in his self-revelation is seen and this is the salvation or redemption and reconciliation of the world. Philip Schaff says,

"The atonement negatively is the emancipation of humanity from the guilt and power of sin and death; positively is the communication of the righteousness and life of fellowship with God. First the discord between the Creator and the creature must be adjusted; and then man can be carried onward to his destined perfection. . . . In Christianity it (the atonement) is revealed in objective reality, according to the eternal counsel of the love and wisdom of God, through the life, death, and resurrection of Christ, and is being continually applied subjectively to individuals in the church by the Holy Spirit, through the means of grace, on condition of repentance and faith. Christ is, exclusively and absolutely, the Saviour of the world, and the Mediator between God and man."¹

Wiley and Brunner hold unique places in current theological thought. Dr. Wiley is regarded as spokesman for Wesleyan-Arminian theology. His three volume work on Christian Theology is a text book at Asbury Theological Seminary, Nazarene Seminary in Kansas City, Western Evangelical Seminary and Taylor University. Dr. Carl H. Henry at the death of Dr. Wiley in the summer of 1961 gave the following tribute:

1. Philip Schaff, History of the Christian Church, Vol. II (New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1892), p. 583.

"Dr. H. Orton Wiley was both the peer of theologians in the Church of the Nazarene and in current theological dialogue as a whole. In a day when many theologians retained but broken fragments of the historic Christian view, Dr. Wiley stood firm against the tide of liberalism. He knew and never ceased to expound the place and power of systematic theology based on divinely revealed truths." 1

Dr. Brunner has had significant impact upon theological thought in America. Rolston makes this sweeping statement: "No voice in generations has so stirred Protestant thought. Everywhere there is criticism, and dissent, as well as approbation but critics as disciples admit the services of the Barthian movement in bringing theology back to God."² Brunner, being proficient in English and French as well as German, prolific in writing, and indefatigable in his travels to the United States and Japan as a lecturer, has exerted a widespread influence.

Rolston quotes Brunner as having said in *The Theology of Crisis* the following,

"From 1700 A.D. to 1900 A.D. Christian Theology changes its distinctively Christian bearings and drifts with an idealistic immanence-faith into theological liberalism. The year 1900 marks the approximate date when it began to sink into a sea of relativistic skepticism. If once man is made the measure of all things, no rational idea, however absolute it purports to be, can ward off the final dissolution of theology."³

1. W. T. Purkiser, "Dr. H. Orton Wiley", Herald of Holiness, (October 4, 1961), p. 12.

2. Holmes Rolston, A Conservative Looks to Barth and Brunner (Nashville, Cokesbury Press, 1933), p. 13.

3. Ibid., p. 22.

The Barthian movement may be described as an orthodox theology adjusted to the facts of modern science without accepting the relativism of modern liberalism. Some have likened the teaching of Barth and Brunner to a resurgence of the faith of the Reformation in a thoroughly modern form. Brunner, whose writings are the easier to understand, has done much to systematize the thought of this resurgence.

It will be very meaningful for us to view the concepts of these men in this vital area of Christian theology. Both are prominent and considerable prestige is attached to their names. But in a far deeper way, the extremities of these days demand much clear thinking at this point if the words "we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son"¹, are to have relevant meaning. Doctrine projected into life is our chief concern; it is then that the Gospel becomes the power of God unto salvation. John Calvin said,

"Doctrine is not an affair of the tongue, but of the life. . . is received only when it possess the whole soul, and finds its seat and habitation in the inmost recesses of the heart. . . . To doctrine in which our religion is contained we have given the first place, since by it our salvation commences; but it must be transfused into the breast, and pass into the conduct and so transform us into itself, as not to prove unfruitful."²

1. Rom. 5:10.

2. John Calvin, Library of Christian Classics, ed. by John T. McNeill, Vol. XX, Institutes of the Christian Religion, bk. III, chap. VI, sec. 4 (London, S.C.M. Press, 1961).

B. The Method of Procedure, Sources and Data.

In order to give orientation and background the first chapter will develop a historical framework of the doctrine of atonement. This will be helpful in seeing the main currents of thought through Church History and helpful in analyzing the thought of Wiley and Brunner. Then, in Chapter II, the writings of Dr. Wiley will be carefully examined, both as he speaks directly on the subject of Atonement and also as he relates it to Arminian Dogmatics. His three volume work on Christian Theology will be the primary source. In Chapter III the writings of Dr. Brunner will occupy our thought. His concept is expressed in many of his writings but The Mediator will be the primary area of study. In a final Chapter it will be possible to make comparisons, seeing similarities and distinctions. A final word of evaluation will conclude this study.

CHAPTER I.

THE HISTORICAL FRAMEWORK
OF THE DOCTRINE OF THE ATONEMENT

CHAPTER I.
THE HISTORICAL FRAMEWORK
OF THE DOCTRINE OF THE ATONEMENT.

A. Pre-Reformation Theories of the Atonement.

The Atonement--how absolutely central in Christian theology and how voluminous have been the writings on this subject through the course of Church History! It is the purpose of this chapter to review briefly the various theories of Atonement and trace them through the Reformation period. It will be possible to see the earliest expressions and see something of their development. This will be most helpful in analyzing the thought of Wiley and Brunner in later chapters.

1. The Classic Theory in the Patristic Period.

In the concept of the early Church Fathers there is less clarity concerning the saving work of Christ than for example the Person of Christ. Schaff remarks:

"The primitive church teachers lived more in the thankful enjoyment of redemption than in logical reflection upon it. We perceive in their exhibitions of this blessed mystery the language rather of enthusiastic feeling than of careful definition and acute analysis. Moreover, this doctrine was never, like Christology and the doctrine of the Trinity, a subject of special controversy within the ancient church. Nevertheless, all the essential elements of the later church doctrine of redemption may be found, either expressed or implied, before the close of the second century".¹

1. Philip Schaff, History of the Christian Church, Vol. II, p. 583.

Statements like the following one from I Clement, VII 4 remain: "Let us fix our gaze upon the blood of Christ and let us know that it is precious to His Father, because it was poured out for our salvation, and brought the grace of repentance to all the world".¹

There is a beautiful letter from an anonymous author to an unknown heathen, Diognetus, which tells of the vicarious significance of the death of Jesus for man. It reads:

"He gave His own Son a ransom for us, the Holy One for transgressors, the Blameless One for the wicked, the Righteous One for the unrighteous, the Incorruptible One for the corruptible, the Immortal One for them that are mortal. For what other thing than His righteousness was capable of covering our sins? By what other One was it possible that we, the wicked and the ungodly, could be justified, than by the only Son of God? O sweet exchange! O unsearchable device! O benefits surpassing all expectation! That the wickedness of many should be hid in a single Righteous One, and that the righteousness of One should justify many transgressors."²

While it is true there was no systematized theory of the Atonement in this early period yet there was sufficient data to formulate what Aulén calls the "Classic Theory of the Atonement". In its central theme it is a Divine conflict and victory; Christ fights against and triumphs over the evil powers of the

1. J.L. Neve, A History of Christian Thought, Vol. I, (Phila., The Muhlenberg Press, 1946), pp. 37, 38.

2. Ibid.

world. In Christ, God reconciles the world to Himself. Aulén says further:

"This is a doctrine of Atonement in the full and proper sense, and this idea of the Atonement has a clear and distinct character of its own, quite different from the other two types (i.e. the Latin and subjective types). It is an objective type and represents the work of Atonement or reconciliation as from first to last a work of God Himself. It is a dramatic type and stands in sharp contrast with the subjective type of view. It describes a change in the relation between God and the world, also a change in God's own attitude." ¹

a. Ante-Nicene Fathers, Particularly Irenaeus and Origen

Many of the Fathers speak of the vicarious suffering of Christ. But we do not have any analysis of why and how Christ's work has redeeming power. Polycarp, Justin Martyr, Clement of Rome, and Ignatius said, "We have peace through the flesh and blood, and passion of Jesus Christ".² The Fathers liked to speak of the gifts which God had brought to mankind and among these is the forgiveness of sins. It is only Irenaeus and Origen who give extended statements on the Atonement and it is worthwhile to consider their thoughts.

1. Gustaf Aulén, Christus Victor, tr. by A.G. Hebert (New York, The MacMillan Company, 1951), pp. 4-6.

2. H. Orton Wiley, Christian Theology, Vol. II (Kansas City, Mo., Beacon Hill Press, 1953), p. 232.

Irenaeus. Irenaeus is the first of all the church teachers to give a careful statement of the work of redemption, and his view is by far the deepest and soundest found in the first three centuries. In his writing 'Adversus Haereses' (i.1) he states his position:

"The Word of God (the Logos), omnipotent and not wanting in essential justice, proceeded with strict justice even against the apostasy or kingdom of evil itself (apostasiam) redeeming it (ab ea) that which was his own originally, not by using violence, as did the devil in the beginning, but by persuasion (secundum suadelam), as it became God, so that neither justice should be infringed upon, nor the original creation of God perish".¹

This Bishop of Lyons in Southern Gaul, who had known Polycarp personally and was filled with the spirit and thoughts of John and Paul, had as his fundamental thought that the God of creation is the same as the God of redemption. Christ the God-man, who is the personification of the eternal, self-revelation of God, is the Mediator of man's salvation.

Neve reports that Irenaeus constructs the recapitulation theory. The Greek term 'anakecalaisiosis', which is translated by the Latin word 'recapitulatio', is found in Ephesians 1:10. Christ appeared as the Second Adam. As the First Adam who fell had produced a generation of sinful men, so Christ, the Second Adam, produces a new generation of righteous men in whom the divine image is restored. In Christ the new man becomes immortal. Through His obedience Christ did what Adam failed to do. He thus destroyed sin and Satan.²

1. H. Orton Wiley, Christian Theology, Vol. II, p. 233.

2. J.L. Neve, A History of Christian Thought, Vol. I, p. 80.

Aulén, says that Irenaeus constructs the first typical example of the Classic Idea of the Atonement. It is important to keep two things in mind concerning this theory. First, the work of atonement is carried through by God Himself. It is not in the sense that God authorizes, sanctions or initiates the plan of salvation, but that He Himself is the effective agent in the redemptive work, from beginning to end. It is the incarnate Christ who overcomes the tyrants which hold man in bondage. God Himself enters into the world of sin and death, that He may reconcile the world to Himself. Therefore Incarnation and Atonement stand in no sort of antithesis; rather, they belong inseparably together. It is God's Love, the Divine 'agape', that removes the sentence that rested upon mankind, and creates a new relation between the human race and Himself, a relation which is altogether different from any sort of justification by legal righteousness. The whole dispensation is the work of grace. Second, it is to be emphasized that this view of the Atonement has a dualistic background--namely, the reality of forces of evil, which are hostile to the Divine will. Consequently, so far as the sphere of these forces extends, there is enmity between God and the world. The work of atonement is therefore depicted in dramatic terms, as a conflict with the powers of evil and a triumph over them. God is at once the Reconciler and the Reconciled. His enmity is taken away in the very act in which He reconciles the world unto Himself.¹

1. Gustaf Aulén, Christus Victor, p. 34.

It is Aulén, who, in his remarkable book, "Christus Victor", makes one rethink the whole position of the Patristic writers. No longer is he able to dismiss them lightly until he comes to Anselm. He contends further that the Classic concept of Irenaeus laid the foundation for Augustine's and Luther's doctrine of Atonement many years later.

Origen. In Patristics the place of Origen is one of great importance. Schaff says,

"Origen was the greatest scholar of his age, and the most gifted, more industrious, and most cultivated of all the ante-Nicene fathers."¹

He had much to do in guiding the early church away from heathen philosophy and from heretical Gnosis to the Christian faith. He has been called the father of critical investigation and performed great service in exegesis. It is interesting that Jerome is quoted as saying that Origen wrote more than other men can read.

In Origen's controversy with Celsus there appears the following statement concerning the atonement:

"By what train of argument were you led to regard him as the Son of God? For he makes us answer that we were won over to him because we know that his punishment was undergone to bring about the destruction of the father of evil. Now we were won over to His doctrine by innumerable other considerations..."²

1. Philip Schaff, History of the Christian Church, Vol. II, p.790.

2. Origen, The Ante-Nicene Fathers, ed. by Alexander Roberts, James Donaldson, Vol. IV (Grand Rapids, Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1951), p. 449.

McGiffert reports that in Origen the saving work of Christ was represented as a work of instruction.¹ Christ showed men the will of God both by teaching and example, telling them of the future rewards and punishments to follow obedience or disobedience and opening to them the depths of wisdom and knowledge. But Origen was interested in giving other explanations of Christ's death. He spoke of Christ paying a price to the devil in order to secure man's release. (This has been recorded in Origen's Commentary on Matthew, Book XIII 8, 9). This concept was common among the Fathers and had appeared in the writings of Irenaeus.

Origen was in agreement with some of the Gnostics who maintained that God offered the devil the soul of Christ in exchange for the souls of men and that Satan accepted the offer, not knowing, as God did, that he would be unable to hold Christ after he had him in possession. Origen seems not to have been troubled by the deceit practiced by God, for to deceive one's enemy was generally regarded as quite legitimate.

Because freedom of the will becomes a subject of great controversy in later development, it is important to note that both Irenaeus and Origen wrote at length on the subject. For example Origen says:

1. Arthur Cushman McGiffert, A History of Christ Thought, Vol. I (New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1933), p. 226.

"The whole of this reasoning, then amounts to this: that God created (in man) two general natures,--a visible, i.e., a corporeal and an invisible nature which is incorporeal. Now these two natures admit of two different permutations. That invisible and rational nature changes in mind and purpose, because it is endowed with freedom of will, and is on this account found sometimes to be engaged in the practice of good and sometimes in that of the opposite."¹

b. Augustine and Double Predestination.

No one of the ancient Fathers is better known than Augustine. In addition to his Confessions there are not only sermons, Biblical commentaries, apologetic, doctrinal, polemic and practical works, but also a vast number of letters. His literary activity covered more than forty years.

It is of significance to note concerning Augustine's doctrine of salvation that Christ had a comparatively small place in his system. His religious experience was an experience of love for God and communion with him, and he needed no mediator through whom to find his way to God. In general it may be said that when he came to reflect upon Christ he thought of Him primarily as the head of the church which, as his body, enjoys the benefits of all he has done.

McGiffert points out that Augustine had no distinctive theory of the work of Christ, and adds that he reproduced at one time or another most of the things that had been said upon the

1. Ante-Nicene Fathers, op. cit., Vol. IV, p. 302.

subject by earlier Fathers.¹ In his sermon 166:4 he shows that he is in agreement with Irenaeus, Athanasius and others; for he speaks of Christ's becoming incarnate that he might deify man and bring them immortality. He says, "For as he was made, by becoming man, a partaker of thy mortality; so he makes thee, by exalting thee, a partaker of his immortality."² The same is true of his thought that Christ died to propitiate God, or to offer a sacrifice for sin, or to pay a price to the devil. But none of these ideas is carried out consistently or made part of a formal theory of the Saviour's work.

Though Augustine speaks of the death of Christ as a satisfaction offered to God yet his meaning of satisfaction differed from that of Anselm. It was Augustine's idea which was in agreement with the general view of that day and which looked upon the death of Christ as a price paid for releasing man from the rightful claims of the devil. Neve asserts that it is not possible to reduce Augustine's statements on the subject of redemption to a consistent theory but it is important to keep the following three facts in mind: (a) Augustine's piety never lost the deep sense of guilt; (b) this conviction led him to a grateful appreciation of the remission of sins in baptism; (c) in this state of mind he put a high estimate

1. Arthur Cushman McGiffert, A History of Christian Thought, Vol. II, p. 105.

2. Ibid.

on the cross of Christ. While stressing the significance of Christ as our King, Augustine never tires of praising Him as the Saviour of sinners.¹

Concerning the process of salvation, or the way in which the atonement becomes effective to man, Augustine had much to say. In an earlier period of his life Augustine spoke of human freedom in opposition to the Manichaeans. But later, on reflecting how his own conversion had come to pass, he came to the conviction that man in his natural condition is incapable of any positive co-operation with divine grace.

Consistent with his Neoplatonic idea of God, particularly the thought that God is the only source of good, Augustine insisted that men are saved wholly by grace. Logic led him to this conclusion. Grace first arouses faith, the initial virtue of the Christian life. Elsewhere this statement is made:

"...in these ways God acts with the rational soul that it may believe in him--for it is not possible for free will to have faith unless there be someone in whom it is persuaded or invited to have faith--God certainly works in man the will to believe and in all things anticipates us with his mercy."²

Augustine elaborates the theme of Predestination at great length. Much of the thought lies outside the scope of this thesis, except for the fact that it lays a foundation for a limited atone-

1. J.L. Neve, A History of Christian Thought, Vol. I, p. 101.

2. Arthur Cushman McGiffert, *op. cit.* quoting from *De Spiritu et Littera* XXXIV (60)

ment. Since there was an overstress on God's sovereignty, it was easy to arrive logically at his famous theory of double predestination. God was an absolute will and foreordained some to salvation and others to damnation. It is true that he usually speaks of predestination to salvation and apparently thinks of the wicked as left wholly to themselves, which of course means their death. But occasionally he goes further. McGiffert, quoting from Eucheridion, 100, gives the following:

"He used the will of the creature who was opposing the creator's will, that he might carry out his own will, thus in his supreme goodness turning to good account even what is evil, to the condemnation of those whom he justly predestined to punishment and to the salvation of those whom he mercifully predestined to grace."¹

Divine predestination was not based upon anything foreseen in men. It does not mean that God chose the good for salvation and the wicked for damnation. Augustine insisted that the ground of choice lay not in men but in God. That some are saved and others not is wholly due to God's secret will which man is quite unable to fathom. To those whom God predestinates to eternal life he gives the gift of perseverance that they may endure to the end; none of the elect can permanently fall away and be lost. Thus grace is as a divine creative act. It is as an infusion of love which works faith in man, dispelling the spiritual ignorance which had come over him through the fall.

1. Ibid., p. 95.

Aulén¹ finds that Augustine accepts the classic idea of the Atonement and says this is specially significant on account of his theological importance. He further states that Augustine's dramatic view of Christ's work is closely connected with his very clear teaching on the Incarnation. He also found that Augustine's Neoplatonic idea of 'eros' prevented him from holding consistently to the Christian idea of the Divine Love proceeding from heaven and shedding itself abroad among men.¹

2. The Latin Theory In The Scholastic Period.

The beginnings of the Latin Theory appear first in Tertullian. It is, as it were, that Tertullian prepares the building materials and then Cyprian begins to construct a doctrine of Atonement out of them. Tertullian was writing concerning penance and he used the words "satisfaction" and "merit" to apply to penance. But Cyprian applied these concepts to Atonement first. It was Cyprian who began to apply the principle to the overplus of merit earned by Christ and interpret His work as a satisfaction. The picture is that of a legal relationship between two parties. As it is applied to Christ, His passion and death earn an excess of merit and this is paid to God as satisfaction or compensation. Thus the Latin idea of the Atonement appears. By way of evaluation Aulén¹ points out (1) the whole idea is essentially legalistic and

1. Gustaf Aulén, Christus Victor, p. 39.

(2) in speaking of Christ's work, the emphasis is all laid on that which is done by Christ as man in relation to God, whereas the Classic Theory laid emphasis upon God from beginning to end.¹

a. Anselm and Satisfaction Emphasis.

Anselm was abbot in the monastery of Bec in Normandy and from 1093, archbishop of Canterbury. He died in 1109 after a bitter conflict with King Henry I. He was a high churchman and a loyal papist. Saving faith, he believed, involved the sincere and humble acceptance of the truth taught by the Catholic church. But faith must be followed by love and knowledge; it must bear fruit both practical and theoretical. He took his motto from Augustine, of whose writings he was an eager student. To him it was not "I know that I may believe" but "I believe that I may know." His writings are remarkably free from references to the Bible and the Fathers. His writings did not attempt to cover the whole range of Christian doctrine but cover only those subjects that interested him. With unbelievers in mind, Anselm undertook to show the necessity of the incarnation by the use of reason alone and wrote his most famous work, "Cur Deus Homo".

Elements of a satisfaction theory had been introduced many years earlier. Athanasius (325-373) spoke of the death of Christ as the payment of a debt due to God. His thought briefly was this: Since God had threatened death as a penalty of sin, He

1. Ibid., p. 83.

would have been untrue if He had not fulfilled His promise. But it would have been unworthy of divine goodness had He allowed rational beings to incur death as a result of an imposition practiced on them by Satan. Nothing but death could solve the dilemma. Thus, the Word, who could not die, assumed a mortal body and having fulfilled the law by His death, offered His human nature a sacrifice for all.¹

Anselm, with the writings of Tertullian, Cyprian and Athanasius, was able to develop more fully the Satisfaction Theory. Many summaries of Cur Deus Homo have been written each with varying points of emphasis. Neve brings the primary thoughts to our attention in the following:

"The key to the understanding of Anselm's range of ideas is the Kingdom of God. God is the Lord and King of the world. In the beginning He created the angels to inhabit His Kingdom. After their fall, God created man as a substitute for the loss which He had suffered. But through a wilful disobedience Adam also sinned and refused God's purpose. Sin, therefore, is embedded in the will and consists of lack of righteousness which man owes God. God's honor is thus offended. For His honor consists in this His will and plan should come to completion and every creature should subject itself to Him. Since Adam and mankind constitute a unity in him and with him, all men have sinned.

"It is impossible for God in mercy simply to remit this sin, because such action would bring disorder into His Kingdom. Therefore there must be either punishment or satisfaction. But punishment, that is eternal condemnation, would have defeated God's own eternal plan of man's salvation in His kingdom. So, then, there had to be satisfaction. But was man able to render an adequate satisfaction? The

1. H. Orton Wiley, Christian Theology, Vol. II, p. 234.

fact was that he could not. What he might have been able to do by means of contrition would not have been an equivalent. Still it had to be man's own satisfaction.

"It was this that made necessary the incarnation of the Son of God. Only as God-Man (Deus-Homo) could Christ take our place and render that satisfaction. The satisfaction, however, did not consist in Christ's earthly life of obedience, for as one living in the world He owed such obedience to God. The significance of a real satisfaction lay exclusively in the giving up of His life. To this He was not obligated, because He was sinless and needed not to die. The value of Christ's death was heightened by His voluntary submission. Such a voluntary, self-sacrificing death of a sinless one God had to reward. But for Himself the God-Man was in need of no reward, for anything that the Father has is already His, and in His sinlessness He owes no debt that might be remitted. Therefore, He gives His reward, the fruit of His work, to those for whose salvation He became man, namely to His brethren who are burdened with debt." ¹

Anselm's basic assumption is that satisfaction must be made by man. The Deus-Homo appears that He might be able to give the satisfaction which God absolutely demands. The Atonement is worked out according to the strict requirements of justice. The whole concept is juridical in its inmost essence; and the same legal idea is carried further, when he goes on to show how this merit earned by Christ becomes available for men. God's demand for satisfaction proves the seriousness with which He regards sin.

b. Thomas Aquinas and Superabundant Merit.

It is said that the perfection of scholasticism was reached in Thomas Aquinas, who by birth was an Italian aristocrat. (d.1274) He was an accomplished scholar of mature Romanism and

1. J.L. Neve, A History of Christian Thought, Vol. I, p. 195.

was a great literary genius with all-embracing interest.¹ His writings were extensive.

In the third part of the Summa Theologiae, Thomas deals with the incarnation and with the work of Christ. He speaks of the rationale of the incarnation. The principal reason for the incarnation is represented as the goodness of God. In this he was in agreement with Augustine but in disagreement with Anselm. He maintained that it was not necessary, in the strict sense, that Christ should have suffered and died. God might have chosen some other way to save men. From Christ's death man learns how much God loves the world and is incited to love Him.

Later, Thomas writes of the appropriateness of Christ's death. McGiffert concisely points out these five reasons:

"First to render satisfaction for sin by submitting to the penalty deserved by men; secondly to show the reality of his human flesh; thirdly to deliver us from the fear of death; fourthly to set us an example of dying spiritually unto sin; and fifthly that by rising from the dead he might give us the hope of a resurrection."²

Christ by suffering out of love and obedience offered God something greater than was needed to pay for all the sins of the human race. It was this thought namely, that Christ's suffering was not only a sufficient but a superabundant satisfaction for the sins of the human race, for which Thomas is particularly remembered.

1. Ibid., p. 200.

2. Arthur Cushman McGiffert, A History of Christian Thought, Vol. II, p. 290.

It is said that Thomas was the first theologian to do justice to Anselm's theory of the work of Christ, but he both modified and enlarged it. Whereas Anselm had strongly emphasized the necessity of the incarnation, Thomas went beyond him and taught that the satisfaction rendered by Christ had both a positive as well as a negative value. It was not only the forgiveness of human sin but also the bestowal of the divine life and the quickening of man's love for God and devotion to him. He brought together both objective as well as subjective elements.

3. The Subjective Theory and Abelard.

A third type of Atonement theory had its beginnings in Abelard. This is known as the Subjective or Example view of the Atonement.

Abelard was born in Brittany in 1079 and was the eldest son of a noble house. He gave himself to the pursuit of learning. He was a pupil of the nominalist Roscellin and the famous realist William of Champeaux. Later he repudiated the teaching of both of these men. In 1141 Pope Innocent II condemned Abelard as a heretic but the sentence was not carried out. He found refuge in the monastery of Cluny and died the following year.

He was not a skeptic or even a rationalist in the thoroughgoing sense. He believed one should fully understand a doctrine before accepting it and that doctrines must be in harmony with reason

or they could not be true. Concerning the Atonement which was set forth in his commentary on Romans, he rejected the thought that Christ by his death paid a price to Satan. He also rejected Anselm's view which had recently been formulated. He maintained there was nothing in the nature of God to hinder the free exercise of forgiveness. The only hindrance was in men, not in God. Christ lived among men and died in order to reveal the love of God, and thus arouse in them an answering love which is their redemption. McGiffert remarks that rarely has subjectivity in ethics been carried further than in the work of Abelard.¹ Years later, in the sixteenth century, much of the thought of Abelard was enlarged by Socinus into that which is known as the Moral Influence Theory of Atonement.

B. Divergent Views of the Reformation Era.

1. Penal Satisfaction Theory.

With the great religious upheaval of the Reformation, the doctrine of the Atonement assumes the more complete form in which it entered the great Protestant creeds. Orr, by way of summary says,

"The Reformers were at one in this view of the expiatory character of the death of Christ, as rendering satisfaction to the majesty of the law of God, violated by sin; and in all the great Protestant creeds, accordingly, is enshrined in some form of words the testimony--'He satisfied the divine justice'".²

1. Ibid., p. 217.

2. James Orr, The Progress of Dogma (London, Hodder and Stoughton, 1901), p. 237.

The Anselmic theory had undergone important changes. It is true that the Reformers had taken over the satisfaction idea but instead of the sacrifice of Christ securing such merit as was capable of being imputed to the guilty, they now held that the satisfaction of Christ was a penal substitution for the sinner. Satisfaction now had the meaning of substitution rather than merit. The Reformers also considered the active obedience of Christ as a part of the redemptive price, as well as His voluntary death. But Anselm said that the satisfaction which Christ offered could not have been His obedience, for this He owed to God as a man.

Grensted, in giving the Penal Satisfaction Theory in short form, says this:

"Justice demands the punishment of sin. Therefore, the attitude of a just God towards the sinner can only be one of wrath. But if the punishment is endured to the uttermost by One who adequately represents the sinner, justice is satisfied and God's mercy towards the sinner can have free play. The thought is wholly Godward, and that from the assertion of which the early fathers shrank is now boldly proclaimed. By the death of Christ, God's attitude towards man is actually changed. Wrath is transformed to love. Mercy is the result of Calvary, or, at least, is freed by the Cross from the necessity of enforcing the stern obligation of justice.

This concept underlies the Augsburg Confession, which speaks of Christ as having

' . . . truly suffered, been crucified, dead and buried, that He might reconcile the Father to us' . . . " 1

(From Article 3 of Augsburg Confession)

1. L.W. Grensted, A Short History of the Doctrine of the Atonement (London, University Press, 1920), p. 204.

Grensted says further in this same connection,

" It is significant that the careful usage of St. Paul who always speaks of man as reconciled to God, and never of God as reconciled to man, is here abandoned." ¹

a. Luther and monergism without determinism.

Luther's atonement theory was not worked out in detail. As one studies his writings, he is impressed with his mystical and passionate rhetoric rather than systematic thought. However, all the elements of the Reformation doctrine are present. His view of sin is much deeper than that of the Middle Ages. To Anselm, sin was a dishonor done to God, or an act which deprived God of His due. But Luther went back to the strong positive view of Athanasius and Augustine which saw sin as a corruption bringing death. It was a corruption of man's very nature which brought with it an inordinate desire to sin. For Luther the thought of God's grace dominated all else. It is upon grace and grace only that justifying faith depends. Man cannot of himself establish such faith, for his will is enslaved to sin. Thus, Luther like Augustine was led to reject all belief in man's free will to do right. Apart from grace, man has not even power to respond to God's call to freedom. However, Seeberg makes this important observation:

"But Luther never, when unfolding his religious ideas, especially in his sermons, permitted these principles

1. Ibid.

to lead him to determinism or predestination. For him there exists between God and man a personal and ethical relation."¹

The following elements of atonement doctrine appear in Luther's writings. The atonement is stated from the viewpoint of legal justice. The death of Christ is the legal penalty for sin. The law demands punishment and that punishment must be inflicted and endured. However, it would not be just that Christ should suffer unless He were a sinner Himself. In other words He must be identified with man in their sin. In explaining the way in which Christ's punishment for sin is made available to man, Luther has a bare concept of substitution. The sin and its penalty cannot be both on Christ and on us too. Therefore we are free. In studying Luther, one sees he is filled with the sense of the great love of God. He brings love into prominence.--God is not a cruel judge. Then too, he constantly insisted the Atonement must be appropriated by faith. This faith comes wholly from God and yet it is a personal thing.

b. Melancthon and synergism.

Philip Melancthon was the systematizer of Lutheran thought. It has been said that what Martin boldly began, this Philip finely spun and gave it the proper form. Neve quotes Luther as having said,

1. Reinhold Seeberg, Text-Book of the History of Doctrines, tr. by Charles E. Hay (Grand Rapids, Parker House, 1958), p. 265, footnote.

"I am a rough pioneer who has to blaze the trail and even up the path. But Magister Philip proceeds quietly and with a clean hand; building, planting, sowing and watering with pleasure according to the rich gifts with which God has endowed him."¹

He was a man of irenic disposition and was ready for concessions in order to serve the cause of union. There were important points where he differed with Luther.

In Luther's controversy with Erasmus, Melancthon was prodded to examine the whole concept of monergism. He became convinced that logically this led to determinism. He could not find determinism in the Scriptures and forcefully objected to it as "Stoic fatalism." He could not believe all things are determined, but felt that God does not cause a man to sin, rather, that man is responsible for sin. He said man is also responsible for accepting or rejecting the promises of God, for God does not force salvation upon an individual as if he were a block of wood or a piece of stone.

Manschreck pointedly says,

"Melancthon consciously steered a course between Pelagius and Augustine because he did not think either remained true to Scripture or to experience... Melancthon never was a Pelagian; he never attributed anything meritorious to the will's activity. He did not use the word "co-operate" and he did not say that the will acts by its own powers."²

1. J.L. Neve, A History of Christian Thought, Vol. I, p. 256.

2. Clyde Leonard Manschreck, The Quiet Reformer (New York, Abingdon Press, 1959), pp. 300, 301.

He felt assured that the promise of mercy was to all men. He could see no reason why only some should receive mercy and others should not, unless man is in some way responsible. If man did not have the power to accept or reject God's gift of salvation, it would not be a gift and man would not be ethically responsible. Neve at this point asserts that as early as 1535 Melanchthon wrote in his *Loci* there were three causes of conversion: The Word, the Holy Spirit and the human will. "He speaks of a freedom of the will that man had retained by which he has the power of applying himself to grace."¹

It is important to remember that the Lutheran Church, by and large, rejected Melanchthon's synergism. However, it furnished a basis for the Arminian development some years later.

Concerning the atonement, Grensted in quoting from the *Loci* (*Loci Praecipui Theologici* p. 603) says Melanchthon has summed up his position in a phrase: "Christ's benefits are these: to bear guilt and eternal death that is, to placate the great wrath of God."²

Melanchthon constantly uses sacrificial language in speaking of the death of Christ, the one true Victim for sin. Christ is the propitiatory sacrifice, making satisfaction for guilt and for eternal punishment.

1. Neve, *Op. cit.*, p. 258.

2. L.W. Grensted, *A Short History of the Atonement*, p. 207.

c. Calvin and Limited Atonement.

Calvin was a theologian who was more precise in his statements and who, in his "Institutio", has left a clear, reasoned account of his belief. He followed the Anselmic method but modified the aspect of justice. He said justice was avenging and demanded punishment for sin in its own right. However, he was not unmindful of the love of God. This will be seen in the following quotation from the "Institutes" which is perhaps Calvin's most characteristic exposition of his atonement theory and the principal elements are all present.

"For God, who is the highest righteousness, cannot love unrighteousness that he sees in us all. . . Thus he is moved by pure and freely given love of us to receive us into grace. . . Therefore, to take away all cause for enmity and to reconcile us utterly to himself, he wipes out all evil in us by the expiation set forth in the death of Christ. . .

The overruling love of God, which is indeed in some way one with His justice is firmly maintained. . . A righteous love cannot love iniquity. God does not hate us, but sin in us. How then can wrath give place and love find a way? It can only be by the full satisfaction of the claims of avenging justice." ¹

According to Calvin's thought, when man considers his natural condition, combined with the stress of the law, there is awakened in him a sense of helplessness. Grace alone saves us through Christ. The purpose of God is the "first cause" of our salvation. God appoints his only-begotten Son to be a

1. John Calvin, Op. cit., Institutes of The Christian Religion, Bk. II, Ch. XVI, sec. 3, p. 504.

"fountain of grace". At this point Seeberg, in interpreting Calvin's thought, says:

"Since now it was to be the mission of Christ both to convince men of the gracious disposition of God toward them, making them his children, and to render satisfaction to the Father in our stead, it was necessary that the Son of God should become man, since for both the purposes indicated both divine and human nature would be required in him. Yet we cannot speak here of an absolute necessity but only of the divine decree by which this was made the method of our salvation. With this general premise, Calvin presents the mediatorial work of Christ under the three aspects of the prophetic, royal, and high-priestly offices." ¹

When the Institutes were first published in 1536 there was only a small section in which he spoke of predestination in its double form. But Calvin was only interested in election. However, in 1539, when the greatly enlarged edition appeared, a special chapter was given to predestination. In this second edition God becomes the author of sin. God's agency effects the Fall and all the actions of men of whatever sort. Moreover, His own glory is represented as the controlling motive in the predestinating activity of God. McGiffert attributes Bucer's influence upon Calvin as the chief cause in this change of doctrine, for in the first edition Calvin had specifically denied that God was the author of sin. It is remarkable that Calvin made Bucer's thought an integral part of his complete system of theology and inserted it in his "Institutes". McGiffert states:

1. Reinhold Seeberg, Text-Book of the History of Doctrine, p. 401.

"Standing by itself, the doctrine of absolute and unconditional predestination would probably not long have found general acceptance... But Calvin gave it an essential place in a system whose controlling principle was the majesty and might of God. As a result, to reject or even to minimize it seemed to limit God and throw contempt upon Him."¹

Orr pointedly says,

"There is a side of Calvin's system which urgently calls for rectification and supplement. Calvin errs in placing his root-idea of God in sovereign will rather than in love. Love is subordinated to sovereignty, instead of sovereignty to love."²

By this method of logical processes and by adopting an absolute and unconditional predestination not only was there no room for human responsibility but the concept of the atonement becomes limited. In actuality Christ's death atones only for the elect, so Calvin says. This was to cause severe reaction a few years later.

2. Governmental Theory of Atonement.

James Arminius was a Dutch theologian (d. 1609) who was the author of a modified reformed theology. After studying under Theodore Beza in Geneva and in Basel, he was appointed to a theological professorship at Leyden University following his ordination. Here he came into sharp collision with a colleague, Franz Gomarus, and as result of their debates, their respective positions were

1. Arthur Cushman McGiffert, Protestant Thought Before Kant, (New York, Charles Scribner's Sons), (1912), p. 85.

2. James Orr, The Progress of Dogma, p. 292.

defined. Arminius held that Calvin's doctrine made God the author of sin and that it restricted God's grace. Further he said that this left multitudes without hope and it condemned multitudes for believing the truth, viz, that for them no salvation was either intended or provided in Christ, and gave an absolutely false security to those who believed themselves to be the elect of God. Therefore Arminius advocated a position of a conditional election, a universal atonement, total depravity of man, resistible grace and referred to but did not assert the thought of conditional perserverance.

To all peoples of Arminian persuasion, the Synod of Dort will always remain as a badly conducted, rigged assembly. The delegation of thirteen Arminians, of whom Simon Episcopus was spokesman, were treated as prisoners and were refused a hearing. The result of the Synod was a foregone conclusion and the canons of high Calvinism were reasserted. Predestination was exalted to the position of a dogma, and its opponents defeated. Seeberg has a pertinent remark just here:

"Predestination was once a support for the assurance of salvation; now it has itself been made the fundamental conception. The course was once from below upward, i.e., from justification to predestination; now it is from above downward, i.e., from predestination to justification."¹

1. Reinhold Seeberg, Text-Book of the History of Doctrines, p. 424.

The modified position of the Remonstrants is briefly as follows: God determined before the foundation of the world to save through Christ those of the fallen human race who should believe on him; man does not by the power of his free will attain saving faith, but he is born and renewed to such faith by Christ through his Holy Spirit; the beginning and also the progress and completion of good in man is dependent upon grace; but grace does not work irresistibly; those who have received the Spirit and faith are able, through the assistance of grace, to struggle against all temptations and come off victorious. A typical quotation from the writings of Arminius concerning predestination is as follows:

"That predestination is the decree of the good pleasure of God, in Christ, by which he determined within himself from all eternity to justify believers, to adopt them and to endow them with eternal life, to the praise of the glory of his grace and even for the declaration of his justice...

"As opposed to election, therefore we define reprobation to be the decree of God's anger or of his severe will, by which, from all eternity, he determined to condemn to eternal death all unbelievers and impenitent persons, for the declaration of his power and anger..."¹

The foundations for a Governmental or Rectoral Theory of Atonement were laid by Arminius but it was Hugo Grotius, a brilliant jurist and originator of international law, who formulated and systematized the theory. It said that the atonement was not a

1. James Arminius, The Writings of James Arminius, tr. by James Nichols, W.R. Bagnall, Vol. II (Grand Rapids, Baker House, 1956), p. 83.

satisfaction to any internal principle of the divine nature, but it was a satisfaction to the necessities of God's government. It was not the exactitude of divine justice of Anselm but emphasized the just and compassionate will of God. Thus he sought to stress the love of God as well as His justice. Grotius differed from Arminius in that he limited the satisfaction made by Christ to the dignity of the law, the honor of the lawgiver and the protection of the universe. This was not in Arminius' original writings. The central idea of the Dutch lawyer was that God must not be regarded as the offended or injured party, but as the moral Governor of the universe. He must therefore uphold the authority of His government in the interests of the general good. Therefore the sufferings of our Lord are to be regarded, not as the exact equivalent of our punishment, but only as proof that the dignity of the divine government was effectively upheld and vindicated. The dignity was as effectively upheld as if we had received the punishment we deserved.

Wiley observes:

"It was at this point, however, that the satisfactionists urged their criticism of his position. He taught that the law under which man is held, both as to penalty and precept, is a positive product of the divine will; and therefore He may, as a moral Governor, relax its demands. It was this position as to the relaxation of the demands of the law that subjected him to criticism."¹

1. H. Orton Wiley, Christian Theology, Vol. II, p. 252.

Grotius used a term which Duns Scotus had used, namely, 'acceptilatio' and thus he was accused of acceding too much to the Socinians.

Wiley in quoting from Pope's Compend of Christian Theology points out this important deficiency of the Governmental Theory:

"It dwells too exclusively on its necessity for the vindication of God's righteousness as the Ruler of all. Not to speak of the invincible repugnance felt by every reverent mind to the thought that our Lord was thus made a spectacle to the universe, this theory errs by making a subordinate purpose supreme."¹

3. Moral Influence Theories of Atonement.

The Moral Influence Theories take their name from the assumption that salvation comes through the appeal of divine love. The value of Christ's death is limited to an influence upon mankind and a power to subdue enmity in the human heart. There is no thought that Christ's death expiated sin, or placated divine wrath, or in any way satisfied divine justice. The only obstacle to man's forgiveness is man's hardness of heart and unbelief. Because Christ's death is a display of God's love, man's unbelief is removed and he is motivated to salvation.

a. Socinus. Socinus points out at some length the inconsistencies of the Satisfaction Theory. He said satisfaction and pardon were incompatible, that the whole substitutionary theory is incompatible with any true justice and in any case

1. Ibid., p. 253.

Christ's suffering does not meet the demands of satisfaction and finally that a satisfaction made and accepted by God was simple license for antinomianism. The primary function of Christ, according to Socinus, was prophetic. As a prophet He taught men the promises of God and also gave them an example of a perfect life. Grensted gives the following quotation from the writings of Socinus:

"Christ takes away sins because by heavenly and most ample promises He attracts and is strong to move all men to penitence, whereby sins are destroyed. . . He takes away sins because by the example of His most innocent life, He very readily draws all, who have not lost hope, to leave their sins and zealously to embrace righteousness and holiness." ¹

This was Socinianism in its baldest form and gave no adequate explanation either of the Cross or of the power of Atonement in Christian experience.

b. Mystical Theories of Moral Influence. These have been called, by Dr. Bruce, "Redemption by Sample". The mysticism lies in the identification of Christ with the race in the sense that He rendered to God the perfect devotion and obedience which ought to be rendered by man and which in some sense mankind offered in Him. The meaning of sacrifice in Scripture, it holds, is only self-sacrifice by self-consecration to God's service.

Schleiermacher held that the atonement is purely subjective. He denied any objective satisfaction to God. His concept

1. L.W. Grensted, A Short History of the Doctrine of the Atonement, p. 287.

of the work of Christ was that being one with God, Christ taught men that they could be one with God; and His consciousness of being in God and knowing God, gave Him the power to communicate it to others. For this reason, He became a Mediator and a Saviour.

Ritschl was one of the most influential representatives of the moral influence in Germany. To him, Christ was a Saviour in much the same sense as Buddha--achieving His lordship over the world by His indifference to it. He was the Word of God only in so far as He revealed this divine indifference to things. Neve observes:

"The revelation in Christ never had the purpose of establishing a new relationship between God and man but was only to reveal to man the never-changing attitude of divine love. . . . The example of Jesus, he says, inspires men with a believing conviction of the love of God and of their forgiveness and justification by Him." ¹

Bushnell's Moral Influence Theory is frequently regarded as the clearest and best statement of moral influence in relation to the atonement. It regards the race as identified with Christ, but is given separate mention because of its distinct character. Christ's priesthood is resolved in sympathy, that is, there are certain moral sentiments, such as the repulsiveness of sin and resentment against wrong in both God and man. These must not be extirpated, but mastered and allowed to remain. Thus Christ came into

1. J.L. Neve, A History of Christian Thought, Vol. II, p. 150.

the world, he held, to renovate the character of man. He did this by demonstrating in His life and death the pity, forbearance, and yearning love of God. These expressions were, strictly speaking, Socinian. These were set forth in an early writing "Vicarious Sacrifice" but later he wrote again on the subject in his "Forgiveness and Law" and in this there are indications of a more orthodox position.

C. Summary

In the review of the Patristic period it was noted there was no careful systematization of the doctrine of atonement. Primitive church teachers lived more in thankful enjoyment of redemption than in logical reflection upon it. Nevertheless, all the essential elements of the later church doctrine of redemption may be found either expressed or implied, before the close of the second century. The Classic Theory emphasized:

1. The work of atonement is carried through by God Himself as the effective agent;
2. It has a dualistic background and in dramatic terms the Divine will triumphs over real evil forces.

The Latin Theory is essentially legalistic and in speaking of Christ's work, emphasis is upon Christ as man bringing satisfaction to the justice of God. Anselm as it's proponent may be summarized in this way: It is impossible for God in mercy to remit sin; there must be either punishment or satisfaction; but eternal

punishment would defeat God's Kingdom plan; since man could not give adequate satisfaction, the God-Man came; only He could take our place and render satisfaction; in giving up His life, He satisfied God's justice; God had to reward this; since Christ needed no reward, He gives the fruit of His work to men who are burdened with debt; this is sufficient for their salvation.

The Subjective Theory had its beginning in the writings of Abelard. He maintained there was nothing in the nature of God to hinder the free exercise of forgiveness. Christ lived among men and died for the purpose of revealing God's love. Mankind thus has a strong moral influence to love God. This is his redemption.

By the time of the Reformation Anselm's theory had undergone important changes and the Penal Satisfaction Theory became dominant. Satisfaction now had the meaning of penal substitution for the sinner, and the active obedience of Christ was considered part of the redemptive price. The thought is wholly Godward. God is reconciled to man rather than St. Paul's emphasis of man's being reconciled to God. With the exception of the later writings of Melancthon, a strong monergism prevails. In Calvin's writings, where the thought is pressed to its logical extreme, grace alone is the effective agent, predestination is absolute and unconditional and little room remains for moral responsibility. It becomes a limited atonement.

It was not long until a reactionary movement brought, through Arminius and Grotius, the Governmental Theory of Atonement. The emphasis was upon a universal atonement, conditional election and resistible grace. Satisfaction, to Grotius, was to the necessities of God's government. It was not the exact equivalent of our punishment but was satisfaction to God's government in that the dignity of it was effectively upheld and vindicated. It was unfortunate that a subordinate purpose was made supreme in Grotius' system.

Socinus, Schleiermacher, Ritschl, and Bushnell adopted varying forms of a Moral Influence Theory of Atonement. As a result of an appeal of divine love, which is strong through the sufferings of Christ, comes salvation. This subjective theory contains no thought of Christ's death as an expiation of sin, or the placation of divine wrath or the satisfaction of divine justice. The example of Christ inspires men with a believing conviction of the love of God. All forms of this theory fall far short of being an adequate explanation.

With this framework and rich background of historical thought in mind, it will be interesting to investigate the Atonement Doctrine of these two contemporary theologians. Their opinions are widely divergent and yet there is much food for thought in their discussions.

CHAPTER II.

THE PRESENTATION OF THE ATONEMENT

BY DR. WILEY

CHAPTER II.

THE PRESENTATION OF THE ATONEMENT

BY DR. WILEY

A. Significant Biographical Notations.

Henry Orton Wiley was born in Marquette, Nebraska in 1877. The family early moved to Oregon and shortly thereafter to Red Bluff in northern California. His earliest professional training was as a pharmacist. He was called into the ministry and went into the work of the United Brethren Church. He attended Pacific School of Religion in Berkeley, California where in 1910 he took his B.D. degree; in 1917 his S.T.M. degree and in 1929 his S.T.D. degree.

In 1901 Wiley came in contact with the Church of the Nazarene and it was during his student days that he became pastor of the Berkeley Nazarene Church. He was ordained to their ministry in 1906. In 1910 he went to Pasadena to be the first dean of Pasadena College. For ten years he was president of what later became known as Northwest Nazarene College but returned to Pasadena in 1926 and took the presidency. Except for an interlude of five years during which time he was editor of the Herald of Holiness, the official weekly magazine of the Church of the Nazarene, he served this college as president for twenty-three years. In 1948 he became President Emeritus and continued to teach and to write until shortly before his fatal illness. In the summer of 1961

Dr. Wiley passed away at the age of eighty-four. A memorial issue of the Herald of Holiness began its tribute to him in this manner:

"Dr. H. Orton Wiley has gone to be with the Lord he loved with all his heart, soul, strength, and in a special way with all his mind. However one might measure him, H. Orton Wiley stood head and shoulders above other men. He has left a place in the holiness movement no one else can ever fill."¹

Wiley was widely recognized outside the Nazarene denomination as a leading theologian. His three volume work, "Christian Theology", was the result of twenty years work and it has gone through seven printings and the translations of his works are having a significant impact upon Japan, Formosa and other foreign countries.

Dr. Gerald O. McCulloh, head of the Division of Theological Education, Board of Education of The Methodist Church said:

"Dr. H. Orton Wiley has rendered significant service to American Christianity both as an author and a teacher. In his Christian Theology he has kept alive an interest in the theological contribution of Jacobus Arminius to reformation thought. Through his teaching he has imparted to younger scholars his enthusiasm for research in the Arminian sources of the Christian demand for sanctification through the work of the Holy Spirit."²

B. The Atonement: Its Biblical Basis and History.

Wiley has a plain manner of speech and his writing concerning the Atonement is presented in the traditional form. By way of

1. W.T. Purkiser, "Dr. H. Orton Wiley", Herald Of Holiness, (Oct. 4, 1961), p. 11.

2. Ibid., p. 12.

introducing the subject he points out the following general remarks: (1) Since the subject may be approached from so many angles, our knowledge will be unbalanced and fragmentary unless we consider the scriptural presentation of expiation, propitiation, redemption and reconciliation; (2) It is important to guard against fallacies which arise through abstract processes of thought. There is not a leading idea of this important subject that has not been drawn out into unprofitable abstractions; (3) A sharp distinction should be made between the fact of the atonement, and the various theories which are advanced as explanation; (4) Literature on this subject is enormous and apart from basic facts becomes confusing and unprofitable.

1. Noteworthy Emphases in the Biblical Basis.

Ten pages are given in Wiley's writing to consideration of the Biblical Basis of Atonement and a study of these reveals his school of thought and to a certain extent his classification theologically.

He says the doctrine of atonement was gradually unfolded to the world. Old Testament sacrifices foreshadow atonement. This is seen in three principal stages of development. (1) Primitive Sacrifices. From the beginning the sacrifices were of divine origin. The earliest example (that of Cain and Abel) shows sacrifice was offered in faith and was divinely approved. Sacrifices were regarded as expiatory in character. This is further

seen in prohibiting blood as food. While the sacrifices had no power in themselves to atone for sin, they pointed forward in faith to Christ who had power.

(2) Sacrifices of the Mosaic Economy. The need for reconciliation became evident in Israel. Sacrifice took on a moral character. Through sacrifice Israel was now dependent on God's will. In the new economy there was a further appeal to man's freedom. The universal law of conscience took on added importance. The Law demanded Holiness (Lev. 18:5). In the sacrifice which was instituted the primary idea was propitiation. Blood had a twofold significance: it was a representation of the pure life which the sinner should have; and it was an atonement made expiatory through death only. Thus the sacrificial lamb was a symbol of the Lamb slain before the foundation of the world. It was the life poured out that was pleasing to God. Sacrifice in the Mosaic economy not only pointed to Christ as the great anti-type, but was a revelation of the true nature of human sacrifice. In this period the Messianic idea developed in Israel.

(3) Predictions of the Prophets supplemented the sacrifices of the law. The prophets more fully developed the Messianic idea. Perhaps the highest reach of spiritual truth in the Old Testament is found in Isaiah's remarkable prophecy concerning the suffering Servant of Jehovah. Since by His stripes we are healed, His death must be regarded as propitiatory.

Wiley next comes to the New Testament concept of sacrifice and says that which was foreshadowed in the Old Testament is completed in the New. Christ is described as having died according to the Scriptures. Our Lord himself represents His death as a ransom for men. He laid down his life voluntarily. Christ's death was sacrificial and propitiatory. This is seen in Romans 3:21-26. It was a propitiatory sacrifice accepted of God for all men, in such a manner that God is just and the justifier of all who put their faith in the efficacy of that death. Notice here that Wiley makes much of the atonement for all men. He says further the death of Christ is never represented as merely a means of propitiation, but as an actual propitiatory sacrifice. It was an objective sacrifice for us. Scriptures teach that Christ takes the place of sinners as a whole. His sacrifice was the equivalent for all who had come under the penalty of death by reason of sin. His death has universal significance because of His divine nature. The death of Christ is not to be limited to moral influence as an external constraining power but must be regarded as a propitiatory offering which avails for the remission of sins.

In explaining the Biblical basis of atonement Wiley makes three subdivisions in this important subject. (1) The Motive of Atonement. The motive for the atonement is found in the love of God. This is the moving cause of redemption (John 3:16). The

atonement whether its motive, its purpose or its extent is considered, it must be understood as the provision and expression of God's righteous and holy love.

(2) Its Vicariousness. Mr. Watson is quoted as saying, "Christ suffered in our room and stead, and as a proper substitute for us."¹ This is shown by the Scriptures which declare that He died for men or in Scriptures that connect His death with the punishment due our offenses, as Rom. 5:6, 8; II Cor. 5:14,15,21; Gal. 1:4. The vicarious or substitutionary death of Christ is known as the procuring cause of salvation.

(3) Its Scriptural Terminology. As being under the curse of the law, the sinner is guilty and exposed to the wrath of God; but in Christ his guilt is expiated and the wrath of God propitiated. I John 2:2, 4:10; Rom. 3:25; Heb. 2:17.

The sinner is under the bondage of Satan and sin, but through the redemptive price of the blood of Christ, he is delivered from bondage and set at liberty. Rom. 3:24; I Cor. 6:20; Gal. 3:13; Eph. 1:7; I Pet. 1:18, 19; Matt. 20:28; I Tim. 2:6; Rev. 5:9.

The sinner is estranged from God, but is reconciled by Christ's death on the cross. By reconciliation much more is meant than the laying aside of our enmity to God. The relation is a judicial one and this judicial variance between God and man is

1. H. Orton Wiley, Christian Theology, Vol. II, p. 228.

absolved by the nonimputation of our trespasses to us. Rom. 5:10, 11; II Cor. 5:18,19; Eph. 2:16; Col. 1:20-22.

In the thought of Wiley three words are of key importance, Propitiation, Redemption and Reconciliation. Each of the Scripture references cited above, are examined in context.

2. Various Theories in the Earlier History of the Atonement.

It is interesting to follow Wiley's interpretation of the earlier history of the atonement. He says the apostolic fathers followed very closely the words of Scripture, teaching that Christ gave Himself for our sins. The views were not formulated into a definite theory. One of the most popular views, he records, regarded the atonement as a victory over Satan and traces the concept through Irenaeus, Origen, Gregory and Augustine. Wiley quotes Dr. Banks as saying that Gregory of Nyssa was the only one who held the ransom theory in its unqualified form but the ransom theory in its qualified form (shorn of objectionable features) was held by Irenaeus and Augustine. Athanasius, Wiley says, is supposed to have been the first to propound the theory that the death of Christ was the payment of debt due to God.

At this point this note is injected: It is during this earlier period that we first notice a trend toward belief in predestination and limited atonement. Apart from Augustine and his followers, it was the common belief that Christ died for all, and

that it was the unfeigned will of God that all men should partake of salvation through Him. The fact that some are saved and some are not was explained by reference to man's free agency and not by electing grace. Before Augustine, synergism was the dominant view--i.e., the individual in his recovery from sin works with God through grace universally bestowed as a free gift, in such a manner as to condition the result. One begins to see one of Wiley's dominant themes just here.

After discussing Augustine, Anselm's theory is seen. He says Anselm gave the first scientific statement to those views of the atonement which from the beginning had been held implicitly by the Fathers. Here satisfaction to divine justice became the leading formula. Anselm gave a prominent place to "honor", "justice", "satisfaction", and "merit" and rejected wholly the theory of a ransom paid to Satan. Wiley observes,

"It should be noted here, that Christ renders satisfaction to divine justice, not by bearing the penalty of a broken law in the sinner's place, but indirectly by the acquisition of merit."¹

Wiley examines the theory of Abelard briefly. Abelard held that atonement was a winning exhibition of the divine love. To him, benevolence was the only attribute concerned in redemption. He says Abelard's position became the basis of the later Socinianism.

1. Ibid., p. 236.

Scholastic Developments. Here are seen the beginning trends for that which later became Tridentine Soteriology and the strict penal satisfaction theory of the early Protestant reformers. Peter Lombard accepted the position of Abelard and opposed that of Anselm. Bernard of Clairvaux and Hugh of St. Victor adopted in the main, the position of Anselm. It was Bonaventura (1221-1274) and Thomas Aquinas who largely shaped the theology of the Roman Catholic Church.

Wiley notes there developed during this period those forces which finally led to the Reformation. He says further that mediating theologians paved the way for reform (1) by admitting a relative view of the atonement but showing it could not supersede the absolute idea of satisfaction without great peril to the Church and (2) by keeping alive the Anselmic idea of absolute satisfaction through Christ alone.

Tridentine Soteriology. Here Wiley points out that the "unio mystica" gave rise to two fundamental errors. (1) The guilt of the sinner was transferred to Christ in the same sense that Christ's merit was transferred to the sinner. This contradicted the universality of the atonement. (2) In the case of sin after baptism, the believer must be configured to his Lord by personal penance. This penance was of course imperfect, but it was regarded as an expiation joined to that of Christ. Thus a relative atonement.

The Reformation Period. Reformers revived the Anselmic theory of the absolute necessity for satisfaction in the divine nature, says Wiley. But satisfaction and merit of Anselm were given a distinctly different direction. Satisfaction became a penal substitutionary offering instead of an accumulation of merit which was imputed to the elect. The voluntary death of Christ removed the penalty from the elect, and His active obedience assured their personal righteousness. The Lutherans held the satisfaction of Christ was sufficient for all sins, both original and actual. The Reformed groups limited the scope of the atonement to the elect. Both regarded the voluntary death of Christ as the procuring cause of salvation.

Over against this the Socinians revived the theory of Abelard, and in a measure that of Duns Scotus. These were expressed in numerous moral influence theories.

According to Wiley it is noteworthy that the Arminians aimed at a middle ground between the extremes of the penal satisfaction theory and those of moral influence. Grotius developed his thought as he came in conflict with Socinians.

3. Modern Theories and Their Inadequacies.

Rather than following a chronological history of the various theories of the atonement, Wiley gives a classification of the principal forms which such theories have taken and points out their inadequacies.

(1) Penal Satisfaction Theory. This, he says, is the theory held by the Reformed churches and generally known as the Calvinistic theory. The thought is defined and the summation of Dr. A.A. Hodge is given an important place. According to Hodge this theory teaches: that the sufferings and death of Christ were a real atonement; that in making it Christ became the substitute of those whom He came to save; that as such He bore the penalty of their transgressions; that in so doing He made ample satisfaction to the demands of the law, and to the justice of God; that thus an actual reconciliation has been made between them and God.¹ (Hodge, Syst. Th., p. 472)

While pointing out that this theory has a valuable element of truth, yet Wiley notes the following weaknesses; it holds to a merely external transfer of the merits of Christ's work, while it does not clearly state the internal ground of that transfer, in the union of the believer with Christ; this theory leads of necessity, either to universalism on the one hand, or unconditional election on the other; it is associated with Calvinistic ideas of predestination and limited atonement and Arminians object to this on the basis that Christ died for all; and it leads logically to antinomianism, though advocates usually deny this. If Christ's active obedience is to be substituted for that of believers, it

1. Ibid., p. 242.

shuts out the necessity of personal obedience to the law of God, says Wiley.

(2) The Governmental or Rectoral Theory. This receives a rather kind treatment but here again Wiley points out insufficiencies. It is stated that Grotius in protest to the rigorous penal substitution theory on the one hand and the Socinian rejection of all vicarious intervention on the other, developed his theory. The Rectoral theory was not a satisfaction to any internal principle of the divine nature, but to the necessities of government. Grotius sought to lay emphasis upon the love of God as well as His justice. Wiley notes particularly that Grotius differed from Arminius by limiting the satisfaction made by Christ to the dignity of the law, the honor of the lawgiver and protection of the universe. Thus for Grotius the death of Christ was merely a deterrent to sin through an exhibition of its punishment. The sufferings of Christ are not the exact equivalent of our punishment, but only the vindication of divine dignity. Richard Watson, of Wesley's day, taught a modified form of the governmental theory. He held that the atonement is a satisfaction to the ethical nature of God as well as an expedient for sustaining the majesty of His government. Dr. John Miley (1813-1895) is the outstanding representative of the governmental theory in modern times. But he almost constructs a new governmental theory out of its former principles.

Wiley points out the following objections to the govern-

mental theory: it does not attach sufficient importance to the idea of propitiation and therefore lessens the idea of a real satisfaction of the divine attributes; it emphasizes the mercy of God in much the same sense that Calvinism emphasizes the justice of God; it is built on a false philosophical principle that utility is the ground of moral obligation; it practically ignores the immanent holiness of God, and substitutes for the chief aim of the atonement, that which is only subordinate.

(3) The Moral Influence Theories. Wiley classifies four general types of moral influence theory. These are the Socinian Theories; the Mystical Theories; Bushnell's Theory of Moral Influence; and The New Theology of McLeod Campbell and the Andover School. These have the basic assumption that salvation comes through the appeal of divine love. They limit the efficacy of Christ's death to Adam's race, making its value consist, not in its influence upon the divine mind, nor upon the universe at large, but upon the power of love to subdue the enmity of the human heart. They do not hold that the sacrifice of Christ expiated sin, or placated the divine wrath by suffering; or that the atonement in any wise satisfied divine justice. Wiley devotes eight pages to the discussion of these theories and concludes there are glaring shortcomings in them.

(4) The Ethical Theory. This is the classification given to the theory of Dr. A. H. Strong and Wiley considers it briefly.

He says Strong has sought to combine the essential elements of atonement under two main principles. The first is the atonement as related to the holiness of God and the second is the atonement as related to the humanity of Christ. The discussion is definitive in nature only.

(5) The Racial Theory. The last of modern theories of atonement is that of Dr. Olin A. Curtis, or the Racial Theory. Wiley says as in the Ethical Theory, holiness in God becomes the supreme factor in determining the nature of the atonement. Curtis found that justice in the satisfaction must be exchanged for holiness, and the automatic necessity be exchanged for the personal need of structural expression. The governmental idea required a profounder conception of the moral law, making it reach into the structure of the divine nature, and granting it a racial goal. The moral influence theory required that its conception of love should be so united to moral concern as to furnish a new atmosphere for holiness. That is, it should be holy love. It is interesting that Wiley does not point to insufficiencies in this theory.

C. The Atonement: Its Nature and Extent.

After considering the biblical basis of the atonement and tracing the development of its leading ideas in the history of the Church, Wiley is now ready for his presentation of atonement concept.

1. The Nature: Definition, the Ground, Vital Principle and Legal Aspects of the Atonement.

While the English word "atonement" covers a wide range of thought yet in theology it is used to express the idea of satisfaction or expiation. Wiley quotes definitions by Watson, Summers, Miley and Pope, who are Arminian Theologians, and points out these definitions set forth the main factors in the atonement. Dr. Pope, upon whom Wiley relies so often, is quoted giving this summary word:

"The finished work as accomplished by the Mediator himself, in His relation to mankind, is His divine-human obedience regarded as an expiatory sacrifice: the atonement proper. Then it may be studied in its results to God, as to God and man, and as to man."¹

a. The Ground or Occasion of the Atonement.

Wiley quotes Article II of Wesley's twenty-five articles and indicates that Jesus Christ by His sufferings, by the shedding of His own blood, and His meritorious death on the cross, made full atonement for all human sin. This atonement is sufficient for every individual of Adam's race. The ground or the occasion of the atonement then, is the existence in the world of both original and actual sin, together with the necessity for propitiation.

There are three necessities in which the atonement is grounded, says Wiley. (1) The nature and claims of the Divine Majesty, or the propitiatory idea. I John 4:10. If one holds firmly

1. Ibid., p. 272.

to the nature of God as holy love, then propitiation becomes the deepest fact of the atonement. (2) The upholding of the authority and honor of the Divine Sovereign, or the governmental necessity. The governmental theory of atonement makes prominent the sacrifice as a substitute for penalty (a substitute for public rather than retributive justice). (3) The bringing to bear upon the sinner, the strongest possible motive to repentance or moral influence theory. This is the appeal of divine love as seen in I John 3:16. He says the cross of Christ represents the greatest exhibition of God's love for man.

b. The Vital Principle of the Atonement.

The atonement is God's method of becoming immanent in a sinful race. He is not speaking of a pantheistic immanence. God is not immanent in man's sin and guilt consciousness. Sin has separated man and God. And yet, if man is to become God's spiritual son, this divine immanence must be re-established.

The pre-existent Logos is the ground of unity between Christ and the race, and therefore a fundamental factor in the atonement. Rom. 3:24-26 sets forth the atonement from its Godward and ethical side. Col. 1:14-22 most perfectly expresses the cosmical or metaphysical relations between God and man. Becoming immanent in the race, Christ becomes the efficient ground of both our justification and our sanctification.

The Incarnate Logos is the procuring cause of redemption.

As he gave existence to the race, so now He gives it life. Man is made in His image, and is constituted a person only in Him. Man is, therefore, bound to Him in a unique manner, and this new relationship underlies His whole redemptive work.

The restoration of the Spirit is a further aspect of this vital principle in the atonement, and is generally known as the efficient cause of salvation. As depravity is a consequence of the deprivation of the Spirit, so bestowal of the Spirit restores man's inner spiritual relations with God.

c. Legal Aspects of the Atonement.

There is a legal aspect. By this Wiley does not mean an artificial or merely external arrangement but simply that the vital principle is the expression of moral and spiritual law. Upon this view, the atonement becomes the transformation and glorification of law. Christ fulfilled the whole range of moral demand.

Christ delivers us from the law, not in the antinomian sense of abrogating all law, as seen in Gal. 4:4,5. Atonement does not do away with the law, but it does deliver men from its legal consciousness by becoming the ground of justification. Justification by faith is God's plan of enabling sinful men to pass from legal to the filial consciousness. The faith principle changes the formal and legal side of justification into something vital and spiritual--from lower legal bondage to the high plane of spiritual sonship.

2. The Vicarious Expiation.

By vicarious suffering or punishment Wiley does not mean merely that which is endured for the benefit of others, but that which is endured by one person instead of another. The two ideas of substitution and satisfaction are part of the concept. The idea of satisfaction rests in the twofold nature of Christ as the God-man. Satisfaction was rendered by One who was both God and man. His human nature involved the penal suffering of which the divine was incapable; and the Divine Nature gave infinite worth to the sacrifice. Since guilt was of infinite magnitude and was an offense against the absolute holiness of God, Christ as the God-man was the only being capable of making atonement for sinners.

It is important in reading Wiley to understand that he holds propitiation to be the dominant idea of the atonement. He says that other ideas grow out of and are subsidiary to propitiation.

(1) Propitiation has reference to the divine nature. This nature is holy love. God cannot tolerate sin, nor can He hold fellowship with sinners. This is an essential, eternal verity and is corroborated by II Cor. 6:14. God's nature being that of holy love, He cannot exhibit this love apart from righteousness, and therefore must maintain the honor of His divine sovereignty. Wiley adds that the idea of propitiation is the dominant note in the Wesleyan type of Arminian theology.

(2) Not only is propitiation concerned with the nature of God as holy love, it involves a consideration of the divine attributes as well. The tendency is to exalt one attribute above another and this has been the source of much error in theology, says Wiley. There is no conflict between mercy and justice--no lack of harmony between truth and righteousness. Thus the nature of God as expressed in the revelation of His perfections, devises a method of propitiation. I John 4:10.

An Exposition of the Scripture Terms Used to Express the Idea of Atonement. Wiley concludes this section with an exposition of three important scriptural terms:

- (1) propitiation--the sacrifice made to God as the ground of redemption.
- (2) redemption--the redemption price paid for the salvation of men.
- (3) reconciliation--the consequent reconciliation effected between God and mankind.

The word used for propitiation in Rom. 3:25 is "hilasterion". This refers to the lid or covering of the ark of the covenant in the holy of holies. Here the blood was sprinkled, and consequently it came to be known as the propitiatory or place of atonement. Note, first, the atonement or propitiation was made in the presence of God. Second, the sprinkling of the blood made possible the exhibition of mercy, and a drawing near to God.

Since propitiation is used in close connection with redemption, it is shown clearly that both propitiation and the

redemptive price refer to the sacrificial death of Jesus. He then considers the meaning of reconciliation. He says it is from the Greek word, "katallassein", which means to exchange, or to change the relation of one person to another, generally in the sense of an exchange of enmity for friendship. This is the word from which we have atonement, for in its strict, literal sense it means an at-one-ment, or reconciliation. This is the word in Rom. 5:11. The word of Col. 1:20,21 is an intensive form and signifies to reconcile fully.

3. The Godward and Manward Aspects of the Atonement.

Wiley makes this statement:

"Propitiation deals with the divine aspect of the atonement. Reconciliation deals with the double aspect of its Godward and manward relations. Redemption deals with the manward aspect."¹

In this section he considers the atonement as an accomplished fact, that is, as reconciliation and redemption.

The Atonement as Reconciliation. This expresses restored fellowship between God and man. It must be viewed in both its Godward and manward relations. God is both the Reconciler and the Reconciled. Man must also be regarded as reconciled--but he says this is best treated under redemption and reserves this for later consideration.

(1) God as the Reconciler and the Reconciled. Some

1. Ibid., p. 290.

object to this saying, God could not both demand and provide atonement. But man was created both dependent upon God and as a free responsible person. The atonement satisfied both of these relations. Scripture at this specific point is II Cor. 5:18, 19.

Two errors must be guarded against. First, one must not regard God as angry with man and that hostility overcome by the sacrifice of an innocent victim, for God himself is the Reconciler. Second, one must not suppose that God was induced to feel compassion for man only after Jesus had, by His suffering, fulfilled the demands of violated law. It was love that gave the Son. Love acted freely in providing the atonement--Grace superabounded where sin abounded.

(2) Reconciliation refers to the state of peace existing between God and man. Rom. 5:11. In the Old Testament amnesty was established through the forbearance of God but in the New Testament this amnesty becomes an established peace. It is further understood that through the vicarious sufferings and death of Jesus Christ, God reconciled the world to Himself. A general peace was established as a basis for God's acceptance of the believer. The reconciliation of individual believers is the acceptance through faith of this general reconciliation and is regarded as the revelation of God's mercy in the souls of believers. Rom. 5:10.

The Atonement as Redemption. The term "redemption" is

from the Greek word meaning to buy back and represents Christ as buying back or laying down a purchase price for the deliverance of man from the bondage of sin. This has objective and subjective aspects, says Wiley. Objectively the entire race is redeemed in that the purchase price has been paid for all mankind. Subjectively, as it applies to the individual, redemption is provisional and is made effective only through faith in the atoning blood.

(1) The ransom price. The ransom price is the blood of Christ. Christ gave Himself as a ransom for all (I Tim. 2:6). He made full satisfaction for the sins of all men. Those who reject this method of salvation must eternally perish.

(2) The ransom price secured for mankind the deliverance from the bondage of sin. According to earlier Wesleyan thought this deliverance from bondage to sin is used in a broad sense and means man is redeemed from the guilt of sin, from the reigning power of sin and from the inbeing of sin. The first results in justification, the second in regeneration and the third in entire sanctification.

4. The Extent of the Atonement.

a. The Atonement is universal, says Wiley in his initial sentence. He then goes on to say this does not mean all mankind will be unconditionally saved, but that the sacrificial offering

of Christ so far satisfied the claims of the divine law as to make salvation a possibility for all. Redemption is universal in its provisional sense--conditional in its application to the individual. Scripture references given at this point are Matt. 20:28 and I Tim. 2:6. Arminianism with its emphasis upon moral freedom and prevenient grace has always held to a universal provisional atonement. Calvinism by its doctrine of the decrees, its unconditional election and penal satisfaction theory has been under the necessity of accepting the idea of a limited atonement--not an insufficient atonement, but limited by predestination.

b. The Benefits of the Atonement. This is closely related to the question as to the extent of the atonement. Wiley says within the range or scope of the redemptive work, all things, both spiritual and physical, are included. Every blessing known to man is the result of the purchase price of our Lord Jesus Christ. He classifies the benefits under the following two main heads: (1) unconditional benefits and (2) conditional benefits.

(1) Unconditional Benefits. First is the continued existence of the race. It is inconceivable that the race would have been allowed to multiply in sin and depravity, had no provision been made for its salvation. Second is the restoration of all men to a state of salvability. Salvation is provided for all, through the atonement. The restoration of the Holy Spirit to the race, as Spirit of enlightenment, striving, convicting, must also be includ-

ed. Third is the salvation of those who die in infancy. We must regard the atonement as accomplishing the actual salvation of those who die in infancy, though Wiley says this is not explicitly stated in Scripture.

(2) The Conditional Benefits. Conditional benefits are justification, regeneration, adoption, the witness of the Spirit and entire sanctification. These are conditional in that they are subject to the individual's acceptance, faith and appropriation of these gifts.

c. The Intercession of Christ. In a final paragraph, Wiley says this transitional point needs to be mentioned. The intercession of Christ is an additional benefit of the atonement. Having finished the work of atonement, which is the ground of His administration, He now lives to make intercession. He died for the sins of the past that He might establish a new covenant; He arose that He might become the executive of His own will. His continued activity consists in carrying into effect, through the Spirit, the merits of His atoning death. References used are Heb. 7:25, Rom. 8:34, I John 2:1, Rom. 8:26, 27.

D. Predestination and Freedom of the Will.

Wiley holds the traditional Arminian position in these areas of theology. In his section on Cosmology, he discusses God's government. He says,

"When we pass to the realm of responsible, voluntary action, there is a new relation which subsists between the purpose of God and the manner in which this purpose is realized. Here God's relation is not properly causative as in conservation and preservation, but moral, that is, it must be exerted in the form of a motive, and not in the sense of compulsion. The finite will is interposed between the will of God and the consequences of that will in free activity, so that the resulting action is not properly the work of God but that of the creature to whom the act belongs." ¹

Therefore, while God has given the power of freedom to the creature and permitted its exercise, a sinful action on the part of the creature cannot be said to be God's act.

In an earlier section while discussing the attributes of God, Wiley comes to omniscience and speaks to the question of the relation existing between foreknowledge and predestination. He says that Arminianism has held that the power of contrary choice is a constituent element of human freedom, and that foreknowledge must refer to free acts and therefore to pure contingency. He agrees with Pope in saying,

"Predestination must have its rights; all that God wills to do is foredetermined. But what human freedom accomplishes, God can only foreknow; otherwise freedom is no longer freedom." ²

Later in speaking more particularly concerning predestination, Wiley indicates that his position agrees with this of Arminianism:

1. Ibid., Vol. I, p. 484.

2. Ibid., p. 357.

"Predestination is the gracious purpose of God to save mankind from utter ruin. It is not an arbitrary, indiscriminate act of God, intended to secure the salvation of so many and no more. It includes provisionally, all men in its scope, and is conditioned solely on faith in Jesus Christ."¹

Thus according to Wiley predestination is God's general and gracious plan of saving men, by adopting them as children through Christ, while election pertains to the chosen ones who are holy and blameless before Him in love. The elect are those who have received Christ as Saviour and Lord.

E. Summary.

As spokesman for present day Wesleyan-Arminian thought, Wiley keeps alive the dialogue of the Synod of Dort.

At the outset he emphasizes that any presentation of the atonement will be fragmentary unless based scripturally upon the right exposition of propitiation, redemption and reconciliation. He guards against abstractions of thought, stressing that there is not a leading idea of this subject which, at one time or another, has not been drawn out to unprofitable abstractions. He is careful to note the sharp distinction between the fact of the atonement and the various theories which are offered as explanation.

In the Biblical Basis, Old Testament sacrifices foreshadow New Testament completion. Sacrifices were of divine origin

1. Ibid., Vol. II, p. 337.

and were expiatory in character. While they in themselves had no power yet they pointed forward in faith to Christ who had power. Sacrifices of the Mosaic economy were propitiatory in character but there is a new emphasis upon the law of conscience and an appeal to man's freedom. The prophets write of a higher Messianic concept and the picture of a suffering Saviour, whose death is propitiatory, is unfolded.

In the New Testament basis, Wiley underlines the fact that Christ's death was a voluntary, propitiatory sacrifice for all men. The universal aspect is for Wiley one of primary importance. Christ's death is an actual substitution for He takes the place of sinner as a whole.

In Wiley's explanation of the Biblical basis of atonement three fundamentals appear:

- (1) Motive--found in the love of God--the moving cause of redemption.
- (2) Vicariousness--plainly stated in Scripture, Christ died for men, procuring cause of salvation.
- (3) Propitiation--sinner delivered from guilt, God's wrath propitiated, judicial variance absolved.

Wiley then traces the doctrine of the atonement historically. Apostolic fathers followed very closely the words of Scripture --no definite theory was formulated. One of the most popular views regarded atonement as victory over Satan. He traces the concept through Irenaeus, Origen, Gregory and Augustine. Gregory of Nyssa, he says, was the only one who held the ransom theory in its unqualified form. Significantly Wiley points to Athanasius as being

the first to propound the theory that the death of Christ was the payment of debt due to God. He underscores the fact that the common belief of the early period was that Christ died for all. Apart from Augustine and his followers, most believed it was God's will that all men should partake of salvation through Christ. The fact that some are saved and some are not was explained by man's free agency--not by electing grace. Anselm's formula of satisfaction to divine justice was the first scientific statement which from the beginning had been implicitly held by the Fathers, says Wiley. Wiley is quick to note in discussing Anselm that Christ renders satisfaction to divine justice, not by bearing the penalty of a broken law in the sinner's place (which view he favors), but indirectly by the acquisition of merit.

In the Reformation development, Wiley places Arminianism in a mediating position between the extremes of High Calvinism with its legalistic penal satisfaction theory and Socinianism with its moral influence theory.

As Wiley comes to discuss more modern theories of atonement, he pays particular attention to the Penal Satisfaction and the Governmental Theories. He maintains the Penal Satisfaction Theory has the following weaknesses: it has merely an external transfer of the merits of Christ's work and does not state the internal ground of that transfer; the theory leads logically to unconditional election and limited atonement; and there is a strong

tendency toward antinomianism inherent in it.

In considering the Governmental or Rectoral Theory, Wiley stresses one crucial point namely: Grotius' systematization was not in keeping with Arminius' teaching. Grotius limited satisfaction made by Christ to the dignity of the law, the honor of the lawgiver and protection of the universe, whereas the concept of Arminius went far beyond this. The weaknesses of the Grotius' Governmental Theory are: insufficient importance is given to propitiation; it overemphasizes mercy; it is built on a false philosophical principle of utility; it practically ignores the immanent holiness of God.

As Wiley sets forth his theory, he states clearly it must include the results to God (propitiation), as to God and man (reconciliation), and as to man (redemption). His concept includes elements of penal satisfaction, governmental and moral influence theories, though the dominant motif is propitiation. The necessities of the atonement are grounded in the nature and claims of Divine Majesty, in upholding the authority and honor of his sovereign government and in bringing to bear upon the sinner the strongest possible motive of moral influence. The vital principle of atonement is Christ's immanence to re-establish fellowship with man. Christ becomes the efficient ground for justification and sanctification. Christ is the procuring cause of redemption and makes possible restoration of the Spirit, who in turn restores

man's inner spiritual relation with God. There is a legal aspect, not merely an artificial external arrangement but a view whereby Christ fulfilled the whole range of moral demand. Atonement does not abrogate the law but does deliver men from legal consciousness by becoming the ground of justification. Justification by faith is God's plan of enabling sinful men to pass from legal to filial consciousness.

Propitiation, which to Wiley is the dominant note of Wesleyan-Arminian theology, satisfies the divine nature. Divine nature essentially is love. But love cannot manifest itself apart from righteousness and therefore the honor of divine sovereignty must be maintained. Propitiation must not exalt one attribute of God above another; there must be no conflict between mercy and justice. The nature of God, as expressed in all of His perfections, is propitiated by the atonement.

Reconciliation deals with the double aspect of its Godward and manward relations. God is both the reconciler and the reconciled. Some object that God could both demand and provide atonement. However, it is necessary to remember man was created both dependent upon God and a free responsible person. As result of reconciliation, a state of peace now exists between God and man. Through the death of Christ, God reconciled the world to Himself. General peace was established and individuals may experience peace through faith.

Redemption is the third key word for Wiley. It has objective and subjective aspects. Objectively, the entire debt due to God by the entire race has been paid by the blood of Christ. Mankind is released from the bondage of sin. Subjectively redemption is provisional and is made effective to the individual only through faith in the atoning blood.

Concerning the benefits of the atonement Wiley makes this sweeping statement: "Every blessing known to man is the result of the purchase price of our Lord Jesus Christ." There are both unconditional and conditional benefits. Man is not allowed to multiply in sin and depravity without this provision for salvation; to all men the possibility of salvation is extended; and salvation is given to those who die in infancy. The conditional benefits of justification, regeneration, adoption, witness of the Spirit and sanctification are obtained and appropriated through faith.

Concerning predestination and free will, Wiley stands with traditional Arminianism. God in His sovereignty has bestowed upon man free will. In the realm of responsible, voluntary action, God's relation is not causative but moral. God's relation is exerted in the form of motive. Thus man's acceptance or rejection of atonement is his own moral responsibility. Wiley understands predestination to be God's gracious purpose to save man from utter ruin and provide salvation for all. Salvation is conditioned

solely on faith in Christ, and all who believe are the elect.

At first reading one may suppose Wiley's presentation is but another restatement of the Remonstrant's position. In fact the five tenets of the Remonstrants are basic to understanding his thought. Yet Wiley does more than that. He blends together many elements of former theories and brings a new understanding of satisfaction in the light of propitiation. He recaptures the essential thought that reconciliation has both Godward and manward aspects and accentuates the rightful elements of the ransom theory, putting them in proper perspective with redemption.

CHAPTER III.

THE PRESENTATION OF THE ATONEMENT

BY DR. BRUNNER

CHAPTER III.

THE PRESENTATION OF THE ATONEMENT

BY DR. BRUNNER

A. Significant Biographical Notations.

The thought of a scholar cannot be divorced from the man himself. The thought cannot be adequately understood if it is removed from the life situation which helped to mold the man.

Paul Jewett makes the following comment:

"In due time it became clear that Christianity as defined by the liberals was not Christianity at all. It had no message from God, and was hopelessly shallow in postulating the essential goodness of man and the inevitable moral progress of the race toward Utopia. Shaken by the First World War and the ominous decline of the Western World, European theologians became increasingly disillusioned. Some of the younger men experienced a profound change in their theological point of view. One such thinker was Emil Brunner."¹

Emil Brunner was born in the canton of Zurich, December 23, 1889, the cradle of the Swiss reformation. After his secondary education, he studied theology at the universities of Zurich and Berlin. He then came to Union Theological Seminary in New York, when religious liberalism was at the height of its influence in this country.

In 1912 Brunner became a minister in the Swiss Reformed Church. The following year he went to England where he taught high school in Leeds. Here he perfected his English which was a

1. Paul K. Jewett, Emil Brunner An Introduction to the Man and His Thought (Chicago, Inter-Varsity Press, 1961), p. 13.

valuable asset later when lecturing in various parts of the world. Upon his return to Switzerland in 1916, he became pastor of a church in the canton of Glarus. It was here he married Margrit Lautenburg. To them four sons were born, two of whom are now deceased.

Brunner had been trained in his theological studies as a liberal. His first published book was a study of symbolism in religious knowledge in which he attempted "to get beyond Schleiermacher", often called the father of modernism. But a profound change in his theological point of view began to take place as he pastored Glarus. No sooner did Karl Barth publish his Commentary on Romans (1919), which has been characterized as falling like a bombshell on the playground of theologians, than Brunner openly avowed himself to be of this new theological persuasion in an enthusiastic review of Barth's book.

He soon emerged as a leading exponent of Barth's theology. He was appointed an unsalaried lecturer on the theological faculty of the University of Zurich. Here he established himself as a scholar in his own right with the publication of "Mysticism and the Word", which was a penetrating criticism of Schleiermacher's theology. He was soon appointed professor of theology at the University of Zurich, a post which he has held (with some interruptions) ever since.

In the early thirties he became involved in controversy

with Barth over the question of natural theology. As the controversy raged Brunner accepted an invitation to become a visiting lecturer in Princeton and Union Theological Seminaries. These were eventful days, as the theological right joined the theological left to challenge his position. He returned to Zurich and continued to lecture to large classes. In 1949 he made a lecture tour to Asia and the Far East. At sixty-three he returned to Tokyo to hold the chair of Christian Philosophy in the International Christian University for two years. He said he went that he might have a little part in making Japan a Christian country and use the last few years God had given him on the missionary battle front. He cut short his stay in Japan because of his wife's ill health and returned to Switzerland in 1955. On the voyage home, he suffered a stroke which seems to have ended his classroom and literary activities. At this time, Dr. Brunner is bedridden and able to see only a few select visitors.

The heart of Brunner's thought on the Atonement is given in five important chapters in his book "The Mediator". They are entitled (1) The Necessity For Reconciliation, (2) The Penal Theory of the Atonement, (3) The Expiatory Sacrifice, (4) The Mediator and (5) The Atonement. It will be of much interest to consider these chapters keeping in mind that Brunner carefully avoids categories and classifications and much of the technical theological terminology. He purposely does this for he strongly feels the true

meaning of the atonement has been lost by traditional phrasing. Concerning a possible classification he does make the following statement in a footnote:

"I am quite conscious of the fact that in thus relating to each other the Logos, the Word of God, Prophet, Christ, and the story of salvation, as the coming of God I am treading in the footsteps of Irenaeus. I would be quite inclined to accept the description. Only I would remind my critics that between Irenaeus and the present day there have been Augustine, the Reformation, and Kierkegaard." ¹

B. The Necessity For Reconciliation.

(1) It is most important that we understand the Cross as the Divine act of Reconciliation. Brunner agrees with Luther in that Christian theology is distinguished from every other kind of theology by being a theology of the cross (theologia crucis). The Cross is the sign of the Christian faith. The Church went wrong in her frequent forgetfulness of the phrase "in hoc signo vinces" and lost the key to the meaning of the Cross.

The text, "He bore our sins", must be understood thoroughly as the foundation upon which stands the whole of the New Testament or the Gospel, as that which alone distinguishes us and our religion from all other religions. It was surprising to find how frequently Brunner quoted from Luther, with little or no quotation from Calvin. He recognizes the element of mystery in the Cross and says it is not the task of theology to explain these

1. Emil Brunner, The Mediator, p. 222 (footnote).

mysteries but it certainly is the task of theology to bring out the meaning of these mysteries in so far as possible.

The Cross is of supreme significance today and must be understood as the Divine Act of Reconciliation. It is only at the Cross that one sees clearly both the "offence" and the "folly" of the Christian revelation. Here alone, at last, the intellectual and moral pride of reason is finally broken. It is the Cross, more than anything else, which differentiates scriptural revelation from all other forms of religion, and from Idealism of every kind.

(2) Schleiermacher's Theology of Reconciliation is not the answer. This theology of the nineteenth century can be traced backwards through the Socinians to Abelard. Theology of Reconciliation begins with Schleiermacher and reaches its high-water mark in Ritschl and the Ritschlian school continues its influence to the present day. Brunner says this theology claims to be Christocentric and asserts to have formulated the scriptural idea of Reconciliation better. But it is clear they have completely failed to understand the meaning of the Cross of Christ. For the Passion of Christ is merely regarded from the humanistic religious point of view as the highest proof of the perfect religious or moral union of Jesus with the Divine Will. To them the Cross is the supreme proof of Christ's fidelity to God as an ethico-religious fidelity to vocation.

Thinkers of this type have no idea that in the Cross, God actually does something--an actual objective transaction. They have no idea that the impassable gulf between God and man has been spanned by the energy of God's own action. Their type of thought is totally subjective. Ritschl was conscious that in developing this purely subjective doctrine of Reconciliation he was in opposition to Anselm and in agreement with Abelard. Like the Socinians before him he draws the main force of his argument from Anselm's defects, as well as from an observation about the use of forensic ideas and the concept of divine honor. He sets up an alternative, either Anselm or a subjective interpretation and chooses the latter.

At this point Brunner says,

"The doctrine of Anselm is a magnificent attempt, but it is neither the only possible one nor is it the only attempt which has ever been made to conceive and establish theologically the scriptural idea of the vicarious suffering of Christ as a sacrifice and as a penalty." ¹

(3) God has revealed Himself in Christ but Guilt stands in the way. In fundamental Christian belief is the thought God revealed Himself in Christ. This means God has come to us, thus it is condescension, self-emptying. This is indicated in Isaiah 53--"There is no beauty that we should desire Him."

Incarnation means "being in the form of a servant", but being in the flesh does not constitute complete self-emptying nor

1. Ibid., p. 440.

does it mean Christ's coming to us is complete. It is only when the body is suffering from weakness and when it comes to die that it reminds us of finitude and infirmity. All forms of death are not the same, for example the death of a young hero in battle, the death of a venerable poet, these are rather glorious. But the Cross is in every respect hideous. It is death of a criminal --on a gallows--sheer torture. Is there any place where one would less expect to see the revelation of the merciful God than on the cross of Golgatha? This is more so when one considers what this death meant inwardly. Here is remoteness from God, suffering and shattering contact with God being regarded as bearing divine wrath. Brunner quotes Luther as saying,

"He tasted to the full the sense of remoteness from God, the presence of the angry God, since He felt Himself to be forsaken not only by men but by God." ¹

It is not enough to say man is far away from God and that God has to come a long way to reach him--this is a negative separation. The truth is that between man and God there is an actual obstacle. This is guilt. Guilt is that element in sin which belongs to the past and this unalterable element determines the present destiny of each soul. Guilt is not in any sense something concrete (this may, perhaps, be regarded as the chief error in the doctrine of Anselm); it is something personal, it is the perverted attitude toward God. Since man's attitude towards God has been per-

1. Ibid., p. 442.

verted, God's attitude towards man has also been changed. It is not merely subjectively from our point of view that our guilt lies between man and God, but objectively, from the point of view of God.

Since guilt is against an infinite God, it has infinite implications. Only one of Infinite character can deal with it. It is because God is so near to man that guilt is so terrible. The more one sees that sin is against God, the more serious it becomes; and the more one recognizes that his sin is irrevocable. This is the great boulder on the path which blocks the way.

(4) Sin against God is an attack on God's honor. But God cannot permit His honor to be attacked, for honor is His Godhead, His sovereign majesty. God would cease to be God if He could permit His honor to be attacked. The law of His Divine Being demands divine reaction. The holiness of God requires the annihilation of the will which resists God. All order in the world depends upon the inviolability of His honor, upon the certitude that those who rebel against Him will be punished.

This reaction is not automatic--it is absolutely personal. God takes a personal share in this reaction. But like the love of God itself, it is a personal movement. God's holy divine wrath is the negative aspect of the Divine Holiness. Sin is an objective reality and separates from God--it is no mere apparent obstacle--no mere misunderstanding.

Only where man recognizes this reality of wrath does he take his guilt seriously; only then does he realize the personal character of God, and his own human, personal relation to God. The more man realizes his guilt, the more he realizes the wrath of God. Man sees a great gulf between him and God--there is no bridge--no possibility of striding through the wall of fire between man and God. Only one thing could help us: if God Himself were to intervene, if He Himself were to remove the obstacle--and this means forgiveness.

(5) What does forgiveness mean? The divine law--the world order--requires that sin should receive its corresponding penalty from God. God cannot approach man as though there were no obstacle. Divine righteousness and holiness give the obstacle such objective reality man cannot push it out of the way. God alone has power over it. Forgiveness would mean the removal of this obstacle--it would mean the contravention of the logical result of the world law, therefore it would mean a process more vast and profound than we could even imagine, a change far more vast than the suspension of the laws of nature. For the laws of nature are laws of Divine Creation, external laws, but the law of penalty is the expression of the personal Will of God, of the Divine Holiness itself. Forgiveness would be the declaration of the non-validity of the unconditioned order of righteousness which requires penalty, says Brunner.

At this point Brunner writes:

God has a contingent freedom of the divine communication of forgiveness, which could not possibly be inferred by reason. Forgiveness, as an unimaginable revelation, as a gift which could never be taken for granted, a free, a gracious gift, is proclaimed in the Bible. It is not a logical necessity to God to forgive. He can forgive or not. It is the very nature of God to possess this freedom. God breaks through all intellectual necessity, all legal idea of an 'a priori' necessity and declares explicit divine forgiveness. Thus forgiveness is revealed to us as something which actually happens as a fact. It is an amazing assurance of forgiveness from God Himself." 1

Forgiveness can only take place as a real divine act.

It is the communication of the divine secret. Such an act would be the most unconceivable revelation possible, something so new it could never be imagined. Further, this forgiveness would have to be imparted in such a way that the holiness of God, the inviolability of the law, and the logical demands of the penal order would still be maintained. This means also it must be of such a kind that it will express the reality of guilt, the reality of divine wrath, and yet, at the same time the overwhelming reality of forgiving love.

(6) What does reconciliation through the Cross of Christ mean? It is spanning the gulf between God and man. It throws a bridge over the abyss. It removes the great boulder which blocks the way. It is a transaction of such a kind that only in it could man be certain of divine forgiveness.

1. Ibid., p. 448.

In this event God makes known His holiness and love simultaneously. The Cross is far more than a symbol--it is the act of revelation which constitutes the basis of our faith in forgiveness. It is an event intended for the world; it is an historical event, a unique event. It is the event of forgiveness of which it is said, "Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world."¹

Only at the Cross of Christ does man see fully what it is that separates him from God; yet it is here alone that he perceives that he is no longer separated from God. At the cross man can see both the One who "is not mocked" and the One who "doth not deal with us after our transgressions". God is shown to be equally the Holy One who asserts His unconditional claims and the Merciful One who gives Himself to the very utmost limits of self-emptying.

(7) "God meets us at the point where we become real. God comes and actually meets us as we are. He meets us where we stand. We stand before Him naked, stripped of all illusions and coverings or masks, with nothing to shield us from His gaze. Our humiliation is complete--we perceive that in ourselves we cannot possibly reach God. Fellowship is not something we can take for granted but something incomprehensible and amazing," says Brunner in his characteristic form of expression.

Brunner is opposed to both the speculative systems of

1. John 1:29.

Idealism and Mysticism which maintain it is not necessary that an objective transaction take place in the Atonement. Guilt is denied--redemption is a perception of unity which was always there--the idea that there is some obstacle between us and God is an illusion. It asserts that fellowship with God is perfectly natural.

Brunner is a realist. This view is that man passes judgment upon himself when he admits he is guilty. The more realistic we are the more knowledge of guilt we have. Fellowship is not taken for granted. It is costly and cost is not paid by man. The real God is the personal God, the One who reveals Himself. Knowledge of guilt, the personality of God, and reality of revelation necessarily belong together. Hence, the perfect revelation of God in the Cross of Christ means both the perfect revelation of the incomprehensibility and impenetrability of His being, of His Majesty and of His freedom and generosity.

C. The Penal Theory of the Atonement.

(1) The ideas of satisfaction and sacrifice are not to be minimized. Brunner speaks of two series of statements which are parabolic in nature. The parables which deal with the payment of debts, which are taken from the practice of the law with their ideas of satisfaction and penalty and secondly, the analogies drawn from the practice of the cultus, with their emphasis upon

sacrifice and the shedding of blood, both merge into one in the idea of expiation. It is this substitutionary expiation which constitutes the divine objective basis of the Atonement.

These expressions sound strange to us today because we are accustomed to thinking in terms of general rather than special revelation. Here the sense of alienation reaches its highest point. The idea of the Mediator emerges in its full significance. Jesus Christ becomes absolutely central to the Christian faith.

The older views of the Church are unintelligible to modern thinkers. They attempt to weaken the significance of the concepts of the New Testament and interpret them as perversions due to later doctrine of the Church. This attempt has failed completely.

The ideas of payment of debt, satisfaction and penalty, and substitutionary expiation are decisive in the witness of the New Testament and the testimony of the Reformation regard them in this manner also. Brunner says the students of Luther who try to show that the atonement was an outlived relic in the world of ideas and is not necessarily connected with his central thought of faith are on very precarious ground. This idea of the atonement, though called "alien" by modern thinkers, has an indissoluble connection to the fundamental message of the Bible.

(2) The penalty, guilt ideas are deep-rooted in the knowledge of divine law. Since Anselm's profound and masterly explana-

tion of New Testament ideas of the Atonement, the Church has emphasized almost exclusively the ideas of satisfaction and penalty. Brunner says this one-sidedness is to be deplored for other ideas have great value. However, Anselm's elaboration of penal expiation was of great importance and the Reformers, Calvin in particular, followed his thought. Brunner further remarks this one-sidedness is not altogether blameworthy for penal expiation emphasizes an idea which certainly ought to stand in the very center of the message of the Bible.

The idea of "penalty" corresponds to that of "guilt". If we understand the idea of penalty we must begin with the nature of guilt. Both concepts are rooted in the knowledge of the Divine Law. Brunner appropriately says,

"The law is the backbone, the skeleton, the granite foundation of the world of thought. The perception of reliable order and of the rule of law, above all the perception of a moral law constitutes the heart of all our natural knowledge of God." ¹

In the Moral law one sees the personal will which shapes the world. Brunner describes the Moral Law as being inviolable, absolutely reliable, unconditional in logic, an absolute identity which endures throughout all changes in events. In all of this Brunner is impressed primarily and chiefly by the eternity and absoluteness of God.

(3) God cannot repeal His Law. God is the sovereign

1. Ibid., p. 458.

Lord, whose will is identical with Himself, whose will can be absolutely relied upon, who is the Lord Yaweh, the "I AM That I AM". He is the Holy God because the world and I are unconditionally His property.

God's unconditional right to own us excludes every sort of sharing with anyone else, all halving of rights, all bargaining, all modification of demand in what the Bible calls the Holiness of God. It is on account of His Holiness that God says: "My glory will I not give to another." It is the very nature of the holy God that He should be supreme and that His sovereignty should be absolute and unquestioned.

The Law is the manifested Will of the Lord God, eternally the same, self-consistent, unchangeable. It is true God's Will is a free personal will but also true His Will is unchangeable, inviolable. Both constitute the conception of Divine Holiness. This holy will of Law is turned toward man.

Brunner says,

"All order, all significance, all beauty, all trustworthiness, all constancy, all fidelity, and all faith, all truth and all good are based both upon the Law, which constitutes the intrinsic content of His will, and upon this unconditional self-manifestation in which the Law is rooted." ¹

God cannot repeal His Law. God cannot cease for one second to will to maintain His purpose unconditionally. To do so would mean chaos. The world is based upon the fact that this Will

1. Ibid., p. 461.

cannot be altered. The glory of God is the unconditioned supreme end and underlies all purpose of every kind. It is an objective purpose. The glory of God is the basis of the rule of law as a whole.

(4) Sin is an infringement of this glory. The law of God is described as an appropriation of human life by God. Through the law, man is described as the serf of God, as God's property. The important point is, obedience is required to whatever the Will of God may command. The inviolate Will of God, that is the glory of God, is the one thing needful.

Sin is the reaction against the order for which man was created. Sin means making man supreme, it is self-will, rebellion against divine order, an infringement of the Divine Holiness and Glory. Brunner's idea is remote from the thought that sin is a philosophical evil, or an opposition to the norm. He says evil as sin means breaking away, the Fall, rebellion, lying, and ingratitude, like the son who strikes his father's face in anger. It is a bold self-assertion of the son's will above that of the father.

Sin alters the attitude of man to God and in so doing alters the nature of man--altered in the sense man cannot find his way back to God. The change not only affects man, it also affects God. For man it has a far-reaching effect in guilt. Man is no longer a blank page, he has his own history, and this history is

identified with you as your present, your past sin is still put down to your account.

But God does not forget. It is a terrible thing. The wound remains open eternally in the remembrance of God. Because the connection between God and man is so personal that guilt exists, working not merely casually, but as the past which affects the present. It strikes terror to the heart of man to know that we must reckon with God.

(5) Disobedience to Divine Law points to death and ruin. What can one expect from God? Since the Law lays down the conditions on which there is fellowship and thus salvation, then disobedience must express the opposite--one can only expect ruin. Since the Law expresses the concrete and personal Will of God, so disobedience to the Law has life-significance. It points to death and ruin.

Divine punishment issues from the Holiness of God, not as a penalty which is deliberately intended for man but simply the fulfillment of the Will of God. It is the punishment meted out by a master to a rebellious subject. God becomes the judge. It is this that gives Holiness of God meaning.

This idea would be intolerable to the mind spoiled by the Enlightenment. But in every part of the Bible the message is clear that God will punish the disobedient. Because the Law in the Bible is wholly existential, heaven and hell, blessedness and

misery cannot be severed from the idea of obedience and disobedience.

(6) Forensic expressions denote vital force. These concepts, law, lord, sovereign, serfdom, property, guilt, penalty and judgment are taken from the sphere of law. The nineteenth century school of Ritschl objected to this terminology. The forensic expressions predominate because in them the Law denotes not merely an idea but an ideal vital force. Forensic expressions in the Bible play a large part. The leading ideas of law, holiness and guilt cannot be expressed without these. Actually the opposition to the use of forensic terms is due to misuse of those who swallow up Divine Holiness with that of the Divine Love. The Bible concept of a two-fold nature of holiness and love is replaced by the modern unilateral monistic idea of God. They also disapprove of the wrath of God. Opposition is thus directed against all that the Bible means by the Holiness of God.

Further, naturalists regard punishment as a relic of the primitive instinct of revenge. At the utmost, they say, the only idea one can connect with God is that of educative punishment, in the service of love or of life. But the harsh thought of the Bible is that God, because He is God can punish man, and must destroy all that infringes His sovereignty. Naturalism superficially makes its own God, a God who is the kind it likes. This, in no way, is a satisfactory explanation.

(7) The only way out is a real alteration. Before the Enlightenment, that is before the Socinians, the general view was that God is the holy and just Judge, whose punishment is to be feared. It was only possible to understand the ecclesiastical and Biblical doctrine of Atonement on this presupposition.

Here Brunner remarks:

"When the idea of guilt is taken seriously this step has been taken. We are all guilty; and to be guilty means to fall under the divine condemnation, and to fall under it to such an extent that every attempt at human flight is impossible." ¹

Hence the "Nostra assumsit" means that the Son comes under this condemnation. Does He wish to meet man? Then here man is and here alone. With the coming of Christ one sees the Divine Will to forgive; one also sees the Holiness of God and thus the Divine Will to punish. The Cross of Christ means the working out of the condemnation and here the revelation of the holy and merciful God is seen.

This is not the picture of a democratic God but a Sovereign God--only this gives meaning to the Cross. The Sovereignty of God means the Holiness of God, the fact that God is God. The Cross is the only place where the loving, forgiving, merciful God is revealed in such a way that one perceives that His Holiness and His Love are equally infinite.

1. Ibid., p. 469.

The Cross is not an idea; everything depends on the actual coming of God. Here something which actually is, actually becomes another reality. Man is guilty, God is holy. There is no other solution than judgment. A real solution can only take place by a real alteration in the situation by means of a divine transaction. The only help is in a real happening which really cleanses us from actual guilt.

(8) A debt must be paid--man cannot pay; the Son of God pays. The New Testament presses the general conception of guilt still further. A debt must be paid, Man cannot pay. Guilt costs. The cost shows the real necessity for the transaction. The character of man's situation determines the character of this necessary event. A debt must be paid which lies utterly outside all human possibilities. The concept of "cost" and the "price" denote the objective condition for the revelation of grace.

This necessity does not proceed from the side of man. But the Cross is the only possible way in which the absolute holiness and the absolute mercy of God are revealed together. God cannot make this process any cheaper because of human guilt and Divine Holiness.

The mystical path would be cheaper for in it guilt is merely an error and God is nothing but love. The way of Enlightenment would be cheaper for God forgives everyone who repents. Neither guilt nor the Will of God to punish are real. But in

Christ, the Person is Himself the Word, therefore, He, Himself must enter into rebellious humanity and become its victim, in order that He may thus complete His "coming" and pay the "cost".

The Cross is conceived as the expiatory penal sacrifice of the Son of God. It is the fulfillment of the scriptural revelation of God in its most paradoxical, incomprehensible guise.

Brunner concludes by saying:

"Because, in His nearness He reveals His distance, in His mercy His holiness, in His grace His judgment, in His personality His absoluteness. It is thus He is God, the One who comes in reality, One who pays the price, and Himself who overcomes all that separates us from Him-- really overcomes it, does not merely declare that it does not exist." ¹

D. The Expiatory Sacrifice.

(1) The ritual idea, though alien, is of great significance. This chapter emphasizes two very important things: sin must be really covered and the love of God must be manifested. Brunner hits hard at modern thought which has retained only the ideas of love, forgiveness and redemption and has rejected the necessary correlative ideas of judgment, holiness and condemnation.

Emphasis upon God, the Holy One and Lawgiver ensures reliability and objective validity. But when this is stressed exclusively the doctrine of atonement becomes one-sided and crudely objective. Anselm only gave importance to the forensic

1. Ibid., p. 473.

ideas. The ritual idea must also be emphasized. It is as important as the idea of penalty. Although it is alien today, the ritual idea runs through the Primitive Church. Expiatory sacrifice expresses a purely personal element in the Atonement.

The ritual side of religion is the reminder that man's life is destined for the worship of God. Moralism reacts against ceremonial religion. The idea of morality is that man belongs through God to his fellow man, but the idea of the cultus is that man belongs solely to God Himself. The thought of the divine right over man has a personal meaning. The center of the cultus is sacrifice. Sacrifice means direct surrender to God, without any thought of social usefulness. All life belongs to God and is consecrated directly to Him, personally.

The most important sacrifice is that which is intended to remove some obstacle which has come in between God and man: the atoning or expiatory sacrifice. The existential danger of a broken relation between God and man is the presupposition of the expiatory sacrifice. The expiatory idea remembers the free personality of God, man as the personal property of God, necessity for direct surrender, the wrath of God as the reaction to man's sin, a sacrificial act a means of expiation, and a priestly mediation.

(2) Sin incurs divine wrath--expiation alone reopens the way. Man is the personal property of God. God desires a personal surrender from man and personal communion with him. Sin breaks

this very personal relation with God. Sin is the self-willed destruction of the personal original divine relationship. It is an injury which no ethical means can heal.

Because it is an injury to the Divine Person Himself, His reaction is wrath. The God who is really angry, really loves. To reject the idea of the wrath of God also means to reject His love. This is no mere anthropopathic idea. God is angry because He is personal, because He really loves. The Bible, and even the New Testament speaks so naturally about divine wrath because it is so full of the thought of the personal love of God. Both Luther and Calvin felt the wrath of God intensely. It is rationalism which has made the thought of the wrath of God alien to our time.

God is angry. To man this means disaster, which he can not avert, is hanging over him. He knows his unfaithfulness is the cause. He sees his impotence to avert this disaster. Inward transformation and return to the original personal relationship is impossible. The way is blocked. If ever the way to God is to be reopened and normal relationship restored, something else must happen. Expiation is the only answer. Expiatory sacrifice which is offered by God, a divine transaction, offered once for all, is the only satisfactory solution to the problem. Both rational moralism and primitive sacrificial religion have only partial and unsatisfactory answers.

(3) God alone can expiate. "The wages of sin is death", this thought permeates the Bible. For example, expressions like, "for we are consumed by Thine anger", appear. Death is more than cessation of life, it is the outward visible sign of profound inward disharmony--it represents the perversion of God's will for man.

Death is only experienced by those who have been created by God as immortal souls. That torment consists in the fact it never ceases. It is this death which corresponds to the wrath of God. This is the death which God wills in His anger. This death hangs over one as long as he is in a state of guilt. Divine wrath is not a mood, or an emotion of God, ~~not~~ something based on fate, but a divine necessity based solely on Divine Will.

Does God only appear to will this death? No! This is the situation. God is not mocked. Death is the result unless something takes place which would satisfy divine anger. It is at this point that religion inserts the idea of sacrifice--the idea of an equivalent.

There was no human equivalent. God alone can make this sacrifice. He alone can cover guilt as though it had never been. Sin is against an infinite God and has an infinite aspect. God provides ~~the~~ sacrifice, He expiates. There can be no thought of a revengeful, bloodthirsty God. It is indeed God Himself who takes everything upon Himself. "Greater love hath no man than

this, that he lay down his life for his friends."¹ "He who spared not His own Son, how shall He not freely with Him give us all things."² Thus in the New Testament the Cross of Christ is conceived as the self-offering of God.

(4) The act of expiation is real. God does something; He suffers; He takes the burden really upon Himself; there is a real transaction.

Sin must be covered and this is the only possible equivalent. Here the idea of sacrifice and the idea of penalty converge, as regards necessity. Something must really happen which would be an equivalent for the judgement of wrath, for the sacrificial death of man, in order that men may know that coverage cannot be achieved for nothing.

Brunner says that for sin, which is an actual disturbance of the divine order of life, there corresponds the divine fact of expiation, as the presupposition for the restoration of order. In the idea of an equivalent sacrifice one sees something of the extent of injury to the world order but also in the remedy, "the reparatio", the quality of the disturbance is seen. This disharmony is fatal for man because it has separated him from the source of life, God. These disharmonies cannot merely be removed by the love of God because it is Holy love which cannot condone

1. John 15:13.

2. Rom. 8:32.

sin and can only express itself in wrath. That God is both the Holy One and the Merciful One finds expression in the sacrifice of the Son of God. This is not merely the idea of sacrifice but actual in a real, concrete, historical event.

Jesus did not wish to ban the temple and sacrificial worship during his lifetime. He connected His own death as closely as possible with the sacrificial cult, with the Passover, for He desired to fulfill the truth in Himself, like the Law. In these days one has to relearn expiatory sacrifice through Christ. The grave nature of the disorder, the necessity for a "reparatio" or "restitutio" is the fundamental idea of the Christian faith. This is expressed in two ways: in the necessity for a special revelation and in the necessity for the Atonement. The Atonement is the final and most profound expression of the whole fact of Christ.

(5) Expiation expresses the love of God. The covering of sin expresses a negative aspect, the reality of the sacrifice reveals that God is Love. All energy can be recognized by the strength of the resistance which it overcomes, by the "work" which it achieves. Divine Love is known by the greatness of the resistance which it overcomes.

The Biblical message of the Cross is that something really happens on the part of God; God overcomes something which concerns Him. Just as his coming is real in revelation, so in the Atonement His overcoming is real, overcoming the real wrath

which lies between God and man. The essence of the Gospel consists in that there is a real event, a sign of the real gulf between God and man and a sign of the real movement of God. It is an event which shows up both the seriousness of man's position and unspeakable wonder of Divine Love.

Apart from this event, the Love of God would resemble Platonic ideas, or the concept of Aristotle. God's Love would mean simply the moral idea of purpose. But then it would not be personal. But he is the God who heard the cry of His people and has come down to save them. The Eternal enters wholly and really into history and breaks through it. This is a paradox but must be believed as a whole.

The self-movement of God towards man is the theme of the Bible. This self-movement is completed at the point where it meets with greatest resistance, where it is confronted with guilt. It is fully seen in breaking down the resistance. This process of overcoming resistance is more than a purely dialectical process, it actually takes place and is an actual event.

E. The Mediator.

(1) The Mediator is the "Nostra Assumsit". A personality, the Mediator, stands at the heart of the message of the Bible. He alone is the content of the message. The "Person" and the "Work" of the Mediator mean exactly the same thing. He is what he does

and He does what He is. These statements mean that He reunites man, who is separated from God. He does this by the very fact that He is a person and this in itself is God's reconciling act. He is the Incarnate Word--God who has come to man. He is the bridge which God throws across to man.

Brunner says this is the great evangelical idea of older patristic literature. This is the doctrine of the "recapitulatio", namely that Christ became what we are, in order to make us what He is. It is this word, first given by Irenaeus and later repeated by Luther, which Brunner makes the motto of his book, The Mediator. It is this doctrine which meant to the Fathers that the Son of God entered into human existence, and plunged into the world of history in all its sin and corruption. Brunner quotes Athanasius as saying at this point,

"We need to recognize that our guilt is the cause of the Saviour's descent, and that our sin drew out the love of Logos to man, so that the Lord came to us and appeared amongst men." ¹

If the coming of the God-man means that the gulf between God and man has been bridged, what more is necessary to assure man of the Divine Will of reconciliation. Is the Cross superfluous? This is a foolish question for the Mediator can only be understood through His personal activity on the Cross. The incarnation and the Cross form an indissoluble unity. The first

1. Ibid., p. 491.

is fulfilled in the second, just as the second begins in the first. The Incarnation is the "Nostra Assumpsit" and the "nostra" means the utmost depths of human existence. The Cross simply means self-surrender to the lowest depths of human existence. The movement for spanning the gulf is the same.

The Mediator is a Person who represents the divine self-movement and comes in divine-humanity. This is the absolutely unthinkable paradox--a real union of real opposites. In His Person a divine happening is made known to man. This is something one can only express by use of mythological expression.

(2) The Mediator completely identifies Himself with humanity. Jesus Christ is the heart of the Gospel because in His Person He unites the human and divine natures. This means the really human and the really divine. His "being" as Mediator coincides with His vicarious action and His vicarious suffering.

The Mediator makes Himself one with humanity in its sin and sorrow. Brunner says,

"Jesus drinks the cup of human existence in all its alienation from God, to the very dregs. Nothing is spared Him; He is not the royal Son of God, who visits man wearing a disguise which He throws off when things become too hot for Him, that at the critical moment He may reveal Himself to the amazed multitude as the Son of God."¹

Christ, in his identification with man, suffers in the usual sense. He does not separate Himself from humanity. He is

1. Ibid., pp. 493, 494.

the friend of publicans and sinners. The Mediator joined with doubtful characters. He seeks them because he wants to belong to them. Christ expressed His identification with everything human, particularly at the central point where man is alienated from God by his sin. He is the only one who has swept away all distinctions between men. The final proof of His identification with humanity was given in His sufferings on the Cross. The Passion is not a transaction as Anselm implies, it is a personal act; it is real, vicarious action, Christ identifying Himself wholly with the human race. He bears the Cross willingly. The suffering of Christ means both surrender for man and unreserved solidarity with that which separates humanity from God. This means He must come under the wrath of God--divine wrath which works death.

Brunner makes this very clear in these words:

"The Mediator gives Himself up completely to this suffering of the wrath which comes to man from God. In this self-sacrifice His identification with humanity rises to its greatest height, in this giving of Himself to the real endurance of the divine judgment, the divine wrath." ¹

"He was obedient unto death, even the death of the Cross."² Obedience is as important as the actual event. It is a personal act. Here is the idea of sacrifice, not merely the forensic idea of penalty. It is real surrender, real suffering.

1. Ibid., pp. 495, 496.

2. Phil. 2:8.

(3) The Mediator acts as God's representative and as the Second Adam. Only he who is true man can suffer from his connection with God. But the way in which Christ suffers from His connection with God is only possible to Him because He acts as God's representative. The depth of Christ's suffering is due to the cause for which He suffers. He knows He is wholly identified with the cause of God, therefore He is in a position to identify Himself completely with man and to feel "the whole misery of man". Christ is the only One who confesses His unity with humanity in the sight of God, and who acts in the sense of this solidarity.

Christ is the man well-pleasing to God, the ideal man, unaffected by the Fall, the "Second Adam". In Him the nature of man is restored to harmony with the Divine Creation. Here, Brunner says, one must carefully avoid the errors of Rationalism. That Christ is the "Second Adam", "the firstborn among many brethren" and "heavenly Lord" is explained by more than psychological reasoning. It is strictly objective. Christ can only be the man in whom God is well pleased, the sinless One, the One who is truly one with humanity because He is also at the same time more than man. He is the Son of God.

It is characteristic of the Mediator that not only does He identify Himself wholly with man, but also that He is absolutely united with God. He comes to men as the One who has no human

aims; His whole purpose is directed towards the things of God. The rhythm of movement is a descent, the One who comes, it is an act of One who brings something to man. The fact that He is One with God, in such a way that the cause of God is absolutely His own cause, makes it possible for Him to make Himself the servant of humanity, who gives His life for the race. He is the Unique Saviour.

(4) The Mediator suffers vicariously. The death of Christ is an ultimate act. It is a sacrifice offered by Himself. It is the suffering of the Messiah; it is the suffering of the Person who can be none other than Himself.

There is a blending of the divine and human elements in His divine vocation. The way in which He approaches sinners could not be taken by anyone else. This service of humanity is not exercised in the general ethical sense, but in the Messianic sense. It is divine help, the help of God--the kind man could never bring.

Christ's death can be described as "fidelity to vocation" in the sense that He had particular vocation and His death is an integral part. He "came to suffer". Christ's Passion and Death is not a moral test which He endured successfully, but a divine deed and a divine revelation.

Brunner reacts strongly against Anselm's impersonal substitutionary transaction. He says:

"For vicarious offering (substitution) is something entirely personal; it is personal in that dual sense which characterizes the personality of the Mediator. In this process the Mediator is acting vicariously both for man and for God." ¹

The meaning of personal surrender here is that of sacrifice and a real surrender of life, of existence, of our life blood, human self-sacrifice for the guilt of others. Personal solidarity makes the suffering and death of Christ vicarious. A close union subsists between the One who suffers and those for whom He suffers.

(5) God deals with humanity through the Mediator. In the Passion, God is dealing with humanity. This is a fundamental perception. God is not merely teaching us something, or clearing up a misunderstanding, but actually dealing with us. God is acting. God deals with humanity as a whole, not one particular generation, but "all who believe".

This is the doctrine of substitutionary atonement. The Passion of this Man possesses divine significance. It has necessary significance, necessary from the point of view of God, a necessary suffering of man. Through this necessary suffering of humanity the divine gift of salvation is given. The Person of the Mediator makes this possible. This divine action is a special act of God. Christ is the God-Man. His death is the expiatory and substitutionary sacrificial oblation. Brunner succinctly says:

1. Ibid., p. 501.

"If this is the meaning of the Cross, then the Cross and thus the Atonement and Revelation are absolutely unique, If here the act really proceeds from God, and if it is true that here something was actually done on the Cross, then this event is such that by its very nature it is capable neither of repetition nor extension in time and in space. It is a "moment" and only one "moment".¹

The Cross of Christ is not like the turning point of an historical event. It is a force in the great magnetic field of history. The Atonement is not history. The Atonement is the expiation of human guilt; the covering of sin through His sacrifice is not anything which can be conceived from a historical viewpoint. It is super-history. Brunner says:

"It lies in the dimension which no historian knows in so far as he is merely an historian. It is an "event" which is only an "event" for faith."²

What matters is that it did actually take place. If it has taken place, then it has happened once for all.

(6) To emphasize the Mediator is to understand the guilt of sin and the forgiving love of God. Neither guilt nor forgiveness is taken seriously where there is no emphasis upon the Mediator. One must realize the reality of expiation through Christ.

The remedy is real only as one knows it is needed. To repent is the presupposition of faith, but it is only completed in faith. It is here man's deepest humiliation consists. The sacrifice of Christ is the only ground of knowledge of the uncon-

1. Ibid., p. 503.

2. Ibid., p. 504.

ditional forgiveness of God. Unconditional means God takes the initiative. The Cross means that the Forgiving One really comes to sinful men. He comes to all. "He is taking our side, the side of us all. Because He comes to us, we know He wishes to have fellowship with us: it is expiation," says Brunner.

This break-through happened once for all, Brunner unequivocally states. He further says that just as it is the very essence of the Christian faith to believe that "in none other is there salvation" so also it is essential to believe that "it happened once for all".

(7) Did the Mediator come only in order to die? It is necessary to clear up one misunderstanding which refers to the death of Jesus and His life as a whole. Some have wrongly conceived that the sole purpose of Jesus' coming was in order to die? In the doctrine of Anselm, the Atonement is almost limited to a celestial, legal transaction and the existence of the Mediator as almost a "means" which was necessary for the transaction.

However, the active obedience of Christ must always be remembered. For the effectiveness of the expiatory sacrifice active obedience must be a presupposition. Christ's life and suffering must not be separated. Rather, the whole life of Jesus should be regarded from this double standpoint of suffering and action. As proof text Brunner cites Phil. 2:8..."became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross".

The Passion of Christ does not begin with His entry into Jerusalem, but on the mysterious border line between time and eternity. It begins with the "self-emptying", with the "coming" of Christ. The Incarnation should be regarded from the point of view of suffering. The "form of a servant" is itself the Passion, the descent into the lowliness of human existence, which culminates in the Cross. All Christ says and does should ultimately be understood "sub specie crucis". The Cross is the total expression of the life of Jesus.

In contrast to the thought of passive obedience, the high activity, the output of great energy by Christ is to be regarded. He comes into a world dominated by the "Prince of this world". He compares Himself to a man who breaks into a strong man's house and binds him. He came not to bring peace but a sword. It denotes extreme effort, the use of all of one's powers, a striding towards the goal. The psychological historical picture of the "Life of Jesus" shows us intense energy, an unconquerable will in the conflict for the Kingdom of God. The meaning of this activity is this: the divine condescension and thus the Passion.

F. The Atonement.

(1) Man is at enmity with God. Religion of every kind is concerned with redemption. Man seeks deliverance from the condition in which he finds himself. He seeks for redemption. But

it is not always clearly understood that the real root of the evil which man seeks to overcome is a wholly personal wrong relationship between God and man: the guilt of sin. It is seldom traced back to the one root, that is sin against God. From this we can be released only by forgiveness. The Christian doctrine of forgiveness is based upon the fact of the atonement.

Reconciliation, real reconciliation, an objective act of reconciliation presupposes enmity on both sides. Man is the enemy of God and God is the enemy of man. Man is God's enemy because he disturbs the divine order, he spoils the creative work of God and conspires with the "Adversary". Human consciousness reflects this objective situation and thus enmity also exists subjectively. Man lives in "dispeace" with his Creator.

(2) God is at enmity with man. There is also enmity on the side of God. God reacts against this disturbance of the order of Creation--this is called the wrath of God. The Divine Holiness transforms this disturbance of the divine order into something objective: the necessity for punishment. This will is personal, God is present in this anger, it is actually His anger. God is not mocked.

Because of the objectivity of guilt and the impotence of man to deal with it, reconciliation must take place. Something more than a change of mind on man's part is necessary.

In what sense can we speak of reconciliation objectively?

Is God reconciled through the blood-sacrifice of the Son? Notice that the New Testament not once says that God is reconciled. God reconciles, but He is not reconciled. He reconciles Himself, but in this process He is only the One who acts, the One who gives. He is not the One who receives. God reconciles Himself in Christ to man. It is an objective happening, an act of expiation. Brunner says, "Here we stand in the presence of the central mystery of the Christian revelation: the dual nature of God."¹

But the wrath of God is not the ultimate reality; it is the divine reality which corresponds to sin. In Himself God is love. This love can only be made known to man through special revelation. But this revelation means that Divine Love "breaks through" wrath. This revelation of the divine mystery of love in the midst of the reality of wrath is the "propitiation" (hilasmos); God cannot and will not contradict Himself. Even as the God of Love, He cannot deny His wrath.

Brunner sums up the objective aspect of the Atonement thus:

"It consists in the combination of inflexible righteousness, with its penalties, and transcendent love; thus it means that the world-dualism caused by sin, which issues finally in death, is declared valid, and at the same time the overwhelming reality of the Divine Love is also justified."²

Only in Christ is the Divine Love truly known; only

1. Ibid., p. 519.

2. Ibid., p. 520.

here is it the revealed love, which has broken through all obstacles to reach us. It is characteristic of the mystery of God that it can only be made known through a special revelation. In Christ we know that God is love and nowhere else. Outside of Christ the God who is operative in the world remains the angry God in his "opus alienum". "He who does not believe is condemned already and the wrath of God abideth on him."¹

Objective reconciliation presupposes the subjective; expiation is the presupposition of justifying faith. The Christian faith has always been firmly persuaded that "in Christ" there is forgiveness of sins. The forgiving love of God cannot become real to man without the picture of this event. For describing an objective "breaking through" expressions drawn from trade, such as right of purchase, gain, provision of necessaries, are used. These have an esoteric usage which the mere historian or philosopher cannot understand. In this event forgiveness takes place. This solves the misunderstanding of the Liberals. One comes back to the simple thoughts of Jesus about the divine forgiveness. Forgiveness really happens.

(3) In the Atonement the subjective process is necessary. The objective character of the Atonement does not rule out the necessity for a subjective process but rather is really the aim of the objective. This subjective process means that for man some-

1. John 3:36.

thing needs to be removed and recreated. This may be called reconciliation (atonement) in the narrower sense. The stain of guilt itself must be removed. This first element, therefore, in the act of reconciliation is the knowledge that one's guilt has been purged or that his "sin is covered". In the New Testament language it is expressed by saying the creditor's account is torn up before the eyes of the debtor. A majestic act of God is made known here.

The positive side of the "covering" process is called justification which is the divine declaration that so far as God is concerned there is no longer any obstacle between man and Him. God once more speaks to man in tones of mercy and not of anger. He speaks to man as to one who belongs to Him. Brunner gives this figure:

"Just as the touch of the royal sword transforms a burgher into a noble so the divine declaration of forgiveness raises the sinner into the state of righteousness." 1

It is not because He foresees the final destruction of sin He declares sin is nothing; on the contrary, it is because, by His Word, He cancels the existence of sin, that sin finally must disappear. His Word both creates and renews the life of the world. This Word is Christ.

Thus the central point, where the subjective and the objective aspects of Atonement meet, is this: the Word of divine justification. Just as a word means nothing unless it is heard

1. Ibid., p. 523.

and heard in such a way that it is believed, so is it true in this case. Justification cannot be separated from the "objective atonement", from the expiatory sacrifice of the Mediator. Justification means the objective transaction becomes to man the Word of God. "When I know that God is really speaking to me I believe," says Brunner.

(4) In this subjective experience, the Atonement becomes real. Brunner makes much of the phrase of Irenaeus, "Nostra assumsit, ut conferret nobis sua" (Jesus Christ, in His infinite love has become what we are, in order that He may make us entirely what He is). My self is crossed out, displaced and replaced by Christ, the Divine Word. This is the happy exchange which Luther spoke about. This forms the theme of the Christian message of the Early Church. At this point Brunner quotes from the Epistle to Diognetus and from Gregory of Naziansen to bear out his point. He says these are simply different ways of expressing the Pauline phrase: "Christ Jesus who of God is made unto us wisdom and righteousness". This does not mean that Christ is a merely mystical force. If this were so, this dynamic force would remain relative like all that is dynamic; but "He is my righteousness". This objective attitude is the distinguishing mark of faith. This is peace. It is the objective character of the fact of Christ and of the Word of Christ which gives its character to this subjective experience.

The Christ, who is a historical figure, is the One who

offered His life on the Cross as an expiatory oblation and sacrificed it once for all, is also the One who speaks to man in the intimacy of faith. It is thus that He "dwells" within; it is thus that He is now really our righteousness and our life, insofar as one believes.

Brunner adds this word of explanation:

"As the Mediator, Christ, in His Person and His Work is the unfathomable mystery of God, into which we cannot and ought not penetrate, so also the Atonement in its paradoxical combination of the subjective and objective, of the historical and the present, of the Word and the Spirit, is the unfathomable mystery of God. It is the mystery of the Triune God. That God speaks for us is the mystery of the Son; that He speaks in us is the mystery of the Spirit."¹

(5) Repentance is the presupposition of Atonement. God speaks His Word to man. God gives faith, God's Word is the content. Brunner expresses it this way, "God's speaking in me is the form of faith; but it still remains true, I must believe". In this union of faith, however, God remains God and man remains man. There is no fusion.

It is of course true, that in the last resort even repentance is the work of God and is only fulfilled in faith. It also precedes faith. Repentance is a sense of guilt, the sense of being wrong, the sense of needing God, the feeling of poverty--this constitutes the point of contact for faith. It means openness to God.

Hence repentance is the presupposition of atonement.

1. Ibid., p. 528.

To be willing to repent means that one is willing to make atonement. Whoever will really and truly make atonement will in the future avoid occasions of evil.

The gift of a "broken and a contrite heart" is not bestowed until a man sees that nothing can help him save this one incomprehensible sacrifice. It is only in faith in the Atonement that repentance is completed. To repent means to recognize the necessity for punishment and to be willing to accept it. It was due to Rationalism and still more to Naturalism that these important truths have been obscured for the modern man. The Rationalist Abelard evolved the doctrine and during the period of the Enlightenment the doctrine of Atonement almost entirely disappeared. All these purely subjective systems lack the profound sense of guilt, the earnestness of repentance.

(6) The Atonement is the beginning of redemption. The Atonement is central--it points backward to guilt and the present state of man but it also points forward to realization. It points beyond itself as the Word of perfect restoration and fulfillment. Forgiveness also includes the promise of redemption. The Word of reconciliation would not be the Word of God if it were not the beginning of redemption. Faith is power, energy, the principle of life, the moral power of renewal. The Mediator is the Door. Therefore through this Door one goes into a new world, to the Kingdom of God to perfection.

To emphasize that man possesses God's presence in Christ in a refracted way, Brunner says,

"We perceive the God of Mercy at the place of horror, at the Cross. Therefore, even faith is a kind of possession in the midst of non-possession, certainty in uncertainty, comfort in despair, joyful confidence in repentance, the love of God in the fear of God, the immediacy of God in a wholly mediated manner, the Divine Word, the Word that is near, in the Word of the Scriptures, in a book, in fellowship with other people in the Church." ¹

The Atonement is simply the beginning of Redemption. Redemption is definitely distinguished from everything else which is called by this name. It points to future hope. One can only risk all for hope where he has a certain hope and where his hope includes everything.

Brunner ends his Atonement thought with these words:

"Only the promise of God is Christ, only the hope of real redemption and the certainty of this hope in revelation can loosen the convulsive clutch with which we cling to the valueless present. The Atonement means our redemption and our life, as well as our humiliation and our death. Death and resurrection, judgment and liberation constitute the content of the word of reconciliation." ²

G. Predestination and Freedom of the Will.

Brunner criticizes Calvin's thought very strongly at this point. He said Calvin denied human freedom, but maintained full human responsibility, while at the same time Calvin asserted that God determined all that happens without ascribing to God the

1. Ibid., p. 532.

2. Ibid., p. 535.

origin of evil. Brunner says,

"This is the element in Calvin's thought which is so unsatisfactory, not to say painful and dishonest. He does not admit for a moment that there is an insoluble dilemma here, a paradoxical statement which cannot be regarded as free from contradictions, a statement which includes within itself two opposed assertions, but he proceeds as though everything were in order, while actually he is flying in the face of logic." ¹

In Brunner's thought the answer lies within the paradox for he says there is a determinism from below and also a determinism from above. The determinism from below would extend to the place where man is entirely morally responsible. God's determinism from above would not extend to the place where he is the author of sin. He further states that God limits Himself in order to create room for the creature, for God wills to have a real "counterpart". He makes the two ideas, creation and self-limitation, correlative. Human freedom has real religious significance. God wills and creates free creatures because He desires communion, not unity. He wills to be worshipped in freedom.

If one starts from the point where election and providence are identical, Brunner says he comes to the following conclusion: as those who have been called by God into responsible existence, we know that God's action gives us existence in freedom. We do not know how this happens. We also know that God does not will our sin, but that He does not allow our sin to drive Him out of

1. Emil Brunner, The Christian Doctrine of Creation and Redemption, tr. by Olive Wyon (Phila., The Westminster Press, 1952), p. 172.

our lives. Even as sinners we remain under God's Hand. Our sin does not frustrate His plan. What we have done against His will has already been, from the very beginning, part of His plan. How this can be we do not know. It has no analogies with the world with which we are familiar.

How can causality or determination, and freedom, co-exist? We are faced with an impenetrable mystery of the divine working of Omnipotence. We know both statements are true but to see through this mystery is the prerogative of the Creator. From the standpoint of revelation we must accept both statements; that God rules and directs all things; and that man alone, and not He, is responsible for the evil that he does.

In his commentary, "The Letter to the Romans", Brunner writes briefly concerning Predestination and Election. He says, redemption, like creation, is also quite solely the work of God and derived from His decree, from His free will. Further he adds:

"He makes what he will and how he will, he redeems whom he will and how he will. He is the Lord God, he is the Creator and has claims on his creatures; the creature however has none, not even the least claim on God. God is able to give and to refuse what he will. From the biblical way of thinking about God the concept of the free election of grace is a necessity." ¹

He goes on to say that to have been chosen by God and to share in the salvation is one and the same thing for Paul, citing 2 Thess.

1. Emil Brunner, Letter To The Romans, tr. by H.A. Kennedy (Phila., Westminster Press, 1959), p. 156.

2:13 as proof text. Salvation is being elected, and being elected is salvation. What is more, it means having been elected from eternity.

This electing has become manifest and effective in Jesus Christ. We have been chosen in the Son of God, from eternity, and in Jesus Christ this love of God now apprehends us. In fact, faith is really nothing but to know and receive the eternal election of God in Jesus Christ. The chosen are therefore the same as the believers, the same as those who belong to Christ through faith.

Has God therefore rejected others from eternity? He says the astonishing thing is that neither Paul nor the Bible anywhere draw this conclusion. One does read in the Bible about those whom God has rejected but never about those whom He has rejected from eternity. Brunner points out that the vessels of wrath in Rom. 9 are yet finally to be saved in Rom. 11. He makes this statement:

"In this matter Paul and the entire Bible are consistently illogical. The Scriptures refuse, as it were, to draw the conclusion which logic would like to draw from the concept of eternal election into the opposite direction."¹

He adds that no part of the Bible so closely approximates the thought of the "double decree of predestination" as does Romans chapter nine; and none so closely approaches the doctrine of universal salvation as the end of Romans eleven.

1. Ibid., p. 157.

If one asks why, these chapters in Romans give the answer. Only the believer can know about election. Faith, though being God's gift, is commanded. Man must believe. The Word of Christ is being proclaimed to all nations, with the claim to obedience. What matters most is the decision of faith. If you do not believe, then you alone are to blame for it. But if you believe, then you know it is entirely God's gift, his grace. Since it concerns the decision of faith to receive God's election through faith, the opposite of election is thus never predestination to perdition but unbelief, the possibility brought about by one's own fault and of which one is warned.

Brunner's doctrine of election is very strong and yet one needs to bear in mind his doctrine of man along with it. In his other writings he has said that the origin and meaning of man's existence lie in the love of God. Man has been created in order that he may return the love which the Creator lavishes upon him, as responsive love. Brunner emphatically insists that man is no automaton; he is not like a child's doll, which says "yes" only when it is pressed on the right spot. Self-knowledge and self-determination are the wonderful and dangerous privileges of human existence. Man is the being who understands himself and in this self-understanding decides or determines what he shall do.

Man is not unconditionally autonomous, for his freedom is restricted by the very character of his Self. He is created

in such a way that he cannot cut himself off from God, who is the source and ground of his personality, and life. He is free to choose what his attitude toward God shall be, but he cannot avoid the consequences of his choice.

A final word. In the Divine-Human Encounter, Brunner says,

"The Biblical doctrine of eternal election means nothing more than this that the divine election of man corresponds to the human electing God as Lord. Being known by God is the same thing as being elected and being elected corresponds, like the divine love, to man's love for God."¹

H. Summary.

In Brunner's presentation of the Atonement, the words repeated most often are "real", "actual", and "objective". He is a realist through and through. It was interesting to observe that Brunner quoted more frequently from Luther than from Calvin in this area of his theology.

In contrast to Idealism in every form the Cross must be understood as the Divine Act of Reconciliation. In contrast to Schleiermacher's humanistic religious point of view, the Cross is an actual objective transaction. God has revealed Himself in Christ, but the actual obstacle of guilt stands in the way. Guilt is not concrete, it is something personal, it is the perverted attitude toward God.

1. Emil Brunner, The Divine-Human Encounter, tr. by Amandus W. Loos, (Phila., The Westminster Press, 1943), pp. 52-54.

Sin against God brings a personal reaction of wrath. God's wrath is the negative aspect of the Divine Holiness. Throughout this study one is aware of a high concept of the transcendence of God. As man recognizes the reality of wrath, he sees a great gulf exists between God and him. Forgiveness would mean the removal of the obstacle of sin, the contravention of the logical result of the world law and can take place only as a real divine act. But even then forgiveness would need to be imparted in such a way that the holiness of God, the inviolability of the law, and the logical demands of the penal order would still be maintained. It is through God's majesty, His freedom and generosity that forgiveness as a gift comes to man.

The analogies of satisfaction and sacrifice have an important place in the Atonement, says Brunner. These ideas are decisive in New Testament thought. Brunner is appreciative of Anselm's atonement thought and describes it as "masterful". Yet he deplores the one-sidedness of its exclusive satisfaction emphasis. He said Anselm was faulty in that guilt was regarded as something concrete.

Penalty and guilt ideas are deep-rooted in the knowledge of divine law and yet God cannot repeal His law. The Law is the manifested Will of the Lord God, identical with Himself, and unchangeable.

Sin is an infringement of God's glory, is a reaction

against the order for which man was created and alters the nature of man in that he cannot find his way back to God. Terror strikes the heart--man can only expect ruin.

The forensic expressions such as law, lord, sovereign, serfdom, property, guilt, penalty and judgment denote vital force. Only those who distort the concept of God's Holiness object to their usage. The forensic terms do not express a primitive instinct of revenge but give the law a vital force which rightfully belongs to it. It is God alone, the holy and just Judge, whose punishment is to be feared; only He can meet man and alter the situation. It is just this which the coming of the Son of God does. The actual coming of God, the actual divine transaction at the Cross provides the solution. The Son of God pays the debt which man could not pay. The mystical path, or the way of the Enlightenment would have been cheaper but these are not true to the facts of the case.

The ritual idea is of great significance. It well portrays the thought of the necessary covering of sin and is the reminder that our life is destined for the worship of God. The sacrifice of God's Son removes the existential danger of a broken relation between God and man. Ritual ideas must be held in balance with forensic ideas. This Anselm failed to do.

God is angry. The God who is really angry, really loves. If ever the way to God is reopened, a once for all expiation is the only solution. God alone can expiate. God does more than appear to will the death of the wicked, death is the result unless

something takes place to satisfy divine anger. The equivalent is only to be found in the sacrifice of God's Son. It is God's action, it is a real act of expiation. In the idea of the equivalent sacrifice, one sees something of the extent of the injury to the world order and the quality of the disturbance.

Expiation expresses the love of God. Divine Love is known by the greatness of the resistance which it overcomes. Apart from this event God's Love would simply mean the moral idea of purpose, a concept similar to that of Plato or Aristotle. But here Love is personal. The self-movement of God breaks down the resistance--is this not supreme Love?

The Mediator, the "Nostra Assumpsit" became what we are, in order to make us what He is. This is Irenaeus' doctrine of "recapitulatio" which Brunner wishes to emphatically reemphasize. The Mediator completely identifies Himself with humanity. By a personal, vicarious action, the Mediator suffered the wrath which comes to man from God. Christ acts as both God's representative and as the Second Adam. He is wholly identified with the cause of God and also the ideal man. The meaning of personal surrender as seen in Christ is that of sacrifice and a real surrender of life, of existence, of our life blood, human self-sacrifice for the guilt of others. A close union subsists between the One who suffers and those for whom He suffers. This is very different from the impersonal substitution about which Anselm wrote. God

deals with humanity through the Mediator. God is not clearing up a misunderstanding but is actually dealing with man. This is an action which happened once for all.

Did the Mediator come only in order to die? The action is more than legal transaction, there was active obedience. His was not passive obedience but his great energy denotes extreme effort--a striding towards the goal. It was a divine condescension and thus the Passion.

Reconciliation presupposes enmity on both sides. Man is at enmity with God and God is at enmity with man. The love of God is made known to man through wrath. This revelation of the divine mystery of love in the midst of the reality of wrath is propitiation. Objective reconciliation presupposes the subjective; expiation is the presupposition of justifying faith. In Christ there is forgiveness of sins. The stain of guilt is removed. In the act of reconciliation there is the knowledge that man's guilt has been purged and his sin is covered. The positive side of the covering process is God's declaration that no longer any obstacle exists between man and Him. This is justification.

Repentance is the presupposition of Atonement. Repentance is the sense of being wrong, of needing God and being open to Him. To be willing to repent means that one is willing to make atonement. It is only through faith in the Atonement that repentance is completed.

The Atonement is the beginning of redemption. It points forward to realization. The Mediator is the Door. Through this Door one goes into a new world, to the Kingdom of God to perfection. It points to future hope.

Concerning predestination and freedom of the will, Brunner's thought is in contrast to Calvin's. He says there is a determinism from below and also a determinism from above. Man is entirely morally responsible--God is absolutely sovereign, though not the author of sin. How can causality and freedom co-exist, he asks. It is an impenetrable mystery of the divine working of Omnipotence. Predestination and election are solely the work of God and are derived from His decree. Those chosen by God share in His salvation. Salvation is being elected, and being elected is salvation. It means having been elected from eternity. But scripturally there is no double predestination. Scripture makes no mention of those whom God has rejected from eternity. The opposite of election is unbelief. Eternal election means that the divine election of man corresponds to the human electing of God as Lord.

CHAPTER IV.

CONTRASTS AND SIMILARITIES

CHAPTER IV.

CONTRASTS AND SIMILARITIES.

It was the purpose of this thesis to investigate the writings of Dr. Orton Wiley and Dr. Emil Brunner relating to the doctrine of the Atonement. It has proved an exceedingly valuable study to see the particular points of emphasis of these contemporary theologians. By way of summary, it remains to consider areas of difference and similarity, concluding with a brief evaluation.

A. Basic Differences.

(1) As was seen in the biographical sections, the backgrounds of these two men are entirely different. Wiley, schooled in Arminian dogmatics, follows in the lineage of Wesley, Fletcher, Miley and Pope. He was a college professor and administrator and his writings take the form of the traditional, systematic approach. Brunner received his formal education at a time when religious liberalism was at the height of its influence and he was trained as a liberal. He follows Barth in that his writings are sharply reactionary to all forms of liberalism. Brunner, for many years, was professor at the University of Zurich and his approach to theology is that of a theological professor. He sees the problem through the eyes of an intellectual facing the scientific, humanistic temper of the moderns. Brunner sets his theology in relation to the intellectual needs of those seeking reorientation of modern culture.

(2) Revelation stands between these two men. They are poles apart when it comes to the subject of revelation. Although this subject does not come under direct scrutiny in this study, yet it is important to remember this in reading Wiley and Brunner. Wiley says Christian Theology is based upon the revelation of God in Christ, the record of which, in both its preliminary and its perfect stages, is given in the Scriptures. He makes revelation in its broader sense to include every manifestation of God to the consciousness of man, whether through nature and the course of human history, or through the higher disclosures of the Incarnate Word and the Holy Scriptures. Christ is the supreme revelation of God but both the revelation and the Christian faith are coincident with the Scriptures. Wiley makes this statement:

"But the Holy Scriptures as the true and inerrant record of the Personal Word, and the medium of continued utterance through the Holy Spirit, must in a true and deep sense become the formal aspect of the one true and perfect revelation."¹

It is at the point of Scripture that these two men diverge.

Brunner would not, by any stretch of imagination, make revelation coincident with the Holy Scriptures. While accepting many conclusions of higher criticism, he regards the Bible as being a human word about the Divine Word. He asks the question, "Where can we find correctly the revelation of God?" and the following reply is given:

1. H. Orton Wiley, Christian Theology, Vol. I, p. 125.

"The familiar places of modern philosophy where revelation was vouchsafed are now discovered to be empty of revelation; nature which is itself caught in contradiction of good and evil; and the human soul which is torn between goodness and sin. Only at one point is God revealed: in the person of Jesus Christ, the Saviour. Christ embodies for reason all the difficulties which revelation engenders: paradox, contradiction. But for faith He is the resolution of the paradox, the abolishment of the contradiction."¹

(3) As is to be expected, some of their primary definitions differ greatly. Brunner, within the framework of the Reformed Church and Wiley, a spokesman for the Wesleyan-Arminian position, vary in their definitions. For example see the definitions of "sin" and "faith".

Brunner says sin never becomes a quality or even a substance. Sin is and remains an act. Sin is never a state, but it is always an act. Even being a sinner is not a state but an act, because it is being person. Sin is the act of turning away from God. However, for a fair treatment of this one needs to turn to Brunner's discussion in "Man in Revolt".²

On the other hand Wiley defines sin as existing both as an act and as a state or condition. To him sin is a voluntary separation of the soul from God, a voluntary transgression of a known law. He further explains that guilt is personal blameworthiness which follows the personal act of sin and involves the two-

1. Edwin Ewart Aubrey, Present Theological Tendencies (New York, Harper and Brothers, 1936), p. 97.

2. Emil Brunner, Man In Revolt, tr. by Olive Wyon, (Phila., The Westminster Press, 1947), pp. 145 ff.

fold idea of responsibility for the act, and a liability to punishment because of it.

Concerning faith, Brunner places the doctrine of justification by faith at the center of his thinking. Revelation is the objective aspect of faith. It is that which makes faith possible. So that faith is not generated from within; it is forced upon us from without. Revelation is complete only when a man recognizes Jesus as the Christ. The moment in which this happens, the individual confesses himself a sinner and in the crisis of faith commits himself to the Saviour. This crisis experience on the negative side is the sense of not being at home in the universe, on its positive side is "decision". Man's present existence is an existence-in-decision. Thus faith is defined as decision. Existential thinking, for Brunner is really a synonym for faith. But the way in which the decision comes about is described in "Schicksal und Freiheit" in Neue Schweizer Rundschau, (1938, Heft 9, p. 533, not translated)

" . . . the will of God encounters man, that will which makes absolute claims upon him. From that place where time and eternity meet, an invisible hand stretches out after me, which seizes me, the hand of the Creator, who claims me His creature for himself, and draws me to Him. In this person, Jesus, God himself speaks to me."¹

In contrast to this Wiley says faith is credit given to the truth. It is that principle of human nature which accepts the

1. Paul K. Jewett, Emil Brunner, An Introduction to the Man and His Thought, p. 25.

unseen as existing, and which admits as knowledge that which is received on evidence or authority. It is to believe, to trust. Saving faith is not a different kind but also has a primary element of trust. It is personal trust in a Personal Saviour. The efficient cause is the operation of the Holy Spirit, and the instrumental cause is the revelation of the truth concerning the need and possibility of salvation. Thus there is a divine and a human element in faith. There is a vast difference between the monergism of Brunner and the synergism of Wiley.

(4) Focal Points of Interest are very different. The theology of Brunner has been called a theology of protest. It is a protest against the liberalism of the nineteenth century, against the subjectivism of Schleiermacher, against Ritschl and his school, against the whole movement of the Socinians. He is opposed to all forms of idealism and mysticism and one is continually aware of this slant as he reads "The Mediator".

Wiley is contending against High Calvinism chiefly. In his emphasis upon the love of God as well as the justice of God, in the Godward and manward aspects of the Atonement and in the section on the extent of the Atonement one is particularly aware that the initial issues which caused rupture at the Synod of Dort are still in evidence. The definition of grace, predestination and election is very different from Brunner's. Wiley strongly supports the Remonstrant's side of the debate. These are some

of the areas where basic differences exist in the theology of these two men.

B. Striking Similarities.

(1) It is interesting to find a large place given to the love of God in the Atonement. In earlier treatments this was a forgotten aspect. Hear Wiley as he says, "The atonement is grounded in the nature and claims of the Divine Majesty. The nature of God is holy love". He proceeds at much length to expound this point. Hear Brunner as he says, "The essence of the Gospel consists in this, that here is a real event, a sign of the real gulf between God and man and a sign of the real movement of God, an event which shows up both the seriousness of our position and the unspeakable wonder of the Divine Love." This becomes a major theme of his writing.

(2) Christ provides an objective Atonement. Christ is not clearing up a misunderstanding but actually made full atonement for all human sin. This is prevalent in the thought of both men. A subjective explanation as in the theology of Schleiermacher or Socinius is far from satisfactory to them. Brunner ably sums up this thought by pointing out that something which actually is becomes another kind of reality. Man is guilty in the sight of God and God is holy. There is no other solution on the basis of the "is" than judgment. A real solution, real redemption out of this

situation is only possible by a real alteration in the situation itself, by means of a divine transaction. This is the thing that happens in the coming of Christ, the Son of God. Both men agree that God initiates the action to bring solution. This is the self-movement of God and demonstrates His love. The Atonement is God's method of becoming immanent in a sinful race. God who is transcendent is immanent in Christ. Only Christ could make possible a once-for-all reconciliation. Thus there is agreement in that Christ is an historical figure and it is He who offered His life on the Cross as an expiatory oblation and sacrificed it once for all.

(3) Both men place primary importance upon the vicarious aspect of the Atonement. By vicarious suffering, Wiley means that suffering not only endured for the benefit of others but also that which is endured by one person instead of another. It encompasses both the ideas of substitution and satisfaction. Christ took man's place and accomplished that which man could not possibly do for himself. Satisfaction was rendered by One who was both God and man. His human nature penally suffered; His Divine nature gave infinite worth to the sacrifice. Brunner stresses the personal aspects of vicarious suffering. He says vicarious offering is something entirely personal; it is personal in that dual sense which characterizes the personality of the Mediator. In this process the Mediator is acting vicariously both for man and for

God. These theologians are in agreement here.

C. Attitudes Toward Irenaeus.

Bishop Aulén in his book "Christus Victor" has made a great impact upon the Christian world by once again calling us back to the "Classic Theory" of Irenaeus. It was not long ago that Atonement thought of the Patristic period was passed over lightly as being an untenable ransom approach. Wiley remarks that it was Irenaeus who first taught that Christ actually gave Himself for our sins. Wiley further goes to the pains of quoting this statement from Irenaeus:

"The Word of God (the Logos), omnipotent and not wanting in essential justice, proceeded with strict justice even against the apostasy or kingdom of evil itself redeeming it that which was his own originally, not by using violence, as did the devil in the beginning, but by persuasion, as it became God, so that neither justice should be infringed upon, nor the original creation of God perish."
(Adversus Haereses 1, 1) ¹

Brunner makes the word of Irenaeus the motto of "The Mediator" namely: "Jesus Christ, in His infinite love, has become what we are, in order that He may make us entirely what He is". He places much emphasis upon Christ, the "Nostra Assumsit". Since to be guilty means to come under divine condemnation, Christ comes under condemnation when he becomes what we are. The "recapitulation" idea which is an absolutely evangelical idea, dominates the older patristic literature on the doctrine of the Atonement, says

1. H. Orton Wiley, Christian Theology, Vol. II, p. 233.

Brunner. This is first seen in the writings of Irenaeus and means that in His Son, God entered into human existence by physical union--He plunged into the world of history in all its sin and corruption. Both theologians are agreed upon the importance of Irenaeus, though Brunner gives more space to this than Wiley.

D. Attitudes Toward Anselm.

In all discussion of the Atonement, Anselm has an important place. Both of the theologians do not in any way minimize his contribution to this central doctrine of the Christian faith.

Wiley says:

"The acute and powerful intellect of Anselm possessed that metaphysical intuition which saw both the heart of the atonement and the heart of divine existence."¹

Brunner says:

"The doctrine of Anselm is a magnificent attempt, but it is neither the only possible one nor is it the only attempt which has ever been made to conceive and establish theologically the scriptural idea of the vicarious sufferings of Christ as a sacrifice and as a penalty."²

Wiley notices that it was Anselm who gave the first scientific statement to those views of the atonement, which had been held implicitly by the fathers. Satisfaction to divine justice became the leading formula. The theory of a ransom paid to Satan was laid to rest once for all and forensic terms were given

1. Ibid., Vol. I, p. 237.

2. Emil Brunner, The Mediator, p. 440.

more prominence than expressed by the fathers. The chief fault of Anselm's theory, according to Wiley, is that Christ renders satisfaction to divine justice, not by bearing the penalty of a broken law in the sinner's place, but indirectly by the acquisition of merit. He disagrees with this basic understanding of satisfaction.

As one reads "The Mediator" he cannot but notice Brunner's frequent references to Anselm. Aulén, in making a summation of Brunner's thought, said that Brunner set himself to make to Anselm an act of reparation. Anselm's working out of the idea of the expiatory punishment of sin was an achievement of the first order and it seems to him no accident that the Reformers, notably Calvin carried on the same idea. Aulén further says that Brunner himself wished to follow Anselm's general line of treatment and particularly emphasizes the idea of Law as the foundation on which the doctrine of Atonement must be built--Law is the backbone, the framework, the granite-foundation of the spiritual world.

Brunner's chief complaint with Anselm is not with the forensic ideas. He says these are necessary and a right understanding of them is vital to the doctrine. But Anselm's treatment is so legal and impersonal. At one point he says;

"Guilt, however, is not in any sense something concrete (this may, perhaps, be regarded as the chief error in the doctrine of Anselm); it is something absolutely personal, it is the perverted attitude towards God, therefore it is something absolutely infinite, like the soul, like the

relation to God itself."¹

At another point Brunner refers to Anselm's treatment as profound and masterly but deplores that he emphasized almost exclusively the ideas of satisfaction and penalty. He stresses other ideas have great value, though the question of guilt and deliverance from it ought to stand in the very center of the message.

Brunner further criticizes Anselm at the point of absolute necessity. He says, according to Anselm, the Atonement is deduced as something absolute, which springs out of the nature of God, with reference to His Glory. Brunner regards this as a non-scriptural element in his doctrine. On the other hand the idea that God simply chose to act in this manner is something less than the thought of the Bible. Therefore the idea of relative necessity formulated by Calvin is the right one, in that from the point of view of Christian knowledge of sin we cannot imagine any other possibility of Atonement than that which has actually taken place in Christ.

The Passion of Christ is not a transaction as Anselm indicates, or a method of expiation ordained by God which gains its value from the costly nature of the sacrifice--it is a personal act, says Brunner. It is real, vicarious action where Christ wholly identified Himself with the human race. Again Brunner takes issue with Anselm.

1. Ibid., p. 443.

Both Brunner and Wiley consider Anselm's thought as basic to Christian doctrine but reparation needs to be made. Both agree that Anselm's thought needs to be amplified and so both of them proceed from the satisfaction foundation to construct their revised and augmented versions.

E. Evaluation.

Getting above the liberal dialogue of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries is like coming once again into the clear sunlight after being long under the cloud of subjectivism. The brilliance of Wiley's and Brunner's Atonement thought have helped us realize the true values of objective Atonement. This trend of seeing the old ideas of the meaning of the cross, the ideas for which historic Christianity has consistently stood, is indeed refreshing. It is one of the heartening signs of the times to find these men recapturing the views which are in accord with the New Testament and with Patristic doctrine. The "recapitulatio" of Irenaeus has practical meaning for us today.

In this study it has been seen that there are broad areas of agreement and specific areas of disagreement. In the foregoing section, attention has been called to these. But it is interesting to find that present day writers are going beyond the narrow confines of one particular category of atonement thought. Both Brunner and Wiley range much farther than one of the traditional theories

of the Atonement. It was not very long ago that to hold more than one of the theories was unthinkable. But contemporary thought has gone beyond the limits of one category.

That which Brunner says in his introduction has practical meaning. He says,

"I have nothing new to say; on the contrary, my main concern is to make clear that what is said here has been the faith of the Christian Church from the very earliest days. He adds further, I am more convinced than ever that the world needs nothing so much as the message of Christ, and that the Church needs nothing so urgently as meditation upon this message."¹

To say what he has said as against the background of Schleiermacher and Ritschl, gives great new impetus to the Church and one feels the Church has once again regained her moorings.

Brunner is much enamored with dialectic-existential thought. The impact of Kierkegaard upon his life must have been tremendous. The dialectical method moves from thesis to anti-thesis and then seeks unity of the contradictory factors in the synthesis. Dialectical theology and the theology of crisis begins in a reaction against the ineffectiveness of modern Christianity. It is ineffective because of its unrealistic view of human nature and society, it has a too easy rationality and escapes from the agonizing problems of human experience. Much of this ineffectiveness is resolved by the actual coming of Christ, the deus-homo. Brunner employs the dialectic method in writing and feels that the

1. Ibid., p. 14.

truth must often be expressed in contradictory statements. Some of these examples we have seen. These statements have a synthesis which lies beyond contradiction, but many times the synthesis cannot be expressed. As in the case of God's sovereignty and the freedom of man's will, the synthesis cannot be expressed--the full understanding is left with God.

Concerning our human attempts to give adequate expression to the meaning of the cross Brunner says:

"Every one of them is necessary and illumines the matter anew but none for themselves alone are sufficient and adequate. All these expressions are radii of a circle which point to one center, yet without touching it."¹

Thus Brunner's contribution to present day theology is of tremendous value. However, it is greatly regretted that Brunner's view of revelation leaves so much to be desired. If revelation must have an historical foundation, how do we define its limits if we reject the Gospel tradition as untrustworthy? If he can delete the virgin birth, the empty tomb, the forty-day post-resurrection ministry, and the bodily ascension, where does one draw the line? A full discussion of this problem lies beyond the scope of this thesis. Since Brunner's theology has been described as a "theology on the wing" it is to be hoped that he will yet become convinced that the Bible is normative for theology and the Holy Scriptures are a part of God's revelation to man.

1. Holmes Rolston, A Conservative Looks to Barth and Brunner, p. 125.

Wiley has made an outstanding contribution to present-day theology. His systematic theology is based upon the divinely revealed truths of Scripture. Love, in his understanding of the Atonement, is a key word. This is a most helpful emphasis and one that was neglected by earlier writers. It is to be regretted that one finds an overstress on propitiation to the exclusion of many other valuable aspects of the Atonement. Often one wishes to pull Wiley down out of his ivory tower and away from classical abstractions and bring him to grips with contemporary problems and current trends of thought. Yet principles for practical problems are there if one is patient enough to dig them out. Wiley has a special appeal to all persuaded of unlimited atonement and conditional predestination and those within the Wesleyan-Arminian tradition will regard him as their spokesman for many years to come.

Earlier it was noted that the purpose of theology is to pass into conduct and so transform us into itself. The preaching of the Cross, as defined in these pages, will save theology from the quicksand of subjectivism and from the idolatry of humanism. It is worthy of a valid projection into life. These words will take on new meaning for times such as these:

" . . . God, who hath reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ"¹
" . . . Christ Jesus: whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation"²

1. 2 Cor. 5:18.

2. Rom. 3:24,25.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. Primary Sources.

- Aulén, Gustaf, *Christus Victor*, tr. by A.G. Hebert, The MacMillan Co., New York, 1951.
- Brunner, Emil, *The Mediator, A Study of the Central Doctrine of the Christian Faith*, Eng. tr. by Olive Wyon, The Lutterworth Press, London, 1934.
- Brunner, Emil, *The Christian Doctrine of Creation and Redemption*, tr. by Olive Wyon, The Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1952.
- Brunner, Emil, *The Letter to the Romans, A Commentary*, tr. by H.A. Kennedy, The Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1959.
- Brunner, Emil, *The Divine-Human Encounter*, Eng. tr. by Amandus W. Loos, The Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1943.
- Brunner, Emil, *Man In Revolt*, Eng. tr. by Olive Wyon, The Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1947.
- Wiley, H. Orton, *Christian Theology, Vol. I, Vol. II, Vol. III*, Beacon Hill Press, Kansas City, Mo., 1953.

B. Secondary Sources.

- Arminius, James, *Writings of Arminius, Vol. I, Vol. II, Vol. III*, translated by James Nichols, W.R. Bagnall, Baker House, Grand Rapids, 1956.
- Aubrey, Edwin Ewart, *Present Theological Tendencies*, Harper and Brothers, New York, 1936.
- Calvin, John, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, Library of Christian Classics Vol. XX, Edited by John T. McNeill, S.C.M. Press, London, 1961.
- Gould, J. Glenn, *The Precious Blood of Christ*, Beacon Hill Press, Kansas City, Mo., 1959.
- Grensted, L.W., *A Short History of the Doctrine of the Atonement*, University Press, London, 1920.

- Horton, Walter M., *Contemporary Continental Theology*, Harper and Brothers, New York, 1938.
- Jewett, P.K., *Emil Brunner, An Introduction to the Man and His Thought*, Inter-Varsity Press, Chicago, 1961.
- Manschreck, Clyde Leonard, *Melanchthon The Quiet Reformer*, Abingdon Press, New York, 1959.
- McGiffert, Arthur Cushman, *A History of Christian Thought*, Vol. I, Vol. II, Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1933.
- McGiffert, Arthur Cushman, *Protestant Thought Before Kant*, Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1912.
- Moran, John W., *Catholic Faith and Modern Theologies*, The Hefferman Press, Worcester, Mass., 1948.
- Neve, J.L., *A History of Christian Thought*, Vol. I, Vol. II, The Muhlenberg Press, Philadelphia, 1946.
- Orr, James, *The Progress of Dogma*, Hodder and Stoughton, London, 1901.
- Rolston, Holmes, *A Conservative Looks To Barth and Brunner, An Interpretation of Barthian Theology*, Cokesbury Press, Nashville, 1933.
- Schaff, Philip, *History of the Christian Church*, Vol. I-VI, Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1892.
- Seeberg, Reinhold, *Text Book of the History of Doctrines*, tr. by Charles E. Hay, Baker House, Grand Rapids, 1958.
- Thiessen, Henry Clarence, *Introductory Lectures in Systematic Theology*, Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, 1951.
- The Ante-Nicene Fathers*, edited by Alexander Roberts, James Donaldson, Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, 1951.

C. Theses.

- Brown, John Jackson, Jr., *A Comparative Study of the Views of Calvin and Arminius on the Doctrine of Predestination, in relation to their Doctrines of the Fall and of Grace*, 1934.

Lindholm, Paul R., A Comparative Study of the Conceptions of the Doctrine of the Atonement Taught By Thomas Aquinas and Martin Luther, 1928.

Meeter, Marvin, The Views of the Atonement of Luther and Calvin, 1957.

Rupp, Andrew M., Biblical Authority According to Emil Brunner, 1949.

Saunders, Bertram H., A Comparison of the Positions of Brunner and Warfield Regarding Biblical Revelation and Inspiration, 1952.

Traina, Robert A., The Doctrine of Man in the Writings of Emil Brunner, 1946.

D. Current Periodicals.

Dr. H. Orton Wiley, Herald of Holiness, Nazarene Publishing Co., Kansas City, Mo., October 4, 1961, pp. 11-14.